



AGENDA

WORK SESSION – *Discussion items only. No action will be taken.*

Discussion of May Preservation month

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 7, 2012

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – *Items not on regular meeting schedule.*

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATION & DISCLOSURES

Open Appointments – Historic Preservation Board

Informational update from Planning Director regarding demolition of non-historic structure at 920 Empire Avenue

Spring Walking Tour – selection of date

REGULAR AGENDA – *Discussion, public hearing, and possible action as outlined below.*

Annual Historic Preservation Award

ADJOURN

Times shown are approximate. Items listed on the Regular Meeting may have been continued from a previous meeting and may not have been published on the Legal Notice for this meeting. For further information, please call the Planning Department at (435) 615-5060.

A majority of Historic Preservation Board members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the Chair person. City business will not be conducted.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department at (435) 615-5060 24 hours prior to the meeting.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2012

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Sara Werbelow, Dave McFawn, Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, Alex Natt, Judy McKie

EX OFFICIO: Tom Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah, Jonathan Weidenhamer

ROLL CALL

Chair Werbelow called the meeting at 5:05 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except David White and Puggy Holmgren who were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 7, 2011

MOTION: Board Member McFawn moved to APPROVE the minutes of December 7, 2011. Board Member Natt seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

The Staff would provide updates on three items this evening. Due to a conflict on 1450/1460 Park Avenue, Chair Werbelow excused herself from that discussion.

MOTION: Board Member Matsumoto-Gray nominated Dave McFawn to assume the chair for 1450/1460 Park Avenue. Judy McKie seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Werbelow left the room. Jonathan Weidenhamer also had a conflict on this item and left the room. Board Member McFawn assumed the chair.

1450 & 1460 Park Avenue – Preservation Update

Planner Kayla Sintz noted that Board Member McFawn had requested an update on the structural stabilization of 1450 & 1460 Park Avenue. She reported that the roof was rotten on 1460 Park Avenue and the roof gave way. Both structures received plywood and new roofing. Waterproofing was also done on both structures. All the windows were boarded up and taken out. The chimney on 1460 Park Avenue was unstable it was wrapped in plywood until it could be secured. The interiors of both structures were structurally supported as needed in various locations. The foundation on 1450 was propped up in the rear because the lack of foundation was causing the structure to move.

Planner Sintz reported that the City received three proposals and interviews were conducted last Friday. A decision should be made in the next two weeks.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked if the HPB could see the proposals. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the proposals were part of the RFP process. Chair Pro Tem McFawn assumed the proposals would be public. Ms. McLean replied that the Board members could look at the proposals; however, she advised that they do it individually and not as a Board. She pointed out that the proposals could be obtained through a GRAMMA request. The request could be submitted to Diane Foster, the Interim Assistant City Manager.

Chair Pro Tem McFawn thanked the City from keeping those properties from further deteriorating. He felt the City did nothing less than what they would have required from anyone else. Planner Sintz stated that direction to resolve the immediate concerns came from the Chief Building Official. When the transfer of property takes place, the developer should have a full preservation plan as part of the proposal.

Lower Park Avenue RDA

Sara Werbelow and Jonathan Weidenhamer joined the meeting. Board Member Werbelow resumed the chair.

Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager, updated the HPB on what was being done in the Lower Park Avenue RDA.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the lower Park Avenue RDA encompasses Treasure Hill down to the City Golf Course, a portion of Bonanza Park, and the bottom of the PCMR parking lots. He indicated the area labeled PCMR Village Core, and explained that when the RDA was drawn up in 1983 the lodges were brand new. There was no reason for that area to be in the RDA today. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that Redevelopment Authorities created Federal statutes in the early 1950's as an effort to cure suburbanization of America and redevelop existing downtown cores. The two main cores by Federal statute are that RDAs can be used for economic development or affordable housing. Park City has two RDAs; Lower Park Avenue and Main Street.

