

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2011

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Sara Werbelow, Dave McFawn, Puggy Holmgren, Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, David White, Alex Natt

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah, Dina Blaes

Chair Werbelow called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m

ROLL CALL

Chair Werbelow noted that all Board Members were present with the exception of Board member McKie who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – November 11, 2011

MOTION: Dave McFawn moved to APPROVE the minutes of September 21, 2011 as written. David White seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carries unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no input.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATION & DISCLOSURE

Planning Director Eddington announced that a joint meeting with City Council and Planning Commission is scheduled for Thursday, December 8 regarding the Lower Park Redevelopment Area (RDA). He invited the Board to attend. Planner Sintz added that Economic Development Director Jonathan Weidenhamer will be preparing a presentation on the Lower Park RDA for the Historic Preservation Board at a future meeting.

Chair Werbelow advised the Board that she would need to leave at 6:15 PM and that the Board should elect a Chair Pro-Tem.

MOTION: Board member Natt motioned to appoint Board member McFawn as the Chair Pro-Tem. Board member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carries unanimously.

REGULAR SESSION – Discussion/Public Hearing/Action Items

210 Grant Avenue – Determination of Significance
Project# PL-11-01382

Planner Sintz reintroduce the item before them as a Determination of Significance to remove the property located at 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory. The Historic Preservation Board originally heard the matter on November 16, 2011. At the meeting the Board made a motion to remove the property. The vote was tied so no motion action took place. A second motion was made to continue the item for three months. The vote was tied so no action was taken. Due to a lack of action the item was continue to December 7.

Staff has not received any additional information from the owner regarding the history of the site. The recommendation of Staff has not changed and still proposes to remove the site from the Historic Sites Inventory.

A consensus was reached amongst the Board that without contradictory evidence the structure is non-historic.

MOTION: Board member Matsumoto-Gray moved to remove the property located at 210 Grant Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory in accordance with the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law outlined in the staff report. Board member McFawn seconded the motion.

VOTE: 6-0. Motion carries unanimously.

Findings of Fact

1. The property at 210 Grant Avenue is located in the Historic Residential 2B (HR-2B) District.
2. The site was designated as a Significant Site by the HPB in February 2009 following analysis and a recommendation made by staff based on information from field visits and several secondary sources.
3. Photographic information was recently made available that indicates that no building existed on the site in 1965.
4. Structural lumber workmanship in the building indicates more recent construction to include lack of saw marks and evidence of kiln drying.
5. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law

1. Information not previously considered in the designation of 210 Grant Avenue as a Significant Site was appropriately considered after February 2009 when the HPB took formal action to designate the property to the Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The site at 210 Grant Avenue is not at least 50 years old.
3. The site at 210 Grant Avenue does not comply with the criteria set forth in Title 15-11-10(A)(2) and therefore the Site is not a Significant Site pursuant to Title 15-11-10.

WORK SESSION

Historic Guidelines Training

Historic Consultant Dina Blaes addressed the Board regarding the comprehensive update and research that occurred when the Historic Sites Inventory and Historic Guidelines were adopted.

The update process started in 2006. At that time a Determination of Significance was taking place with every single Historic District application. The Land Management Code (LMC) language regarding the historic inventory was in conflict with the current practices. The LMC referred to a historic list but there was no list on file. The previous survey that was considered up-to-date was done in 1983 by volunteers of the Historic Society.

Mrs. Blaes outlined the process of the update. First a selective reconnaissance level survey was conducted, which requires review field work, the research of physical attributes of buildings, and photography.

The previous criteria on determining significance lacked specificity, it required; age of the building, a vague description of significance, a vague description of integrity. Overall the criteria were highly discretionary. There was a huge range for staff interpretation and how the final produce was viewed under the old guidelines.

Demolitions were made after the release of the Historic Property Inventory in 2007 which resulted in a Temporary Zoning Ordinance put into place by City Council. Sixty-seven buildings listed on your current Historic Sites Inventory were not on the previously adopted list. The demolitions created a positive outcome in that the City Council and Historic Preservation Board looked closer at how the City defines Historic and what the process is for preserving them.

The currently adopted Historic Sites Inventory is a two-tiered inventory. The highest designation is Landmark and the criteria follow that of the National Register. The second tier is Significant and is made up of locally relevant criteria.

Chair Werbelow asked when the next update to the Historic Sites Inventory would take place. Mrs. Blaes answered that typically City's will preform a new reconnaissance survey every 5-7 years.

Discussion ensued regarding the National Register nominations and the review of structures that were listed on the National Register. Ms. Blaes stressed the importance of why the criteria for Landmark sites is only that the structure be eligible for National Register. She clarified that the Historic Sites Inventory shows along with the designation of the site that eligibility of the site to be on the National Register. She cautioned that the there are some Significant sites that are currently listed on the National Register.

The Board wanted to pursue a brainstorming session in the future on ways to increase preservation awareness and get people excited about registering on the National Register or updating their status on the Register.

Mrs. Blaes reviewed the process for the update of the Historic Design Guidelines. The previous guidelines were last updated in 1983 and allowed for a large range of interpretation by the project planner. The new guidelines gave a redefined process and new requirements for submittals. She emphasized the importance of not waiting 25 years to update these new guidelines.

Board member White suggested that the Board have a mandatory discussion every year on how the guidelines are working, identify problem areas, and find solutions.

Board member McFawn inquired as to when the next survey should take place. Mrs. Blaes responded that the Historic Preservation Board should have a policy discussion on timing. She suggested the Board review conducting another survey in regards to significant eras in Park City.

MOTION: Board member McFawn moved to adjourn the meeting. Board member Natt seconded the motion.

VOTE 6-0. Motion carries unanimously.

Historic Preservation Board adjourned at 6:11 PM.

Prepared by _____

Patricia Abdullah
Planning Analyst

DRAFT