

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2011

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

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Katie Cattan, Polly Samuels McLean, Mike Kovacs

ROLL CALL

Chair Werbelow called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – July 20, 2011

MOTION: Dave McFawn moved to APPROVE the minutes of July 20, 2011. David White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no input.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATION & DISCLOSURE

Director Eddington announced that at the next Planning Commission on October 12, at 6:00 p.m. there would be a Charrette on all the neighborhoods in Park City except Old Town. A Charrette for the Old Town neighborhoods was held two weeks prior. Director Eddington encouraged the Board members to attend and provide their input.

Planner Kayla Sintz and the Board reviewed the DRT Item/Matrix. Planner Sintz noted that the seven properties identified in red had not yet come back fully online, but have had approved reconstructions. She noted that some do not have a structure sitting on site, some have pulled a building permit, and others have an approved preservation plan. Planner Sintz noted that the properties outlined in red were not complete and were either under construction or the site would appear to be vacant.

It was noted that 919 Woodside was not outlined in red. However, the HPB recently heard an appeal on moving the structure forward on the site, and they upheld the Staff's decision not to move it forward. Planner Sintz believed Patricia Abdullah had inadvertently missed it when she did the red highlighting.

There was also a question on 109 Woodside. The comment indicated that the applicant was proposing improvements on a freestanding garage; reconstruction proposal pending review. Ms. Sintz explained that the owner came in for a pre-application and suggested that they would possibly like to reconstruct the structure. The Staff provided them the criteria for reconstruction and the owner has not returned with that material. A decision has not been made because additional information was not submitted.

There was a question on whether 1323 Woodside was a City owned property. Planner Sintz answered no, and explained that the City allowed the developer to take down a structure per a dangerous code provision as determined by a building official. An agreement is in place that requires the structure to be reconstructed within that same neighborhood. Planner Sintz believe it was being looked at as part of the Lower Park Avenue RDA. Director Eddington remarked that the agreement occurred in early 2009. Planner Sintz referred to the comment that indicates no HDDR and clarified that full measured drawings were taken of the structure before it was demolished. The property did not go through an application because there was no proposal for an addition or renovation. Planner Sintz offered to come back with additional information regarding the agreement.

REGULAR SESSION – Discussion/Public Hearing/Action Items

Land Management Code Amendments to Add Historic Preservation Board review and approval of all Reconstruction and Disassembly applications of Historic Sites.

Planner Sintz noted that page 29 of the Staff report summarized the City Council report. In addition, the attached City Council report included the February 2011 visioning notes. The Staff report also included minutes from the Planning Commission meeting that reflected the discussion by the Planning Commission when they reviewed the draft ordinance for the LMC change. Also included were the meeting minutes from the last City Council meeting on September 25. Planner Sintz noted that the City Council wanted input from the HPB and continued the item to October 27. Based on the information provided, the Staff requested that the HPB give their recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed changes to the LMC.

Planner Sintz remarked that the HPB would be looking at a recommendation based on whether they feel the HPB role is more of an appeal body or whether the Board's role would be effective on reconstructions. The City Council would take their recommendation under consideration and provide direction to Staff on whatever changes would be applicable.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, stated that the Planning Commission had forwarded a negative recommendation for the proposed changes, which was counter to the direction the City Council had given the Staff during visioning. As indicated in the Planning Commission minutes, the primary concern was the length of process. Therefore, the City Council wanted input on how the HPB felt about these changes. Ms. McLean clarified that the City Council would consider the HPB recommendation, but they would not have to follow it.

Chair Werbelow asked if it would be appropriate to hear public comment prior to the Board discussion. Assistant City Attorney advised that public comment would be appropriate.

Chair Werbelow opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, stated that she had attended the Planning Commission meeting and nearly 100% of the public thought it would add another layer to an already cumbersome process if the HPB also had to approve demolition. Ms. Meintsma thought the HPB should have some involvement in demolition

and reconstructions; however there should also be confidence in the competency of the Staff to review and approve demolitions. She would like any plan for demolition to come before the HPB for comment. It would not have to be an approval or denial. This would allow the HPB to understand what was going on before the demolition occurred and to be prepared to answer questions if approached by the public. Ms. Meintsma also encouraged a specific definition for disassembly.

