

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
VISIONING SESSION  
FEBRUARY 10, 2009

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Todd Ford, Roger Durst, Puggy Holmgren, Gary Kimball, Ken Martz, Adam Opalek, Sara Werbelow.

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Brooks Robinson, Kirsten Whetstone, Kayla Sintz, Jeff Davis, Jacque Mauer, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah.

VISIONING SESSION

---

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, opened the meeting at 6:18 p.m.

Director Eddington stated that the objective of this meeting was to talk about visioning for 2009. He acknowledged that the HPB has been working for the past several months on the Historic District Design Guidelines and the Historic Sites Inventory. Director Eddington encouraged a free discussion among the Board members to give the Staff a sense of direction for the goals they would like to accomplish in 2009.

The Planning Staff introduced themselves.

Director Eddington offered a list of topics to begin the discussion.

Council Member, Liza Simpson, thanked the long-term Board members and the newer members for their service to the Historic Preservation Board. She noted that some times are easier than others but they would not have a Historic Preservation Board without their contribution. Council Member Simpson also thanked the Staff for their contribution because they are the other half of the process. Their hard work and research helps the HPB make informed and responsible decisions. Council Member Simpson stated that she would not stay for the entire meeting because she did not want her position on the City Council to hinder their ideas or input.

The HPB thanked Council Member Simpson for her efforts as the City Council Liaison.

Chair Ford thanked everyone for attending. He reiterated that the agenda was a loose organization of preliminary ideas and the intent of the meeting was to have free flowing conversations. Chair Ford suggested that they begin the discussion with overall thoughts and visions for the direction the Board would like to go and what they want for the Historic District. That preliminary discussion should help frame the specifics of how to achieve their goals and the tools necessary to carry out that vision.

Board Member Adam Opalek stated that he joined the HPB to get more involved in Park City. He has seen a lot of changes in the fourteen years he has lived in Park City and some have been negative changes. Board Member Opalek was not against growth but he felt the issue was how to control and maintain growth.

Park City offers various venues and variables to attract people and the Old Town area needs to be preserved and protected. In his opinion, people who want to live in large homes should move somewhere besides Old Town. Park City offers a number of places where people can build 6,500 square foot homes without issue. He was bothered by the

fact that developers come in and are able to build outside the guidelines and the spirit of the HPB. He felt the Planning Department is now playing catch up to lay some ground rules. Board Member Opalek intended to do everything in his power to preserve keep Old Town and to keep it small.

Board Member Werbelow stated that she comes from a development background. Her father was a responsible developer who made wise choices in scale and community appropriateness. She sees her role on the Board as being a resource for the community. She agreed with Board Member Opalek that Old Town should keep its appeal and its culture because that is a main reason why people come to Park City. Board Member Werbelow felt the HPB was a good way for her to get involved in helping to preserve the scale and character of the historic district. She believes houses are inevitable and they cannot stop growth. Board Member Werbelow wants to help people who have homes in the historic district understand how to blend growth and change appropriately and responsibly. She had hoped the HPB could be a tool and a resource for the community and she was insecure about their current role. Board Member Werbelow referred to the handout for the CAMP and noted that "arbitrary" and "capricious" were two words that caught her attention. If they develop new tools as a resource, the process should not be arbitrary or capricious. Those are her two biggest concerns. She is a layperson on the Board and she is looking towards developing core and legitimate tools to help the community grow responsibly and appropriately.

Board Member Durst stated that he was back on the Board for the second time. He found the first time very intriguing. He was not on the Board when the design guidelines were discussed; however, he shared a number of critiques during that time but never felt like his comments were acknowledged. Board Member Durst stated that in order to retain something you have to change it. There is a dynamic taking place in town. To assign an inherent value to something historical but not acknowledge its significance is a liability for trying to retain the character and ambience. Board Member Durst stated that because something is old does not necessarily make it valuable. On the other hand, something new would not be completely contrary to what they are trying to create for Old Town. Diversity and complexity is one of the charms of this community and that is what they are trying to sustain in Park City. He felt that could take place and he was challenged by the opportunity.

Board Member Martz stated that he has served on the current HPB for 2-1/2 years. He was also a member of the Historic District Commission in the 1990's. As a Board member, he spent the last year or more revising the design guidelines and in that time he helped to complete the Historic Sites Inventory twice. He noted that the guidelines are still in the process of being adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council and he looks forward to seeing how those guidelines are implemented. Board Member Martz anticipated a rough start but he felt things could turn out well if the Staff and the HPB work together to utilize the guidelines. He anticipated that some changes might need to be made because the document is not perfect.

