

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF MAY 2, 2012

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Sara Werbelow, Puggy Holmgren, David White, Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, Judy McKie

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

---

ROLL CALL

Chair Werbelow called the meeting to order at 5:18 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Alex Natt and Dave McFawn

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Ruth Meinstma, a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, stated that a landmark structure at 335 Woodside was approved on Thursday. Ms. Meintsma had issues related to how the project applies to the new guidelines. She asked if the HPB would consider bringing it up for consideration or appeal to relook at the project.

Director Eddington explained that the 335 Woodside project went through the Historic District Design Review process and it has gone through Staff review. The application was approved last Thursday. Director Eddington noted that Ms. Meintsma lives within in the vicinity of the project location and came in as a member of the public to look at the plans and ask questions. She had concerns regarding some of the design aspects that were approved.

Director Eddington understood that Ms. Meinstma was requesting that the HPB either do a call up or join her in an appeal of the design review. Director Eddington noted that the HPB had not seen details of the 335 Woodside project. He explained that Ms. Meintsma has the opportunity to appeal the design, but there would be a cost associated with that process. Another option would be for the HPB to call it up and review the design in more detail.

Chair Werbelow wanted to know what basis the HPB would have to call it up. Director Eddington replied that they would call it up based on a request by a member of the public. If the HPB felt it was better for Ms. Meintsma to bring the appeal herself, the City could look into possibly waiving the appeal fee if the cost would be a hindrance for Ms. Meinstma. The HPB could forward a recommendation to the City Manager to waive the fee, but there was no guarantee that it would be done.

Chair Werbelow felt it was a difficult decision without knowing the specific issues. Director Eddington pointed out that the HPB could not know the specifics in case it did come up on appeal or the HPB chose to call it up. Chair Werbelow asked for the meaning of a call-up.

Assistant City Attorney Polly Samuels McLean clarified that the term call-up is used when it is done by the City Council. Under the Appeal section of the Code, 15 -1-18, a Board has the ability to appeal an item within its jurisdiction. Therefore, the HPB has that ability per Code. In this particular case it would be done in response to a request

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

from a member of the public. Ms. McLean could not ever recall an internal discussion regarding fee waivers; but another issue was timing. Director Eddington stated that to appeal an approval for an HDDR must be done within ten days.

Ms. Meintsma believed this was a good project for the HPB to be involved in because it deeply involves and tests the design guidelines. It is a landmark structure and very pristine. A lot could be learned if they look at it closely, and it may become a test case for future projects. Ms. Meintsma had done a lot of research and she had good, clean information. She stated that if the HPB did not want to be involved, she would go ahead and file for the appeal.

Ms. Meintsma stated that she had support to help with the \$500 application fee. However, she asked the HPB to entertain the idea of call-ups because another citizen may not have the financial means to appeal a concern in the future.

Chair Werbelow reiterated that without knowing something about the project it would be hard to bring an appeal.

Board Member White assumed that he was not allowed to participate in the discussion because 335 Woodside was his project, even though it had already been approved. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the rules of approval would apply in this matter.

Board Member White recused himself and left the room.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray recalled a previous discussion about reviewing new guidelines projects after they had gone through the process. She noted that the Board had determined that they could not get involved in the process until the project was approved because they would lose their appeal status.

Chair Werbelow noted that timing was an issue because the ten day period would end on May 7<sup>th</sup>. She clarified that someone would have to file an appeal by May 7<sup>th</sup> in order for it to come before the HPB. Director Eddington replied that this was correct. The HPB would either call it up as an appeal or a private individual could bring an appeal forward prior to May 7<sup>th</sup>.

Board Member McKie wanted to know who the HPB would be appealing to if they called it up as an appeal. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that they would appeal it to themselves. Chair Werbelow explained that they would be stopping the applicant's process.

Board Member Holmgren thought it made more sense for a third party to file the appeal rather than have the Board get involved. If timing was an issue, the HPB would not have time to visit the site and do all the research. In her opinion, the role of the HPB was arbitration. Chair Werbelow concurred.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray agreed that the HPB did not have the necessary background information to make a decision on whether something was appeal worthy. She trusted that Ms. Meintsma had done her research and would bring an appeal to the HPB.

