

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF MARCH 18, 2009

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

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Dina Blaes, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah.

---

Chair Todd Ford called the work session to order at 6:05 p.m.

## WORK SESSION

### CAMP Debriefing

Dina Blaes commented on the CAMP Training and requested feedback from the Board Members, particularly regarding design guidelines and the Historic Preservation Board's duties. She recalled an exercise where everyone voted on certain purposes based on the purposes currently listed in the Land Management Code. The five purposes that received the highest votes were included in the Staff report. Ms. Blaes asked if the HPB thought the LMC should reflect the emphasis that was discovered at the CAMP.

The Board began their discussion with the Design Guidelines. Chair Ford asked if there were issues or items in the design guidelines that the HPB would like to discuss or revise before the guidelines are adopted. Ms. Blaes referred to a suggestion during the CAMP to have a pull sheet that identifies the common issues in repeated applications. The Planning Department could give this sheet to the applicants in addition to the larger document that lays the groundwork for the preservation program.

Board Member Werbelow asked if considering the suggested simplification tactics could slow down the process of adopting the guidelines. Ms. Blaes stated that most could be administrative documents that are given to the applicant along with the design guidelines, which is the formal approved document required in the LMC. Ms. Werbelow stated that the actual practice of interacting with the community could help them get a sense of what those areas might be to simplify the process. She asked if that would be acceptable if they should have everything set up before exposing the process to the community.

Ms. Blaes believed the Staff could identify five items right now that are constant issues as a good place to start. The evaluation the HPB has requested on a regular basis would also help to facilitate the issues. Ms. Blaes stated that windows and additions are immediate issues and she believed sustainability would be an issue in the near future.

Board Member Durst stated that his problem was less with the guidelines and more with the structure of the design review team. He believes the current design review team is more of a plan team that looks at heights, setbacks, density, etc. Those are issues of regulation but the discussion is about guidelines. His opinion is that the guidelines have been and will always be a subject of judgment. Mr. Durst was unsure if all of the Planners were imbued with design aesthetics but having a Staff architect on the team is

a positive contribution. The next team member is a building official, but they are not looking at design, they are looking at securing health, safety and the integrity of the building. Mr. Durst stated that the applicant and/or his designer are biased because they are presenting the proposal. Mr. Durst felt it would be helpful to have the Historic Preservation Board represented on the design review team or someone from the Park City Historic Society or someone from another venue. This person could be an Ex Officio member of the design review team and they could add historic perspective to the design review.

Mr. Durst believes the defect is the design review team and the CAMP reinforced that in his mind. He has a personal bias being an architect and he is not willing to let that go. He thought the design review team should take advantage of the skills and vision of others. He thought the Design Review Team should be limited to 7 members or less. Mr. Durst clarified that he has no quarrel with the guidelines because it provides direction, but they cannot assure the quality of the community by providing direction in a prescriptive manner. All elements of design need to be taken into account.

Mr. Durst remarked that he has never agreed with the definition of design as written in Appendix B. Ms. Blaes clarified that the definition comes from the National Park Service and it relates specifically to designation of landmark sites. Mr. Durst stated that regardless of who wrote it, he did not think it was a good definition of design. He noted that color was left out of the definition; however, in looking at the elements of visual perception they cannot take things out of context. Mr. Durst had a problem with the limited definition.

Board Member Holmgren stated that the Board specifically deleted the color restrictions because they did not feel color should be restricted in Park City. Mr. Durst clarified that he was not suggesting that they restrict color. He believes color should be an element of design and it should be looked at in context with other visual elements and it should work with the design.

Board Member Kimball stated that if color is not mentioned, it would not restrict the architect. Eliminating color from the definition leaves it open for an architect to experiment and do what he wants with color.

Board Member Holmgren noted that page 33 of the guidelines address paint and color. She read, "Original material such as brick and stone that are traditionally left unpainted should not be painted. Materials that are traditionally painted should have an opaque rather than transparent finish. Provide a weather protective finish to wood surfaces that were not historically painted. When possible low VOC paints and finishes should be used". Board Member Holmgren recalled that the paint issue was a testy conversation before color restrictions were eliminated. She was one who was instrumental in getting it removed. Board Member Durst respectfully disagreed with Board Member Holmgren.