Council Member Simpson stated that the guidelines are not on hold, but the City Council wanted to test them through the CAMP training before they were adopted. She believed that the City has a habit of revising things and then thinking it is done. It is time to start treating all the guiding documents as living documents that need to keep evolving. She suggested an established checkpoint for reviewing those documents.

Board Member Martz agreed that an evolving document would be a healthy process.

Board Member Kimball preferred to preservation over development. He does not like McMansions and he favors people history more than building history. Board Member Kimball hated to see the miners' heritage exploited. He believed there were other areas in Park City that can handle the development and size of larger homes.

Chair Ford stated that people history gets lost in the process and he wanted to explore ideas on how to extract the people history and make it part of the process. He noted that Board Member Kimball is the only one on the Board who knows the history and stories behind particular structures and his knowledge is valuable.

Planner Katie Cattan suggested that the HPB begin each meeting with a story related to either an item on the agenda or something else of importance. The story would be written down as part of the record. The Board members favored that idea. Planner Cattan noted that the stories should come from Gary Kimball or Puggy Holmgren and not from Staff. Board Member Werbelow suggested adding that to the agenda to encourage public participation. She remarked that compiling historic information about individuals and structures would be a great resource to have available.

Council Member Simpson suggested that Board Member Martz, as the liaison to the Historical Society, could explore that possibility. Board Member Martz stated that the Historical Society has a lot of historic information on record in addition to oral history.

Board Member Durst felt it was also important to tell a story that projects the future of the home. He thought it would be good to have a counterpoint idea between the past history and future projection of a specific building. It would show where they have been and where they might be going.

Chair Ford thought that some of the buildings themselves tell the story about change and adaptation. Board Member Holmgren stated that a number of buildings have fallen through the cracks in terms of the history of the name. She used the Carl Winters Buildings as an example. The streets are also losing their historic names as those names are being replaced with numbers. Chair Ford remarked that the landmark status should give them an opportunity to identify structures that have been modified by placing a plaque on the structure that tells its story.

Board Member Martz felt they should incorporate the Historical Society into the process and take advantage of the resources that are available. Board Member Holmgren noted that the Museum has a walking tour of Main Street and she suggested the possibility of a walking tour through Old Town.

Board Member Holmgren suggested that the HPB and the Historical Society work together on this idea. Board Member Martz stated that he and Chair Ford have already discussed having more interaction with Sandra Morrison and her staff.

Planner Kayla Sintz stated that as a new Staff member, she would like to have greater interaction with the Museum and the Historical Society.

After further discussion, Director Eddington suggested that the HPB invite someone from the Historical Society to periodically attend their meetings and provide updates. Chair

Ford thought they should explore how the Historical Society and the HPB can help each other. Board Member Durst felt they should also look at other resources such as the University of Utah, the Utah Historical Society and the Utah Heritage Foundation.

Council Member Simpson noted that the next item on the agenda was communications. She believes that free and open communication is important and that the Board has her blanket support. Council Member Simpson stated that during the City Council visioning session, she raised the issue that boards and commissions were not invited to a City events. Boards and commissions do invaluable work for the City and they need each other in certain situations and it fosters better open communication. Board Member Simpson believed the City Council decided that all Boards and Commissions would be invited to events. She encouraged the Board members and the Staff to request additional information when needed because communication is key.

Chair Ford felt it would be helpful if the Staff could provide a brief update at each HPB meeting on current and upcoming projects before the Planning Commission and City Council. This would keep everyone informed in the same loop of communication working towards a common goal.

Council Member Simpson stated that the City Council sends a liaison to the Planning Commission and the HPB and the Planning Commission has decided to send a member to the City Council meetings. She agreed with Chair Ford's suggestion that the Staff update the HPB on matters before the City Council and Planning Commission.

Chair Ford stated that his total frustration when he first joined the Board was how far the HPB was out of the loop. The Board members would receive calls from citizens asking about specific projects that they knew nothing about. His goal is to have more open communication with other Boards and the public so the HPB is aware of the issues related to projects, even if they are not actively involved in the review of that project. If they are informed, they can be the liaison to the public and help with the public process.

Board Member Simpson discussed ways the Staff could keep the HPB updated. The HPB is on the front lines of the historic district and it is important that they be kept informed on a regular basis.

Board Member Werbelow agreed that public communication and interaction was a key component. She did not think the job of the HPB was clearly defined. She believed one purpose of the visioning session should be to discuss their role. Board Member Werbelow stated that the public did not understand the change from the Historic District Commission to the Historic Preservation Board. Their purview is very small and people do not realize that the HPB is a public resource. She believed the public is misinformed and it is important that they know exactly what the HPB is supposed to do.