Ms. Meintsma reiterated her intent to file an appeal. Regardless of the outcome, she suggested that the HPB have a discussion on process to address any similar situations in the future.

Board Member White returned to the meeting.

On a separate issue, Ms. Meintsma recalled a suggestion for a concerned citizens email list on historic structure projects. Director Eddington asked if Ms. Meintsma was talking about projects that go before the HDDR. Ms. Meintsma stated that quite often the public is shocked and surprised when they see something happening, and it would be good if citizens could be notified by email so are informed and aware.

Director Eddington recalled having that discussion and one of the questions was whether they could set up an e-notify list for current projects. He explained that it is harder to notify on projects at the pre-application stage. E-notify could be used when formal applications are submitted for a Historic District Design Review. Director Eddington stated that a list similar to the list of HDDR projects could be posted on the website. Ms. Meintsma suggested that some type of notification would educate people and get them involved. It would also prevent people from being confused and irate.

Planner Sintz stated that the design review team looks at everything for both the pre-application and the regular application. She believed Ms. Meintsma was talking about a broader notification when someone turns in a full HDDR. Director Eddington stated that if they e-notify for HDDR applications, it would need to be expanded to include all other applications in an effort to be fair.

Board Member McKie suggested that they could expand the HPB webpage to include a list of active HDDR projects. Director Eddington stated that he would work with the IT Department to simplify the system and come back with a solution.

#### STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS & DISCLOSURES

Chair Werbelow noted that she had not received any noticing for the last few HPB meetings. She asked if other Board members had been notified. Board Member McKie stated that she was notified for this meeting, but she was not notified for the previous meeting. Chair Werbelow felt it was important for the Planning Department to be consistent in notifying the Board members when HPB meetings are scheduled.

Planner Sintz reminded the Board of the Heritage Foundation event on Friday and Saturday.

#### INFORMATIONAL UPDATE REGARDING 16 SAMPSON AVENUE

Planner Sintz had prepared a timeline for 16 Sampson Avenue. It is an old project that has gone through numerous reviews and designs and it is tied to a project at 201 Norfolk.

Planner Sintz stated that a condition of approval for 201 Norfolk indicates that a building permit cannot be pulled with a structure crossing a lot line. She explained that the building permit for 201 Norfolk has to be pulled by May 27<sup>th</sup>; therefore, 16 Sampson must come down prior to that date or 201 Norfolk loses all approvals.

Planner Sintz reported that in February 2006 a determination of historical significance was processed by a different owner on 16 Sampson. The structure was found to be historically significant. In October 2007, the HPB adopted the Historic Sites Building Inventory. 16 Sampson did not meet the criteria to be on the inventory because at that time only landmark structures were listed. When several structures were left off the 2007 list, the City Council placed a moratorium on all Old Town structures in 2008. The objective was to review the criteria, lower the standards, and create a two-tiered list of landmark structures and significant structures. In February 2009 the new Historic Sites Inventory was adopted and 16 Sampson was found to be significant at that time.

Planner Sintz noted that in 2007 a plat amendment was approved for 16 Sampson and 201 Norfolk. The goal of that plat was to do a garage addition to 201 Norfolk and to move 16 Sampson and dedicate a portion of the street to the City. That plat was approved and a newly created lot line went directly through the historic structure. There were several reasons why that could have occurred. When the structure was dropped from the Historic Sites Inventory in 2007, the intent may have been to demolish the structure. There were also different guidelines in place at the time that allowed historic structures to be moved.

Planner Sintz stated that in November 2008 the Staff received applications for 16 Sampson and 201 Norfolk for Historic District Design Reviews and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permits. When those were turned in they were processed together as one application because the projects share a driveway and both properties are owned by one owner. In 2009, 16 Sampson was found to be significant and went back on the list. Planner Sintz noted that both applications were deemed vested under the old guidelines. In May 2009, the owner questioned why the historic information was conflicting. Much of the design had already been done and the owner submitted a determination of significance to challenge the historic designation. The HPB reviewed the application and unanimously approved keeping 16 Sampson on the Historic Sites Inventory. There was also unanimous support for the design that was being proposed. It is the same design that is currently proposed. There was very little historic fabric left and they hoped to salvage a few boards in order to re-mill the siding for the new structure. It was a successful idea to try to save the scale and take it back to the 1930's tax photo.