Sandra Morrison, Park City Historical Society and Museum, pointed out that the discussion was not to change the rules and that the LMC and design guidelines would still be in place. A review by the HPB would allow the public the ability to know what was occurring in the Historic District. The Historic District is important to the entire town and a resource that drives the economy. Ms. Morrison believed there was a misunderstanding regarding reconstruction, because it makes a structure ineligible for the National Register for Historic Places. Therefore, the more reconstruction that occurs, the less eligible Park City becomes for being on the National Register. Each building is not listed individually. It is a grouped listing because Park City is an intact historic mining town. Each time they take a piece out of the puzzle they become less historic. Ms. Morrison hoped the City would continue to encourage people to preserve the historic nature of Park City for now and for future generations. Regarding the issue of process, Ms. Morrison believed that because this resource is so important as a community, it would be appropriate for any application for demolition to come before the HPB.

Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Board Member McKie liked the idea of the Staff presenting reconstruction projects to the HPB. She wanted to know if making comments on a reconstruction without actually making the decision would affect their ability to serve as the appeal authority.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that if the HPB hears an item and makes a decision, the appeal would go to the Board of Adjustment. If the final decision stays with the Staff, she did not think the Board Members would be able to comment, either individually or as a Board, because they would be the appeal authority. Ms. McLean remarked that there were two options. The first option would allow the Staff to review and approve or deny the demolition and provide an informational report to the HPB. The second option would be to have the decision come to the HPB using the same criteria.

Chair Werbelow recalled from minutes provided in the Staff report that someone had suggested a notification/discussion type process. In those minutes Ms. McLean had recommended that the policy be codified for consistency. Chair Werbelow agreed with that recommendation. It should not be an information dialogue because it needed to be one way or the other.

Board Member McKie asked if there a current public process for demolitions. Planner Sintz noted that page 31 of the Staff report contained a City Council analysis of how much time the process would take if HPB review and approval was added to the process. She noted that bullet point #3 referenced a 14 day noticing requirement. That notice would be sent to property owners within 100 feet, and that is their time to provide input on the initial application. Typically the Staff receives phone calls and written correspondence or comments. The Staff waits for public comment before beginning their analysis, and they use those comments and concerns when analyzing the guidelines.

Board Member Natt believed the crux of the issue was noticing, and that was being driven by the demolition that occurred on Park Avenue without informing the public. He asked if there was a better way to notice the community as to action regarding historic structures, without changing the function of the HPB. Director Eddington replied that the noticing procedure had already been changed. New property signs now show illustrations of the proposed project and provide contact information. Board Member Natt asked if notices were published in the paper and posted on the internet. Board Member McKie thought it would be good to have a link where people could check for reconstructions on the internet. Access to that information would also benefit the HPB members.

Board Member White asked if they could be notified of active applications as a Board. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that she would not recommend codifying that procedure, but the Staff could provide that information through email or during an HPB meeting. Ms. McLean noted that the trigger date would be the only difference in the noticing process with HPB review and approval. Planner Sintz explained that the typical noticing boundary for the Staff review was 100 feet. If the HPB would review and approve reconstruction projects, the Staff would recommend a 300 foot boundary, which is the current policy for a steep slope CUP and the noticing range for other Boards and Commissions.

Chair Werbelow understood that if the HPB became involved in the approval, the appeal board would then be the Board of Adjustment. However, she believed that having the HPB involved in the approval process would allow the Board to see reconstructions and disassemblies and enable the public to hear about these projects before they occur.

Board Member Natt pointed out that a public noticing procedure already exists, which allows the public 14 days to make comment and request information. He did not believe anything more would be accomplished through a public hearing. If the argument is that more people would attend a public hearing, he thought that issue could be resolved by advertising the reconstruction and panelization in the same manner, and informing people that the Staff would be making the decision. He could not understand why the HPB would have to hear each application.

Chair Werbelow remarked that under the current process one or two neighbors may interact with the Staff, but there is no chance for the public as a group to hear all the issues in one forum.

Board Member Holmgren thought the current process would be sufficient if the project was properly advertised to the public. She noted that the HPB is an appeal Board and taking a different direction would create additional problems.

Board Member McFawn concurred with Board Member Holmgren. He liked that the HPB was an appeals Board. He thought the HPB could still recommend that initial noticing occur at 300 feet even if they were not involved in the approval process. Board Member McFawn noted that the 2009 Guidelines were more restrictive than the previous guidelines for reconstructions. Planner Sintz agreed, and noted that demolition of 657 Park Avenue occurred under the old guidelines and noticing procedure.