Mr. Weidenhamer remarked that on the City Tour to Boise in 2008, the City Council was impressed with the historic district in downtown Boise. Following that tour, the City started to define their role in redevelopment during Visioning in 2009. They continue to try and understand what their role is and should be in redevelopment. After three years of planning and significant costs for consultants, Mr. Weidenhamer was prepared to identify that role for the Lower Park Avenue District.

Mr. Weidenhamer noted that Design Workshop was hired to study Lower Park Avenue and they broke the projects into three areas; 1) parking lot redevelopment; 2) transit, traffic, circulation, walkability; 3) community and neighborhood redevelopment. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the projects were presented to the City Council and six goals evolved for maintaining green spaces and the fabric, scale character and authenticity of the City as they move forward with growth.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that as the economic development manager he could see challenges in redevelopment between collecting tax dollars in RDAs and the six goals to maintain the historic fabric. The direction was to score housing alternatives, talk about

connecting City Park up to the Resort, look at community and senior centers, and community and sustainability and green goals.

Mr. Weidenhamer reported that Michael Barille with Design Workshop designed a plan for the City showing two different phases or alternatives. Option One was a dense 80-100 unit option with affordable housing, mixed housing, and senior housing, which effectuated the goals and brought in tax dollars. It also added market rate units to help with costs. The City Council thought it was too big and rejected the plan. The City Council favored Option 2. Moving north to south he indicated the district that was allowed to run rampant during the 1980's. The City Council wanted to set a pattern and a precedent for that area and use their ability to control scale and size. They talked about having three and four-plexes at the north end and going to single family homes as it moves south into Old Town proper. That was the direction they were actively pursuing. Mr. Weidenhamer was excited about the idea of ultimately having an east/west connection to connect the base of the Resort to City Park, which then connects into the rest of Old Town and Main Street.

Mr. Weidenhamer reported that the next steps were to implement the neighborhood plan. They were actively working with PCMR on a plan for their parking lots. The goal is to extend the RDA. Mr. Weidenhamer explained that the Lower Park Avenue RDA expires in 2015. It will generate approximately \$6-8 million before it expires, and that money will be used for the neighborhood plan. If the City decided not to help PCMR redevelop their base district, there was no need to extend the RDA. However, the City Council has chosen the direction of partnering with PCMR on a redevelopment project and they were looking at extending the RDA. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that if the RDA could be extended, it would generate another \$8-15 million. He remarked that an RDA collects property tax increment, and he explained the increment formula. Any incremental tax growth from new projects goes into the RDA and the RDA puts that money back into the District.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the City priority was neighborhood planning. If the RDA is extended, they would partner with PCMR. Mr. Weidenhamer remarked that conversations with PCMR were a result of four joint meetings with the Planning Commission and the City Council, where they tried to hone in on the City's role and posture related to redevelopment. Based on those joint meetings, the decision was made for the City to proactively influence opportunities rather than just react and regulate. That could mean different things for different areas. For PCMR, the City would help the Resort build a parking garage on their main parking lot and shift some of that density to the remainder of the development parcels. It could also mean pulling density out of Treasure Hill to create a new receiving zone. It would all look like new increment into the district. Mr. Weidenhamer noted that the City was currently working with PCMR on a proforma development level. The goals Park City hopes to obtain are parking, transit, circulation, and housing. Unless the parking garage has a major transit component the City will not be involved. The City has very stated goals on managing and influencing traffic, parking and circulation.

Chair Werbelow asked about the relationship between the new transit center concept with the existing transit center. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that they would be fully integrated. PCMR is the number two transit stop in the entire system and it is extensively used. However, it is a 25 year-old system and 25 year-old streets that were never built to accommodate present day activity. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that PCMR is

working on bifurcating who their clients are and loading and unloading certain clients and visitors in specified locations. They were trying to figure out the user and how it could be best managed and controlled through road width and lanes and transit. Tied to that is the walkability bond. The City has \$4.5 million tied into what is called the Dan's to Jan's project, which begins to address vehicles at the edge of town and balances the different competitions for the modes of travel. The intent is to plan the stretch from Dan's to Jan's as comprehensively as they plan the transit component.