Planner Sintz remarked that in May 2009 the 16 Sampson HDDR was approved by Staff; and in that same month the Planning Commission approved the Steep Slope CUP for 201 Norfolk. In June 2009, the new Historic District Guidelines were approved. Planner Sintz stated that when the moratorium was put in place and they were revising the guidelines, the Staff was also asked to look at Steep Slope conditional use permit criteria and amendments to the Land Management Code. When 16 Sampson came in, it not only got caught in the moratorium, it also got caught in the LMC criteria change for Steep Slopes. For that reason, the addition to the rear had to be redesigned, which caused a delay from when 201 Norfolk was processed and the conditional use permits for 16 Sampson Avenue were approved.

Planner Sintz reported that in August 2001, 16 Sampson received Planning Commission approval for the Steep Slope CUP, and at the same time 201 Norfolk received a second year extension for its Steep Slope CUP. Since the projects are tied together and share a

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

driveway, the intent of the owner has always been to build the structures at the same time.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray understood that it was a total tear-down reconstruction with possible salvaging of some boards. She noted that some of the summaries indicate that the structure would be moved. Planner Sintz explained that when discussing the 2009 Guidelines they sometimes talk about the structure being picked up and placed, kept in place or kept intact. The references to 16 Sampson being moved related to the issue of moving it off the property line. Minutes from past meetings point to the fact that it was reconstructed. Planner Sintz stated that the challenges of the structure are that old guidelines 65, 66 and 67 were applied. She felt it was important to follow the timeline of the 16 Sampson structure.

Board Member White clarified that the intent to move the structure was based on the fact that the property line runs through it. Planner Sintz remarked that moving the structure was approved for a previous design and that approval still exists. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray pointed out that in reality the structure would be demolished rather than moved. Planner Sintz stated that the structure would be reconstructed and moved to the back of the lot. Board Member White emphasized that it was being reconstructed but not panelized. Planner Sintz replied that this was correct.

Board Member McKie stated that an ongoing issue for her is that reconstruction was never intended to be used the way it is in Park City. The definition of reconstruction under the old guidelines is very similar to the definition currently in the LMC, which is verbatim to the definition used by the National Park Service. When she addressed her concern with the Preservationist Consultant, she was told that people purchase old mining homes for the land value and not for the actual home. They let the homes sit and deteriorate. Board Member McKie stated that the current guidelines and the requirements for reconstruction within the LMC are outside of how reconstruction is actually defined. She understood that the reason for doing reconstruction differently in Park City was to deter people from allowing houses to deteriorate so it could be torn down and reconstructed. She believed the situation was different for 16 Sampson Avenue because the house is not deteriorating and there is no deterrent. The owner found a loophole that allows them to tear down a habitable structure that was being lived in up until a few days ago. Board Member McKie thought the process was backwards because the City approved a reconstruction for 16 Sampson, and then it can vanish. She noted that currently the structure is still sitting there.

Planner Sintz remarked that the structure sitting there is not the historic fabric of the structure. Board Member McKie pointed out that it is listed as a significant structure on the Historic Inventory. Planner Sintz reiterated that 16 Sampson was still under the old guidelines and the old process. Director Eddington felt it was important for the HPB to understand the process because there are more projects that fall under prior Codes and prior guidelines. Board Member McKie had a hard time believing that the intent of the old guidelines was to allow something like this to occur.

Board Member White stated that he has been inside the house several times. The structure has been modified significantly and he agreed that there was very little historic fabric left. The shape of the roof is the primary historic element remaining. He asked by the house at 16 Sampson was originally left off the HSI list and put on at a later time.

