

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 2009

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

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Dina Blaes, Jeff Davis, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

ROLL CALL

Chair Ford called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

MINUTES – JANUARY 14, 2009

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, referred to page 11 of the Staff report, the first full paragraph and the sentence, “Mr. Mammen agreed and stated that this was one problem with the old guidelines.” Director Eddington stated that Mr. Mammen had reviewed the minutes and felt that statement was not reflective of what he had said. Mr. Mammen had recommended that the sentence be revised to read, “Mr. Mammen agreed that the perhaps the de-listing of historic structures may be a concern, which the Board should address in the creation of new guidelines. This is not an issue, nor was it a concern in the current guidelines.” Mr. Mammen felt this better reflected his intent.

Chair Ford asked if the Staff had reviewed the suggested amendment to the minutes. Director Eddington answered yes. Dina Blaes stated that she was not present at the January 14th meeting and asked for clarification of de-listing as it pertained to that particular discussion. When they say that modifications would de-list a property, were they talking about de-listing from the Park City Inventory or the National Register. Chair Ford believed the discussion referenced the Park City Inventory. Ms. Blaes replied that the issue of modifications was resolved when the City Council adopted the modifications to the Land Management Code on January 22nd.

Board Member Martz recalled that one particular property was under discussion as a possible issue. Now that the inventory has been completed, the house in question is proposed to be included on the inventory. Board Member Martz pointed out that it was the yellow house that was being discussed at the time.

Chair Ford remarked that the discussion related to the proposal before them that evening and the conversation was mostly about the examples that were presented in the slide presentation by the applicant.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren move to APPROVE the minutes of January 14, 2009 as amended by Staff. Board Member Martz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Jeff Davis noted that on January 14th the HPB found the structure located at 1323 Woodside Avenue to be historically significant. To update the HPB, Planner Davis reported that the Chief Building Official, Ron Ivie, had given an order to demolish the structure at 1323 Woodside due to unsafe conditions. The applicant would be required to submit a preservation plan so reconstruction can be incorporated within the project.

Chair Ford wanted to know who would review the preservation plan. Planner Davis replied that the Staff would review the preservation plan. Once they determine the plan is complete, they will notify Ron Ivie.

Dina Blaes announced that the training camp on the Historic District Guidelines. is scheduled for February 26th and 27th. The Staff, City Council, Building Department, Legal Department, Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Board have all been invited to attend. This camp is a mentoring program from the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. The training session workshops are scheduled from 1:00-5:00 on February 26th and 8:00-5:00 on February 27th.

Council member, Liza Simpson, pointed out that the City Council generally begins their meetings in the afternoon and she was unsure how they would handle attendance on February 26th.

Ms. Blaes stated that the session would involve in-depth discussions about the legal framework that gives the authority to do preservation in communities. They will talk about the importance of identifying and designating historic sites and why that is important foundation work for a preservation program. They will also talk about design review and pick apart the draft design guidelines. Ms. Blaes noted that the design guidelines and the associated proposed LMC changes have been sent to the trainers. The goal is to have design review exercises during the latter part of the second day, to test the guidelines. Ms. Blaes remarked that the intent was to schedule this workshop before the design guidelines are adopted in case adjustments need to be made. Ms. Blaes felt this was critical training and encouraged all the Board members to attend if possible.

Board Member Durst asked about the trainers. Ms. Blaes replied that she would send all the Board members a bio on each of the trainers. Chair Ford suggested that the invitations/RSVP's include a schedule breakdown for the two days.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the HPB still planned to have a visioning session. Director Eddington stated that their visioning meeting was scheduled for February 10, 2009, 6:00 pm. at the Sidecar.

Ms. Blaes stated that the NACP training camp is part of a series of trainings that the Staff will be doing over the next two months. She also would include the schedule for the Staff trainings if any Board members wish to attend.

Ms. Blaes asked the Board Members to especially consider attending the training on March 3rd with the State Historic Preservation Office. She noted that the HPB previously supported having a requirement within the Land Management Code that any proposed projects related to Landmark sites result in the building retaining its designation as a Landmark site. This means that any project would have to meet the Department of Interior Standards. On March 3rd the State Historic Preservation staff will walk through these sites with the Staff and approach the methodology for making sure an application complies with the Department of Interior Guidelines.

