

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JANUARY 6, 2016

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriquez

ROLL CALL

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

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

November 18, 2015

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the minutes of November 18, 2015 as written. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

December 2, 2015

Board Member Melville referred to page 39, first paragraph, and corrected "One example was 535 Park Avenue" to correctly read **435 Park Avenue**. Ms. Melville referred to the second paragraph on page 39 and corrected 1061 Norfolk to correctly read **1063 Norfolk**. Ms. Melville referred to the third paragraph on page 39 and corrected 918 Empire to correctly read **819 Empire Avenue**. Ms. Melville referred to page 40 and corrected 411 Main Street to correctly read **411 Park Avenue**. Ms. Melville referred to page 41, second paragraph and changed "The Silver Queen at 625 Main Street" to correctly read, "The Silver Queen **and 625 Main Street**".

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes as amended. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Hewett abstained since she was not present for the December 2, 2015 meeting.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Bruce Erickson reported that the HPB would be returning to their original schedule of one meeting each month since they had moved through the critical period of preserving specific homes. Based on the number of applications submitted for material deconstruction permits, the Staff believed those could sufficiently be reviewed under the normal meeting schedule.

Director Erickson stated that the main agenda item for the next few months would be review of the Historic District Guidelines.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff had considered the valuable input provided by the HPB at the last meeting on the examples of various homes that were presented. The City Council had given the Planning Department direction to move forward on this year long process. They intend to use the comments provided by the HPB to work through the guidelines in an effort to protect historic neighborhoods. Director Erickson stated that one of the ways they were articulating that mission was looking at customer service. One of the customer bases they were looking at were people who currently live somewhere else but would like to come to Park City in ten years. The goal is to keep that dream alive for people to come to Park City and see historic structures in the historic neighborhoods. Director Erickson clarified that the customer extends to people they would be telling the story to 50 years from now.

Board Member Melville asked if the number of applicants had slowed down or whether the Staff had adjusted the ones they were looking at. Planner Grahn replied that the HPB would only be reviewing the ones for material deconstruction on Historic District Design Review applications. If the Staff finds that the number of applications is more than what could be handled in one meeting, they would look at potentially going back to two meetings a month.

Director Erickson stated that a clause in the new ordinance that was adopted gives the Planning Director more authority on non-historic materials and those would not be reviewed by the HPB. However, anything historic would come before the HPB.

Board Member Melville reiterated a previous request for the Staff to provide the HPB with a list of what is approved administratively just so they could be aware and updated. Planner Grahn suggested providing a list every quarter, and at the same time inform the HPB of the work flow and the number of applications that were being processed.

Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that the Staff provide the HPB with the updated Code changes for review during a work session at the next meeting.

Planner Turpen pointed out that the Staff had not approved any pre-applications since the last HPB meeting.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff had set a vigorous schedule for the Guideline revisions, and pages 69 through 72 of the Staff report contained an outline of the Design Guideline revisions. The Staff intended to discuss the Design Guidelines monthly and to get HPB feedback. The goal was to complete the Design Guideline revision by the end of the year so they could be adopted by the City Council. Planner Grahn noted that the Guidelines are a living document and they have not been updated since they were adopted five years ago.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff would like to provide an article monthly regarding historic preservation. This month the HPB was given an article about Aspen and how they were looking at preserving their ski era buildings.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1445 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction – Significant House. The applicant is requesting to remove: a non-historic portico on the front façade; the front door; a secondary entrance (door, stairs, railing) on the south elevation; a rectangle of approximately 21.5 feet by 14.5 feet of the rear wall of the historic house; the roof the non-historic garage to accommodate a new second level addition; and a rectangle of approximately 19 feet by 29 feet of the non-historic garage wall.
(Application PL-15-02871)

Planner Grahn reported that the historic house was built as a hall and parlor. However, the house burned down around 1992 and it appears to have been reconstructed by 1996. Planner Grahn noted that the materials being reviewed this evening were not historic materials because very little material, if any, was salvaged from the fire. The Staff had visited the site with the architect for that verification.

Planner Grahn explained that the structure was listed on the Historic Sites Inventory and the HPB would be looking at the impacts of removing materials on the historic reconstructed portion of the house.

Planner Grahn noted that the proposal is to remove the front portico, which would be replaced with a full width porch. The applicant was also proposing to remove the front door and replace it with a new front door.

Board Member Holmgren asked if there were old tax photos. Planner Grahn answered no. She had also consulted the Sanborn Fire Maps to see if there originally was a porch on the historic structure, but a porch was not showing.

Board Member Melville thought there should have been documentation at the time of the reconstruction. Planner Grahn agreed; however, there was nothing in the Building Department files and this was all the information they had in the Planning Department records. Planner Grahn had checked to see if grant funds were given for the reconstruction and she found that it had received a grant. There was information as to how it was being reconstructed, which also included a garage addition, but there was very little detail.

Board Member Melville asked why the Staff felt that the portico of the front façade was not historic. Planner Grahn replied that it was not historic because it was built in 1996 and the materials are not historic. In looking at the Sanborn maps, the house originally did not have a porch. The existing porch is more reminiscent of a house from the 1920s or 1930s. Planner Grahn believed that the full-width porch that the applicant was proposing to put on was more in keeping with the hall and parlor vernacular architecture style that is typically seen in Park City. Ms. Melville asked for the year of the Sanborn map that was shown on Page 45 of the Staff report. Planner Grahn replied that it was the 1929 Sanborn fire Insurance map. She reviewed the map to orient the Board to the structure and noted that there was no porch. Planner Grahn noted that the Staff report also references the earlier Sanborn maps back to 1907. Because it was on the outskirts of town, it came on to the Sanborn maps later than other parts of town.