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

Planner Sintz explained that the 2007 HSI list that was adopted, which did not have 16 Sampson Avenue, had higher criteria more in line with landmark structures. However, everyone felt that other structures were also important, even if they did not meet the landmark status; and new criteria with lower standards was written specific to Park City to bring in other historically significant structures under that umbrella. When the standard was dropped, 16 Sampson met the criteria and was added to the list.

Director Eddington noted that the City utilized the Secretary of the Interior Standard, which resulted in the Park City's landmark list. The list was significantly reduced from where it was the prior year once the stricter criteria were applied. Based on public feedback the standards were broadened which resulted in the significant list that was added to the Landmark list.

Board Member McKie disclosed that she lives across the road from the 16 Sampson property. She does not know the owners but she is acquainted with the person who currently lives in the house. She has been inside the house and was shocked at how different the house looks now compared to the original photographs. In her opinion, the historic fabric is not only the roof but also where the house sits and the orientation of the house. Planner Sintz reminded the Board that it was important to focus on the old guidelines and not the criteria under the new guidelines.

Board Member White asked if the structure was still sitting over the property line. Planner Sintz answered yes. Board Member White stated that that would be the exceptional case called for in the guidelines. Board Member McKie questioned how that could be an exceptional case when both properties were owned by the same person. Planner Sintz replied there were two owners when the plat was processed.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the normal procedure with the City has been that if an existing building sits on a lot line prior to recordation of the subdivision, the structure needs to be removed. For some reason it did not occur with 16 Sampson Avenue; but that was unusual from the typical process.

Board Member McKie was concerned about setting a precedent. There was no guarantee that similar situations would not occur. In her opinion the issue went beyond old and new guidelines. Planner Sintz stated that guidelines were the issue because the new guidelines would never allow a plat through a historic property. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray clarified that it was allowed to happen because 16 Sampson was not listed as historic at the time the plat was approved. Planner Sintz pointed out that in the past structures were moved and additions were allowed that were very different from what the new guidelines allow.

Assistant City Attorney McLean remarked that even though the Board may disagree with the findings or the HDDR that occurred, the fact is that it did occur and the period for the appeal process has passed. Under Utah law there is vesting and a reliance on City decision. Therefore, it is important for the City to stand by earlier decisions. She recognized that it is difficult for people who were not involved in the decision process to accept what occurred; but owners have the right to rely on the decisions that were made.

Board Member McKie felt there was good reason to lower the cost of the appeal fee so people have the ability to appeal something they oppose. Chair Werbelow asked if the

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

public would have been notified when the plat amendment occurred three years ago for 16 Sampson. Director Eddington replied that there would have been public noticing. He did not believe that appeals were an issue since the problem was remedied with new design guidelines and revisions to the LMC. In addition, HDDR approvals now have an expiration, which they did not have in the past.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray felt the best remedy was public outcry to put pressure on those with vested rights to consider what is best for the community and re-apply under the new guidelines. Board Member McKie asked if the HPB could write a letter to the owners expressing how they feel. Director Eddington stated that the Board members could write a letter as concerned citizens. The owner has vested rights and the Board would be appealing to their civic commitments.

Board Member White stated that if both properties are currently owned by the same person, the rule of law requires the owner to remove the lot line with a new plat amendment before proceeding. Planner Sintz noted that the structures share a driveway but they do not touch, which makes it a different situation. Board Member White thought the structures were sitting on the property line. Planner Sintz explained that 16 Sampson currently sits on a property line. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray understood that the owner needs to remedy the situation before obtaining a building permit, and their remedy is to knock down the structure. Board Member White understood that the owner intended to demolish the structure and reconstruct it in a different location off the property line. Planner Sintz replied that this was correct.

Chair Werbelow asked Director Eddington to explain his comment that they could expect to see more projects under the old guidelines. Director Eddington presented a matrix of active approvals. Those identified in blue were based on the 1983 guidelines. The HPB should expect to see those projects come forward with work that was done based on the old design guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren stated that this has always been a problem in Park City and in Utah in general. It was a strong and unanimous opinion of the former HPB to add a very specific and formal sunset clause to the LMC to keep these situations from occurring.