Chair Werbelow asked if a commercial component was envisioned in the scenario Mr. Weidenhamer had presented regarding neighborhood redevelopment. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that the Staff would recommend support commercial to add vitality and energy. He did not think the policymakers were convinced that commercial was needed.

Board Member Natt thought that was being short-sighted. The Board members concurred. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray suggested that other mixed-uses would be appropriate and interesting. It was an opportunity to bring in exciting Old Town/Resort/Park connection types of uses. She thought a coffee or bagel shop would be good, but there were also ideas for recreation commercial uses.

Referring to a slide, Mr. Weidenhamer indicated the location of the existing fire station and noted that A & B were rebuilt or replicated historic scale buildings. They have always talked about C being a community or senior center. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the Fire Department moved to Park Meadows and the building is used to store buses and Public Works items. He also believed the building was used for seasonal housing.

Board Member Natt noted the transit center on Park Avenue and asked if Mr. Weidenhamer was talking about a separate transit center at PCMR. Mr. Weidenhamer explained that Park Avenue was only intended to be a pullout, similar to the stop in front of the library. There have been discussions as to whether or not Park Avenue should have a major transit hub. The policymakers believe there is a strong transit presence at the Resort and there was no need to replicate it. Board Member Natt asked if the intent was to draw people from City Park to the Resort or visa-versa. He pointed out the uphill climb to the resort. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that some of the concepts show a people-mover to get people to the Resort because the grade is challenging. Board Member Natt asked if there would be a view corridor between the Resort and the Park. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that the goal is to be able to look up from City Park and see the Resort. The idea for the parking lot at PCMR is to get from there into the base of the Resort without having to cross through lodges and up the fire gate.

Planner Sintz stated that 1323 Woodside was a significant structure that was mandated to be demolished by the former Chief Building Official for safety reasons. On the drawing, B identified the location chosen by the City Council for the 1323 Woodside reconstruction, per an agreement with the property owner.

Board Member McFawn asked if PCMR would still be used for functions in town where people can park, but in a better parking structure with better access in and out. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that the City would have to get the benefit of reserved event parking. They are working out the details regarding number of spaces and costs.

Board Member Natt thought they would miss a good opportunity if they did not put a commercial component on the first level with housing on top. It would be beneficial to have people living, eating and working in this location. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that one reason was to avoid competing with existing business at PCMR. A second reason was to avoid generating more traffic to the neighborhood. The intent was to provide a service to the little neighborhood they were trying to create and make a vital place. Planner Sintz pointed out that the current Land Management Code Zoning for this area only allows support commercial and existing business related to the Resort.

Board Member Natt felt this was clearly a transitional area between a more commercial zone from Jan's into town. He could not understand why they would not want to blend it. Mr. Weidenhamer thought it was likely that the parking garage would have more affordable housing, which would meet the policy goal of more affordable housing on site.

Board Member McKie asked if the property the City was talking about buying already had existing structures, or if the development shown on the drawings was new development. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the fire station was vacated by the Fire District. It was currently being used, but the building is old and does not have a much longer life. The senior center is a historic structure that was moved to its current location; however, it is not on the City's Historic Inventory. The rest of the land is vacant.

Board Member Natt asked if the new construction would be City construction or something else. Mr. Weidenhamer was unsure. The City could engage in a joint venture or they could sell the land with stated goals.

Chair Werbelow wanted to know how they pull the trigger on this substantial vision that was being formulated and how it relates to historic preservation. Planner Sintz replied that a portion of the land is in the RC zone and another portion would be in the HRC. They would have to follow any current process, such as the historic pre-application and HDDR, the same as anyone else. Mr. Weidenhamer remarked that first they would need to start with a community engagement process. The City Council has identified their goals, but to vet what would actually be built would start with community engagement.

