

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 1, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Puggy Holmgren, Randy Scott, Douglas Stephens, Jack Hodgkins

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

Director Erickson announced that Anya Grahn would be conducting the HPB meetings in addition to being the project planner on specific agenda items.

Chair White remarked that at the last meeting he requested that the Board consider nominating a new Chair. He noted that it was on the agenda for this evening.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox nominated Douglas Stephens as Chair of the Historic Preservation Board. Cheryl Hewett seconded the motion.

Mr. Stephens accepted the nomination.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox nominated Puggy Holmgren as Vice-Chair of the Historic Preservation Board. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

Ms. Holmgren accepted the nomination.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Stephens assumed the Chair.

Chair Stephens noted that Randy Scott was the new Board member on the HPB and he asked Mr. Scott to briefly introduce himself.

Mr. Scott stated that he is a Park City Old Town resident living on Park Avenue. He was also as new member of the Board of Trustees for the Historical Society

and Museum. Mr. Scott remarked that he has a deep passion for not only Park City, but the civic responsibility they all carry. He has a true passion for maintaining Park City's history.

Chair Stephens thanked Mr. Scott for volunteering to serve on the HPB.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

December 7, 2016

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of December 7, 2016 as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn reported that she had emailed the Board members to let them know that the RFP was available for the artist to do the artwork for this year's preservation award.

Planner Grahn stated that as the Chair, Mr. Stephens needed to sign the Certified Local Government (GLC) Grant. She noted that the grant would be used this year and through 2018 for memberships. They will do a study on character zones, expanding the boundary of the 1978 National Register District, and paying for the preservation consultant that helps with the Design Review Team meetings every Wednesday.

CONTINUATIONS - (Public hearing and Continue to date specified).

336 Daly Avenue – Relocation – Significant Garage and Chicken Coop. The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing historic garage and chicken coop to the south side of the property.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 336 Daly Avenue to a date uncertain. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1063 Empire Avenue – Material Deconstruction – Significant designation. The applicant is proposing a remodel restoration: Secure existing structure for lifting; build new concrete foundation with basement and garage additions; re-position and anchor home on new foundation; restoration/renovation of historic home with a rear addition.

Planner Grahn noted that she would be reviewing the application for Ashley Scarff, the project planner, who was not able to attend this evening.

Planner Grahn reported that in 1892 the pyramid roof cottage was constructed. She presented the 1892 Sanborn map which showed how the structure looked at that time. A full-width front porch wrapped around on to the south and there was an L-shaped addition. The L-shaped addition was removed by 1907, but the shape of the house remained the same through 1941. Planner Grahn referred to the historic photos included in the Staff report, and noted changes that occurred between the 1940s tax photograph to 1981. The north half of the porch was enclosed, the entry door was moved to south wall, the vertical siding was replaced that was possibly hiding some type of foundation, and a new concrete foundation was poured. By 1995, the porch that had wrapped around to the side was enclosed. The window openings were replaced with new vinyl windows.

Planner Grahn commented on the material deconstruction. The first was that the house would be lifted and raised two feet in order to pour a new concrete foundation. The next step would be to remove the porch enclosure and restore the full width of the front porch. Next would be to restore the window openings. Planner Grahn explained that when the side wrap around porch was enclosed, the space became interior living space. Rather than to restore the original window opening, the applicant was proposing to shift the window opening over slightly in order to maintain the same appearance shown in the tax photo.

Planner Grahn understood that it was unusual not to restore the original window opening, but the intent was to keep the visual asymmetry of the house.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the comments regarding door openings also included the garage door opening. Planner Grahn replied that they could discuss the garage door opening; however, at this point they were only talking about the windows.

Board Member Scott understood that the old vinyl windows were being replaced. He assumed that when the windows are replaced it would be to the ratio of

normal historic windows. Planner Grahn stated that the windows would be restored to the appearance shown in the historic photograph. Any new windows installed on a historic structure are required to be wood. Aluminum clad windows are allowed on an addition to the historic structure or on the basement level.

Chair Stephens asked Planner Grahn to identify which window would be moved slightly from its original location; and he asked why it was not being put in the same place.

Jonathan Gray, the project architect, explained that the symmetry of the pyramid roof over the form below with the old porch before it was filled in cut that back. Looking at it as a single unit, placing the window further to the left would bring back a symmetrical appearance to the front of the house and balance those two windows. Chair Stephens asked if the porch on the south side created the change. Mr. Gray answered yes.