Board Member Werbelow stated that Board Member Durst had laid out two issues that she felt needed to be discussed. She asked Board Member Durst to explain what he feels is lacking in the definition and why he believes it would have implications in evaluating these guidelines.

Board Member Durst replied that there are certain elements of any design that should never be isolated. Each element should be looked at in context and it should not be

ignored. He appreciated the idea that they should not tell the applicant what color he could paint a surface, but it is relevant to the surrounding units. Color is no different from the form, mass, scale and proportions. They all need to be recognized because they are all a part of the design. If you remove one you do not have a complete design. He agreed that it would be improper to define a color palette.

Board Member Durst did not understand from the definition how space and structure define design. It is the job of the design to show that the building has a substantial structure and that it will maintain its integrity. He believes the best measure of architecture is space, but that is not defined. If they want to go into the interior of the building they need to go further than they already have.

Ms. Blaes remarked that space does not only refer to interior space. It responds to the space within the site. She believes the structural system is an issue and used the Alamo as an example of where structural systems are critical elements of the historic character of the building. Ms. Blaes stated that there are times when the structural system can reflect an important element of the design.

Chair Ford admitted that he had not read the Glossary of Terms as thoroughly as he read the rest of the document, but he felt Board Member Durst made a good point in that a definition should specifically reflect the document in which it is contained. He stated that in the definition of design, keeping in mind that the definition continues through C, D, F, and G as part of the master definition of historical integrity, the definition of design should reflect the items they are attempting to provide guidance for. He thought this would bolster the defense of the guidelines if their definition of historical integrity included some of the items they are specifically regulating within the guideline structure.

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, stated that D discusses finishes, painting, carving, joinery, tools, etc. He asked if A-G is missing something. Director Eddington stated that he would not look at the definition of design as the comprehensive definition of design as in design review, because there is a definition of design review as a process. As he reads A-G, he believes it is very comprehensive. They could add more if the HPB wishes, but it should be discussed in detail during the public hearing portion of the meeting. He pointed out that this was only a work session to discuss the CAMP and what they learned in terms of the application to design review.

Ms. Blaes suggested that they launch this discussion regarding the definition into the public hearing to benefit the public. Ms. Blaes asked if the HPB had other issues relative to the CAMP.

Board Member Holmgren liked the concept of certificate of appropriateness. She liked the concept of opening the door so the HPB does not become the design Nazi.

Chair Ford was hesitant to slow the design guidelines process. He would like to have the design guidelines in place because applications continue to come in and they are aware of the limitations of the old guidelines. Significant work was done on the revised guidelines and they were originally approved in September. Chair Ford asked Director Eddington for a time estimate for adopting the LMC amendments and the design guidelines. Director Eddington believed the goal was to have everything completed by the end of April. They were waiting until after the CAMP to give the HPB the opportunity to see what other cities are doing. Once they get an approval from the HPB, the LMC

language will go to the Planning Commission for approval. They hope to get approval from the City Council for the design guidelines and the LMC language simultaneously. Director Eddington felt they are on schedule to meet the mid to end of April time frame.

Chair Ford favored the idea of a one-page summary. He was not opposed to constructively adding elements for the betterment of the document if it could be done within the time frame outlined by Director Eddington. Chair Ford did not think the HPB should delay the package being approved and enacted by the City Council.

Board Member Kimball noted that the Crescent Tramway between Woodside Avenue and Park Avenue is off the map, but it should be left on. Ms. Blaes stated that she is working with Spencer in the IT Department to make that change, as well as other changes. Director Eddington noted that they are working with property owners along that Tramway to make sure they put up the required signage.

Board Member Werbelow asked if there were other issues, besides the ones raised by Roger Durst, regarding adding an additional participant to the DRT. Chair Ford suggested that they hold this discussion and any other discussion related to the design guidelines for the public hearing.