REGULAR AGENDA/ACTION ITEMS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

Historic Sites Inventory – The adoption of landmark and significant sites revised inventory

The Staff recommended that the HPB conduct a public hearing and approve the attached resolution as Exhibit A in the Staff report, adopting the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The Staff report contained background on how they have reached this point.

Ms. Blaes clarified some points in the Analysis and Discussion section of the Staff report. On January 22nd the City Council adopted amendments to the Land Management Code that changed the way historic sites are designated in Park City. She noted that the Staff report contained the LMC language under the analysis and discussion section. Ms. Blaes pointed out the criteria for designating sites to the inventory for both landmark sites and significant sites. She noted that one of the requirements for designation of a significant site is to retain essential historical form. This is defined in the LMC as the “physical characteristics of a structure that make it identifiable as existing in or relating to an important era in the past”.

Ms. Blaes referred to the Process section and noted that in the previous LMC it was not clear who could apply for a building to be designated. That has now been clarified and it can be either the owner/applicant or the Planning Department. Following this action, an owner or the Planning Department can bring additional applications to the HPB for consideration and designation as significant or landmark sites. Ms. Blaes remarked that another point that was clarified in the LMC changes was to clearly state criteria for removal of a site. She felt it was important to understand that adoption of the Historic Sites Inventory would not preclude any applicant or owner in the future to come before the HPB with additional information as to why their building should not be on the inventory list. The owner has the right to be heard and to have a public hearing to determine whether or not it should be removed from the inventory.

Board Member Durst clarified that the request could come from the owner or the Planning Department. Ms. Blaes answered yes.

Ms. Blaes noted that the City does not have intensive level surveys on all these buildings and they have done their best to increase the amount of information to help justify designation. However, it is possible that an owner could come forward with a fully researched intensive level survey that would show that the site does not meet the criteria for designation. The intent is to have a clear process in the LMC for allowing that to occur. Ms. Blaes believed this would be discussed further as they look at the LMC changes being proposed for the design review process, as they affect landmark sites versus significant sites.

Ms. Blaes stated that the Staff report contained information regarding significant impacts and the consequences of not taking action this evening.

Ms. Blaes distributed copies of corrections to Exhibit B. She also passed out documents for individual properties with information that was representative of the type of information that is electronically available to the Staff. Each document contained a three or four page written description providing a legal description, architectural description, cites sources used, tax records, photos, and sandborn maps.

Ms. Blaes stated that the corrections made for the inventory being approved this evening were for: 74 King Road, 143 Norfolk Avenue, 668 Norfolk Avenue, 713 Norfolk Avenue, 929 Park Avenue, 14 Prospect, and 130 Sandridge. She had prepared a power point presentation showing past and current photographs of these properties to show the modifications made to each structure. After reviewing each property, corrections were made and the above stated structures were re-designated.

Ms. Blaes reviewed each site and explained why, after further assessment, 74 King Road was re-designated as a landmark site; 143 was re-designated from significant to landmark; 668 Norfolk was re-designated from landmark to significant site because the roof top rear addition renders it ineligible for National Register listing.

Board Member Kimball noted that 668 is actually 662 Norfolk, however Norfolk no longer exists in that location and suggested that they use Crescent Tram as the street address. Ms. Blaes clarified that the legal description is listed under 668 Norfolk and she preferred to keep that address. She stated that for many properties, the City's address does not match the County's address.

Ms. Blaes continued with the designation corrections. She noted that 713 Norfolk was re-designated from landmark to significant site because of significant alternations to the side and rear. 929 Park Avenue was re-designated from landmark to significant because of alterations. She noted that some of the alterations are reversible and the structure could return to its landmark status. Until then it should be designated as a significant site. Ms. Blaes remarked that 14 Prospect was originally listed as a significant site, but based on photographic information they discovered that it should be listed as a landmark site. She noted that the alterations to the front entry portico are easily reversible.

Chair Ford wanted to know if alterations are reversible on both 929 Park Avenue and 14 Prospect, why one can be a landmark structure and the other is not. Ms. Blaes replied that 929 could not be landmark primarily because of changes to the window openings. The difference is what was added but can be taken away versus something that must be completely reconstructed.

Ms. Blaes noted that 120 Sandridge was originally listed as a landmark site; however the tax card indicates that changes were made outside the historic period and the property was re-designated to a significant site.