Board Member Hodgkins commented on garages in general and how they allow the garage entrance to be at the front of the house, which significantly changes the historic feeling and the façade. Whether or not the windows are historic, he thought they need to recognize that the façade of the house with the garage underneath it significantly alters the original look of the house. Even if the house is only raised two feet, it requires significant changes to the landscaping, and the house looks a story taller than it did originally. Board Member Hodgkins believed the addition of the garage was the piece that detracts from the historic nature. He thought the infill of the porch and not having the garage was closer to the original design than what was being proposed.

Chair Stephens stated that if the window was not going back to its historic location, it somehow needs to be documented on the building. He asked if that was an issue for concern. Mr. Stephens pointed out that if it was being moved to make it more symmetrical, he would not want to make it worse by having seams in the siding.

Mr. DeGray realized it was an unusual situation. He would be more comfortable leaving it in its original location and leaving the seam in the siding on the front as it is, rather than trying to move it over. Chair Stephens clarified that he was not opposed to moving the window, but he was struggling with how to deal with this type of situation in the future because it would set a precedent.

Chair Stephens agreed with Board Member Hodgkins regarding the garage doors.

Board Member White asked for the location of the garage door in relation to the porch and the front of the house. Mr. DeGray replied that the garage door is set back at the wall of the building and it would create a shadow line. Mr. White

noted that landscaping would mitigate the garage door. Mr. DeGray pointed to the east elevation and noted that the walls were at their tallest point at the porch to support the porch, but the walls diminish as they get closer to the street because the slope of the grade comes down to the street level. At that point he estimated a height of three or four feet.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the house was already high. Mr. DeGray answered yes. It is an uphill house and there are steps that lead up to the main level. He explained that the adjustment in elevation is within the two foot allowed by Code, but it is minimal and would allow for the driveway to be flat going into the house. Mr. DeGray stated that very little adjustment is needed to make the garage work.

Chair Stephens believed the primary issue was the garage and moving the house. However, it is next to the 11th Street stairs and there was little or no opportunity to come into the house from that side. He suggested that the Board discuss the other items and come back to the garage.

Planner Grahn commented on replacing the existing vinyl window, as well as the proposed window and door changes. She noted that the portion of the porch that was enclosed is a non-historic addition. The applicant was proposing to remove those windows and doors and add French doors and a new window.

Planner Grahn stated that the non-historic wood deck on the south side would be reconstructed. It is not historic but the applicant would like to keep it; and it does not take away or detract from the historic building.

Planner Grahn commented on the removal of a non-historic rear concrete addition. It appears that at some point a shed roof addition was added across the back, and it was probably extended in the 1950s or 1960s and it was filled in with concrete blocks. The applicant was proposing to remove it in order to accommodate the new addition. As part of the rear addition, approximately 16 feet of the historic wall would be removed along the historic shed roof addition. It would also go on to the roof and replace the dormer, which is also not historic and was likely built in the 1980s.

Planner Grahn stated that the next item was removal of the historic chimney. There was not a photo of the chimney, but Planner Grahn believed it was at the center of the flag portion of the pyramid roof.

Planner Grahn stated that the houses they have looked at in the past have usually been cross wings. When they talk about chimneys they usually try to preserve the one that is more on the front part of the house that can be seen from the street. If there is a secondary chimney it is on the back and usually served a kitchen or a wood stove and was not meant to be seen from the street.

Planner Grahn stated that the chimney on this house is unusual because it is one of the first pyramid roof houses they have looked with this configuration where the chimney is centered on the flat portion of the roof. She remarked that in some cases the applicants were asked to reconstruct the chimney using the existing brick just to maintain the historic chimney; and in other cases the chimney was removed because it was secondary and the chimney on the primary façade was restored. The applicant was requesting feedback from the HPB regarding the chimney.

Chair Stephens thought the chimney should be reconstructed and restored to be consistent with has been done in the past. He assumed the chimney would not be functional, in which case they could restore just the visible portion.

The Board concurred with Chair Stephens regarding the chimney.

Planner Grahn stated that the last item for discussion was the non-historic concrete wall that was added in the 1980s. A portion of the wall would have to be removed in order to get the garage underneath that portion of the house. She reiterated that the wall is not historic and does not contribute to the historic integrity of the site.