Chair Werbelow asked if a time frame had been set. Mr. Weidenhamer answered no, not at a policy level. Procurement steps may need to be taken before they reach that point.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray indicated the reference to condo workforce housing, and asked if anything was specified as affordable housing. She wanted to know what happened to senior housing. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that senior housing is a stated priority for the City Council in this district. He was unsure if the Park Avenue condos were a goal or how it was related. If they do not accommodate senior housing on Park Avenue, he assumed it would be a strong priority for the Lower Park RDA. Mr. Weidenhamer remarked that the idea for workforce housing is to have market rate with seasonal units attached. Board Member McFawn favored housing for seasonal workers.

Downtown – Main Street Project Update

Mr. Weidenhamer presented exhibits for the downtown area. He stated that the Downtown Action Plan was created by the City in 1998, and it has been the blueprint

over the past 15 years for everything from a transit center to bulb-outs to some of the streetscapes. The Downtown Action Plan has been completed and it's time for a new plan. Mr. Weidenhamer noted that the Historic Park City Alliance, the HPCA has been coming to the City for the better part of three years asking what they plan to do. Over two years ago the City told the HPCA to outline what they would like to have done. Andy Beerman, acting as President of the HPCA, actually provided a series of strategic plans and events and infrastructure. Their committee hired IBI to prepare preliminary plans for downtown. The area runs from Hillside, Lower Deer Valley and all the way down to the Lower Park Avenue District.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that Park City was the first entity in Utah to ever use the RDA, and this was the first RDA in town. This RDA brings in approximately \$1.3 annually. \$400,000 of that goes to the School Board as settlement on a lawsuit filed against the City and the RDA, in which the School Board won. The remaining \$920,000 goes towards paying off the debt on the China Bridge parking garage, and that runs for the life of the RDA. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that there was only \$400,000 in total scratch and that is being used to run the current project with IBI on projected redevelopment. Mr. Weidenhamer outlined the scope of the IBI project.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the quadruple bottom line scoring balances economy, environment and social goals, without sacrificing the fourth part, which is keeping Park City Park City. The process was just beginning and the details were limited. He anticipated that the public process would begin in April and once they get public input, they would look for direction from the City Council and input from the Historic Park City Alliance Board. The goal of the process is to factor the projects and preliminary cost estimates into the budget process to compete with other City priorities.

Chair Werbelow asked about funding source for some of the larger concepts. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that it competes for General Fund money with all the other goals because the RDA is allocated to the debt for the parking garage. It speaks to the question of whether or not to identify additional revenue sources such as property or sales tax. The budget prioritization budget process will try to keep things at a policy/philosophical level in terms of what type of funding should be allocated to what type of project.

Chair Werbelow asked if the Main Street merchants play a financial role. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the merchants were looking at a willingness to assess themselves to do certain things. He used radiant heating as an example.

Mr. Weidenhamer remarked that policy direction is to build a central gathering area at the site of the existing post office. The idea is to have a gathering place in the center of town that is connected to City Hall and would function with a flexible Swede Alley. At this point the HPCA believes it is unrealistic because the post office has no intention of leaving. The HPCA has suggested focusing on the Brew Pub lot where they could build a one-level parking garage and a plaza that is street level with Main Street. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the policy question is, "the biggest bang for the buck" for downtown if that is the primary driver. Options are being researched and considered.

Planner Sintz stated that projects like the plaza would go through the pre-application and HDDR process, but it would not come back to the HPB unless there was an appeal. The

Staff would keep the HPB informed on progress and updated on the public input sessions.

Board Member Natt asked about the timetable for reconstruction of the Kimball Arts Center. Planner Sintz was unsure of the timing because an application had not been submitted. She suggested that they direct their questions to the Kimball Arts Center for answers.

WORK SESSION – Annual Historic Preservation Award

Planner Sintz reviewed a slide of the ordinance that was adopted by City Council. She indicated the six categories at the bottom with language stating “criteria not limited to...” The ordinance indicates that the Annual Preservation be selected during the month of June. Planner Sintz noted that the HPB has a light schedule and the Staff wanted to give them the opportunity have that discussion now.