Board Member Melville asked by what criteria they decide whether demolitions of taking off elements is appropriate. Planner Grahn replied that page 43 of the Staff report outlined the criteria that was agreed upon as part of the LMC changes. Ms. Melville requested that Planner Grahn explained how each criteria applied to this demolition application.

Planner Grahn stated that regarding the porch, the proposed work mitigates any impacts that would occur to the historical significance of the building and any impact that would occur to the architectural integrity of the building. She believed the porch work would actually increase the architectural integrity by replacing the non-historic porch with a full-width porch that is more reflective of the style of architecture seen on a house built in the late 1800s to early 1900s in Park City.

Board Member Melville asked Planner Grahn to explain how the criteria, "Partial demolition is required for the renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation of the building, structure, or object" applies to this request. Planner Grahn stated that proposal would not have to meet all of the criteria. She explained that each criteria depends on the work being proposed. Every criteria cannot be applied to one specific action. Ms. Melville pointed out that most of the back of the house was being removed. Planner Grahn stated that they would talk about the back of the house after they address the front porch and the door.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that when she went to look at this house she noticed that there were as many large full front porches on historic buildings on Park Avenue as there were small porches. She was comfortable with this proposal for that reason. Ms. Melville clarified that Ms. Beatlebrox felt that the full-width porch would be compatible. She asked if the smaller porch would also be compatible. Ms. Beatlebrox thought both porch sizes would be compatible. Ms. Melville thought that was a problem. Planner Grahn remarked that it was the same problem the Staff had in determining whether or not they should leave the existing porch or do a full-width porch. After a full review and discussion with the architect, the Staff found that putting a full-width porch back on this house was not inappropriate, since there was not a porch originally on the house.

Planner Grahn stated that deciding on a portico or full width porch could be a matter of test or a matter of which one is more appropriate. In either case, her personal opinion was that adding a full-width porch would not disturb the architectural integrity of the house.

Board Member Stephens did not believe the low gable porch was appropriate and it was probably not original to many of the homes built in that time period. He thought the earlier porches did not have adequate footings to hold up the porch and they failed. They were replaced with a simpler low gable porch to handle the issue of snow load over the front door. Mr. Stephens stated that he has seen documentation on very specific homes that go back to the 1900s which show the longer porches being more appropriate and more consistent.

Chair White was comfortable with the porch that goes all the way across. His experience with the majority of these homes is that they all had full-width porches across the front.

Board Member Melville stated that she struggled initially with the demolition of the porch without knowing what it would be replaced with. She thought the Board was put in an awkward situation of having to review demolitions that are important without the benefit of knowing what would go in its place. In this case, they know it will be a full-width porch that appears to be consistent with the historic period.

Mr. Stephens thought they could make that basis because the existing gable porch is new. If the HPB approves removing non-historic material, the replacement should not matter that much. Ms. Melville remarked that a lot of houses are reconstructions with mostly new material. She did not think they could say that any relatively new material was no longer part of the historic house. Board Member Stephens disagreed. Ms. Melville understood that if a house is reconstructed with mostly new material it is still considered historic

under the Code. Planner Grahn that a reconstructed house with new materials remains on the local Historic Sites Inventory.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that the HPB was reviewing this application because the house was on the HSI. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that the porch was not original to the house, but it was added during the reconstruction and not three or four years later. Planner Grahn agreed, but she was unsure why the decision was made to add the porch.

Board Member Melville stated that she was not against this particular porch. She was only trying to point out the difficulties they have in reviewing these demolitions. Planner Grahn agreed that it is difficult without knowing what the removed materials would be replaced with. Board Member Melville understood their role in design review, but she did not believe replacement should be a separate issue from demolition.

Board Member Holmgren personally preferred a sitting porch over a stepping porch.

Planner Grahn asked if there was consensus for removing the porch. The Board concurred.

Planner Grahn commented on the proposal to remove the non-historic front door and replace it with a door that meets the design guidelines. The Staff found that the proposed exterior change shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site. Planner Grahn stated that any new door would have to meet the design guidelines, and the applicant was not proposing to relocate the door, expand the width or change the proportions.

Board Member Hodgkins questioned whether the argument of not being historic materials was appropriate in a reconstruction. He believed that was the issue they were struggling with. Planner Grahn replied that they needed to look at it from the standpoint of whether replacing the door would affect the reconstruction.

Director Erickson stated that one reason the Staff was being so rigorous on these demolitions is that they are telling the story to the next HPB 50 years from now. Making determinations about historic or non-historic materials is building that record. The relevancy of this discussion is about making sure the record is accurate going forward. Director Erickson stated that when the Board reviews demolitions the Staff will do their best to articulate the change in generic terms, such as one porch for another. He believed that would be fair without affecting the HPBs ability to review an appeal of a Staff decision.

Board Member Melville stated for the record that she was not opposed to the HPB losing their appeal ability and letting it go to the Board of Adjustment. Director Erickson understood her position. However, the most important goal right now is to get the Historic District Guidelines in place so the HPB understands them and can articulate them to the public; and so the Staff can apply them correctly. He believed the best way to accomplish that would be for the HPB to be the appeal board because they would know the regulations.

There was consensus among the Board to allow the front door to be removed and replaced.

Planner Grahn remarked that the applicant was proposing to remove the secondary entrance which has the porch overhang, the concrete steps and the door. She stated that not only are the materials not historic, but the Staff does not believe the door, porch and stair configuration was historic. She reviewed a diagram showing the original gable of the house where the shed addition was added. The secondary door sits in an awkward position in the middle. Planner Grahn did not believe it was historically there when the house was reconstructed. She assumed it was added because of how the rooms were reconfigured in the reconstruction.

