



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
APRIL 7, 2008  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
10:00 AM

**WORK SESSION – 10:00 AM**

- 5 147 Ridge Avenue – Design Advice & Guidance
- 17 Historic District Guidelines Discussion

**REGULAR MEETING**

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

ADJOURN

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department, 615-5060, prior to the meeting.

Published: April 5, 2008

Posted: April 4, 2008



## **WORK SESSION**



## Historic Preservation Board Staff Memo



**DATE:** April 7, 2008  
**AUTHOR:** Kirsten Whetstone  
**TITLE:** 147 Ridge Avenue  
**TYPE OF ITEM:** HPB Guidance Request

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

### Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board provide guidance to the owners of 147 Ridge Avenue in regards to shifting the existing house on the lot.

### Project Information

**Applicant:** Jonathan deGray, owner's representative  
**Location:** 147 Ridge Avenue  
**Zoning:** Historic Residential (HRL)

### Background

On February 20, 2008, Staff received a letter from the owner's representative of 147 Ridge Avenue. The owners request direction on whether the historic house can be shifted to the west a distance of about 5' on the north corner and 12' on the south corner and rotated about 30 degrees to align the building with the lot lines.

On June 23, 2006, the applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review application for an addition to the house (Exhibit A). Staff has been working with the applicant on the design. Revised plans were submitted on January 30, 2008. A plat amendment to create a lot of record from several lots was approved by City Council on August 2, 2007. The plat amendment established a maximum footprint for 147 Ridge at 1,500 sf which is a reduction from the LMC maximum of 2,631 sf.

The request for guidance falls under the additional duties of the HPB within the Land Management Code section 15-11-6(F) "Provide advice and guidance on request of the property owner or occupant on the construction, restoration, alteration, decoration, landscaping, or maintenance of any cultural resource, and property within the Historic District, or neighboring property within a two block radius of the Historic District."


On March 17, 2008, the HPB continued this item to April 7, 2008.

### **EXHIBITS**

- A -Plans from Applicant dated February 19, 2008
- B- Letters from Applicant

**NOTES**

1. Project boundaries, not set upon in record.
2. The architect is responsible for verifying building setbacks, zoning requirements and building heights.
3. This site plan is based on a field survey performed on 7/13/04.
4. Property corners are shown.



LINE	BEARINGS	DISTANCE
1	S 15° 10' 00" W	1.00
2	S 75° 00' 00" W	10.18
3	N 88° 52' 24" E	7.41
4	S 22° 30' 00" E	6.77
5	S 20° 00' 00" E	7.18



STAFF: JAMES WOOD  
 DATE: 07/13/04  
 PROJECT: 147 RIDGE AVENUE

EXISTING CONDITIONS  
 147 RIDGE AVENUE  
 FOR: JAMES WOOD  
 JOB NO.: 7-13-04  
 FILE: E:\Projects\Comp\Comp\147Ridge\147Ridge.dwg

SHEET  
 1  
 OF  
 1

Jonathan DeGray  
Architect


1000 N. 1000 E. Salt Lake City, UT 84143  
Tel: 801.487.1234 Fax: 801.487.1235

HISTORIC RESTORATION AND ADDITION

WOOD RESIDENCE  
187 RICE AVENUE PARK CITY, UTAH

SCHMATIC PLAN

A-1



BASE LEVEL  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

LOWER LEVEL  
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"


SCHMATIC PLAN

WOOD RESIDENCE

Jonathan DeGray  
Architect

NO. 10 STATE ST. NEW ORLEANS, LA. 70112  
PHONE: 525-1234

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION  
1770 GARDEN ST. NEW ORLEANS, LA. 70112  
PHONE: 525-1234






SCHEMATIC ELEVATIONS


WOOD RESIDENCE  
147 RIDGE AVENUE, PARK CITY, UTAH

Jonathan DeGray  
Architect



P.O. BOX 11418 PARK CITY, UTAH 84302  
PHONE: 462-2222 FAX: 462-2222  
WWW.JONATHANDEGRAY.COM

HISTORIC RESTORATION AND ADDITION





SITE PLAN  
147 RIDGE AVENUE  
PARK CITY, UTAH



GLOBAL PLAN  
1/8"

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Jonathan DeGray - Architect

January 29, 2008

Park City Municipal Corporation  
443 Mariac Avenue  
Park City, Utah 84060

Attn: Ms. Kirsten Wherstone, Planning Department

Re: Anne Wood Residence  
147 Ridge Avenue

Dear Kirsten,

The owners of 147 Ridge Avenue have asked me to undertake designs for a remodel and addition to the existing historic residence. As you are aware I have been working with Ray Milliner since the summer to develop a schematics design that is acceptable to the owners and staff. At this time I am seeking approval to shift the building location 8' to achieve a superior design solution.