Mr. Blaes reviewed the list of mining related sites and structures as outlined in the packet. She noted that these structures were originally assessed in 1991 by Sandra Morrison in the reconnaissance level survey. They all meet the criteria for designation of

significant sites as shown in the photographs, however, further verification needs to be done to make sure each structure still exists. Due to the snow, they were not able to do any verification. Ms. Blaes requested that the Board approve the mining related structures listed in the packet this evening as significant sites on the inventory, with the stipulation that additional research and verification for any designation of landmark sites would be done and that any of these designations could come back to the HPB at a later date.

Chair Ford asked if the mining structures are all inclusive and asked about a structure at the end of Daly. Ms. Blaes stated that if there are additional structures, she recommended that the HPB make a motion to instruct the Planning Staff to do a full reconnaissance level survey of all mining related structures to be part of a comprehensive package. She was not comfortable submitting any other structures for designation without further information.

Board Member Holmgren referred to page 37 of the Staff report, the current Boulevard Buildings, and recalled that the HPB had previously determined that those buildings were in bad shape. Ms. Blaes replied that they are in bad shape, but she was directed by former Planning Director, Patrick Putt, to conduct an intensive level survey, and those came in as being eligible for National Register listing.

Board Member Martz commented on 1062 Woodside Avenue and understood that prior to his time on the Board, the HPB had found that building to be insignificant. Ms. Blaes replied that the determination was made under old criteria. She pointed out that new criteria was established by City Council action on January 22nd. Board Member Martz noted that in the 1990's, 632 Deer Valley Loop was found to be insignificant. Ms. Blaes reiterated that those previous determinations are irrelevant due to the new criteria.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, asked if there was a list of sites that the HPB previously deemed as significant that were not on the list. Ms. Blaes stated that she did not know every determination of significance that was made in the last five years. However, she could say that the structures on the list meet the criteria in the current Land Management Code, which was adopted on January 22nd. She believed there were more buildings on the list than the HPB had deemed significant in previous decisions, since the City Council had broadened the criteria to include more buildings.

Board Member Kimball asked Ms. Blaes to comment on the house on Doc Holiday Drive that was moved in from Coalville. He noted that Doc Holiday Drive did not exist during the mining era and the house from Coalville appears out of place. Ms. Blaes explained that the criteria in the Land Management Code talks about moving structures into a location that is dissimilar from its original location. From what they know about the original location in Coalville, they did not feel it met the definition of dissimilar location as approved by the City Council. Ms. Blaes pointed out that the structure would not meet landmark status because of the distance it was moved, but it does meet the criteria for significant sites.

Ms. Blaes stated that as the Board Members go through the PDF file, the address may be different from the address of the structure seen in the photograph. She wanted it clear that it is the structure in the photograph and not the address that is important. As an example, she indicated photographs of structures that no longer exist or exist in some other form or place, or plans were approved for partial reconstruction. She specifically

mentioned 118 and 124 Daly Avenue as examples. For those types of structures, the Historic Site form indicates which of those should be re-evaluated if the owners follow the plan that was approved by the Planning Department. Ms. Blaes strongly recommended that when those projects are completed or nearing completion, that they make sure these structures are considered to be significant sites on the inventory and that they comply with the plans approved by Staff.

Chair Ford thought this detail might need to be addressed in a resolution to indicate that when the address and the photo do not correspond, the photo rules. Ms. Blaes believed the HPB could state this as part of their motion.

Chair Ford asked if the properties that might have different addresses should be included as aka addresses. Ms. Blaes pointed out that in cases where there are several known addresses for one structure, those are identified on the forms that were passed out this evening as an aka.

Chair Ford opened the public hearing.

Ron Whaley, a resident at 819 Park Avenue, noted that earlier the Board addressed mine sites that were quite a ways out of the City limits. He wanted to know how wide a net the Board was casting in their evaluations.

Chair Ford did not believe any of the mine sites were outside of the City limits. Mr. Whaley argued that 90% of the sites are outside the City limits. Chair Ford clarified that those sites were brought into the City as part of the annexation of Park City Mountain Resort.