Board Member McFawn agreed with the concerns to maintain the historic properties and not threaten their historic registry; but he was comfortable that it would be more difficult to for a reconstruction to be approved.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray believed the noticing issue could be sufficiently addressed. A greater concern was that reconstruction and panelization is a sensitive issue and different from a standard application. In her opinion, she could see no reason for the HPB to preserve their appeal function when the Board of Adjustment could handle those appeals. As a preservation-oriented Board tasked with specific roles, including preservation of cultural resources and protecting historic sites, she felt it was important to have preservation-minded people review reconstruction proposals in a public forum. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray thought that would be a great extension of the current function of the HPB. She was not suggesting that the Staff be removed from the process. The Staff and the HPB should work together as a team. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray was in favor of forwarding a positive recommendation to involve the HPB in reconstruction, based on the importance of this resource.

Board Member McKie clarified that the HPB would only be giving up their role as the appeals body for reconstruction and disassembly. She was told that this was correct. Planner Sintz referred to the minutes from the last City Council meeting and noted that one Council Member talked about possibly only having the HPB review reconstructions, but not disassemblies.

Chair Werbelow supported the comments by Board Member Matsumoto on the importance of having the HPB review reconstruction applications. She did not believe their involvement would add another layer and delay the process. Chair Werbelow concurred that the HPB would look to the Staff for recommendations and work together as a team. Chair Werbelow thought the distinction between reconstruction and disassembly was important, and suggested that the HPB could consider only looking at reconstructions.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gary thought disassemblies were also a significant action, and she asked about the number of disassemblies. Planner Sintz stated that the Staff initially made the recommendation to City Council for both reconstruction and disassemblies because it is a concern when pieces and panels are removed from a structure and taken off-site. Planner Sintz stated that within the last year the Staff has seen one reconstruction and they are currently in the process of reviewing a panelization request. In past years she estimated a 3:1 or 4:1 ratio between reconstructions and disassemblies.

Board Member McKie liked the idea of a forum where the public could attend and voice their opinion. However, while she is preservation-minded, she is not a builder and would need to respect and trust the opinion of a professional in terms of whether or not a structure could be saved.

Board Member White was confident that the Planning Staff and the Building Department could handle these sensitive situations. He believed that the HPB role as an appeal board was important. If they take on the approval process for reconstruction and give up their appeal authority, he was uncertain whether the Board of Adjustment would have the expertise to hear an appeal on such a sensitive matter. Board Member White agreed with Boards Members Holmgren, Natt and McFawn to keep the current process.

Board Member Holmgren asked if it was possible to publicly notice reconstructions or disassemblies. Assistant City Attorney McLean explained the noticing process for administrative lot line adjustments. From a legal perspective reconstruction and disassembly could be noticed in the same manner, which includes a firm date of when the review would take place. Board Member McFawn favored increasing the initial notice to 300 feet.

Board Member White believed the problem with 657 Park Avenue resulted from a breakdown in the noticing process. In his opinion, noticing would be the key factor in this situation. Chair Werbelow agreed that noticing was a factor; but it was also the fact that the HPB was not informed on any level. Board Member White clarified that the breakdown in noticing included the HPB.

Director Eddington commented on a number of changes that have occurred since 657 Park Avenue. The Staff started creating the matrix that is included in the HPB Staff reports, which would inform the HPB of proposed reconstructions. In addition, the guidelines and the LMC were different from what was in place at the time of 657 Park Avenue. Director Eddington believed the concerns regarding the opportunity for public comment could be addressed by increasing the noticing boundary to 300 feet. Planner Sintz pointed out that besides taking input from people within the noticing boundary, the Staff also receives input from anyone who happens to see the public notice sign posted in the property. Anyone who provided input is notified of the Staff's decision and they are eligible to appeal. Planner Sintz stated that the new signs have been an effective tool that generates more reaction and comment.