Planner Sintz asked if the HPB wanted to form a subcommittee. She recalled from discussions last year that everyone wanted to be involved. They should also set a timeline and target dates to meet the June selection announcement.

Board Member McFawn noted that a subcommittee could not have more than three members, otherwise it constitutes a quorum. If more than three people were interested in sitting on the committee, he felt they were committed to involving the entire Board.

Chair Werbelow was on the subcommittee last year and she volunteered to step down this year to give someone else the opportunity. Board Members Matsumoto-Gray, McKie and Natt wanted to be involved in the selection process.

Chair Werbelow reported that last year she, David White, and Roger Durst were the subcommittee for the award. David White was absent this evening, and she could not speak for him regarding his thoughts on the subcommittee. Board Member Holmgren was also absent. Chair Werbelow thought it was difficult to make a determination this evening without giving Board Members White and Holmgren the opportunity to voice their opinion. She recognized that the June deadline was approaching and suggested that the Board Members begin to think about projects in town that could be a potential award recipient and present those ideas at the next meeting.

Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that the HPB could form a subcommittee of three members to brainstorm, and then bring the best ideas to the Board to evaluate as a whole. Board Members Natt, McKie and Matusmoto-Gray were willing to meet prior to the next HPB meeting and come back with specific sites for discussion.

Board Member Natt asked if an award needed to be given. Chair Werbelow stated that an award did not need to be given; however, the HPB created the program and since their purview as a Board had somewhat diminished, it would be a shame not to carry this opportunity forward. Board Member Natt asked if the project needed to be recent within the last year. Chair Werbelow answered no. Board Member Natt was concerned about giving out an award without good reason. He understood that the language indicated an “annual award”, but he wanted to reserve the right to not present the award if they could not find a suitable recipient.

Planner Sintz offered to provide a list of projects that occurred over a specific time frame if needed. The Board discussed the process and the criteria for choosing a recipient.

Board Member McKie thought that the Washington School Inn was a project to be considered. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray suggested 1101 Norfolk because they were interested in doing a TDR. Planner Sintz reported that the owner of 1101 Norfolk received a development credit letter from the Planning Director, but they have not notified the City of their intent. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that another house in her neighborhood on Empire Avenue did a sustainable redevelopment. She would research that project further and report back. Chair Werbelow pointed out that the Washington Inn and the two on Lowell Avenue and Empire Avenue were unique concepts that the community should be made aware of.

Board Member Fawn recommended having a three-member subcommittee to bring back possible ideas for the next meeting. He suggested limiting the number to 3 or 4 potential recipients. Board Member Natt favored the idea of a tour to the Washington School and the Museum.

Planner Sintz stated that the next meeting would be scheduled for April 4, 2012. Chair Werbelow remarked that if the Board made a decision on April 4th, they would have time to commission the artwork of the chosen structure or some other deliverable item. Board Member McFawn pointed out that if they choose artwork, they must go through the Public Art Advisory Board. He recalled that last year the Advisory Board provided names of artists to consider. Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that any time the City is involved with art, it is recommended that the Public Arts Advisory Board be involved.

The Board favored the idea of presenting the award on their own, as opposed to tagging onto a museum event as they did last year.

Meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



Author: Kayla Sintz
Subject: 2012 Preservation Award
Date: April 4, 2012
Type of Item: Informational

Pursuant to Resolution 11-20 the Historic Preservation Board has the ability to identify and award exemplary historic projects in compliance with the Historic Guidelines on an annual basis in the form of a Preservation Award based on criteria not limited to:

- Adaptive Re-Use
- Infill Development
- Excellence in Restoration
- Sustainable Preservation
- Embodiment of Historical Context
- Connectivity of Site

On March 7, 2012 the Historic Preservation Board created a sub-committee to discuss and report back to the Board on candidates for the 2012 Preservation Award.

Staff is requesting discussion on the following items:

- Sub Committee discussion regarding potential properties
- Future Action
- Artist Selection
- Presentation Timing