Mr. Whaley objected to the incorrect listing of his property at 819 Park Avenue to the inventory list. He was aware of the stated procedure that the City followed, however, he sees no other governmental activity where a citizen needs to defend himself against an allegation with such abusive conduct by the City. He stated that the HPB through the auspice of the City, compiled an inventory list based on the compilation of second and third hand information. That information is being deemed by the Board as being accurate without checking it themselves or asking the property owners to verify that information. Mr. Whaley pointed out that when this inventory is passed, this information would become law and have the effect of law. The only way a property owner can defend himself is by paying \$200 for the privilege of appearing before the HPB to correct something that violates the sensibility of transparent government. Mr. Whaley assumed that none of the Board members had gone through the inventory to check viability and correctness, which he believes violates the matter of fair government.

Susan Coring, a resident at 1141 Park Avenue, believed there was an error in the Inventory and she was unsure if this was the forum to present that correction.

Chair Ford encouraged Ms. Coring to continue.

Ms. Coring noted that the Inventory shows her property correctly at 1141 Park Avenue and the next segment picture shows an accessory building identified as being the back of their property. She noted that this was incorrect and the accessory building should be listed at 1129 Park Avenue.

John Stafsholt, a resident at 633 Woodside, stated that his house was recently included as a significant site and he applauded that action as the right thing to do. He indicated that others in attendance this evening had the same situation where their structures were not protected and not on the original inventory list. Those properties have since been included and the property owners believe the City is doing the right thing by trying to protect these historic houses. Mr. Stafsholt reminded the Board that the temporary zoning ordinance would expire in three days. If the HPB does not take positive action on this Inventory, they will start seeing demolition permits on Monday. He urged the HPB to follow through with the process.

Chair Ford closed the public hearing.

Chair Ford asked for an update on the demolition moratorium. He asked if there was pending action from the City Council if this inventory list is not approved within the next three days. Director Eddington was unaware of pending action and noted that the TZO would expire on February 7th.

Assistant Attorney McLean clarified that State law requires that the moratorium only last for six months. If no action is taken after six months, the moratorium would expire. Ms. McLean pointed out that the existing moratorium would expire in three days, however, if this inventory is adopted, the protections as part of the resolution would apply.

The next City Council meeting was scheduled for the following evening. Ms. Blaes pointed out that nothing related to the Historic Sites Inventory was noticed for that agenda. The inventory could be discussed but no action could be taken.

Chair Ford asked if it was necessary for the City Council to vote the inventory into law. Director Eddington answered no. The HPB has that full authorization. Ms. Blaes remarked that this item could be heard again at the next HPB meeting on February 18th.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that some of the pictures in the packet had nothing written underneath them. Ms. Blaes stated that those were probably accessory buildings.

Ms. Blaes stated that two pieces of information had been prepared. The designation came as a result of the historic site forms that were prepared on each of the properties photographed in the packet. The forms contain substantially more information than what was included in the photograph. She used a structure at 543 Woodside as an example. Accessory structures behind the building were identified on the form but they were not shown on the photograph. Ms. Blaes felt it was important to understand that there is a group of documentation on file with the Planning Department that supports the designation. The resolution states that anyone can request copies of that documentation during regular business hours and it would be provided.

Board member Durst asked if it had to be an all or nothing resolution or if the HPB could hold certain properties in abeyance. Ms. Blaes replied that the language in the resolution talks about the list in its entirety. Assistant Attorney McLean believed the HPB could consider removing questionable structures from the inventory; however, she suggested that it be done in a manner where all the criteria is reviewed. If structures are taken off the inventory they would be exposed to demolition without a CAD or any other restrictions.

Board Member Werbelow clarified that the existing inventory list has 359 sites and the proposed list has 400 sites; therefore, 46 new sites were added. She asked if there was any type of designation to identify the newly added sites. Ms. Blaes stated that the information was available but she had not broken it out on the inventory. Board Member Werbelow felt it was difficult to approve this resolution without knowing the new sites and what had changed to make them eligible for this new list. Board Member Werbelow was sensitive to the fact that there was a TZO deadline, but she felt it was important to discuss this fact.

Director Eddington stated that if the Board members had concerns about a property being on the inventory, the HPB could adopt the inventory this evening and direct the Staff to re-review specific sites. Those sites would be protected from demolition if the list was adopted in its entirety, but the sites should be identified at the time of adoption. Director Eddington point out that if the HPB adopted the list this evening and found other sites that they wanted to consider, that could be discussed at the next HPB and the Staff could be directed to do further analysis. Chair Ford clarified that the HPB has the authority to add or remove structures at any time. There is no timeline for the Staff or property owner to bring forth new information or to request that the Staff conduct a more thorough examination of a property. Director Eddington agreed and noted that that language was added to the LMC. Chair Ford remarked that their authority also extends to adding potential mining structures following more intense analysis.