Board Member White Hodgkins recalled an earlier photograph that showed a different wall. He assumed that historically there was a wall there. Planner Grahn agreed that an earlier photos show some type of a railroad tie retainer. By 1995, photos showed the concrete wall that exists today.

Board Member White asked if the applicant was planning to repair the wall and then face it with stone. Mr. DeGray replied that because it was not a historic wall they were planning to replace it with a stone veneer wall. That was proposed on the HDDR drawings.

Chair Stephens commented on a home on Lower Park Avenue that was restored but did not have a garage. He asked if the owner chose not to do a garage or if it was impossible to have a garage. Planner Grahn stated that under the LMC, historic properties are exempt from the parking requirement in an effort to encourage good preservation. New houses and new construction need to provide two parking spot, and parking is a luxury for historic houses. Planner Grahn stated that a couple of things are challenging on Park Avenue. One is meeting setbacks and the other is not being able to go underground because Park Avenue is in the flood plain and a basement is not possible. In addition, because of the topography, digging deep under the house would not be allowed on a flat lot. Hillside lots work better for a garage because they become a basement and they are mostly concealed except for the garage door.

Planner Grahn remarked that some of the other issues on Park Avenue tend to be the setback and the relationship on the street. There is usually not an opportunity to put an accessory structure at the front of the house or to add an addition to the front of the house because it would detract from the historic look. Planner Grahn knew of a few cases on Park Avenue where lots were bought so the front of the house is on Park Avenue and the back of house is on Woodside, which can accommodate a garage. Chair Stephens recalled a number of houses on Daly Avenue that were raised and a garage was placed underneath.

Chair Stephens asked about the Design Guidelines that minimize the impacts of the garage door. Director Erickson referred to Section D-4.2 of the existing Design Guidelines, which addresses garage underneath structures. They also went through a photographic study that Planners Grahn and Tyler had put together when they started on the revisions to the Historic District Guidelines; and they talked about the effect of garages and the effects of retaining walls regarding the garages. During that discussion there was no talk of not doing the garage. The discussion was whether it was right or wrong and the effect of the garage door. Director Erickson stated that he and Planner Grahn believe that the City should do nothing that penalizes the historic homeowner's opportunity to redevelop. It is a balance of historic preservation and not penalizing the owner of a historic home. Done correctly, they would allow the less than two-foot height raising of a building on the uphill side, and the proper shadow lines on the garage door. That was the philosophy behind how the design guidelines were set up.

Planner Grahn pointed out that the revisions that were made a year ago with the garage study have not been approved by City Council. Therefore, they were still working with the Design Guidelines that are currently in effect.

Chair Stephens clarified that the Staff thought this met the Design Guidelines. Planner Grahn answered yes. She believed the applicant had done a good job in meeting the Design Guidelines. She noted that this is a Significant home and it is not eligible for the National Register. For that reason, they have more flexibility than they would if it were a Landmark house because a garage beneath a Landmark house could take away its National Register listing. Planner Grahn noted that in this case, the basement addition does not extend beyond the wall planes. The porch will cantilever over the garage wall, which will help create a shadow line and minimize its appearance. She stated that the site will be regraded after construction of the addition. The garage door measures 9' x 9' which keeps that small scale.

Director Erickson stated that the other conclusions resulting from their discussions was that the retaining walls in front of these houses not related to the garage were more impactful than the garage itself. He noted that the Staff was comfortable in this case.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood why the applicant wanted to make the two windows symmetrical. She did not have a strong opinion either way and she was fine with either moving the window or leaving it where it is. Ms. Beatlebrox noted that the door was already off center, and she was delighted that the applicant wanted to restore the porch.

Board Member Holmgren was comfortable with what was proposed. Board Member Hodgkins did not have further comments. Board Member White was comfortable with the proposal, including the garage door. Board Member Hewett had no further comments. Board Member Scott liked what was proposed.