The suggestion was made to post the materials submitted with a reconstruction or disassembly application on the website so the public would have the benefit of knowing what was involved. Board Member McKie asked if the HPB could be invited to attend site visits with the Staff or the Building Department for informational purposes. Board Member Holmgren did not think it would be appropriate to attend a site visit as a Board because that puts them in an official capacity. However, if she saw a project noticed in the newspaper, she would make an individual effort to visit the site.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that under the Code, as a Board the HPB has standing to appeal Staff decisions. Board Member Natt was surprised to learn that unless a person had submitted comments or contacted the Staff within the comment period, they were not eligible to appeal a decision. Board Member Matsumoto stated that when a situation occurred in her neighborhood the people had no idea of the process. They wanted to oppose the project after it was approved and found that it was too late.

Board Member Natt liked the fact that the HPB has standing, and he envisioned it as a safety valve for concerned citizens. He also has confidence in the ability of the Staff. Board Member Natt stated that when he applied to join the HPB, he saw it as an opportunity to help the citizens who felt they were not being considered by Staff. He believed the ability for the HPB to appeal a decision they might oppose is the answer to the problem. Board Member Natt was not in favor of changing the Code to correct one perceived issue when that issue could be corrected directly through better noticing and public comment.

Board Member Werbelow re-opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma did not believe the difference between reconstruction and disassembly was that great. She has seen many historic homes reconfigured and she has photos that she took just walking around town. Ms. Meintsma stated that disassembly is not separate from reconstruction because the story is there, but when disassembly occurs things get changed. The disassembly tells the story and says what is historic and what the house is and was, and how it morphed over time. With that education they begin to understand the house visually and the reconstruction takes places. Ms. Meintsma did not believe the two could be separated. She also thought it was important for the HPB to be involved in the entire process and educated from beginning to end. As the appeal Board, if someone appealed a decision by Staff the HPB would only be educated at that point, and in her opinion that would be too late. Ms. Meintsma has confidence in the Staff, but she believes they need help and another set of eyes.

Marianne Cone commented on noticing and stated that people need to be hard pressed to read public notices in the newspaper. She asked if it would be legal for the Staff to compile an email list for reconstruction noticing and have those people spread the word. The email list would be comprised of people from different neighborhoods who would volunteer to receive the email and notify their neighbors.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that it would not be illegal to have the email list. The City can always notice more than the minimum requirement of the State. She pointed out that the current noticing procedure already goes beyond the State requirement. She noted that it would be a question of technology and resources, but it could be done. Ms. McLean remarked that currently people can sign up for a link to the HPB meeting agenda. She suggested that it might be possible to create a similar link for administrative actions. Director Eddington stated that the Staff could look at several options.

Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Board Member White remarked that the comments made by Ms. Meintsma were accurate; however since the new guidelines were adopted the required documentation has increased significantly and the process is better. Board Member McFawn stated that he has seen the same things Ms. Meintsma mentioned when he walks around town, but he believes things are better now that the Planning Staff stays more involved throughout the project.

Chair Werbelow summarized that there were two issues; one was noticing and the other was the role of the HPB in the reconstruction process. She understood that the majority of the Board did not favor adding reconstruction and disassembly decisions to their purview. However, they would recommend enhanced noticing.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray reiterated her preference for having the HPB involved in the process of reviewing reconstruction and demolition projects. She understood the opposing view, but she felt the issue was extremely important to the fabric of the Historic District and it should be taken seriously. Improved noticing would be beneficial, but the choice was whether the HPB wanted to be the appeals board or whether they wanted to be active participants in the decisions regarding reconstruction and disassembly.

Board Member Holmgren asked if there were other structures besides 657 Park Avenue that would be subject to the old guidelines. Planner Sintz replied that all the structures on the list were under the 1983 guidelines. Many are under construction or in the process of having pulled a building permit and were doing footing and foundation work. Any projects where the HDDR had expired were not included on the list. Board Member Holmgren asked if the Staff had received any new applications for disassembly under the 1983 guidelines. Planner Sintz replied that there was an application for 109 Woodside and a panelization request for a property on Daly Avenue. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that there was no evidence that the new guidelines were broken. Planner Sintz agreed. Certain criteria must be met and that is only one layer that was added to the new guidelines. She itemized additional documentation that is required now but was not required under the old guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren questioned why they would fix something without knowing whether it was broken. She preferred to let the Staff do their job and continue to update the HPB.

Board Member McKie suggested having a liaison from the HPB to Staff for reconstructions and disassemblies, similar to the liaison with the DRT. Board Member White noted that reconstruction or disassembly projects would go through the HDDR process and that would be the same liaison. Board Member McKie pointed out that the liaison cannot update the Board until a decision is made, which would be too late to give input.