Ms. Blaes commented on the HPB duties and noted that five received a huge number of votes in the CAMP exercise. Those five were highlighted on the list of existing list HPB purposes and additional duties. That list was included in the Staff report. She asked if those should be emphasized within the LMC. Ms. Blaes noted that there was some repetition in the purpose of the additional duties. She noted that there are fifteen or sixteen duties and if they did one focus area within each of those duties they would be spending their time trying to achieve fifteen or sixteen different things. Chair Ford suggested restructuring those duties because some do overlap. Restructuring would reduce the duties to a reasonable number.

Ms. Blaes stated that because restructuring would fall under the LMC amendments, they would make revisions to the changes scheduled for public hearing at the next Planning Commission meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Blaes remarked that she has also requested that the Planning Commission packets be provided to the HPB. The policy is set at the HPB level but the decision is being made by the Planning Commission. Is it important that the HPB see the changes being proposed because they will be reflected in the LMC amendments.

Director Eddington called for discussion on the top five duties the HPB chose during the CAMP. The first was the guidelines. The second was recommend changes to the LMC. Chair Ford stated that the key word is "recommend", because the HPB has been out of the loop of the LMC changes. He felt that LMC regulations affecting Old Town should come through the HPB for a recommendation to the Planning Commission, so the Planning Commission can be fully informed of the HPB's opinion when making their decision.

Ms. Blaes pointed out that sending the currently proposed changes to the HPB prior to the Planning Commission would slow down the process considerably. In an effort to keep the process moving, Ms. Blaes suggested that the Board Members attend the Planning Commission meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

Director Eddington stated that when the HPB receives the Planning Commission packet, they should contact the Planning Department with any changes or comments they would like passed on to the Planning Commission.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean stated that all the Board Members were invited to attend the Planning Commission meeting; however, she recommended that they choose a designated representative for the guidelines and the LMC amendments so the HPB would be represented by one spokesperson. Chair Ford noted that these amendments have not been discussed by the HPB and he thought it was pointless to designate a Board Member to summarize what they have not discussed. He preferred to have the Board Members who attend speak for themselves.

Chair Ford referred to an article in the newspaper that said Park City would be reviewing the grants program. He was asked to make a comment but he knew nothing about it. Director Eddington believed the grants program is reviewed annually by law. Ms. Blaes stated that the article had implied that it would be a comprehensive review of the internal system and whom they give money to.

Chair Ford requested that the next agenda include a Staff update on the grants program.

Board Member Werbelow stated that grant money is one of the greatest incentives the City has to offer, but the dollar amount and the parameters are unclear. This was discussed in her group during the CAMP and she was very interested in being thoroughly educated on the grants program.

Director Eddington agreed that neither the Planning Department nor the HPB has focused enough on incentive grants. It is a positive opportunity for proactive public outreach and it should be developed further.

Director Eddington stated that item four from their list of five important topics talks about inventory applications; however, the Staff is also working to revamp other applications and he would be asking the HPB for feedback during that process.

Board Member Durst commented on the incentives being offered by the utility companies and the government for green buildings. He thought the HPB should discuss how that would overlay with historic preservation. He felt they could expand that consideration into the Grant Program.

Ms. Blaes had provided handouts regarding solar panels and pointed out that there is a lot that can be done to green a historic building before solar panels are considered. She noted that because solar panels are cool, most people overlook doing the simpler things such as windows, etc. Director Eddington wanted to explore green building with the HPB and the City's Sustainability team to see how far they should go with some of those issues. He felt it was important to expand that discussion.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff is working internally to address some of the issues discussed at the visioning session, as well as the five issues identified in the Staff report. Those will come back as agenda items for the HPB to discuss.