Planner Kirsten Whetstone agreed that there is confusion in the community over the HPB and this was their opportunity to help the community understand the value of the Historic District. She felt the Board should brainstorm ways to market the Historic District. The question is whether or not Park City as a whole is proud of their historic district and if not, why not.

Director Eddington stated that the HPB should be a proactive resource. He wanted them to play a larger role than just being a body the public comes to for information.

Board Member Kimball stated that the historical society does a walking tour each year and that is quite successful. He thought that could be one avenue for getting the word out. Director Eddington suggested that the City could showcase one structure as an example of a great historic preservation project. He thought they should market the Historic District in more ways than just agenda items reviewed by the HPB.

Planner Whetstone stated that there is a historic preservation week. She commented on the events that take place during preservation week and noted that the Staff used to have more involvement. Planner Sintz felt this was an example of the disconnect between entities that has damaged the public perception of the HPB and other boards and commissions. She thought they should begin bridging that disconnect.

Board Member Martz stated that the historical tour provides a great way to learn the history behind the buildings and the town. Chair Ford did not want the HPB to become an advocacy group but he wanted to get the word out. He felt the grant program is one tool they could use. Those who receive grant money should be willing to open up their house for one night so the public could see how the home was restored. Board Member Holmgren favored that idea.

Board Member Martz stated that during the days of the Historic District Commission, every homeowner in the Historic District would receive a memo from the City suggesting that it was time to apply for a Historic Grants Program. If a homeowner had a project, they could apply for the grant and the HDC as a group would drive around and select five or six appropriate grants each year. He believed this encouraged people to get involved and it went a long way towards restoring Old Town.

Council Member Simpson recalled a previous discussion from the HPB about providing incentives for homeowners who preserve historic structures. She felt they had hit on the right issue because Park City is losing the people who take pride in owning a historic home. Council Member Simpson was happy to hear ideas or conversations on how they can tip it back the other way. She believed that 20 years ago the grant program was vital, but the issue is no longer monetary. She thought public recognition of historic homeowners may be a greater incentive for preserving historic structures.

Planner Whetstone remarked that another incentive could be a competition for the best historic project of the year.

Craig Elliott asked to speak as a member of the public and a business owner in Park City. Mr. Elliott stated that he previously discussed the idea of having a design board programs in town. Until recently, he was on the Board of Directors for the AIA, State of Utah. They had given him the authority to move forward with a committee for the Wasatch Back or for Park City. Mr. Elliott remarked that the AIA could work with an entity such as the Historical Society to put that committee together. He thought bringing in an organization that has recognition throughout the State would help add value to their discussion. Council Member Simpson favored having an organization like the AIA work with the Historical Society on incentives that would recognize historic preservation, and more importantly, recognize the continuum of quality design. She reiterated that recognition may be more engaging than a monetary incentive.

Board Member Durst stated that in response to the question of what the HPB is commissioned to do, it is their job to review the standards for historic preservation as it

applies to Park City. When they talk about design review, it is by nature a subject of judgment. He felt the application of the guidelines is prescriptive. Board Member Durst remarked that as long as the guidelines are prescriptive they would continue to get monster houses and strip malls. He would like the Historic Preservation Board to become the Design Review Commission so they can make subjective decisions. Under the current process, when the Staff brings them an application, they are limited to prescriptive criteria.

Board Member Durst used the Treasure Hill project as an example of why a Design Review Commission would be beneficial and would take some pressure off the Staff.

Planner Cattan reported that the Staff intends to mix Planning Commission and HPB members to form a design review committee for the Treasure Hill development. The first three elements are employee housing, traffic, and mass and scale. When the discussion moves to mass and scale, a sub-committee will be created.

Board Member Durst felt it was important to understand the elements of visual perception and to put those elements into context. He wanted to know who would be responsible for doing that and he believes it should involve the Historical Society and a professional design group.

Planner Whetstone noted that a Town Lift Task Force was formed during the review of the Summit Watch project and that Task Force consisted of representatives from the Planning Commission and the Historic District Commission. She thought that project emphasized that there is no guarantee for what you get. In spite of the task force, The Summit Watch does not work from a planning perspective and it does not reflect Main Street. She noted that the task force needs to go beyond the Planning Commission and HPB and it needs to involve technical support.