Board Member Holmgren believed there was consensus among the Board for increased communication and notification. If that could be accomplished it would eliminate many of the problems.

Board Member Natt stated that if the Board has the ability to object to a Staff decision, he wanted to know how the Staff decisions would be communicated to the Board. Director Eddington replied that it would be on the spreadsheet. Board Member Natt felt it was important for the Board to be notified when the decision is made so they could take action within the 10 day appeal period.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that if the Staff was to implement e-notify, each Board Member would be notified when a final decision was made on a reconstruction or disassembly. Board Member Natt assumed that the HPB could call a special meeting to decide whether or not to pursue an appeal.

Planner Katie Cattan suggested that the Staff could review a reconstruction or disassembly and bring it to the HPB as a work session item and walk through the process of how the decision was made. The HPB could then determine whether the Staff was going about it correctly or whether the Board should be the review body. Planner Cattan clarified that the Staff would come to the HPB after noticing for the 14 day appeal. If the decision is not appealed, the Staff would present the reasons for their decision to the HPB. At that time, the Board could revisit the issue of being the review body on future applications. If the decision was appealed within that 14 day period, the HPB would act as the appeal body.

The Board discussed with Staff the procedure and timing for sending a recommendation to the City Council. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray suggested that the HPB could send

the City Council a summary of their discussion indicating that the Board was split on changing the ordinance, and inform the City Council that the Board would like time to consider the option suggested by Planner Cattan. Board Member McKie stated that since many of the Board Members were new, an additional six months of experience would give them more insight on effective preservation measures.

Board Member McFawn favored waiting six months to forward a recommendation. He also suggested a straw vote to see how many members favored or opposed having the HPB review reconstruction projects.

On the issue of having the HPB retain their appeal body status, Boards Members McFawn, Natt, Holmgren and White would vote in favor of remaining the appeal body. Board Members McKie, Werbelow and Matsumoto-Gray would vote to change the LMC and have the HPB review and approve reconstruction projects. Chair Werbelow clarified that the vote was 4-3 for not supporting the proposed change to the LMC.

Assistant City Attorney McLean asked if there was consensus to wait six months before forwarding a recommendation to the City Council. There was consensus for waiting on a recommendation; however, the Board was not comfortable specifying six months because they wanted to wait until one application had completed the process.

Assistant City Attorney understood that the Board was ready to make a recommendation that the City Council amend the Code to increase the noticing to 300 feet.

MOTION: Board Members McFawn made a motion to wait until one application for reconstruction has gone through the process without an appeal to use it as a work session example of how Staff came to their decision. Board Member Natt seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Board Member McFawn made a motion to forward a recommendation to the City Council for a change to the LMC to increase the notification boundary to 300 feet, to e-notify the public and the HPB members each time final action or a determination is made on a reconstruction or disassembly application, and to publish notice in the Park Record. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

1450/1460 Park Avenue – Review of City Owned Properties

The HPB held a site visit prior to the meeting.

Because she is part of the group interested in purchasing the subject properties, Chair Werbelow recused herself from this item and left the room.

Board Member McFawn assumed the chair as the Chair Pro-Tem.

Planner Sintz noted that page 79 of the Staff report was a cover sheet outlining purpose statements B and C in the Land Management Code. She read Statement B, "To identify as early as possible and resolve conflicts between preservation of cultural resources and

alternative land uses; and Statement C, “To provide input to Staff, Planning Commission and City Council towards safeguarding the heritage of the City protecting historic sites, buildings and/or structures.”

Planner Sintz stated that the City Council has discussed a possible sale of the properties at 1450/1460 Park Avenue and they were in the process of attempting to write an RFP, which would solicit different proposals for the properties. Based on the HPB role and purpose statements in the LMC, the Staff was looking for guidance from the HPB similar to the previous reconstruction discussion, but more generalized to the purpose statements. Planner Sintz noted that the City Council was scheduled for a Council only site visit next Thursday, and they would be discussing the matter during the City Council meeting that same evening. Planner Sintz noted that it would be appropriate for the HPB to attend the City Council meeting to hear the discussion.