Board Member Melville asked if it was part of the reconstruction. Planner Grahn replied that it was included but it was probably an addition to the reconstruction but not an original feature. Ms. Melville assumed it was a best guess and not based on accurate information. Planner Grahn stated that it was based on how the side looks compared to other houses in Park City that do not have this feature. Board Member Hodgkins pointed out that it also sits behind the gable. Planner Grahn explained that usually when changes like this are proposed to a historic structure, the Staff requests that it occur beyond the midpoint of the house so it is not visible from the primary right-of-way and would not detract from the historic house.

The Board was comfortable removing the secondary entrance.

Planner Grahn commented on the proposal to remove a portion of the rear wall in order to accommodate the addition. She reported that the shed roof was constructed as part of the 1993-1996 addition. The materials are not historic, but given the shape and form of the house it looks like a reconstruction of what had been there. The Staff found that the proposed partial demolition is required for the renovation of the building. They would not be able to add on to the house without removing this material.

Board Member Melville believed that removing the back would impact the historic house. She asked how the rear addition would impact the historic house. Planner Grahn stated that based on the design, where the rear portion is being

removed there would be a transitional element before the new addition starts. The new addition will connect between the historic house and the garage. Ms. Melville asked about the massing in relation to the historic house. Planner Grahn stated that the architect had done a good job of keeping the addition fairly small. The massing will change above the garage and that part will be visible from the street. However, the new addition would be minimally visible from the right-of-way in terms of looming over the historic house.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, confirmed that the height of the addition would not be visible from the street at all except for the area above the garage. The garage itself is already tall off the driveway and they will be pushing that up a little bit to add living space above the existing garage footprint.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the depth of the addition would go past the existing garage. Mr. DeGray replied that it would be flush. He noted that the Staff has reviewed the plans for compliance with the Historic District Guidelines. Pending the outcome of this meeting, it has all been approved. Ms. Beatlebrox asked if an elevation would show it rising at all above the roofline. Mr. DeGray stated that it would look at it head-on. However, looking up from the street level it would not be visible. Planner Grahn noted that it is not visible from the street level because the transitional element pushes it back from the historic house.

The Board was comfortable with removing the back wall.

Planner Grahn reported that the garage was not historic and it was never listed on the Historic Sites Inventory. The garage was not a reconstruction. It has all new material and it was added as part of the 1993-1996 remodel and development of the site. The applicant was proposing to remove the garage because it was going from a one-story building to a two-story building that will connect to the house. That was the reason for removing the gable and the roof on the side elevations.

Board Member Melville asked about the accessory structure on the Sanborn map. Planner Grahn was unsure and noted that it does not currently exist on the site. However, there is a small accessory structure behind one of the neighboring houses on Woodside that sits on the hill. Board Member Melville asked for the height of the garage at completion. Mr. DeGray recalled that it would be 22 feet. Ms. Melville asked if it was higher than the current roof of the house. Mr. DeGray answered no.

Board Member Stephens was uncomfortable talking about the future design because it design review was the role of the Planning Department. Mr. Stephens did not believe the HPB should be basing their decision on the height of the garage or whether it is visible from the street. He understood that the Board

wanted to know what it would look like, but he believed that Mr. DeGray had designed the project in good faith with these items being removed. Mr. Stephens pointed out that most architects would not have a design at this point in the process and they would not be able to answer these questions. He thought it was inappropriate to be asking Mr. DeGray.

Board Member Melville disagreed from the perspective of her first question, which was by what criteria the Board could decide whether these demolitions were appropriate. For example, one criteria that the 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. She questioned how they could make that determination without having some idea of what would happen after demolition. Ms. Melville thought it was appropriate for the HPB to know something; otherwise they would just be saying that it is okay to remove materials from historic buildings. Planner Grahn understood her point; however, they also have to relate it to the demolition of the affected material and not what is put in its place. Ms. Melville stated that both were exterior changes. Planner Grahn explained that in this case the proposed exterior change is to remove the roof in good faith that the replacement would meet the design guidelines and the LMC.

Board Member Stephens thought it was a matter of interpretation. In his reading, "proposed exterior changes" means the actual removal of the material being proposed. It is not the material that will be added.

Board Member Melville read, "The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual appearance of the neighborhood where demolition is proposed". Mr. Stephens pointed out that the proposed scope of work is not what is being built or added on to the building. The scope of work is what they would approve to be removed from the building. Ms. Melville was unsure how the Board could provide helpful input if all they can look at is the material that comes off the building. She believed it was not an issue with this particular application, but she was raising these points because they will come up every time. Planner Grahn agreed that she was raising good points, but the problem is that the HPB does not do design review and the Staff could not provide them with design information.

Chair White stated that Planner Grahn was correct. It is legal for this structure and many other structures to have additions. Currently, it is up to the Planning Department to follow the Guidelines to make sure the additions comply. Since the HPB is not a design review Board, he agreed with Mr. Stephens that they could not delve further.

Chair White understood Ms. Melville's concern about taking off elements without knowing its replacement. He personally felt comfortable that it would all work out through the Design Review process. Ms. Melville assumed that it would probably work out, but she questioned what the Board was adding under the new criteria of looking at demolitions if their decisions are based on assumptions that it will all work out. Chair White stated that they were tip-toeing around. He did not believe that was a good thing, but they have no choice.