As some back round to the project 147 Ridge is a historic home that has been the subject of a lengthy plat amendment process with the city. This process involved a complicated land exchange between the owner, Anne Wood and the city. The result is the plat which was just approved and recorded at the end of last year that cleans up the ownership of Ridge Avenue and gives the city a clean title to the right of way. The plat also stipulated a reduction in the allowable building footprint from 2586 sq. ft. (per LMC formula) to 1500 sq. ft.

During the course of designing the remodel and addition to the historic home I have tried a number of alternatives to place an addition to the rear of the home that would not overpower or visually compete with the historic home. I have found that the way the home is currently sited makes this job difficult mainly due to how close the home currently sits to Ridge Avenue on the east side. One of the options I have examined is to shift the building location by 8' (see attached plans). By moving the building this small amount I can add on to the rear of the historic home and maintain enough room around the building to step the addition away from the historic home. This in effect allows the historic home to read as the dominant form as viewed from the street on all sides.




In light of the above information I am asking the planning staff for a favorable determination to move the home at 147 Ridge Avenue as described in the accompanying drawings. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding this request. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,




Jonathan DeGray - Architect

RECEIVED  
JAN 30 2008







Historic Preservation Board April 7, 2008





RECEIVED

JUN 23 2006  
Page 14 of 23



JUN 23 2006





JUN 23 2006



# Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



**Author:** Dina Blaes, Consultant  
**Subject:** Historic Preservation  
Design Guidelines  
**Date:** April 7, 2008  
**Type of Item:** Legislative

Planning Department

## **This meeting will include:**

- 1) Continuation, if necessary, of the discussion surrounding panelization (20 minutes);**
- 2) Review of comments on the Design Guidelines received to date (20 minutes);**
- 3) Determine who will attend the CAMP training opportunity on April 17 (5 minutes)- registration deadline is April 11.**

## **Section 1: Issues/Topics from previous meetings:**

### **I. Disassembly/Reassembly (panelization) of Historically Significant buildings**

Continuation of discussion, if needed. Staff received considerable input from the HPB during the discussion on March 17, 2008. In general, HPB remarks confirmed that the section in the draft design guidelines with regard to panelization reflects their desired policy direction. Greater emphasis, however, should be placed on retaining historic materials when feasible, requiring greater documentation of physical conditions before an application is considered, defining extensive rehabilitation (when significant amounts of historic materials cannot be saved because of condition, but will be accurately reproduced), and an overall understanding that panelization should not be considered unless the applicant can prove that it will further the City's preservation goals. In addition, the construction of additions (garage or living space) should only be approved if the applicant can show compatibility. The HPB members emphasized their desire to set a standard that result in panelizations being infrequent rather than being the standard or initial approach proposed by an applicant.

Staff does not expect this discussion to continue at this meeting, but if HPB members have comments or information to add, 20 minutes has been allotted.

### **II. Residential Infill**

Staff will return at a subsequent meeting to discuss this item.

## **Section 2: Comments on specific sections of the Design Guidelines**

**Comment #1 (Martz): I'm excited about the prospect of utilizing these new guidelines. I do think it is going to cause an adjustment reaction to owners and builders. I think the building and planning department should at some point present a detail as to how they**

**are going to implement a process to accommodate these new guidelines and how to monitor the building process along the way to insure compliance. I think this has been a real problem even with the current program.**

Response: We are planning to provide materials to assist the planning staff. Note in Section 3, we expect to present drafts of these materials to the HPB in May.