Mike Kovacs, Assistant City Manager, stated that the RDA invested \$800,000 to purchase the properties and they would like input from the HPB regarding preservation practices for those properties.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the HPB had raised this issue during their visioning and because the City owns the properties, the question was raised as to whether the HPB would want to provide input or a recommendation to the City Council in relation to the LMC subsections read by Planner Sintz. Ms. McLean recommended that the HPB submit their input in the form of a letter. She noted that the HPB could also choose not to comment on the matter.

Board Member McKie believed this related to what the Board has been wanting in terms of having more opportunities to provide recommendations on historic sites outside of the appeals process. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray understood that providing input would not jeopardize their ability to hear an appeal because the comments would be general and not related to a specific use.

Planner Sintz noted that both properties were listed on the Historic Sites Inventory and were subject to the design guidelines. She noted that the Staff received a pre-application from the Co-Housing Group under the new guidelines, and Board Member McKie sat in that review.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn closed the public hearing.

Board Member McKie firmly believes that the goal of preservation is more than just the retention of the historic fabric, material and features of a building. It is also the setting and the site. Having those properties on that much land is significant and the land is significant to the properties. Board Member McKie was concerned about development on those properties because it is rare to see older houses with that much lot space. It could potentially be a great community project. Instead of selling the properties, it would be an opportunity for the City to give the community the experience of stepping up as preservationists. Board Member McKie remarked that it was time to decide whether they want to be a top tier preservation community or if they want to allow development that would potentially threaten preservation. Her recommendation would be to require a

preservation easement for any development on the property. Therefore whatever is built would defer to the primary resource on the site, which are the two historic structures.

Board Member White concurred with Board Member McKie. However, because the property is sizeable, both historic structures should be restored in their own right. Whether they turn the property into a park or build affordable housing, the use should not be connected to either house. Board Member White believed that any additional development should be small and it should not overwhelm the two existing homes.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn asked if Board Member White was referring to the original structures when he referenced restoring the homes. He wanted to know his thoughts on any additions that may be older than 50 years. Board Member White stated that if the additions are significant because they are old, that would be acceptable. However, if they are non-contributory, they could be removed and the original structure rehabilitated.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray agreed with all comments. She thought it was important to acknowledge that a major part of the uniqueness and character of the site is the amount of land and space. The fact that the space fronts City Park provides the opportunity to combine something with that use. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray commented on the historic features that were pointed out during their site visit. She believed there was an opportunity to be creative with this project due to the amount of land. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray agreed that any development should be considered in respect to the size and scale of the existing homes, even though there are larger house and buildings on either side. The larger buildings should not determine the predominant design of this neighborhood. She noted that new development and improvements to the property should complement the historic character of the site.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray wanted to know the City's obligation for accepting and choosing proposals, and if there was a restriction on the market value. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that the City Council has the discretion as an owner to decide how to sale the property. There was no legal requirement to take the highest price.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with all the comments. Any additional buildings developed on the lot should be comparable in size with the two historic structures that would hopefully be restored. She was curious as to why the buildings have sat vacant for so long and have been allowed to go into serious neglect.

Mr. Kovacs did not have an answer as to why the properties have been neglected. He pointed out that currently there are no RDA plans for those two structures.

Board Member McKie understood that the City requires citizens to properly mothball their properties when not in use, and she thought the City should be required to do the same.

Board Member Natt remarked that Board Member White accurately expressed his sentiment on redevelopment. He was pleased that Board Members Holmgren and McKie raised the issue of neglect. For a community that is committed to preservation, the City should do a better job of maintaining the property they own. It was difficult to see the structures in such a sad state of repair. Board Member Natt questioned whether the HPB should do an inventory of City-owned properties and walk through those properties on a regular basis to make sure the City is undertaking its responsibility as a

good citizen of Park City. Board Member Natt was encouraged that the City was finally doing something with these properties.

Planner Sintz indicated a correction to the Staff report. She erroneously put that the City acquired the property in 2008, but they were actually acquired in the Spring of 2009.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn concurred with all the comments made by the Board members. When they write their letter of recommendation to the City Council it should include preserving the buildings, keeping and saving all the significant pieces, and any new building should be similar in size and scale to the existing structures on each respective lot. They should also ask the City to make sure the buildings are properly mothballed as soon as possible, the same as they would require any private citizen. They should let the City Council know that the HPB is very disappointed in the lack of preservation of those two buildings.