Planner Grahn stated that a motion should include a condition of approval that requires the applicant to restore the historic chimney in its original location.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to proceed with three conditions; 1) that the Chimney is restored to visual approval that meets the historic guidelines; 2) that moving of the window is allowed per the drawings; and 3) the garage with the setbacks and dimensions is allowed, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1063 Empire Avenue

1. The property is located at 1063 Empire Avenue, Lot 1 of the Floden Subdivision.
2. The historic site is listed as Significant on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Sources list conflicting dates of construction of the single-family dwelling, but the original owner purchased the property in 1892. The Summit County Recorder lists the date of construction as 1904.
4. The pyramid house has largely retained its original form, with minor additions made over time.
5. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
6. The Historic Sites Form notes the Era of Significance as the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

7. On August 15, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1063 Empire Avenue. The application was deemed complete on August 29, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.

8. The applicant is proposing the following Material Deconstruction: Demolition of nonhistoric foundation elements, restoration of full-width front porch with restoration of street-facing entryway and original roof form, reconstruction of non-historic wood deck, restoration of original window and door openings, removal of non-historic rear addition, removal of rear dormer and portion of historic walls, removal of historic chimney, and cutting of concrete retaining wall.

9. Staff finds that the pre-1981 concrete foundation is non-contributory to the historic integrity of the historic house and the material deconstruction is required for the rehabilitation of the building.

10. Staff finds that the ca. 1981 enclosure to the north of the front porch is noncontributory to the historic integrity of the Significant house, and the material deconstruction is required for the restoration of the original full-width porch.

11. Staff finds that the material deconstruction of the current windows and doors is required for the successful restoration and renovation of the building. The addition of the French doors on the south side of the house is beyond the midpoint of the historic house and will not be visible from the right-of-way; staff finds that this proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

12. Staff finds that the non-historic deck is non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the site, and the proposed exterior change will not destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property that are compatible with the historic site.

13. Staff finds that the non-historic rear addition is non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.

14. Staff finds that the material deconstruction outlined above is required for the proposed renovation and rehabilitation of the building, structure, or object. Additionally, the proposed scope of work mitigates, to the greatest extent practical, any impacts that would occur to the historical significance and architectural integrity of the building.

15. Staff finds that the proposed exterior changes should not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible

with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

16. Staff finds that the non-historic concrete retaining wall is non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site, and removing a portion of it to accommodate a driveway is necessary for the rehabilitation of the home.

Conclusions of Law – 1063 Empire Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding historic structure deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 1063 Empire Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 3, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Project Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Project Planner.

3. Any deviation from approved Material Deconstruction will require review by the Historic Preservation Board.

4. The historic chimney shall be restored in its original location.

WORK SESSION – Discussion only, no action taken

Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites

Planner Grahn stated that an objective this year was to look at new guideline revisions for both residential and commercial buildings. She and Planner Tyler have spent a lot of time looking at what other cities do, how they handle infill and look at things. They were bringing it to the HPB for input to gauge the direction they should be taking. Planner Grahn pointed out that Park City does not want to

be Williamsburg; but not so loose that they lose the integrity and character of the District, or lose the National Register nominations.

Planner Grahn stated that before looking at other cities, she did a wrap-up of what they have in Park City. The biggest styles are the hall-parlor, the crosswings, and the pyramid roof cottages. All three were different styles of Victorian architecture. A number of the details seen around town that existed historically were made possible because the railroad came to Utah. They could be mass produced either in the East and brought out, or the equipment was brought to Utah so they could be built.

Planner Hannah Tyler stated that another, but less prominent style of architecture found in Park City, is the crossman style. The typical forms are the front gable, clipped gable or the hip roof. Some of the defining features are short and square columns, deeper overhangs with boxed or enclosed eaves, and prairie inspired windows and doors.

Planner Grahn commented on the A-frame structures. After World War II, as the car became more accessible to Americans, people spent their leisure time at a vacation house. The A-frames were easy to construct and many were built throughout Park City starting in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Planner Tyler stated that the Design Review Team gets a lot of proposals for Mountain Modern structures. The structures are boxy and have sharper angles, and most have a flat roof. There is also more glass than what was seen historically, as well as a combination of materials that often articulate the different modules that were connected to make the larger structure.

Planner Grahn presented examples of architecture from four different communities; 1) Williamsburg, VA; 2) Breckenridge, CO; 3) Madison IN; 4) Telluride, CO; and 5) George Washington University Neighborhood, Washington DC. Williamsburg was an actual living city and the residents were moved out. Anything that was not a 17th or 18th Century building was demolished. Stringent design guidelines require that any structure built in the Old Town area had to look like pre-Revolutionary or Revolutionary War era architecture.

