



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
FEBRUARY 25, 2008
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
10:00 AM

WORK SESSION – 10:00 AM

PAGE #

5 Historic District Guidelines Discussion

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

▪ No Items

ADJOURN

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department, 615-5060, prior to the meeting.

Published: February 23, 2008

Posted: February 22, 2008

WORK SESSION

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



Author: Dina Blaes, Consultant
Subject: Historic District Guidelines
Date: February 25, 2008
Type of Item: Legislative

Planning Department

In an effort to keep the *Design Guidelines* review and comment process on schedule—and as noted in earlier staff reports—this report is organized into three sections: Issues/Topics; HPB Comments; and Timeline.

Section 1: Issues/Topics from previous meetings:

1) Changes to the Design Review Process – Does the HPB support the proposed changes? Specifically, the introduction of an optional Volunteer Peer Review Meeting? The proposed change in the sequence of steps concerning Notice and Decision (LMC 15-11-11)?

- Staff requests a continuation of the discussion (item first discussed at the February 11 HPB meeting) and further direction from the HPB. The following provides a framework for discussion:

Issues raised by HPB & others...

1) Role of HPB in the Design Review Process

a) In general

i. City Council directive

ii. Courtesy notice idea discussed at 28 Jan HPB meeting

b) Current potential for problems w/“guidance” and appeal auth. – D. Blaes

2) Volunteer Peer Review Meeting

a) Making it mandatory rather than voluntary – K. Martz

b) Issues around undermining appeal authority – M. Harrington

3) Certain projects to automatically require more rigorous review process because of their potential for harm to historic resources – P. Putt, K. Cattan & T. Ford

4) Appeal to Planning Director seems redundant and unnecessary– T. Ford

5) Inspection procedures to ensure compliance with approved plans– K. Martz

Also, please review the meeting minutes for a summary of the discussion points raised at the February 11 HPB meeting.

2) The accurate reconstruction of buildings that once existed in Park City? Does the HPB support this policy in general or only in conjunction with panelization?

- Staff requests HPB direction on this issue. We will not be addressing panelization in depth, but rather further clarifying the concept of reconstruction in a historic preservation context.

3) Disassembly/Reassembly (panelization) – HPB has, at previous meetings, expressed the desire for panelization to be considered under extremely limited circumstances.

- Staff will present policy recommendations for consideration and discussion at the March 17 meeting. Roger Evans from the Building Department will participate in this discussion.

4) Residential Infill – The potential conflict between requesting an owner/applicant to determine a style and design in a manner that is true to its architectural elements and details vs. prohibiting and/requiring architectural elements that may dictate the style of new residential buildings.

- Staff will return at a subsequent meeting to discuss this item.

Section 2: Comments on specific sections of the Design Guidelines

On February 25, HPB members will receive a printed copy of the latest iteration of the Design Guidelines. This draft includes the Commercial Infill section and reflects the incidental changes requested by the HPB and staff (Katie Cattan) to date.

Section 3: Timeline & Next Steps

February 27, 2008

Joint Council/Planning Commission/HPB meeting. HPB should participate in

- 1) An update of the review of proposed design guidelines;
- 2) An update on proposed revisions to Chapter 15-2-2 Historic Residential (HR-1) of the Land Management Code – among other changes, these revisions include:
 - a) Building height changes; and
 - b) Establishment of a Volunteer Peer Review Meeting as part of the Design Review Process;
- 3) A discussion regarding applicability of the design guidelines to Historically Significant Buildings located outside the H Zones; and
- 4) A discussion of the proposed two-tiered approach to the design guidelines;

March 17, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session – return to regular meeting schedule

Meeting will include:

- 1) Brief follow up discussion, if necessary, surrounding the policy directives given at the joint Council/PC/HPB meeting on February 27;
- 2) Continuation, if necessary, of the discussion of item 2 from Section 1;
- 3) Discussion of item 3 from Section 1

Roger Evans is scheduled to participate in this discussion in order to bring the perspective of the Building Department.

April 7, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session

Meeting will include:

- 1) Continuation, if necessary, of the discussion surrounding panelization;
- 2) Discussion of residential infill; and
- 3) Review of comments on the Design Guidelines received to date

April 21, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session

Agenda to be determined.

May 5, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session

- 1) Review of Design Guidelines with illustrations & photographs; and
- 2) Review of support documents prepared for staff & public:
Revised Information Guide for Design Review Process

Methodology/approach "instructions" for staff
Existing Physical Condition Report, if applicable
Revised Application Form, if applicable
Public Comment Form, if applicable
Application Certification Letter, if applicable

May 19, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – Public Hearing

- 1) Review and take public comment on proposed Design Guidelines.

June 2, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – Public Hearing

- 1) Resolution to recommend adoption of Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings.

Planning Commission review/ adoption scheduled for June 11, 2008

City Council review/adoption scheduled for June 19, 2008

11 February 2008, 10:00 a.m., City Council Chamber, 445 Marsac Avenue
Park City HPB Meeting

I. Review Memo dated 8 February 2008

II. Two-tiered approach to the guidelines – Does the HPB support this approach?

A) Why did we chose a two-tiered approach

1. Incorporates general principles, rooted in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, that ALL design review applications should meet.
2. Provides methodology for the staff to review applications.
3. Other...