Board Member Holmgren remarked that some of the old trees on the property and the lilac bushes should be protected.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn asked if there had been former structures on those lots prior to the City purchasing the property. Planner Sintz would need to do a search on the Sanborn maps to make that determination. Board Member McKie remarked that there had been some type of small outbuilding because she had seen it on the Sanborn map.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that in addition to including the old trees in their recommendation, there was consensus that the general openness of the landscape and the yard and the proportion of built to unbuilt space is a defining feature of the property. Chair Pro-Tem McFawn pointed out that it was evident that additional buildings would be built on the property and some of the openness would be lost. The Board discussed several possibilities for the property, including the opportunity for TDRs. Chair Pro-Tem McFawn asked if the Board was interested in including in the letter a recommendation for a 3:1 or 4:1 TDR for what those spaces could offer.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that any application would be under the new guidelines and whoever develops the property would need to abide by those requirements.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn stated that he would like the City to be open to the possibilities of preserving as much land and open space as possible, recognizing that the trees do not grow overnight. Whether it be a 3:1 TDR possibility to help encourage open space or a community garden, the HPB would like the City to broaden its scope. If buildings are built on the property, the City should recognize that they should be in the size and scale of the existing building.

Board Member McKie liked the idea of recommending a preservation easement because a preservation easement gives flexibility to preserve more open space than would otherwise not be preserved with the design guidelines.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn would draft a letter of recommendation to the City Council. He asked about the procedure for sending it to the Board members for review within the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act. Assistant City Attorney stated that once the letter is written it could be emailed to each of the Board members to make sure it

accurately reflects the discussion this evening. She reminded him that one Board member was recused and she should not receive the letter. If anyone has comments, they should only reply to Board Member McFawn as the Chair Pro-Tem and not “reply all”. Director Eddington offered to help finalize the letter once Board Member McFawn receives all the comments from the Board members. The letter should be submitted to Mr. Kovacs Monday morning in time to have it included in the City Council packet. If they miss that deadline, the letter could be scanned and emailed to the Council.

Chair Pro-Tem McFawn closed the regular session and the Board moved into work session.

Board Member Werbelow resumed the Chair.

WORK SESSION

General Plan – Informational Update

Planner Cattan reported that the Staff has been working on the General Plan and they wanted to have a discussion with the HPB regarding historic preservation and how it relates to the General Plan. Planner Cattan noted that there have been two public outreach sessions. Last summer the focus was on having people rate the goals and to look at the uses within town. There was good feedback on uses in different neighborhoods. Planner Cattan stated that the most current Charrette focused on Old Town and what works and what needs to be fixed, what are icons and what needs to be protected.

Planner Cattan noted that the document on page 240 of the Staff report listed the goals presented at the public outreach meetings. She explained the process and the exercises that were done at both outreach sessions. Goals were identified on a chart and people were asked to put a green sticker if they agreed with the goal and a red sticker if they disagreed. It is hard to disagree with preservation, but the results were very telling. The Staff was surprised that “offer financial assistance to owners of historic structures to foster ongoing redevelopment and maintenance, and continue strengthening the historic district grant program” came up red.

Planner Cattan stated that the goals when seen through the eyes of the community are different from what the Board sees when they review the goals. The priorities are also different. Planner Cattan requested that the Board review the goals and identify which ones they believe were most important.

Board Member Matsumoto thought number goal four, “identify specific design related issues that may affect the District’s overall integrity” was important because it speaks to continuing to update the Historic District Guidelines.

Chair Werbelow asked how the HPB would re-evaluate the guidelines and make changes. Planner Cattan stated that the Staff already has changes to bring forward. Planner Sintz explained that one change was linked to the issue of having the HPB review reconstructions and panelizations. Therefore, they delayed general housekeeping issues to bring everything forward at one time in the event the HPB would take on that review. Planner Sintz stated that the intent was for the HPB to review the guidelines annually because it is a living document. She noted that the HIS inventory is also reviewed by the Board annually and the two documents should coincide.

Chair Werbelow thought it would be beneficial to hear from the designers in town and compile feedback to consider when updating the guidelines. Planner Sintz stated that the update discussion would be publicly noticed and everyone would have the opportunity to provide public input.