Chair Ford commented on a recommendation for the HPB members to meet in groups of two in order to consolidate their thoughts and to pare down the list into a top five. He

asked if the Board members were interested in meeting with him on an individual basis to share their thoughts on priorities so he could attempt to compile them into a smaller list.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she had also received the email with that recommendation and she responded back by saying that the HPB works very well as a group because they bounce ideas off of each other. As a group they would keep the discussion to HPB matters more than they would if two people were just talking.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff would be willing to facilitate a second visioning session for the HPB if they want to prioritize specific issues.

Board Member Werbelow noted that the City's visioning session begins the end of March. She thought it would be helpful for the HPB to have a second visioning session so they could present a united presence in that process. She asked if it was possible for the HPB to correlate into the larger visioning process for the City. Director Eddington was unsure if there would be a preservation table at the first session but he would contact the Community Affairs Department to see if that would be facilitated. He noted that the March 31<sup>st</sup> session is the community visioning kickoff. April 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> is a series of meetings. He stated that if the HPB would like a second visioning session to create a priority list, that could be done prior to the Community Visioning sessions. He would forward an agenda to the Board members so they would have that schedule. He encouraged the Board members to attend and make comment.

Chair Ford asked the Board if they preferred to have a Phase 2 visioning session with the entire HPB or if they prefer to discuss priorities with him in a smaller group setting. Board Member Werbelow felt they were more efficient as a Board. Board Member Durst favored an informal visioning session similar to the first one. Board Member Holmgren agreed. She believes they are good together as a group because they are so different.

Chair Ford asked Director Eddington to schedule a date prior to the March 31<sup>st</sup> Community Visioning. Director Eddington stated that another approach would be to wait until after the Community Visioning to see what issues are raised. Ms. Blaes agreed that if the HPB discussed specific issues in their first visioning session, it might be interesting to see if those same issues are shared by members of the community and other Boards.

After further discussion, the Board agreed to wait until after the first Community Visioning to schedule their second visioning session.

REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING

ROLL CALL

Chair Ford called the meeting to order and noted that all Board Members were present.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### Minutes of February 10, 2009

Board Member Durst referred to page 17, second paragraph, third line and corrected “not necessarily good architecture” to read “necessarily good architecture”.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 10, 2009 as amended. Board Member Durst seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### Minutes of February 18, 2009

MOTION: Board Member Durst moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 18, 2009 as written. Board Member Opalek seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

## PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

There was no comment.

## STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington reiterated that the Staff would provide the information for the Community Visioning and he encouraged the HPB to keep those dates open.

Chair Ford referred to a comment at the last meeting about sending a letter to the Editor regarding the inventory. He noted that a letter was not necessary because the article was corrected a few weeks later because of his constant haranguing. Ms. Blaes stated that Jay was persistent in contacting her about the inventory because Chair Ford had done a good job in being persistent.

## PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION ITEMS

1. Design Guidelines for Historic District and Historically Significant Buildings in Park City

Dina Blaes, Preservation Consultant with the Planning Department, stated that the Staff was requesting that the HPB forward a recommendation to the City Council to adopt the design guidelines as presented this evening or as amended during this meeting. The Staff report contained a brief background on how they have come to this point.

Mr. Blaes requested that the discussion focus on a summary of changes since the last edition, a policy they all felt strongly about, and solar panels.

Ms. Blaes reviewed the summary of changes. After a discussion at the last meeting about the acknowledgment page in terms of who was “chair” and when, the Staff recommended that the acknowledgement page reflect the Chair and Vice-Chair at the

time the guidelines were adopted, as well as the dates of service of those individuals who no longer serve on the Board.

Ms. Blaes referred to page 3 and noted that the Staff had followed the HPB's suggestion for making sure the format for presenting the information is under separate headings for landmark sites and significant sites so it is easier to read and understand. On page 6, changes to the four treatments for historic sites are set up more prominently within the text so preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction are clear.

Mr. Blaes recalled a request for a residential illustration similar to the illustration titled "traditional storefront component". She noted that residential components are commonly known. If specific terms are used within the paragraph of building types and styles and need to be included, she suggested including them in the glossary.