Planner Tyler noted that Breckenridge was not as stringent as Williamsburg, but they definitely have a much more conservative approach to historic preservation than Park City. Breckenridge encourages infill that mimics much of the historic materials and mass and scale of the historic structures. They would like the historic details to be brought into the new infill. Breckenridge also encourages modules. The Staff has explored that for Park City as they look at new construction to encourage smaller pieces that are pieced together to make a larger house. The smaller pieces help maintain the mass and scale of the historic structures throughout the District.

Planner Grahn stated that Madison, Indiana is one of the most beautiful cities along the Ohio River. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2006, which is an even bigger honor than being on the National Register. Madison Indiana has many 19th and early 20th Century buildings. The examples she chose to show this evening were more in scale with the time that Park City was developed. Planner Grahn stated that Madison hones in on compatibility as being scale, height, materials, orientation, shape, placement, rhythm and pattern of openings; so it relates to the historic district overall, but it clearly reads as being a new building.

Planner Tyler stated that Telluride has the same issues as Park City in terms of being a mountain town. They are not as strict as Breckenridge, but they focus on infill that adds to the overall visual continuity of the District. Telluride looks at the similar features of a building, such as traditional historic scale, pedestrian oriented design, setbacks, mass and scale, simple forms, materials. Planner Tyler remarked that their infill is new, but it strongly reflects the mass and scale, proportions and form of the historic structures. They would like to adopt elements of the historic structure and apply them in a more modern fashion. Planner Tyler stated that this was more the direction they would recommend for Park City.

Planner Grahn presented a photo of an addition in the George Washington University Neighborhood in Washington, DC. She noted that the building to the left was built in 1926. The addition on the right was built in 1984. She stated that Washington DC is good at their design guidelines, but their idea of compatibility is more about location, size, materials, and overall appearance. They want to make sure that their historic buildings can be rehabilitated and reused. Planner Grahn pointed out the number of changes to the building that deviated from the historic. She asked the Board members for feedback on this approach.

Board Member Hodgkins did not believe it was that different from the example photos they showed from Telluride. It looks of its time period. He thought the question was whether in 15 years, people would still want whatever they approve now.

Board Member Scott stated that in the 1980s the design elements strayed from what was normally seen. He could definitely see a difference in the Telluride example with the materials, but the size and scale seemed relatively consistent. He favored Telluride's approach.

Director Erickson referred to the Washington DC photo. He remarked that the Staff thought it went too far because the '80s becomes too stylized. It was easy to recognize the new period by the half windows. That is not the intent of the Guidelines. The Guidelines intend to illustrate that the new construction is not

the historic construction, but not make it so iconic that it becomes a style unto itself. Since he and Planners Grahn and Tyler are more historic district preservationists, rather than strict icon preservationists, they are more concerned about rhythm and scale and reducing the icon of new construction.

Board Member Scott stated that going back to the beginning of the presentation where they showed glass structures and straight and flat roofs, he believed it would be a short period of time before Park City will be able to say they know when that was built because of the style. Director Erickson agreed. Using 1134 Lowell as an example, he noted that because of the nature of Lowell, the contemporary design sticks out because of the mass and scale; not necessarily because of the materials. It dates itself differently than the district they were trying to protect.

Planner Grahn stated that in looking at the different communities, and listening to feedback from the HPB as they went through the design guidelines for historic structures, she presented how they should proceed. Using infill that has a traditional form, such as a crosswing or pyramid roof, they should be using more modern materials because that will help it be more distinct than the historic pyramid roof next door. If using a more modern form, it should be toned down by using more traditional materials because it helps it blend in with the district.

Planner Grahn noted that last year they talked at length about compatibility and determined that it was mass, scale, the shape or form of the building, and using modules. She believed there is a time and place for flat roofs. Based on feedback from the HPB, it should not be the primary roof form, but if it is, it should not be as visible from the street because it sets the tone. Planner Grahn stated that they will look at that further as they go through the LMC revisions for flat revisions.

Planner Grahn stated that the ratio of openings to solids needs to be consistent with historic structures. Walls of glass will detract from adjacent historic buildings. They want to encourage porches as a traditional form of development, and helps bring these building to relate more to the streetscape. Stepping uphill or downhill as necessary, particularly on new construction and infill on Main Street.