Director Eddington presented a second sheet of completed projects that had received a certificate of occupancy. A third list was projects that were withdrawn or expired. The Staff would continue to update the list and keep the HPB informed.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, public hearing, and possible action.

440 Main Street - Grant  
(Application #PL-11-01254)

Planner Kirsten Whetstone introduced Shane Barber, the owner of 440 Main Street, the Bandits Grill and Bar Restaurant. The structure is listed on the new Historic Sites Inventory as a landmark site eligible for National Register of Historic Places. It is also part of the Park City Main Street Historic District. The building was constructed in 1898 and according to the HSI the structure remains very close to how it was described in the Register nomination. Some modifications have occurred over time; one of which has to

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

do with the lower panel area below the storefront window. The applicant would like to restore the panel to its original look.

The Staff report contained a brief history of the structure. Planner Whetstone noted that the application was submitted in 2011. The design review team met on site and after looking further, the contractor wanted time to confirm whether more significant work would be required. The applicant and Staff have been in contact and the applicant requested to keep the application open and pursue the grant.

Planner Whetstone noted that grant money for this application would come from the CIP for Historic Grants funds, since there were limited funds left in the Main Street RDA. An exploratory permit was obtained and the contractor was able to submit another bid on what it would actually cost to bring it back to the way it looks in an old photograph.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the request for this grant and consider awarding the applicant a portion of the eligible costs listed. A 10% contingency was included in the bid to cover unexpected utilities or other unexpected issues. The contingency was not included in the itemized amount for the grant request. The eligible expenses totaled \$15,320 and half of that amount would be \$7,660.

Planner Whetstone stated that typically the property owner is responsible for paint. In this case, given the repair, it may be necessary to repaint the entire façade. The Staff requested that the HPB discuss whether a portion of or all of the paint should be granted.

Chair Werbelow opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Werbelow closed the public hearing.

Board Member McKie disclosed that Bandit's was one of her favorite eating establishments.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked if the plywood on the front covered up the historic element. Mr. Barber answered yes, and explained that the concern is not knowing what is behind that. There appears to be grates behind there and they do not know what those are. They were unable to explore enough without damaging or tearing away a lot of the building.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Staff report contained a rendering provided by the contractor showing how the new store front would look. The contractor would like to bring back the raised panels and bead board to restore the original look.

Board Member Holmgren referred to the photo with the gentleman and young girl and the ladies dining room and suggested that those might be windows in the basement. Mr. Barber stated that he had that same thought; however, the contractor measured where it was and determined that it was not deep enough to be a window. The old foundation stone makes it difficult to see anything. Planner Whetstone noted that because it was covered the grate could not be seen from the inside. She clarified that Mr. Barber did not intend to bring back the grates.

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

Board Member McKie asked if the photo presented was the only picture. Mr. Barber answered yes. Other pictures he found were either shaded or the structure was blocked.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked if the paint estimate was for the entire front facade. Mr. Barber answered yes. The existing paint is so old that it would be hard to match.

Chair Werbelow liked the project and supported the grant request.

MOTION: Chair Werbelow moved to award a grant in the amount of \$7660 to cover a portion of the costs associated with the discussed restoration of the Bandit's Grill and Bar at 440 Main Street. Board Member McKie seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member McKie commented on the possibility of expanding the grant program. She commented on several houses around Old Town where the owners do not have certificates of occupancy for various reasons. If the grant program could be expanded to include interior items it would help to get those homes livable and back on the market.

Director Eddington stated that there is a list of uninhabitable structures. Last year the City worked with the architectural firm CRSA to provide an update on some of those structures. There were approximately 26 properties on the list that have varying degrees of issues. Most of the structures are occupied.

Board Member White noted that currently plumbing, electrical and heating were eligible items under the grant program. Board Member McKie was unaware that those items were eligible. Board Member Holmgren stated that the grant program was initiated primarily for that reason. Board Member McKie suggested that they reach out and inform people that the grant program is available. She noted that owners pay out-of-pocket and then get reimbursed from the grant. Since some have to obtain loans if they do not have available cash, Board Member McKie thought it would be helpful if the City could provide a letter stating that the owner would be reimbursed when the project is completed.

#### ANNUAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION AWARD

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray thought the home at 841 Empire Avenue at the top of Crescent Tram would be a good candidate for the preservation award. It was on the Historic Home Tour last year and everyone liked it. She noted that the owners went to great lengths to do a lot of sustainability focused efforts in their remodeling. She had contacted the owner to get a list of those features but she had not yet received it.

Board Member McKie stated that she did a personal field trip to look at historic structures but she did not have any suggestions at this time. She noted that at the last meeting the HPB talked about announcing the award in May since it was Historic Preservation Month. Board Member McKie stated that everyone in the subcommittee was excited about the Washington School Inn. If there are no other options, it could be considered if the issues are cleared up.

Planner Sintz reported that the Washington School Inn turned in their CUP modification and she was meeting with the architect the next day. Board Member McKie asked Planner Sintz to email the subcommittee with updates if anything progressed.

Board Member White recalled a previous conversation about taking a field trip in May. Director Eddington offered to set up a field trip.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray noted that they have consistently talked about 1101 Norfolk. It was the first project under the current guidelines and they also did the transfer of development rights. She stated that giving the award to a residential property was also considered because it could be used to set a good example. However, the benefit of awarding a more public property is that it allows people to visit the property. Board Member Matsumoto stated that they also talked about giving it to a house that has not had a significant remodel as an example of preservation. Board Member White thought the structure at 1101 Norfolk met that example. He believed 1101 Norfolk was a great choice, but felt the Board should go look at it.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she had an aerial photo of Park Avenue, Woodside and Empire. Some of the photos are structures from the 1940's. She thought it would be interesting for the Board to do a walking tour to see how many structures in the photo still exist.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray suggested that they could give it to a neighborhood. She noted that the Prospect and Sandridge neighborhoods still have a lot of historic houses.

The Board agreed to tentatively schedule a walking tour on Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>. Planner Sintz stated that she would check to see if they could conclude the tour at the Washington School Inn to look at the interior. She suggested that someone contact the owners of the other properties being considered to see if they could walk through the interior of those structures as well.

## WORK SESSION

### Discussion of Historic Sites Inventory designation and nomination process

Director Eddington stated that the Staff wanted to discuss the issue of nominating structures and sites for the Historic Sites Inventory. There had been some confusion with regard to 920 Empire and how sites get nominated. The Staff would be discussing the process with the City Council during a work session on May 17th. Director Eddington did not think the City Council would want to make a recommendation without hearing input from the HPB.

Director Eddington noted that the LMC section that deals with nominating sites was attached to the Staff report. He stated that currently building and property owners can nominate a site to the Historic Sites Inventory and/or the Planning Department. The current methodology is that if a structure or site is nominated it would come into the Planning Department and the Planning Staff would do research, review and analysis. If it appears to potentially qualify, the Staff would recommend an intensive level survey to dig into the sites history and begin to research old photographs, Sanborn maps and other available documentation from various sources. The completed survey would then

be presented to the HPB. Director Eddington remarked that the HPB as a body is the entity that would actually vote on any structure.

Director Eddington stated that there was some question as to whether the Board should be able to nominate a structure and then bring it back to themselves. There is confusion as to how that would work. Currently the Board members have the ability to come to the Planning Department and suggest that they research a building that is not on the list but may qualify. He was unsure whether the HPB, either individually or as a Board, would want to take on the task of finding a building and doing the research and analysis and then funding an intensive level survey. That would be the process if they do the nominating. He felt it was better to bring any potential candidates to the Planning Department rather than do the work themselves.

Director Eddington understood that the matter would put the HPB in a slightly awkward position. However, he wanted to open it up for discussion to see if the HPB was interested in altering, amending or revising the LMC to modify the nominating process; or whether it was better to keep the current process but clear up the confusion.

Board Member McKie clarified that if they kept with the current process the Staff would do the legwork and bring it before the HPB. In addition, if the Board or a Board member finds something that they think belongs on the list, they could still nominate that structure. Director Eddington stated that they could recommend that the Planning Department nominate the structure and begin the intensive level research.