Mr. Blaes noted that page 20 included photographs of a landmark site and a significant site. The second paragraph on page 20 was also changed to address landmark site retaining their landmark status after a project is complete. Ms. Blaes intended to discuss that matter later in the meeting.

Ms. Blaes reviewed a number of changes that still need to be made to Appendix A, the maps. She noted that Planners Kayla Sintz and Katie Cattan had requested that addresses be provided for those properties within the zoning district that are landmark and significant sites. They are currently in the process of doing that.

Mr. Blaes stated that terms were added to the glossary and many of them came from members of the public. She is currently with Planner Sintz to prepare a model application that would be included as an appendix.

Ms. Blaes remarked that minor modifications were made throughout the document based on comments from the public.

On the issue of landmark sites retaining landmark status, Ms. Blaes stated that at two previous meetings the HPB supported the policy that proposed changes to a landmark site must not cause the site to lose its designation as a landmark site. Because designation of landmark status is tied to National Register eligibility, a landmark site must be eligible for the National Register after any changes are made to it. Ms. Blaes stated that this raises two issues. One is reconstruction of historic buildings. She stated that Ron Ivie appreciates the ability to have reconstruction as one of his tools as opposed to demolition. Ms. Blaes pointed out that a reconstructed building is rarely eligible for the National Register and it is not based on how Park City wants to use it. Ms. Blaes stated that the way the HPB and Ron Ivie wants to use it is a good way and they should not take that tool away from Ron Ivie. It should stay in place with the knowledge that a reconstructed site is no longer going to be a landmark site. There is very little alternative based on the condition of some of the houses, otherwise the result would be demolition requests.

Ms. Blaes remarked that the second issue is the impact of the policy on development proposals. She had provided Exhibit B in the Staff report to demonstrate some of the concern. Ms. Blaes stated that the ultimate problem is that many of the projects in Park City are seen as successful preservation projects. The gulf needs to be bridged



between what the policy represents in practice and what is actually happening in Park City that is seen as positive preservation.

Board Member Durst thought the graphic in Exhibit B was very telling. He asked if there was any kind of graphic that would show something accurately executed and something not accurately executed to explain reconstruction.

Chair Ford asked if the definition of landmark sites specifically references the National Register. Ms. Blaes answered yes and noted that the LMC states that Park City adopted that definition. With regard to reconstructed buildings, Ms. Blaes believed that the way Ron Ivie wants to use reconstruction and how they have been done in the past is very successful. If they worry about losing landmark status by allowing reconstruction, they would end up with demolition by neglect because people will let their property deteriorate so they can apply for a CAD.

Ms. Blaes stated that the LMC amendments are being presented to allow an exception. The LMC specifically states, "except for reconstructed buildings, no landmark site or project associated with a landmark site can result in the site losing its designation." Ms. Blaes pointed out that the language builds in an exception for reconstructed buildings. Chair Ford clarified that there is criteria for allowing reconstruction. Ms. Blaes replied that the criteria is very strict. Reconstruction is only allowed if the Building Official says that it meets Section 1-15.1 of the International Building Code for dangerous structures. Chair Ford asked if the guidelines are in conflict with the proposed LMC amendments. Ms. Blaes replied that with regard to reconstruction, the two documents do not conflict.

Ms. Blaes asked if the HPB was comfortable with a landmark site being reconstructed and then considered a significant site, because it is still protected against demolition. Chair Ford was comfortable as long as the criteria for reconstruction would keep the structure as a significant site. Board Member Werbelow did not think they had an option, since the alternative could be demolition.

Board Member Holmgren asked if grants would be offered to reconstruction. Ms. Blaes could see no reason why it could not be offered. She noted that reconstruction is a recognized approach in preservation as a last resort to save a structure. Board Member Werbelow felt the LMC was very straightforward about it being a health and safety issue.