Mr. Stephens thought the purpose was for the HPB to make sure that historic additions on historic homes that might be significant to the architecture and the character of the home are not removed. The objective is to give the Planning Department and the design community an understanding of what they have to work with when they design these houses in the future, and which additions, if any, can be removed.

Director Erickson asked the Board to look at how Planner Grahn had drafted the Conclusions of Law because she was asking them to make findings consistent with the Guidelines. He noted how she had also referenced the design in the HDDR in the Conditions of Approval. Director Erickson explained that the ordinance was structured to 1) inform the HPB of the actions to be taken for the demolition; 2) finding conclusions of law that these are consistent with the guidelines for demolitions; 3) make a condition of approval that the changes that are brought forward in the HDDR are consistent with the design guidelines.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff looks at the criteria that applies to a particular section to determine whether or not a finding of fact could be made that the action would not harm the historic home. That Staff then asks the Board for input and whether they concur.

Director Erickson understood the concerns expressed in their discussion and he would talk with the Staff to see how far they could push the envelope towards the future; but they are required to follow the steps as outlined.

Board Member Hodgkins asked how the garage falls under the HPB jurisdiction if it is no-historic material and non-historic reconstruction. Planner Grahn replied that it is on a historic site and it will be connected to a historic house. Therefore, they need to look at it holistically, but with limited information. Chair White noted that it also relates to demolition which the HPB is required to review. Planner Grahn stated that it was also part of a larger HDDR.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that this issue come up often with accessories structures that are not historic. She clarified that it is within the purview of the HPB because it is associated with the site; however, the Staff recommendation is generally that the structure can be altered per the demolition portion because it was not historic to begin with.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if HPB approval of a demolition was contingent on doing something specific; or whether the homeowner could remove materials and elements and then do nothing. Planner Grahn replied that it was contingent on the Historic District Design Review approval which is addressed in the conditions of approval. Mr. Hodgkins understood that the applicant must move forward with the project. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that before the applicant could pull a building permit, which would include removal of the material, they are required to put down a financial guarantee to ensure that the work is completed.

Planner Grahn noted that the last item was to remove a portion of the north wall of the non-historic garage in order to accommodate the new addition. The Staff found that the proposed partial demolition was required for the renovation of the building.

The Board was comfortable removing the rectangular piece of material.

The Staff recommended that the HPB review the application, conduct a public hearing and approve the material deconstruction of non-historic materials at 1445 Woodside Avenue.

Board Member Melville referred to Finding #8, "The material on this wall is not historic and the addition was not a historic reconstruction..." She asked if they knew that for certain. Planner Grahn answered yes, and apologized for previously saying that it was historic. She explained that it retains the shed roof appearance, but she did not believe the Sanborn map was reflective of the existing addition. Ms. Melville asked if Planner Grahn was certain that the addition was not historic. Planner Grahn noted that in looking at the 1929 Sanborn map it was clear that the current addition does not match the addition shown on the maps, and the footprint is not the same.

Board Member Melville noted that the Conclusion of Law refers to a pending ordinance and she believed it was no longer pending. Assistant City Attorney replaced "pending ordinance" with "and the Land Management Code."

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the review of material deconstruction permits for the buildings and structures located at 1445 Woodside

Avenue as indicated on the Agenda, and based on the Staff recommendation and the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff Report and as amended to revise the Conclusion of Law as previously stated. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 1445 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 1445 Woodside Avenue, Lot 1 of the Frandsen Subdivision, Amended.
2. The historic house is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The house was originally constructed c. 1898, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, as a hall-parlor with no front porch. In 1992, the historic house appears to have suffered from severe fire damage as a building permit was issued to demolish and reconstruct it on September 15, 1992.
4. Staff has confirmed the HSI form's findings that the siding, windows, doors, portico, and other features of the house are of new materials and are not historic. Staff finds that this house was reconstructed following the fire and it is likely little to no historic material was salvaged from the fire and reused on the reconstruction of the house.
5. On July 29, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house at 1445 Woodside Avenue; the application was deemed complete on August 19, 2015. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
6. The applicant will remove the existing non-historic porch on the front façade and replace the existing front door. As the applicant will be replacing the porch with a new full-width front porch, the proposed work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the building and any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the building.
7. The applicant will also remove a secondary entrance on the south elevation, including the existing non-historic door, concrete stairs, and railing. The proposed exterior change shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.
8. The applicant will remove a portion of the rear wall of the house, measuring approximately 21.5 feet by 14.5 feet, as well as a portion of the roof on the rear of the house in order to accommodate the new addition. The material on this wall is not historic and the addition was not a historic reconstruction, but rather a new addition constructed around 1993-1996. The partial demolition is required for the renovation of the building.
9. The applicant will also remove the gable roof of the non-historic garage to construct a second level addition above the garage. The partial demolition is required for the renovation of the building.

10. The applicant will remove a portion of the north wall of the non-historic garage, measuring approximately 19 feet by 29 feet, as well as a portion of the roof above this area. The partial demolition is required for the renovation of the building.

Conclusions of Law – 1445 Woodside Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and the LMC.

Conditions of Approval – 1445 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 23, 2015. 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. Design Guideline Revisions – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for Park City’s Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB) (Application GI-13-00222)

Planner Hannah Turpen reported that this was one of many Staff reports for Design Guideline revisions that the Historic Preservation Board would see this year. She reviewed Exhibit A to explain what they would be looking at this evening and the process for future meetings. The left side of the exhibit showed how the Guidelines are currently laid out and the right side showed the proposed revisions. Planner Turpen noted that the Guidelines have not been revised since their adoption in 2009.

Planner Turpen commented on Site Design and Universal Guidelines. She pointed out that the existing Site Design does not have as many sections as the Proposed Site Design. The Staff was proposing to add more sections to address additional items in the current Design Guidelines.