**Comment #2 (Martz): Do we need components for façade easements and maybe bonding in certain cases.**

Response: At the March 17 HPB meeting, Roger Evans reminded the HPB that the City currently requires a bond for historic preservation projects. Façade easements have not been discussed and should not be part of the design guidelines.

**Comment #3 (Martz): On the significant properties good documentation of the building process should be kept for future reference over the years.**

Response: The draft guidelines call for greater documentation at the application phase than is currently required. Additional requirements—model, perspective drawings—were mentioned in conjunction with disassembly/reassembly, but were not discussed in detail.

FYI-Application/permit files are kept in the planning office for five years, after which time the entire file is archived in a digital format.

**Comment #4 (Martz): Membership of the HPB. I was under the impression that there was to be a person selected from the Historical Society as their designate. I thought City Council did pass this about a year ago.**

Response: LMC Chapter 15-11 -2. TERMS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS currently reads as follows:

Members of the HPB shall serve terms of three (3) years. No member may serve more than two (2) consecutive terms. The terms shall be staggered. Terms may expire on May 1, however, members of the HPB shall continue to serve until their successors are appointed and qualified.

(A) The Mayor shall appoint a new HPB member to fill vacancies that might arise and such appointments shall be to the end of the vacating member's term.

(B) It is the first priority of the City Council that the HPB have technical representation in Historic preservation. Therefore, when vacancies occur and if appropriate, it shall be the first consideration of the City Council to ensure that there is a licensed architect, or other professional having substantial experience in rehabilitation-type construction, serving on the HPB, and secondly, that there is representation from the Park City Historical Society. After being notified by the City of a vacancy, at least two (2) nominations shall be rendered to the City Council by the Park City Historical Society if it desires to participate in the Application process.

(C) In addition, the HPB should include members with the following qualifications, or representing the following interests:

(1) A member recommended by or associated with the Utah State Historical Society or Utah Heritage Foundation.

(2) A member living in the Historic District with demonstrated interest and knowledge of Historic preservation.

(3) A member appointed at large from Park City with demonstrated interest and

knowledge of Historic preservation.

(4) A member associated with Main Street Business and commercial interests.

Therefore, the LMC makes Historical Society representation a priority during the application process, not a mandatory requirement. Staff does not recommend a change at this time. Does the HPB want to recommend a change?

**Comment #5 (Ford): Overall, I think we need to rethink some elements of these guidelines. After a more careful review, my overall take is that these guidelines are currently VERY weak and far too subjective and offer far too few specifics. When I compare these Guidelines to say Telluride [www.town.telluride.co-gov/](http://www.town.telluride.co-gov/) I am struck by how much information is not in our Guidelines. I invite you all to review the Telluride Guidelines.**

Response: The level of specificity of the current draft is based on 1) direction I received from the Planning Director, 2) meetings with members of the local design community, and 3) negative reactions to the 1995 draft design guidelines (never adopted) being overly detailed and prescriptive. If the HPB wishes to see explanations beneath each guideline, we can certainly talk about the issue. I do not agree, however, that providing lengthy examples under each guideline is the best approach. We can more explicitly state the character-defining elements of Park City's historic resources; thereby providing guidance and examples in a manner that states what is important to Park City without creating a "menu" of design solutions to be checked off a list that ultimately do not contribute effectively to the character of the community.

Telluride's guidelines are great for Telluride, so read them with that in mind. In addition to the city's design guidelines, I would encourage HPB members to review Telluride's Land Use Code. It is extensive with regard to historic resources. The two—design guidelines and Land Use Code—work in concert and the guidelines should be reviewed in the context of the Land Use Code. It is also important to note that Telluride is a National Historic Landmark (less than 2,500 sites in the U.S.) in addition to being listed on the National Register of Historic Places (more than 80,000 sites in the U.S.), and it utilizes a local overlay zone approach, all of which are quite different from the situation in Park City.

If you are interested in other examples of design guidelines go to [www.uga.edu/sed/psd/programs/napc/guidelines.htm](http://www.uga.edu/sed/psd/programs/napc/guidelines.htm) which is the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions' online design guideline page. It provides access to design guidelines from across the country.