Board Member Werbelow asked if there needed to be language in the resolution that addresses additional review between now and the next meeting. Assistant Attorney McLean stated that the resolution would not change if the HPB wanted to adopt the inventory in its entirety and protect all the listed sites, based on Dina Blaes' review and supporting documentation. If they would like to have more analysis on specific structures, they would still be adopting the resolution in its entirety; however, they would be directing Staff to look into certain sites more intensively. Ms. McLean remarked that the Land Management Code was recently amended in order to enable the HPB to adopt the inventory based on the listed criteria. Part of those amendments added the appeal process that a property owner or the City could request at any time. Therefore, the City can review a site at any time to re-designate its status.

Board Member Martz commended the excellent job that was done on this entire project and he was ready to make a motion to adopt the resolution. There is an additional appeal process built into the system and if there is an appeal, either by an individual or by the City, he suggested that the fee could be waived and a more in-depth assessment of the particular property could be done. Board Member Martz felt that any appealable properties could be handled on an individual basis once the listed is adopted.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with Board Member Martz. This was a job well done and everyone involved should be commended. She was ready to vote on a motion.

Board Member Durst asked if the fee could be waived. Ms. McLean believed it would be left to the determination of the City Manager. She was unprepared to give a definite answer this evening and offered to look into it. Ms. McLean asked if the HPB was suggesting that the fee be waived indefinitely or within a specific time period. Board Member Martz commented on a number of situations where the City has waived fees.

Chair Ford felt the fee should be waived if the property owner proposes to add a property to the list or upgrade a property from significant to landmark. In his opinion, the fee should not be waived for removing a property, de-listing a property, or moving it from landmark to significant status.

Ms. Blaes pointed out that 15-11-7 in the LMC provides limitations to the power of the HPB and currently states that the HPB has no authority to waive or increase any requirement of any ordinance of the City. Chair Ford noted that Section 2 of the resolution states, "Historic Sites Inventory shall be kept on file and available to the public in the City Recorder's Office. The support documentation may be kept in the Planning Department so long as it is referenced by the inventory on file." Chair Ford requested that "may" be changed to "shall".

Board Member Durst stated that he had recently joined the Board again. He remembered early on when Ms. Blaes first conducted her survey and went through the analysis and the process on some of these properties. Board Member Durst stated that he received his packet at the 11th hour and had very little time to review the list in its final form. Board Member Durst stated that he could support this resolution only if the HPB took it upon themselves to review this inventory of properties collectively and come back with some comments. He understood the imperative of getting this done based on the TZO, but he was not entirely comfortable adopting this resolution.

Chair Ford was under the opinion that even if the HPB voted to adopt the resolution this evening, they were by no means done with the list and that the HPB, the Staff, Ms. Blaes and property owners would be examining some of the shadow properties that are on the cusp. He suggested organizing field trips in March after they have an opportunity to look through the lists and redline the properties in question. This would give the HPB the opportunity to determine whether or not those properties should be further examined more officially to see if they need to be upgraded, downgraded or removed.

Board Member Werbelow was inclined to adopt the list this evening based on the amount of work that went into the analysis, and her concern with the expiration of the TZO. She agreed with Chair Ford in terms of further analysis. Board Member Werbelow noted that the resolution states that the Preservation Board has determined that these buildings or sites meet the criteria. If the list is adopted this evening, more analysis would be required in they are faced with an appeal. Her main concern is their ability to have a more fluid analysis.

Assistant Attorney McLean explained that the appeal process requires the HPB to review all the criteria listed in the Code to determine whether or not a site should be on the list. The HPB cannot determine that a site should remain on the inventory based only on the fact that it is already on the list.

Board Member Werbelow understood that the HPB would be required to review the criteria. However, she worried about the inclination to err on the side of the original analysis and felt it would lessen the opportunity to review a site from an objective standpoint.

Ms. McLean stated that the process does not give deference to the list when reviewing an appeal against the criteria.