Board Member Natt felt the role of the HPB was to bring preservationist approach and knowledge to the guidelines at the outset. If the City Council approves the changes but the Staff does not apply them properly, the HPB would have the ability to override the decision making. Board Member Natt thought it was important to look hard at the outset to promote the expectation that if the guidelines are met the project would be approved.

Planner Cattan understood from the comments that the fourth goal should be merged into the last goal, "continue to update the Historic District Design Guideline and the current Historic Sites Inventory", and the implementation strategy would be for the HPB to review it annually.

Regarding the lack of public support for the grant program, Planner Sintz explained the perception based on comments she heard. She noted that the HPB could address the issue by making the general public aware of the benefits of historic preservation. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray believed many owners of historic properties are unaware of the grant program or unsure whether they would qualify. She favored the idea of educating the public on the program itself and where the money comes from.

Chair Werbelow asked if the General Plan addresses the grant program. Director Eddington replied that the current General Plan addresses historic preservation but it says very little about the grant program.

Planner Cattan stated that historic character was one of the core elements from Visioning 2009. She noted that the current General Plan makes general statements such as "maintain the historic character of buildings". The objective is to make the new General Plan more comprehensive and to implement strategies to make sure the core values are not lost. She explained that the Staff would put together goals and implementation strategies to make sure the goals are met. They also plan to have score cards to go back and periodically rate the strategies to see if they are working to maintain the core values. Once they hear input from the HPB regarding the goals, the Staff would bring back implementation strategies for review.

Chair Werbelow identified specific language that she thought was too soft. She suggested that the Board should think about ways to deepen the roles of educate, promote and encourage, and what some of the programs could look like. Board Member McFawn believed they already strengthen, promote and encourage through financial assistance and grants through the RDA program. The issue is how to promote historic preservation for the public-at-large where the community wants it and clamors for it. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray favored an earlier comment about having a volunteer steward from each of the neighborhoods.

From the standpoint of involvement in the General Plan process, everyone agreed that the Staff should presents goals, objectives and strategies in a work session format for discussion and interaction with the HPB.

Board Member Matsumoto referred to the item, "To maintain the National Registry status of existing districts". She thought it would be interesting to know where they stand and whether it would be appropriate to implement a warning of a danger zone for some districts. She also thought it would be interesting to discuss areas where Park City's Code differs from what the National Registry would require to list a historic home. Planner Sintz noted that when the guidelines were written the HPB at that time made it clear that this was not the goal of the guidelines. However, the issue could be revisited. As a starting point they could have an intensive review of the National Register Eligibility Requirements and how it differs from the guidelines.

Planner Cattan asked if the Board would like TDRs added to the list of incentives. They answered yes. Board Member McKie thought another form of incentive would be to emphasize preservation as something to achieve because it is worthwhile and benefits the community. She suggested using the Park Record and the radio once a month to build awareness. Chair Werbelow agreed with the property. She would like the ability to educate the realtor community.

Board Member McKie thought the City should lobby the National Trust for Historic Preservation to bring their annual conference to Park City. For the past several years they have been talking about Main Street and the economic downfall. The National Trust typically holds their conference in larger cities, but it has been held in smaller towns, particularly if it is a preservation-minded community.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that a history teacher from Park City High School wants to have his history students create and maintain a mobile app of a historic walking tour of Park City. He would be interested in applying for money to get the infrastructure, and the children to be involved in taking the pictures and maintaining the descriptions. He asked if the City would be an interested partner in that type of project.

Planner Cattan summarized that the Staff should begin implementation strategies and the HPB would review the guidelines and HSI annually. They should tie in public awareness to the grant program. The language of the goals was soft and should be better clarified. The HPB favored looking at a neighborhood steward. Suggestions were made for radio and PCTV. More information was requested on how to maintain the National Registry status. Adding incentives and communicating with the public and getting involved with the schools, educate and interactive apps.

Brainstorming ideas

Planner Sintz believed that most of the ideas were articulated in the General Plan discussion. There were no further comments.

Planner Cattan reported that the City Council and Planning Commission held a joint meeting, at which time the Staff was specifically directed to produce a Bonanza Park Area Plan to be completed by January. Therefore, the Staff time is dedicated to that plan and the HPB should not expect to see anything on the General Plan until January. In the meantime, if the HPB has additional ideas, they should email those to Planner Cattan or Planner Sintz to be included in their General Plan work.

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Approved by _____
Sara Werbelow, Chair
Historic Preservation Board