Chair Ford had a sense that Park City is scared to death of design. All they do is quasi-Old Town-Deer Valley aesthetics and call that planning and design. He believed that Mr. Elliott and Board Member Durst were trying to say that they need to reinvigorate design in the community. Chair Ford remarked that in the past, the HPB has been seen as a squasher of design.

Board Member Kimball stated that he hates the Sweeney's development in Old Town. The Board members can speak about it as citizens, but it is out of their purview as the HPB. There are guidelines specific to Old Town and he thought everyone should adhere to those.

Board Member Martz stated that he was on the Town Lift Task Force in the 1990's when lower Main Street was being developed. He noted that they had to deal with the 1985 agreement of the heights and volumetrics at that time and it was the same issue they have today with the Treasure Hill Development. Board Member Martz remarked that not all the HPB members are architects and he was glad to have one on the Board.

Planner Cattan stated that if the Planning Commission makes a decision and the City Council has concerns, the City Council can call it up. She suggested that they look at the LMC to see if the HPB could call up a decision the Staff made if they have concerns.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she hates the Summit Watch because it is ugly and a misuse of property. She did not believe any other project should be allowed to slip through the cracks again. Board Member Holmgren thought that Treasure Hill should be held to the highest standards of all.

Planner Whetstone asked if Board Member Durst thought the mass and density proposed for Treasure Hill could be designed to fit in that space. Board Member Durst replied that it could be designed but it would take native genius and necessarily good architecture. In his opinion, Park City is not meant to be Williamsburg, Virginia or Virginia City in Nevada. This community is not destined to be a museum and they cannot be what they were 100 years ago.

Board Member Kimball stated that he has lost respect for the architectural community and believes they have become very egotistical.

Director Eddington stated that an ongoing challenge is whether the guidelines are too strict or not strict enough.

Board Member Opalek felt the question is where this town wants to go and whether they want to sell out or preserve their heritage. He thought it was obvious that everyone at the meeting had the ability to sway in either direction. Board Member Opalek was not opposed to modern architecture, but he was trying to protect and preserve something important, and he could see nothing wrong with doing that. He agreed that progress will happen and they cannot stop it. They have challenges in promoting preservation because everyone is trying to go green and they are losing the aesthetic look. He felt those two issues should be their focus. They are not going to replicate a house that was built in the late 1800's because it would not sustain the community. What they need to do is encourage the property owner to design or refurbish a home with the characteristics from that era. Board Member Opalek stated that the art deco look is fine, but not in Old Town.

Mr. Elliott referred to an item on the agenda regarding the General Plan. He asked to share his personal thoughts about how things work from his perspective as an architect. Mr. Elliott stated that the only real constant in the world is change and there are many different ways to live in that change. They can either deal with the impervious flow of change as it comes at them, or they can have a vision of where that change is going and make change a vision. Mr. Elliott stated that in 2001 he made a presentation to the City Council that suggested his vision of the future of Old Town. He has Old Town in mind with every drawing he does and everything he does is about living in the future. Mr. Elliott stated that in 2001 he suggested to the City Council that the vision for Old Town needed to be developed. His personal view in 2001 was that Old Town was developing and changing from a General Commercial District into an arts and entertainment district where everyone wants to go. Mr. Elliott believed that vision still applies today. He noted that people live and work in arts and entertainment districts. Mr. Elliott suggested that instead of trying to solve short-term issues, the HPB should be looking at long-term solutions. He noted that the General Plan does not address a vision for the Historic District and it should. If they are always looking at the little issues, it is hard to get a big picture.

Chair Ford stated that from a design perspective he would argue that Old Town Park City is turning into a second home community where the front porch is abandoned and

the inter-relationship is more walled off. He noted that an arts and entertainment district is interaction in the public and private realm. Chair Ford felt they lost interaction through the past guidelines and the fill the box mentality. He believes that design decides interaction.

Director Eddington stated that during the City Council visioning session, the Council promoted changes to the General Plan. They realize that there are two directions; where they are going and where do they want to go. Currently there is nothing that identifies where they want to go. The General Plan is loose and rarely referenced. It is a shelf document that is fairly dated. As they start to gather data for re-writing the General Plan, an important element is that they ultimately want for Old Town and how it should be designed to meet that goal. Director Eddington emphasized that input from the HPB would be valuable in determining those design solutions. He hoped the current design guidelines were also a step in the right direction. Director Eddington estimated that the General Plan re-write would be a two-year process. He expected to start within the next month or two.

Board Member Opalek asked about a vision statement. Director Eddington stated that the HPB would have the opportunity to put together a mission statement for the General Plan.