Planner Turpen commented on National versus Local Review. She stated that the Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction. She stated that the City does not always enforce the Secretary of Interior Standards. They rely solely on the Design Guidelines which are based on the National Standards; but the City enforces its local document.

Planner Turpen started the discussion with Universal Guidelines. She noted that the Staff was proposing to change Universal Guideline #4 to include, "It may be appropriate to reproduce missing historic elements that are consistent with properties of similar design, age and detailing in some cases". They also added clarification to Universal Guideline #9 with language, "The new work should be differentiated from the historic structure or construction and should be compatible with the historic structure or construction in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment".

Board Member Melville noted that the Board does not always see the problems the Staff has when applying the Guidelines. She asked for an example of why it was being proposed and how it would help the Staff.

Planner Grahn clarified that they were looking at guidelines that apply only to Historic residential structures. Ms. Melville stated that her question was more specific to the changes for Universal Guidelines 4 and 9. Director Erickson noted that the Board saw an example this evening where a non-historic porch would be removed and replaced with a porch that may be more historically in keeping with the home. That type of situation was addressed by Universal Guideline #4.

Planner Turpen noted that the language underlined in red in the Staff report was new language that the Staff was proposing to add. The Staff had added language in areas that needed more clarification so when the Guidelines are applied it is clear and not open to interpretation by a developer. Director Erickson used the boarding house renovation on Park Avenue that was discussed at the last meeting as an example of how the added language would bring the home more into compatibility, which was the purpose of this particular section. The language talks more about rhythm and scale and certain elements.

Planner Turpen assumed that the Board had read the Staff report and were aware of the proposed language. Therefore she did not intend to read all of the changes. She had only read #4 and #9 because the Universal Guidelines are broad and she wanted to hone in on exactly what was being changed in this section. Board Member Melville encouraged the Staff to give examples to help them understand the reason for the changes and the benefit.

Planner Grahn spoke about Site Design and Building Setbacks.

A.1 Building Setbacks and Orientation - Planner Grahn stated that the Staff removed "A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant", because they were addressing it in a different section.

A.2 Topography and Grading – Planner Grahn noted that nothing changed other than adding “or vice-versa” in A2.2. She explained that if the site is relatively paved they would not want to change the built or paved area too drastically because it would change the character of the site.

Ms. Melville noted that word “Grading” had also been added. She asked if the Guideline, “Maintain the original grading of the site” had been applied in the past. Planner Grahn stated that it also says, “...when and where feasible. She stated that the LMC requirement is to retain the finished grade after the project within four feet of existing grade. In Old Town they always look at where the grade will be after a new basement foundation goes in because they try to avoid having too much visible concrete. Director Erickson explained that this particular clause refers to the historic home that was raised and put on a very modern concrete foundation. The HPB had concerns about how the grading and the metal retaining wall that was in place. The intent of the proposed change is to clarify how they review that particular action. Director Erickson referred to the HPB picture of the house with the oversized steps and noted that this guideline would try to avoid that from occurring again.

Planner Grahn reiterated that the language written in black was currently in the existing Guidelines. Only the proposed changes were shown in red. Planner Turpen clarified that all the language in black was being applied currently, and the purpose of the changes in red was to strengthen that language and make it easier to enforce the guideline.

A.3 Landscaping and Vegetation - Planner Grahn stated that site grading was removed because it was addressed under Topography and Grading. She pointed out that in addition to protecting mature vegetation with this guideline, they were also trying to protect the historic houses from mature vegetation as stated in Guideline A.3.1. Planner Grahn stated that either the Secretary of the Interior or the National Parks Service came up with Design Guidelines for energy efficiency. That was where the storm water management features and storm water management systems, etc. came from in A.3.7. They want to make sure that people develop landscape plans that last and that landscaping is not being redone every year. That was addressed in the language added to A.3.3.

Board Member Holmgren understood from the photos she has seen and people she spoke with that Park City used to have a lot of fruit trees and lilacs. She was vocally opposed when the plum trees were removed behind a restaurant. Ms. Holmgren suggested that in the Design Review process the Staff could encourage applicants to plant that type of landscaping because it does grow. Planner Turpen stated that they could add a sidebar and include examples of vegetation that was historically found in the City. She thought it would be interesting for the Staff to do that research.

Board Member Melville liked the added language in A.3.2 to protect established vegetation and replace removed vegetation with similar vegetation. She noted that too often mature trees are removed during construction and replaced with smaller stick-like trees. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff has had a policy to address those situations. When mature trees are taken down the Staff requests that it be replaced with a 2:1 ratio of something similar. In addition, they look at the diameter of the tree at chest height to make sure that if a 10" diameter is replaced with a 1" diameter, they need to replace it with ten trees. The Staff was looking at revising that requirement, but they were losing a lot of mature vegetation and this Guideline would help reduce the amount. Ms. Melville thought it was better to require bigger trees as opposed to a lot of smaller trees.

Board Member Holmgren suggested that the Staff research which trees do well in Park City. For example, aspen trees last about four years and eventually need to be removed. Box Elder is another garbage tree that people like to plant.