**Comment #6 (Ford): As the City has more and more designers from out of town, these Guidelines really do need to be a GUIDEBOOK for HOW to design a historically sensitive structure. For example, what are historic roof pitches, what are the traditional roof materials, how large may street front glass windows be, should the second floor have more or less glass than the first, etc? I am of the opinion that these Guidelines must have much more meat on the bones.**

Response: See response to Comment #5.

**Comment #7 (Ford): Commercial Infill – Universal Guidelines, no.2, I think this could be clarified a bit. I understand the need to prohibit copy cat design, but one should be permitted to emulate certain elements of the existing structure.**

Response: The guidelines do not prohibit new construction that is compatible with historic structures, as noted in Universal Guidelines #1, #5 and #6. The term and concept of “emulating” suggests imitation or copying. If the term “compatible” does not provide enough direction, we can add terms like “well-suited”, “attuned”, “similar”, and/or “harmonious” as a means of expanding on the concept of “compatible”.

**Comment #8 (Ford): Commercial Infill – On Parking, the vehicular access should not be permitted on the front. Parking lots should be to rear or side. They should be heavily screened with historically sensitive fences, walls and or landscaping.**

Response: The commercial infill section applies to all the “H” commercial districts, not just the Main Street area where, clearly, vehicular access on the front should not be permitted. Some areas in the HCB and the HRC may be able to accommodate vehicular access from the front of the property. Providing flexibility and acknowledging that the commercial districts include areas like Main Street, but also areas where residential type buildings may be adaptively reused for commercial developments is why we included the guideline that reads, *New parking required in conjunction with new commercial-type construction may be appropriately accommodated on site when the design of such parking contributes to the overall character of the district and is compatible with surrounding Historically Significant buildings.*

Finally, keep in mind that the parking-related sections of the guidelines will likely undergo significant modifications following discussions with the Engineering and Planning staff.

**Comment #9 (Ford): Commercial Infill – 1.1 A new building constructed behind an existing Historically Significant commercial-type building..., Continue to feel that new construction should not be forced to be visually distinct. Why cannot it seem like an organic growth of the historic structure. Should we have all new construction look like the new museum addition (which btw, appears to have not instituted any one of our many suggestions.) Much more detail is needed here.**

Response: We will be discussing this issue in depth at a subsequent HPB work session.

**Comment #10 (Ford): Commercial Infill – Roof detail seems very low. For example would a flat roof be permitted. If so, would it need a parapet? What if the new building is next to two other non-historic structures. Relying on the surrounding shapes etc. seems fairly loosey goosey to me.**

Response: So noted, but the flat roof question needs clarification because the answer is “it depends”. Is the building being proposed in the Main Street NR Historic District? Is it an infill project on lower Park Avenue? Its location will likely determine whether or not a flat roof would be compatible with the surrounding Historically Significant buildings.


With regard to the parapet—if the proposed flat roof is compatible with surrounding Historically Significant buildings then it will likely incorporate a parapet. Universal Guideline 5 reads, *Exterior elements of the new development—roof forms, cornices, storefronts, entrances, upper façade, etc.—should be of human scale and should be*

*compatible with surrounding Historically Significant commercial buildings.*

With regard to relying on surrounding roof shapes—the word “surrounding” may be defined as “on the same block”, “within 300 feet”, etc... if the HPB feels it is too vague as stated.

**Comment #11 (Ford): Commercial Infill – What is an example of “featureless material”? I think back to the new museum, of which I am not a fan. That has large expanses of what I would consider featureless materials. In fact, the entire new building is featureless.**

Response: This is an area where consistency in the decision making process is critical. The best way to define this is by being consistent in approving and/or denying materials that are proposed in the design review applications.



**Example of featureless material.**

Source: *Architectural Guidelines for Corridor Development*, Lake County, IL

**Comment #12 (Ford): Commercial Infill – What does “used authentically” mean?**

Response: Materials should be used in a genuine way. I do not have a photograph to include here, but I am sure you have all seen stone veneer—wall or bay window—suspended above the ground. Stone, even stone veneer, should be grounded and not appear to defy gravity. Also, when a stone or faux stone veneer comes to a corner, it should wrap around the corner.