Board Member Holmgren stated that there is only one Old Town and it needs to be preserved. Director Eddington remarked that part of the issue with Old Town is that there are different neighborhoods within Old Town and there is no cohesiveness. Old Town does not have an HOA and there is no real sense of community. He suggested that one goal could be finding ways to create that sense of community. They hear a lot from developers and second homeowners in terms of what they want for Old Town; but they do not hear from the Old Town residents in a cohesive manner.

Board Member Holmgren stated that a few years ago when someone purchased the house at 1151 Park Avenue to use as a coffee shop, the neighborhood became very cohesive and united to stop that coffee shop.

Chair Ford felt that a portion of the HPB agendas should be dedicated to visioning discussion. He thought the discussions were helpful and pertain to matters such as amending the design guidelines as they move forward and the types of proposals they should make to the City Council. Chair Ford stated that a worthy debate is whether or not the HPB wants to take on a much more active role in design review. Chair Ford proposed that in addition to hearing updates from the Staff on City Council matters, the HPB should also carve out 20 or 30 minutes in the agenda to discuss what they want to address at their next meeting and direct Staff to provide whatever information would be needed.

Board Member Kimball preferred to have a visioning session similar to this one once a quarter.

Board Member Martz suggested that the HPB move into closed session following an applicant's presentation, to discuss that specific project. He felt this would allow them to be open with their thoughts. Director Eddington pointed out that the HPB cannot meet in closed session. Board Member Martz suggested that the HPB could at least talk about how they make decisions, or discuss why a decision was made on a specific project.



Board Member Martz stated that he did not necessarily agree with Mr. Elliott's philosophy for Old Town. It is important to compromise but they still need to maintain a sense of community and protect what they have.

Chair Ford stated that one advantage is that the HPB appears to be more aware of what Old Town is and they have very diverse sets of views, philosophies and backgrounds. That is a strength and they should feel free to be open with their comments and not be afraid of offending each other or the Staff. He felt it was important to have 15-30 minutes during each meeting to raise issues and to better understand each other. He hoped it would eventually lead to consensus on certain items.

Director Eddington stated that this type of discussion could be added to the agenda. He noted that the Planning Commission has recommended a similar type of approach for their meetings. Chair Ford remarked that knowing there is a partnership with Staff regarding options and topics would help bridge the gap between meetings.

Chair Ford pointed out that not all of their meetings are public hearings or appeals, which is why he believes it is important to have more informal work sessions. There is no formality of process and it allows them to be free and open in their discussion.

Chair Ford remarked that whether you agree or disagree with Craig Elliott, he is a very well spoken member of the design community. He did not want the HPB's perception of the design community to be marred by the disparages they have had over the last six months. Chair Ford believed they should engage the design community as an entity of the public and not be afraid of them. He was frustrated with how certain representatives have represented the design community over the last six months. As part of the public, he felt the HPB needed to reach out to the design community.

Board Member Werbelow stated that there needs to be public outreach with the regular citizen. Director Eddington reported that the Staff has been working with the City to develop a new website. The new website could have web pages for the HPB and the Planning Commission, which would provide a better opportunity to reach out to the public.

Planner Whetstone stated that at the last Planning Commission meeting when the Commission discussed steep slopes, there was more interest from homeowners than from the designers. The disappointment for the Planning Commission was that the comments were focused on individual property owners and what it would do to them personally. They were hoping to hear more from the design community.

Chair Ford felt the most productive input during a Planning Commission public hearing was when Craig Elliott made his point by drawing on the whiteboard. It was more productive and constructive than other designers and architects who spent their comment time screaming and yelling. He remarked that when they start re-writing the General Plan, it will be important to focus people on drawing not swearing.

Board Member Durst felt that the HPB, in conjunction with the Staff, should start with a quarterly design report that would get people interested in what is going on in town and to understand that every piece of design has its history. The Board members could comment and have it published in the Park Record. The report could identify

modifications and changes that certain individuals have made to their property. It would get people thinking about the impacts being created by real things happening in town.

Board Member Opalek suggested that the Park Record could spotlight a particular house or structure each week and provide a short history of the project and any renovations that have occurred.

Director Eddington stated that the HPB could recommend a specific house to the Park Record for a pro-active opportunity, as opposed to always being the critical design review Board. The Board members and Staff discussed specific ideas for spotlighting historic properties.

Director Eddington hoped to be able to incorporate more discussion into future meetings so the HPB can be more proactive, particularly in dealing with General Plan issues. He encouraged more one on one interaction and recommended that the Board members email or call any of the Staff with questions or comments they would like to share.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Todd Ford, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board