Board Member Stephens remarked that the Board was looking at the vegetation on its own merits, but the Planning Department looks at it in relationship to parking, construction, etc. He thought it would be interesting to get an idea from the Planning Department on how they weight what is more important. Mr. Stephens stated that Mr. Erickson had commented on a historic house that was lifted and the grade was changed, but at the same time a garage was going in to facilitate off-street parking. He recognized that it was a difficult job but he was unsure how they judge it. Director Erickson replied that it was an interesting balancing act. The first priority is not to negatively affect the historic home. The second priority is not to negatively affect the historic district, which is where vegetation comes into play. He stated that the Planning Department would rather restrict grading and protect a tree than to accommodate parking. However, fir trees go decadent after 60 years and Aspen trees are inappropriate. He believed the strongest trees in the District are fruit trees and lilac bushes. Director Erickson believed it was appropriate to add plant materials as a sidebar. He clarified that he is personally opposed to removing a dead tree if it is a wildlife tree with bird species living in it.

Board Member Holmgren asked if there was an ordinance that prohibits using rain barrels. Director Erickson answered yes. Ms. Melville thought the ordinance had been changed to allow it. Director Erickson explained that the State Division of Water Rights regulates how much water can be collected without a permit. Water can be collected in a rain barrel and registered, but the rest has to run down stream so farmers can water the grass. He was unaware of any restrictions in the Historic District Guidelines that prohibit water barrels.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board wanted to add a guideline regarding rain barrels. Board Member Holmgren stated that she would like the ability to use them. Director Erickson reiterated that she already has that ability because the

City does not regulate rain barrels. He suggested that if a rain barrel is proposed as part of a reconstruction or restoration the Staff could ask that the location be included on the site plan. If an owner wanted to place a rain barrel on their existing home it should not be an issue for the Planning Department to regulate unless it encroaches into the setback or over a property line.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that the Staff include a comment in the redlines to indicate items that were redlined because they were moved to another section. Another option would be to underline it in a different color. She believed it would help the Board know that it was not deleted and where they could find it.

Planner Turpen stated that she and Planner Grahn were finding numbering errors. She asked the Board to let them know if they find issues with the numbering. Planner Grahn pointed out that the sections are numbered primarily to keep the Staff reports organized. She assumed the final version of the Design Guidelines would have to be renumbered based on comments and feedback from the HPB.

A.4 Stone Retaining Walls - Planner Turpen recalled discussing this item in the Fall and early Winter in terms of what defines the streetscape. They found that there are a lot of historic retaining walls but it is difficult to regulate what new walls are supposed to look like and how they deal with the ones they already have. She pointed out that most of this section was in red because the current guidelines have very little about retaining walls.

Planner Turpen stated that A.2.1 talks about maintaining a line of stone retaining walls along the street; and that goes back to the streetscape. She recalled from the Fall discussion that Board Member Stephens talked about how the walls stepped with the topography of the street and they needed to be able to respect that. She stated that A.2.2 was moved to another section. Director Erickson referred to the April Inn retaining wall as an example and noted that the new guideline would regulate that wall much more effectively. Ms. Melville liked that that language specifically calls for reusing the existing stone where possible. She thought it would be even better if they could make the language stronger than "where possible". Director Erickson suggested, "to the greatest extent practicable".

Board Member Hodgkins asked why they named this section stone retaining walls and not just retaining walls. Planner Grahn stated that they could change it to masonry retaining walls because it also includes brick and concrete. Planner Turpen suggested changing it to Retaining Walls to encompass all walls.

Planner Turpen noted that the newly proposed A.2.2 states that "Walls should be repaired with materials that closely approximate the original". She stated that

A.2.3 addresses reducing the number of failing walls by encouraging applicants to improve the drainage behind existing walls. A.2.4. - New walls shall be consistent with historic features and design, materials and scale. A.2.5 - Walls of brick should be reconstructed based on physical or pictorial evidence. A.2.6 – Maintain stone in its Natural Finish. It is not appropriate to paint, stain or plaster over stone.

Board Member Melville asked if this would prevent the use of plate steel. Planner Grahn believed it was covered under A.2.4 in terms of materials. Board Member Hewett asked if they could list the type of stone that would be preferred if a wall was built from scratch. Planner Grahn stated that recommended materials could be listed as a sidebar; however, she cautioned against being overly prescriptive. Director Erickson thought they could be consistent with what they know on local knowledge, and that the stone needs to retain a traditional shape and that the materials need to be sourced locally. He would work on geographically defining locally.

Chair White stated that recently they have been saying that walls should be of stone in a size that a person could carry, and they should be hand stacked or look hand stacked to be consistent with how the walls were originally built. The Board talked about stone size, shape and color. Planner Turpen thought they could include a photos of an authentic Park City wall, which would make it easier to enforce. She stated that the Staff has been successful in Design Review Team meetings making it clear that the stone must be something a miner could carry and that it is rectangular or square. Ms. Melville was not opposed to that criteria as long as it resulted in something historic looking and not a wall with modern stone.

A.3 – Fences - Planner Turpen noted that in A.3.1 language was added to state, “Historic fences should be preserved and maintained”. She noted that language in A.3.2 describes what appropriate wood fences should look like. Wood fences should have flat, dog-eared or pointed tops similar to what was typically used. The language gives specific dimensions. Planner Grahn noted that the information was pulled from the previous Park City Design Guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren asked about metal fences. Planner Grahn believed they would be open to it as long as it was compatible with the design of the building. However, the LMC does not allow chain link fences other than for LOD fencing. Planner Turpen stated that A.3.3 says, “New wood and metal fences located in the front yard should be traditional designs and patterns”.

Board Member Stephens asked if the wood picket fences were only for reconstruction. He preferred to move the measurements into a sidebar to keep it from becoming too specific. Mr. Stephen thought a 3-1/2 inch wide board would have been new dimensional lumber. In the 1900s it would have been a 4-inch

board. He believed a sidebar would force the applicant to show what was there or what might be compatible with the house, but still allow some flexibility.