Planner Grahn asked if the HPB agreed with the Staff proposal or whether they had missed something.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it assumed that any location within Old Town should be treated similarly. He recalled the study about different zones and what was more common in certain areas within the town. Mr. Hodgkins stated that he would like to keep the characteristics that they discovered were common within those locations and created those zones within Old Town remain distinctive and

not just have something written where anyone can do the same thing in any location. Planner Grahn stated that they were having a consultant put together a character zone study that will help define those character defining features in each neighborhood, and lay those on top of the guideline revisions.

Director Erickson thought it was a valid suggestion and asked if the Board concurred that it was better to individually address each of the neighborhood character zones. He believed it would help tell the story they were trying to tell by maintaining the character and not being so linear in their analysis. Director Erickson noted that they were taking cues from the Denver historic districts and their character zones. They were also taking cues from Minneapolis. If the rest of the Board was comfortable with that, the Preservation Staff could make it work. The Board concurred.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted from the presentation that Breckinridge said has said that two approaches to choosing an appropriate style may be considered. The first approach is to distinguish old buildings from new one by variations in their architectural character. The second approach strives to blend the new with the old by using the historic styles of the District. Ms. Beatlebrox found it interesting because it gave a lot of leeway to do one or the other to avoid just cookie cutter and imitation. There leeway for things to be distinguished. She liked the idea of two approaches.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed because it also allows the homeowner to have some kind of leeway and to keep structures built in the same time period from looking the same.

Board Member Hewett remarked that Park City errs on the side of avoiding duplication. She believed there was so much variation because many of the houses have been changed since they were first built. She thought very few houses look identical. Ms. Hewett did not share the same concern about ending up with copycat rebuilds if everyone has the opportunity to make things look more historic. She agreed that allowing more flexibility would be good. Ms. Hewett used the example of orientation, which is so restrictive that very little ornamentation is allowed because it was not part of the historic periods.

Board Member Holmgren liked the idea of the neighborhood zones because some places in Old Town are very different from other places. When she used to walk her dogs she was genuinely shocked at the difference between Woodside and Empire.

Director Erickson stated that they talk about wanting to make sure that the new infill can be distinguished from the historic, but the new is not disruptive to the neighborhood. They want to give flexibility in historic preservation without

disrupting the overall neighborhood character. “Distinguish not disruptive” are the watch words.

Chair Stephens thought Director Erickson made a good point. He understood that the objective this evening was for the HPB to provide direction. He asked if the Staff felt they were given adequate direction from their comments.

Planner Grahn stated that when they come back next month with Design Guideline revisions for new construction on residential properties, they will include the highlights of their conversation this evening to see how they were reflected in the guidelines and whether they need to be altered.

Chair Stephens thought it was important to encourage design with the values that Director Erickson had outlined.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that as they look at historic homes and have the guidelines where the historic home is usually street fronted and there is transitional element and more volume in the back, he asked if the new guidelines would keep that similar pattern. In looking at the historic streetscape, they should want the smaller volumes of the houses that are closer to the street to keep the same rhythm and pattern.

Planner Grahn agreed. She thought the LMC does a good job of that for uphill lots because it requires a step at 23 feet. They will definitely look at incorporating his suggestion into the guidelines, because a lot of it will have to do with the perceived mass and scale of a neighborhood.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to page 37 of the Staff report regarding Telluride, which talks about providing open space in commercial projects that will be perceived as a public amenity. She knows there is not as much room in Old Town as there is in Telluride, but it is nice to have open space as a public amenity. She used the corner of Heber and Main as an example. Ms. Beatlebrox was unsure if that could be done in Park City, but was struck by that as a guideline.

Chair Stephens called for public input.

Ron Whaley stated that in 1982 he was on the Historic District Commission doing exactly what they were doing this evening. He was struck by the virtual similarity between the conversation of 1982 and the conversation this evening. Mr. Whaley commented that the character of zones and the underlying lots in conjunction with the underlying topography. For example, going up Daly Avenue, the accessory buildings on the left-hand side are out in front because they are accessible. The houses are in the back because that is where they had to go because of the lot limitations. He noted that there is a creek coming down Daly

Avenue, but the homes were built behind the creek. Therefore, there is the road, the creek, and then the structures. The creek flooded in 1984 and was thereafter was culverted. The position of those homes based on the hillside, the creek, and the dedicated road. What appears to be a neighborhood by design was a neighborhood built by where building could occur and why. Mr. Whaley stated that that portion of the subdivided Park City happened well after the typical 25' x 75' lot. He remarked that there was an underlying matrix of different lot sizes, couple with the street, the old stream and the hillside. It is different on the right side of the street where there are extreme physical constrictions from the hillside. Mr. Whaley stated that the rolling history of the town was in time and geography. What they see as a neighborhood was largely there by virtue of the landscape and the time that they built.