B) What are the benefits of the two-tiered approach?

1. Sum of the parts. The parts may seem compatible, however when put together, they don't quite hit the mark. Universal guidelines give a framework or context for evaluating the solutions proposed under the specific guidelines.
2. Alerts the applicants of the overarching principles up front and makes them part of the application process instead of just a non-binding statement.
3. Other...

C) What are the disadvantages of the two-tiered approach?

1. Quite different than what you have been doing up to now.
2. Requires the Planning staff to look at the bigger picture while also requiring "checklist" of individual elements – going to take some getting used to.
3. Other...

III. Application of design guidelines to Historically Significant buildings located outside the historic districts – Does the HPB support this approach?

A) What does this mean?

1. Regulatory impact on owners of HS buildings located outside the historic Districts;
2. Planning Department work load – potential to increase the number of resources that will require greater level of review than before.

B) How many buildings out of the 400+ designated buildings are outside these boundaries?

C) Current Authority of Design Guidelines

LMC 15-11-10 HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES. The Historic District Design Guidelines shall apply in all zones within the Historic District, which are designated throughout this Code by the Use of the word "Historic" in the Zoning District name, or the letter "H" in the abbreviation of that name.

III. Proposed changes to the Design Review Process – More clearly articulate concerns in preparation for joint PC, HPB, City Council meeting on 27 Feb 2008.

A) Current process – Note LMC is supplemented by Information Guide titled, *Design Review Process for Properties in the Historic District*

15-11 -11. HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN REVIEW.

(A) The Planning Department shall review and approve, deny, all Historic District design review Applications associated with a Building Permit to build, locate, construct, remodel, alter or modify any Building, Structure, Site, or other visible element, including but not limited to, signs, lighting fixtures, and Fences located within the Park City Historic District.

- (1) The Owner and/or Applicant for any Property shall be required to submit an Historic District design review Application for proposed work requiring a Building Permit in order to complete the work.

(2) Planning Department staff shall review all Historic District design review Applications, including those associated with an Allowed or Conditional Use, which upon determining compliance with the guidelines, shall be approved by the department staff without HPB review or hearing.

(B) **NOTICE.** Prior to taking action on any Historic District design review Application, the Planning staff shall provide notice pursuant to Section 15-1-20 of this Code.

(C) **DECISION.** Upon taking action on the Application, the Planning Department staff shall make written findings, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval, if any, supporting the decision, and shall provide the Owner and/or Applicant with a copy.

(D) **APPEALS.** The Owner, Applicant, or any Person with standing as defined in Section 15-1-18(D) of this Code, may appeal any Planning Department staff decision made on a Historic District design review Application to the Planning Director. All appeal requests shall be submitted to the Planning Department within ten (10) days of the decision. Notice of all pending appeals shall be made by staff pursuant to Section 15-1-20 of this Code. The scope of review by the Director shall be the same as the scope of review at the staff level.

(1) In those cases, the Director shall either approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the proposal based on written findings, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval, if any, supporting the decision, and shall provide the Owner and/or Applicant with a copy.

(2) Any Director decision may be appealed to the HPB. Appeal requests shall be submitted to the Planning Department within ten (10) days of the Director's decision. Notice of all pending appeals shall be made by staff pursuant to Section 15-1-20 of this Code. The scope of review by the HPB shall be the same as the scope of review by the Director.

(3) Any HPB decision may be appealed to the Board of Adjustment pursuant to Section 15-10-7 of this Code. Appeal requests shall be submitted to the Planning Department within ten (10) days of the HPB decision. Notice of all pending appeals shall be made by staff pursuant to Section 15-1-20 of this Code. Appeals shall be considered only on the record made before the HPB.

B) Proposed process – See pages 17-22 in the *27 January 2008 Draft* of the Design Guidelines

- 1) Step 1: Pre-application – contact the Planning Department
- 2) Step 2: Document Existing Conditions – Historic & Non-Historic
- 3) Step 3: Voluntary Peer Review Meeting
- 4) Step 4: Application Submitted and Certified
- 5) Step 5: Public Comment Period
- 6) Step 6A: Compliance with Design Guidelines – Approval
- 7) Step 6B: Non-Compliance with Design Guidelines – Denial
 - A. Appeals
 1. To Planning Director
 2. To HPB
 3. To BOA
- 8) Step 7: Following Approval – Building Department

C) Issues raised by HPB & others...

- 1) Role of HPB in the Design Review Process
 - a) In general

- i. City Council directive
- ii. Courtesy notice idea discussed at 28 Jan HPB meeting
- b) Current potential for problems w/“guidance” and appeal auth. – D. Blaes
- 2) Volunteer Peer Review Meeting
 - a) Making it mandatory rather than voluntary – K. Martz
 - b) Issues around undermining appeal authority – M. Harrington
- 3) Certain projects to automatically require more rigorous review process because of their potential for harm to historic resources – P. Putt & K. Cattan
- 4) Appeal to Planning Director seems redundant and unnecessary– T. Ford
- 5) Inspection procedures to ensure compliance with approved plans– K. Martz
- 6) Other...

ADJOURN