Chair Werbelow thought the current process was the best approach.

Board Member McKie asked if the issue was being raised because new buildings were coming up because they were reaching the 50 year mark or for some other reason. She asked if there were any hidden structures that the HPB was unaware of. Director Eddington replied that a policy discussion that the Staff would be bringing to the HPB in late summer is whether they want to start looking at the recreation era as a historic period. Currently, historic preservation is the mining era and the decline of the mining area.

Board Member Holmgren noted that the infamous A-frames would be part of the recreation history. Director Eddington stated that the A-frames would be the first to qualify given the timeline.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray had a general feeling that every decision about the Historic Sites Inventory comes from Dina Blaes. She agreed that Dina is very thorough and they were lucky to have her; but she thought it would be beneficial to have multiple preservation consultants with different backgrounds and points of view weigh in on some of the difficult or questionable decisions. Chair Werbelow and Board Member McKie supported that idea.

Director Eddington stated that Dina Blaes with Preservation Solutions is very well versed in addressing their concerns. Dina has taken her cues from the HPB starting in 2005-2007 when the Board made recommendation on the eras, building, and sites they wanted to look at; as well as the LMC revisions they were interested in making. Director Eddington was confident that Ms. Blaes could continue to address their concerns if they

move into a new era. He noted that the City has a contract with Dina Blaes. However, if the HPB was interested in another viewpoint they could talk to her about the possibility of working with a sub-consultant as a different viewpoint.

Board Member Matsumoto pointed out that the decisions are not always cut and dry. Two preservation consultants who look at the exact same thing can come to two different conclusions. Planner Sintz stated that technically the guidelines should be written in a way that makes it completely understandable. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray replied that there were too many subjective judgments in the guidelines. Planner Sintz disagreed. The old guidelines were subjective but that was changed with the new guidelines. Planner Sintz understood that Sandra Hatch, another preservationist, was involved with 920 Empire. Director Eddington stated that two separate consultants looked at 920 Empire and they both gave the same opinion.

Board Member Matsumoto stated that if the HPB would be determining what goes on the inventory, they are not the experts. They have their particular backgrounds but they take their cue from the preservation consultant and how the guidelines were interpreted. She personally would prefer more information from different points of view in that discussion.

Chair Werbelow agreed, but she was unsure how they could do it logistically. Director Eddington suggested that the property owner could hire a second consultant at their own expense. Over the past several years, when the City has used their consultant and someone hired another consultant, the consultants have come to the same conclusion. The benefit of having the more definitive guidelines based on the Secretary of Interior Standards is that it is not arbitrary and capricious. It is very focused. You meet the codes and you meet the guidelines. The Staff has a specific intensive level survey sheet to follow for their research.

Chair Werbelow believed the concern was less about the properties that were going on the list and more about the properties that were dropping off. She thought it was critical to have more than one opinion on the determination of insignificance.

Board Member McKie stated that if someone from the HPB had known that 920 Empire was no longer on the list, they could have stepped in with a recommendation to reconsider adding it to the HSI. Director Eddington noted that 920 did not qualify for the Historic Sites Inventory for a number of reasons, but it could have gone through the process if the Board had been aware it was not on the list. He clarified that the list comes to the HPB for the final decision; however they take their cues from the preservation consultant. The information is presented to the HPB for either approval or removal. Director Eddington noted that Historic Preservation has become more refined over the last 25 years and it is more black and white. Director Eddington reiterated that the City has a standing contract with Dina Blaes, but he would explore ways to bring on a sub-consultant.

Director Eddington asked if the HPB wanted to play a different role in the nomination process, or if they were comfortable with the Planning Department and the property owners being the two nominating entities; with the understanding that the HPB members could bring building sites to the Planning Department to nominate.

Historic Preservation Board  
Minutes of May 2, 2012

The Board members were comfortable with the current process. Director Eddington invited the Board to attend the City Council work session on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_

Sara Werbelow  
Historic Preservation Board