Sean Kelleher, a resident at 409 Echo Spur, stated that he was the developer of the project at Echo Spur. Mr. Kelleher thanked Anya, Hannah and Bruce Erickson for bringing together a number of people in town to talk about some of these issues. He stated that Echo Spur was not happenstance. When they started to work on that project a few years ago, they came to the Planning Department and asked what they wanted to see. The project is in the HR-1 zone and is not considered infill. The houses to the west are Ontario in HR-1. To the east is not HR-1, and it is more of a 1990s type of development. There are more historic homes closer to Deer Valley Drive. Mr. Kelleher stated that even though it was not infill, the project was new and wide-open slate. In conversations with Planning, they wanted something that was more mountain modern, and they discussed what might or might not work. They were looking for good houses that met the general plan guidelines, but was also in line with what Planning wanted. Mr. Kelleher commented on the number of flat roofs around Old Town. Mr. Kelleher stated that in his project they also considered issues of sustainability, storm water management and other things that benefit from having a flat roof. There is less runoff with flat roofs and as the snow melts it is stored on the property. Mr. Kelleher stated that he wanted to take a pragmatic approach with his project at the time for what they thought was the right way to do it, and they came up with that concept.

Cindy Matsumoto did not object to flat roofs on Echo Spur, but she found the flat roof on 1131 Lowell to be disruptive. As they move forward, she would like to limit where flat roofs are allowed. She finds them disruptive to the rhythm of the street. Ms. Matsumoto could see where flat roofs might have a place in other neighborhoods, but not on Old Town streets.

Chair Stephens close public input.

Planner Grahn stated that a few months ago they were looking at applications coming forward and what the Planning Department was currently working on. In the past the staff would provide a quarterly list of ongoing or active Historic

District Design Review and the pre-historic District Design Review Applications. Louis Rodriguez had prepared a list that was given to the Board members this evening. Director Erickson noted that 146 permits were either in process or were processed in 2016.

Annual Legal Training on Open Public Meetings Act

Assistant City Attorney McLean conducted the annual legal training on the Open Public Meetings Act. She reminded the Board Members to update their disclosure forms. Ms. McLean stated that the LMC Code was updated online and it was very accessible and searchable. If any of the Board members wanted a hard copy of either the LMC or the Historic District Guidelines they should contact Louis.

Assistant City Attorney McLean reviewed the authority and purpose of the Historic Preservation Board. She noted that the HPB used to be an appeal authority for Historic District Guidelines. However, the Code was changed and they are no longer an appeal authority because the Board was now involved with reviewing historic material deconstruction, as well as providing input if a home is being rotated, moved, or panelized. The HPB continues to do the Determinations of Significance. Ms. McLean outlined additional duties that the City Council may ask of the HPB. Most of the duties remained the same; however, one change is that the City Council may ask the HPB to be part of the Design Review on city projects outside the Historic District.

Assistant City Attorney McLean reviewed the requirements of the Open Public Meeting Acts. The most important item was abiding by the spirit of the act. The Open Public Meetings Act makes sure that the Board acts in a transparent manner in the public eye, that the meetings are recorded and that notice is given. Ms. McLean stated that the Act only applies to meetings. If the Board members attend the same public event, that is not considered a meeting as long as they do not discuss business. Ms. McLean reminded the Board to be careful about having a meeting after the meeting and email communications. If emails get GRAMA'd their computer is searched for other emails.

Assistant City Attorney McLean read from the Act, "Citizens are entitled not only to know what government decides, but to observe how and why". Even if people disagree, when they see how a decision was reached it adds a lot of understanding. State law requires that the meeting occur in one permanent location. Ms. McLean stated that the HPB has not requested for people to participate electronically. If there is an interest she was willing to talk about it, but it was not encouraged because so much of the meeting is visual.

Assistant City Attorney McLean thanked the Board members for their service.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
February 1, 2017

The meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board