Board Member Durst clarified that the properties at 2780 Kearns Blvd. are owned by the City. He recalled previously negotiating engineering support for the accessory buildings off of Marsac or Sandridge, which are privately owned. Board Member Durst stated that if these buildings are designated as landmarks, the City has the responsibility to sustain the buildings to avoid hazards. He wanted to know what would be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the privately owned structures. Ms. Blaes replied that the owner would be responsible and that would be enforced by the City through the Building Department. Ms. Blaes pointed out that this would occur regardless of whether or not the building is listed on the historic sites inventory. The enforcement is the same for any structure in Park City. The only separate protection these historic buildings receive is the CAD process.

Chair Ford noted that the new guidelines that were adopted attempt to add a level of enforcement by prohibiting demolition by neglect. Ms. Blaes stated that the language is reinforced in the design guidelines, but the legal authority is addressed in the proposed LMC changes.

Board Member Martz recalled that the City had assisted in funding a project to reinforce and refurbish four out of five of those structures on Sandridge.

Chair Ford noted that cemetery gates and mining structures were included in the definition of a structure. He wanted to know where the line was drawn in terms of walls or other structures. Ms. Blaes stated that structure is a defined term in the LMC and they followed that definition. She noted that building is included under the umbrella of a structure; but building is more clearly defined in the LMC and includes main buildings, attached, detached and public and accessory as separate definitions of building. Chair Ford questioned the legality of adding cemetery gates but not landscape elements.

Board Member Kimball stated that the gates on the cemetery were relatively new. Ms. Blaes replied that the gates and the fencing at the Glenwood Cemetery are new but they are considered reconstruction. They are part of the National Register nomination and they are listed on the National Register. Therefore, they qualify as being a locally designated landmark.

Chair Ford noted that the criteria for designated sites on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory does not mention landscapes. It only mentions buildings, accessory building and/or structures. He wanted to know why the cemetery would be on the list. Ms. Blaes replied that the cemetery is made up of structures and buildings and it is considered a site under the defined term in the LMC. Chair Ford was concerned about opening up the issue to appeals on some of these sites that are not defined in the LMC as a structure. Ms. Blaes read the definition of a Site in the LMC that was adopted by the City Council, "An area, lot or piece of land where a building, main, attached, detached, public, accessory buildings and/or structures were, are, or will be located." Chair Ford asked if the definition Ms. Blaes had read was included in the criteria for designated sites. Ms. Blaes replied that it was.

Board Member Werbelow asked if any of the 46 new sites came on as landmark sites. Ms. Blaes answered no.

Chair Ford reminded the Board about the two amendments that were discussed this evening and should be included in the motion. The first was in Section 2, changing

“may” to “shall” and the other was to add language indicating that the photo or image in the inventory would rule if there is a discrepancy between the address given and the picture. Director Eddington suggested that the motion include the annexed area of Park City that includes the new mining sites.

MOTION: Board Member Martz made a motion to accept the resolution to adopt the Park City Historic Sites Inventory pursuant to the Land Management Code Section 15-11-12 with the amendments 1) to change the wording in Section 2 related to support documentation from “may” to “shall”, 2) that the annexed portion of the mining era sites be added to the Site Inventory, and 3) that in the case of discrepancies between addresses and pictures of the site, that the picture would be the site designation and not the address. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed 6-1. Board Member Durst voted against the motion.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren made a motion to direct the Staff to do a full survey and inventory of all Park City mining sites/structures as soon as the weather permits. Board Member Martz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Blaes asked if there were specific sites the HPB wanted to identify this evening for discussion at the next meeting. It would be helpful to have specific addresses. This would allow the Staff time to compile additional information before the next meeting.

Board Member Durst asked if those sites could be conveyed to Ms. Blaes outside of this meeting. Board Member Martz was interested in discussing the property at the top of Daly, the change shop and the mine entrance to the Daly Mine. He was also interested in the entrance to the Ontario Mine at the top of Marsac. He also suggested the tram towers that go up to the Ontario Mine and come down to the Marsac Mill.

Based on the comment from Susan Coring, Chair Ford suggested that the Staff look into 1141 Park Avenue to see if the rear accessory structure is on a different property. Chair Ford asked Ms. Blaes to set a timeline for the Board members to submit their red flag sites to her for the next meeting. Ms. Blaes stated that these could come back for discussion as a work session item on February 18th. If necessary, specific sites could be scheduled on the regular agenda in March. Ms. Blaes requested that the Board Members submit their concerns to her by Wednesday, February 11th. They could either email her or communicate with Director Eddington.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Approved by _____
Todd Ford, Chair
Historic Preservation Board