Ms. Blaes noted that she had compiled examples of recently completed projects as Exhibit B. She stated that the projects shown would not have been approved if the policy of a landmark site must retain landmark status was in place. Ms. Blaes had done an assessment on 297 Daly Avenue and provided a progression of photographs of the other projects. At the end, she had provided examples of landmark sites that had been altered but still retained landmark status. She pointed out that size and scale of the additions, as well as retention of historic materials, was a major factor in retaining landmark status. Mr. Blaes remarked that the policy as crafted would not have enabled 297 Daly, 841 Empire or 1013 Woodside Avenue to be done. In her opinion, that could have been a problem because these three projects are considered successful preservation projects in town. If the HPB agrees, they should withdraw their support for the policy that landmark sites must retain landmark status.

Chair Ford opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma commented on the discussion during work session regarding the design review team and having a member on the team who was historic preservation capable. She felt this was extremely important because that person could influence and educate the rest of the design review team and that education would carry through when dealing with a non-historic house next to a historic house. Ms. Meintsma referred to a comment about not needing someone from the Building Department on the design review team because that person would not have design perspective. She noted that several additions to historic houses should not have occurred, but they did because they were minor changes and handled under the Building Department. She felt that having the Building Department involved with the design team, that person would also be educated about the process and the concept of design. Regarding the definitions, Ms. Meintsma stated that she has spent a lot of time reading through the guidelines and the definitions became very important to her as a layman and she was constantly referred to definitions that were not there. She went to the National Park Service for a definition before using the dictionary. Ms. Meintsma found the definitions in the National Park Service to be very helpful. However, she found that some of the National Park Service definitions did not seem to apply to the Park City Guidelines. In talking about design, Ms. Meintsma felt color should be included and suggested that color could be a shade as opposed to a hue. She stated that color helps the look of a house and even though the guidelines do not legislate or dictate color, including it in the definition could provide leeway or back up. Ms. Meintsma believed that everything involved in design should be in the definition.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the new guidelines were introduced to the Planning Commission during one meeting. The Commissioners decided that they needed time to review the document and continued their discussion to a future meeting. She was under the impression that for the HPB the guidelines are there to help mold what they want to see happen in Park City. For the Planning Commission, the guidelines are seen as laws they have to enforce. Ms. Meintsma believed that incentives would make it easier for the Planning Commission to give the HPB what they want. She pointed out that incentives have only been talked in general terms, but powerful incentives need to be put in place. Ms. Meintsma stated that the guidelines are good and they will do everything the City wants them to do. Because of that, she supports the idea of having an HPB member attend Planning Commission meetings.

Chair Ford closed the public hearing.

Using the photographs on Exhibit B, Ms. Blaes discussed 841 Empire and 1013 Woodside and outlined what would cause those projects to be removed from the landmark list.

Referring to the 2006 photograph for 841 Empire, Chair Ford asked if the garage alone would remove the home from the landmark list. Ms. Blaes answered no. She could think of four houses in Park City that have garages included in the basement that are on the National Register or eligible for National Register. She explained that the key is how you choose to treat the garage and the site itself.

Chair Ford stated that the houses at 841 Empire and 1013 Woodside were nice houses but they do not meet the design guidelines. He felt they were perfect examples of why Ms. Blaes was correct in pushing them away from pattern book theories and keeping them strongly tied to the National Historic Register and historic guidelines. He pointed

out that are not trying to provide guidance for cuteness. The intent is to preserve their historic integrity. Chair Ford thought the exercise Ms. Blaes demonstrated shows that it would have been impossible for these properties to go through the process and meet the guidelines. He strongly supported keeping the landmark to landmark status as part of the guidelines.

Board Member Kimball pointed out that none of the houses shown on Exhibit B had come before the HPB. Board Member Holmgren stated that 817 came to the HPB requesting a small grant for work on the porch. Ms. Blaes understood that it was a controversial project, but she thought it was well executed. Because it received tax credits, it went through a Staff assessment and was also under the scrutiny of the State Historic Preservation Office and the IRS and Park Service for strict adherence to the guidelines.

Ms. Blaes stated that she had included 1895 Three Kings Drive as an example to show that the site did not limit the ability to build out, back and up. For whatever reason, they chose to make sure the treatment was incredibly sensitive to the historic resources.