Planner Turpen stated that A.3.5 talks about how the wood fence should be painted to be complimentary to the adjacent house. A.3.6 encourages the use of drought tolerant shrubs in place of a fence or wall. A.3.7 states, "Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry shall be subordinate to the associated historic building or structure and shall complement the design of the historic structure and fence in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment". She pointed out that the current guidelines do not address arbors and the Staff sometimes gets pushback on arbor proposals because nothing is in writing.

A.4. – Paths, Steps, Handrails, & Railings (Not associated with porches). Planner Grahn noted that these were ones not associated with porches. The first guideline was moved from a different section. A.4.3 relates to compatibility and the issues they identified in various photos at the last meeting. Language in A.4.4 indicates that Historic handrails should be maintained and preserved if they exist. In A.4.5 they need to make sure that they complement the historic structure and the site in general.

Board Member Hewett asked for an example of a historic handrail. Planner Grahn replied that all handrails have to meet the Building Department Code for safety. Historic handrails could just be a wood railing on steps. It could also be similar to metal plumbing pipes that are simple in design. Ms. Hewett stated that she was thinking of the 1970s houses where some things are not attractive. She was concerned about suggesting round circle railings.

A.5. – Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures.

Planner Grahn reiterated that the Staff was seeing more demand for arbors and these types of structures. The language promotes that they be subordinate to the associated historic buildings or structure, complement the design, and should be limited to rear or side yards so they are not in the front yard or affecting the integrity of the site. They should not be attached to associated buildings or structures because they would no longer be a freestanding shade structure.

A.6. – Parking Areas, Detached Garages and Driveways.

Planner Turpen stated that the change to this section was primarily adding language for clarification and details. A.6.5 was added to "Consider using textured and pour paving materials other than smooth concrete for driveways in the front yard. Use permeable paving where appropriate on a historic site to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas. A.6.6 was added to say, "Avoid paving up to the building

foundation to reduce heat island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff”.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the textured and poured paving materials language reminded her of how the City beautified the area going to the Transit Center. She asked if they were talking about that type of material or something different. Planner Grahn thought they would be open to people using pavers. Traditionally there were wood sidewalks and gravel or dirt driveways so there was some room for flexibility. However, they would not want the driveway to detract from the historic site or become the focal point. Textured materials would be allowed and pavers would be considered a textured material. She pointed out that the language specifically states poured concrete because a smooth concrete finish is too modern.

Board Member Melville asked how the Guideline would keep people from paving over the entire front of the house. Planner Grahn replied that it goes back to the design guideline regarding the site plan and how they should not have a substantial amount of paved or built area. Planner Grahn stated that the LMC and the current Design Guidelines do not allow more than 12’ of width on the driveway. They could add it to this section for clarification.

Board Member Melville asked how the Staff addresses the fact that these are only guidelines and not requirements when applicants raise that issue. Director Erickson stated that if the Staff makes a determination based on applying the design guidelines, the applicant would have the right to appeal that decision to the Board of Adjustment. Planner Grahn believed the LMC also states that if there is a discrepancy between the guidelines and the LMC the stricter of the two applies.

Director Erickson followed up on the question regarding the 12’ driveway width and noted that it was addressed in D.3 of the existing Guidelines.

Board Member Beatlebrox complimented the Staff on thoroughness and a job well done. It was evident that they had carefully listened to the comments made by the Board and they had drafted language that made the guidelines very clear.

Planner Grahn explained the breakdown of Exhibit A and the color coded categories. Director Erickson stated that in effect they were remapping the Guidelines between the existing and the proposed. It was more of a tracking mechanism for the Staff.

Planner Turpen commented on process. She noted that the Design Guidelines would not go to the City Council for adoption until the HPB completes all of the revisions.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

Jim Tedford stated that he was representing a group called Preserve Historic Main Street. They have been testifying the past few years concerning the Kimball Corner. As he listened to the proposed changes a couple of things came to mind. He thought separating residential and commercial was an excellent idea because some things do not apply to both. Regarding the proposed changes, Mr. Tedford noted that they had used the words “compatible” and “subordinate”, which are important words in terms of what their concerns for Kimball Corner. He pointed out that the definitions in both the current Design Guidelines and the General Plan were not the best. Mr. Tedford stated that compatible and subordinate can be interpreted in many ways without a very clear definition.

Cindy Matsumoto, a Park City resident commented on language under Fences, “Drought tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of a fence or a wall.” She felt that would encourage more xeriscape which would not fit into the Old Town look. Ms. Matsumoto favored Board Member Holmgren’s idea of using lilac or rose bushes or other vegetation that was historically used between homes. Ms. Matsumoto asked the Staff to explain why they were waiting until all the revisions were completed before bringing them forward. Since the Guidelines were being revised section by section, she questioned why the City Council could not vote on them section by section. She thought it was better to have people follow the new guidelines this year when they start doing their fencing and landscaping in March rather than waiting another year to implement them.

Planner Turpen stated that the Design Guidelines are set up different than the LMC. It is one document and each section is not its own chapter. Planner Grahn explained that the goal was to keep the document together rather than section by section to avoid confusion in trying to update the website on a monthly basis. The Staff gives the Council quarterly updates and they will include which sections are being revised in each update.