I would like to talk with the HPB about this issue at a later date within the broader context of substitute materials. We will likely discuss this and residential infill together. It is important because substitute and/or imitative building materials are not new—Mt. Vernon’s wood siding is chamfered and covered with sand-impregnated paint to make the boards look like stones, stucco is often scored to look like stone ashlar, and the addition to the Joseph Smith Memorial Building uses fiberglass foam to replicate architectural details from the original drawings—and warrant further discussion.

**Comment #13 (Ford): Commercial Infill – Could staff please bring in the list of appropriate colors for our review?**

Response: Yes. They will be provided at the meeting.

**Comment #14 (Ford): Commercial Infill – Words such as “compatible” and “proportional” are used extensively throughout this section. I think the section relies far too heavily on these rather subjective terms.**

Response: So noted.

**Comment #15 (Ford): Commercial Infill – Mechanical equipment should be permitted on the roof if it is screened from adjacent public ROW. The screen should be a historically sensitive roof feature (perhaps such as a parapet).**

Response: Roof-mounted equipment may be appropriate in some circumstances and we can clarify this guideline.

**Comment #16 (Ford): Commercial Infill – Loading docks should only be permitted off of alleys or back yards. Heavily landscaped with fences, walls and landscaping. Provide examples of appropriate materials.**

Response: Because Park City lacks alleys and easily accessible back yards, this is not always possible. We can emphasize, however, the importance of visually minimizing these service areas.

**Comment #17 (Ford): Commercial Infill – As a whole we are totally missing urban design element. What about streetscape, alleys, plazas, pocket parks, public art?**

Response: So noted, although—like sustainability—these issues are often tangentially related to preservation design guidelines rather than integrally related. The preservation guidelines present an opportunity to reinforce what the parks department, engineering department, and sustainability team are trying to accomplish. Other policy documents may speak to these issues and will be reviewed as we compare the guidelines to these documents and the LMC for consistency.

### **Section 3: Timeline & Next Steps**

**April 7, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session**

Meeting will include:

- 1) Continuation, if necessary, of the discussion surrounding panelization;
- 2) Review of comments on the Design Guidelines received to date

**April 17, 2008 @ 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. –Training Opportunity (See below)**

**April 21, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session**

Agenda to be determined.

**April 23, 2008 @ time tba – Joint Planning Commission, City Council and HPB meeting**

Meeting will include:

- 1) Discussion of Steep Slope CUP process and possible HPB involvement.

**May 5, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – HPB Work Session**

Meeting will include:

- 1) Review of Design Guidelines with illustrations & photographs; and
- 2) Review of support documents prepared for staff & public:
  - Revised Information Guide for Design Review Process
  - Methodology/approach “instructions” for staff
  - Existing Physical Condition Report, if applicable
  - Revised Application Form, if applicable

Public Comment Form, if applicable  
Application Certification Letter, if applicable

**May 14, 2008 @ time tba – Joint Planning Commission, City Council and HPB meeting**

Meeting will include:

- 1) Discussion of proposed LMC amendments to building height and building footprint in the HR-1 District.

**May 19, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – Public Hearing**

- 1) Review and take public comment on proposed Design Guidelines.

**June 2, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – Public Hearing**

- 1) Resolution to recommend adoption of Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings.

Planning Commission review/ adoption scheduled for June 11, 2008

City Council review/adoption scheduled for June 19, 2008

### **HPB TRAINING OPPORTUNITY**

**WHAT:** CAMP = Commission Assistance & Mentoring Program  
A program of the National Association of Preservation Commissions (NAPC)  
Sponsored by State Historic Preservation Office & SLC Historic Landmarks  
Commission

**WHEN:** Thursday, April 17 from 9 AM to 4 PM (One-day CAMP)

**WHERE:** Utah State Historical Society offices, 300 Rio Grande Street, SLC

**COST:** \$55 per person (does not include conference registration)

**CONTACT:** Robin Zeigler, Preservation Planner  
Salt Lake City Corporation, 451 South State Street, Room 406, SLC, UT 84111  
Tel. 801/535-7758

The NAPC CAMP brochure is attached. The City will cover the cost of registration.

This CAMP is being offered in conjunction with the Utah Heritage Foundation's annual statewide preservation conference, April 17-19 at Ft. Douglas. For full conference information and a registration form go to

<http://www.utahheritagefoundation.org/pdf/2008uhfregistrationbrochure.pdf>