Board Member Werbelow agreed with Chair Ford about supporting the landmark to landmark policy. They have gone to great lengths in the process to clearly delineate between landmark and significant and she preferred to keep the language as written.

Director Eddington clarified that 1041 Empire and 1013 Woodside were not examples of projects they would not like to see based on the new guidelines. The Board members concurred.

Ms. Blaes stated that if the HPB feels strongly about retaining that policy, she wanted it clear what that would mean in terms of Land Management Code amendments. In order to achieve that they would need to look at the LMC a little closer and harsher, because it may require looking at the height requirements. It will also require working with the Legal Department on drafting appropriate language. Ms. Blaes felt the best approach would be to apply the more restrictive rule if one is more restrictive than another.

Ms. Blaes stated that this was one reason why it was important for the HPB to attend the April 8<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting. The Planning Commission was concerned with the landmark policy approach and she thought it would be helpful to hear from the HPB as to why that is important. She intends to go through the same exercise with the Planning Commission to help them better understand the difference. Ms. Blaes remarked that the Planning Commission was concerned about the perception of limiting development options. Board Member Werbelow pointed out that a garage and an addition are still allowed so they are not limiting the ability to make a historic house more functional.

Ms. Blaes stated that after discussing garages with the State Historic Preservation Office, she was confident that they could successfully argue that garages are a logical next step in the evolution of preservation. Park City has a long tradition of raising houses to accommodate foundations that never existed in order to have areas under living space to allow for movement and growth.

Ms. Blaes noted that the last item in the Staff report was a discussion regarding revisions to design guidelines to facilitate solar panels. Director Eddington explained

that the Planning Department is working with the Sustainability Department to look at opportunities to see what can be done to reduce energy consumption and energy costs. He stated that they are looking at everything from putting anemometers to test wind power in different areas of Park City and the County to joining National Programs. Director Eddington asked if the HPB thought energy sustainability was viable in the Historic Districts. If they think it is, he suggested discussing it in conjunction with the guidelines now as opposed to coming back for an amendment.

Board Member Holmgren asked why the Museum was able to put in solar panels. Director Eddington stated that the Museum worked with the Sustainability Department and the Planning Department. As a city owned building they went to the City Council for approval and that approval was granted. The solar panels had to be flush or at a slight angle with a limited braising on one side subject to review by City Staff. Director Eddington pointed out that the Museum facilitated the discussion he was requesting this evening as to whether they should look at putting solar panels on structures in the Historic District.

Board Member Holmgren thought the newer solar panels are better than the larger, thicker panels in the past. Board Member Opalek agreed. He and Board Member Durst have discussed this issue and he believes it needs to happen moving forward in order to be progressive. His only concern was keeping the architectural integrity. He thinks some manufacturers are striving towards producing a product that has the aesthetic values Park City would be looking for but they have not achieved that yet. Board Member Opalek challenged the HPB and the Planning Department to use the houses the City purchased at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue as test models for a green building with alternative materials; and at the same time, keeping it in conjunction with everything they are trying to save and preserve. Director Eddington favored that idea and noted that the Planning Department is working with the Community Affairs Department and the Sustainability Department on those houses.

Board Member Durst felt it was inevitable that the City would need to look at all elements to reduce energy consumption. If they approach the design by containing the integrity of the given historic building, he asked how the HPB would feel about a complimentary accessory structure to provide for things such as windmills. Board Member Durst stated that a provision in the LEED certification recognizes the solar reflective index on a roof. More credit is given if solar reflectors are used. He noted that the design guidelines talk about muting materials so they are not reflective and that presents a conflict and cross purposes for conservation. At some point the City needs to reconcile those differences.

Board Member Durst stated that storm windows are a big part of preservation on the eastern seaboard and is something the HPB might need to consider allowing in terms of energy conservation.

Board Member Kimball noted that storm windows could be placed inside the building. He supports conservation and if they want to put in clotheslines again, he would support that also because it is historically correct and fitting.