Assistant City Attorney suggested that since the Guidelines were divided between existing historic houses and new construction, there may be some break points to address Ms. Matsumoto’s concerns. Planner Turpen thought they could possibly structure the new document in a way that would allow more frequent updates. Planner Grahn agreed that it would be beneficial to everyone if the Guidelines could be changed as often as the LMC.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, had an issue with a small change on the Universal Guidelines. She pointed to the language under Landscaping, “Use to advantage the existing storm water management features such as gutters.” She was told by Sandra Morrison that there were no gutters in Old Town. Ms. Meintsma understood that gutters have become essential to help with barrels and sustainability, but since gutters did not historically exist she thought

the language as written was confusing. Ms. Meintsma noted that the language in A.5.7 “providing landscape separations” was also shown in A.6.2. She referred to the language regarding retaining walls, “Maintain the line of stone retaining walls.” She recalled that the Planning Commission calls that the setback.

Planner Grahn explained that the language in the guideline was talking about height and not the setback from the street. She offered to revise the language for better clarification.

Ms. Meintsma referred to language in A.2.3, “To reduce failure of walls, improve the drainage...” She watches a lot of structure go up and she watches the drainage that is used in new construction or new construction under historic structures. Often the drainage is nothing more than gravel backfill. She stated that gravel backfill is unsightly and nothing grows in it so it becomes dead space. She had researched different drainage systems and there are different levels of gravel and different environmental fabrics. Topsoil can be put over the top of gravel so things can grow. Ms. Meintsma suggested the possibility of coming up with a fundamental system of drainage behind a wall.

Director Erickson was not in favor of coming up with a system, but they could recommend that the final landscaping needs to have sufficient top soil and a means of retaining the top soil. It would then be up to the engineer to work out the details. He thought Ms. Meintsma had made a good point.

Ms. Meintsma referred to A.2.4 and the different types of retaining walls. She asked if simple scored concrete was the same as wood form. Planner Grahn thought it was. Ms. Meintsma clarified that if it was scored concrete it would include wood form. Planner Grahn offered to change it to simple board form concrete for clarity.

Ms. Meintsma was confused with the language, “Wood fences should be painted using colors complimentary to the adjacent house”. Planner Grahn stated that the intent is to make sure it is obvious that the fence belongs to the house. She was not opposed to eliminating the guideline if there were concerns about regulating color.

Board Member Holmgren noted that paint and color were not mentioned in the proposed guidelines and she suggested that they could just let it go. Board Member Stephens interpreted the language to mean that the fence should be painted as opposed to having an unfinished cedar fence. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. The intent is for the wood to be painted. Planner Turpen thought they should just say that the fence should be painted. Ms. Beatlebrox agreed. She read the guideline from the standpoint of an artist and her interpretation of complimentary colors is probably different.

Planner Grahn suggested that they remove the guideline from this section. The Guidelines will have a new section regarding the treatment of historic building materials, and they could address the need to paint wood in that section.

Ms. Meintsma referred to language in A.4.3 under Paths and Steps stating that the steps should complement historic structures in materials, size and scale. She asked if it would be easier to identify a maximum width.

Planner Grahn stated that it would depend on the site. She preferred to keep the language more subjective.

Ms. Meintsma referred A.5.2, Installation of Gazebos, and the language stating that they shall be limited to rear side yards and have limited visibility when viewed from the primary right-of-way. She suggested revising the language to say, "limited visibility when viewed from public right-of-way" to address the situation of a corner lot. Ms. Meintsma suggested that they add visual examples under landscape treatment for driveways and walkways. Director Erickson clarified that it was more of a greenspace. He explained that many newer homes have a grassy area between the driveway and the sidewalk to maintain the 12' width.

Ms. Meintsma commented on off-street parking in the rear yard. Board Member Holmgren thought the language should be revised to make "If locating the parking area in the rear is physically not possible..." the first sentence. The next sentence could be that the off-street parking should be located within the rear yard.

Ms. Meintsma referred to #7 of the General Guidelines, the second sentence, "Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exist." Her interpretation is that if a house never had a front porch that architectural element could not be added.

Planner Grahn explained that the intent of the sentence is not to add features that never existed. The last sentence talks about reproducing missing historic elements and it can be based on physical or photographic evidence. For example, they might know a railing existed but they do not always have the best physical evidence. In some cases they can look to a neighboring house and reproduce an element based on their dimensions.

Ms. Meintsma understood that clarification but she still questioned whether an element could be added if there was evidence that it never existed. She referred to the first item the HPB reviewed this evening. Planner Grahn replied that it was also a reconstruction and the porch that exists was added because whoever approved it at the time thought it contributed to the historical look and feel of the

house. In this case the added porch was not in keeping with the era of the house; whereas a full-width porch was typical on hall-parlor homes. Planner Grahn pointed out that this was a unique situation because the home was reconstructed after a fire and given the neighborhood. Ms. Meintsma was concerned that they were opening a door for many things to occur if they justify it based on what exists in the neighborhood. Planner Grahn explained that if an element is being reconstructed based on photographic or physical evidence it should be replicated. However, if a new element is added, it must be compatible with the house.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Melville referred to Mr. Tedford's comment regarding the definitions of "compatible" and "subordinate". She suggested that the HPB should look at the current definitions to see whether or not they are adequate. Planner Grahn offered to schedule that review for the next meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox thought they should also look at the definition of "complementary".

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the HPB should make a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not to consider the amendments as outlined. Board Member Beatlebrox was uncomfortable making a recommendation until the suggested changes were incorporated and the guidelines are re-drafted. She wanted to look at the next draft before forwarding a recommendation. Chair White concurred.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the draft that was discussed this evening to February 3, 2016. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was a way to have links to each section rather than relying on a full PDF document. Planner Grahn thought it was a good suggestion and they would look into it. Planner Turpen pointed out that if items are eliminated from some sections, the links would not be current. Assistant City Attorney McLean thought the Staff could meet internally to come up with a strategy to address this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Approved by _____

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
January 6, 2016

David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board