Director Eddington clarified that the HPB would advocate solar panels in the Historic District as long as they can be done correctly and inconspicuously. The Board members concurred. Ms. Blaes suggested adding additional language in the sustainability section of the design guidelines that talks about the need to look at the embodied energy within

the existing building and where energy losses occur within the historic structure. This would encourage taking care of obvious problems first before looking at more intrusive elements such as solar panels or wind turbine. Chair Ford thought solar hot water heaters should also be suggested and encouraged in the sustainability section. Director Eddington liked the idea of adding a statement that the City is looking at sustainability elements and they will continue to look at allowing it as the technology changes and improves.

Chair Ford called for discussion on the Design Review Team. Ms. Blaes thought it would be helpful for the HPB to talk about the skills necessary to be on the Design Review Team. Board Member Werbelow thought the first skill should be expertise in historic preservation. She did not favor choosing an architect from the community because that could result in too many biases. Chair Ford suggested that it be someone skilled in the National Registry standards and specifications that are referenced in the guidelines.

Board Member Durst stated that as a current Board Member of the Utah Heritage Foundation, he has been told that the Foundation could recommend someone to act in an ex officio capacity. He believes the people who serve and the Staff at the Utah Heritage Foundation are knowledgeable in historic preservation. Board Member Durst reported on a Preservation Leadership Training Camp in Deadwood, South Dakota June 20-27. He has thought about attending and would be willing to share travel costs if anyone else was interested.

Ms. Blaes remarked that Preservation Leadership Training is very intensive. She noted that a preservation training camp was held in Park City in 1995, which resulted in the City purchasing the Old Garage.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, advised that the HPB could not have a Board member sit on the Design Review Team because that would present a conflict. Chair Ford clarified that Board members were not being considered. Board Member Durst asked Ms. McLean who she thought would be appropriate to serve in a historic capacity. Ms. McLean explained that the conflict relates to appeals, because design review is appealed to the Historic Preservation Board. It would be appropriate to have an outside third party sit on the design review team.

Chair Ford believed there was agreement from the Board that historic expertise was missing from the DRT. Ms. Blaes noted that the expectation was that there would be a historic preservation professional on the Design Review Team. However, that was never clearly spelled out and she thought that language should be made clear. Director Eddington remarked that the Planning Staff would also like someone skilled in historic preservation to sit on the Design Review Team. He suggested that it be someone with Ms. Blaes' knowledge and expertise who could provide the Department of Interior perspective regarding preservation. Ms. Blaes stated that it needs to be someone that represents the Planning Department and not someone from another organization that would be in conflict. It could also be a contracted individual who would represent the Planning Department. Board Member Werbelow thought it would be helpful if that individual had a vested interest in the historic of Park City.

Board Member Durst wanted to know the justification for bringing the applicant or his designer into the Design Review Team. They should be there to present their designs

but they should not be a member of the DRT. Ms. Blaes replied that the process is that design review would occur before detailed designs are finalized. The review gives the applicant feedback before he gets too far into the process. After hearing Ms. Blaes' explanation, Board Member Durst agreed that it made sense, but he did not think the language reflected that intent. After further discussion, Ms. Blaes suggested changing the terminology of Design Review Team. Chair Ford felt they should add a sentence stating that the architectural drawings shall be taken no further than schematic phase until after the design review. Ms Blaes pointed out that the application packet contains everything required for an application. In that packet, the applicants are instructed to come in with schematic drawings and a general outline of the project scope. Chair Ford requested that it be reiterated in the language under the Design Review Team.

Ms. Blaes asked if Board Member Durst would be more comfortable if the definition of design included height, scale and color. Board Member Durst stated that he did not care about height but he thought form, mass, scale and either pattern or texture should be added because those elements provide a visual perspective. He felt strongly that color should be included as something the designer must put into context with the design of the City. Regarding space, Board Member Durst thought they should think about negative space in terms of what happens around the site.

MOTION: Board Member Durst moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to City Council on the design guidelines as revised. Board Member Werbelow seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

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