

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2014

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair John Kenworthy, Lola Beatlebrox, Marian Crosby, Cheryl Hewett, Puggy Holmgren, Hope Melville, David White

EX OFFICIO: Planning Manager Sintz, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpin

ROLL CALL

Chair Kenworthy called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the November 5, 2014 minutes was continued to January 7, 2015.

PUBLIC INPUT

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Anya Grahn reported that that the City Council was having a work session the following evening to discuss the Historic District Grant program based on the feedback provided by the Historic Preservation Board.

Planner Grahn had emailed the Board members a resume template on Utah State History that needed to be filled out and returned to her within the next week or two. It is for historic preservation annual auditing purposes and it helps Park City keep their Certified Local Government status.

Planner Grahn reported that the HPB meeting in January would be held on January 7, 2015.

Board Member Melville commented on the Parkite building at 322 Main Street and noted that the City has a conservation easement on the historic structure. Ms. Melville thought the green paint on the new building was so similar to the color of the historic structure that the historic structure seemed to disappear rather than stand out. She asked if there was anything in the Design Guidelines or in the agreement that required keeping the historic structure more distinct. Ms. Melville pointed out that the two structures were distinct when they were different colors. She also felt the different colors helped to break up the mass of the large building.

Planner Grahn offered to find out whether the issue was addressed in the design guidelines under siding material. She pointed out that the design guidelines do not regulate color. Ms. Melville assumed there was some language in the guidelines requiring that the historic facades stand out from the rest of the building.

Board Member Holmgren recalled that this was a major issue when they were revising the Land Management Code, and the final decision was that the City should not determine what colors people choose for their structures. She recalled a phrase that was used by a former member of the Planning Department that these were guidelines, not rules. Ms. Holmgren remarked that her house is purple because of the decision not to regulate color following a very contentious discussion.

Board Member Melville believed that aside from the color issue the guidelines should address keeping the historic façade distinct and not allowing it to disappear into the rest of the building.

Planning Manager Sintz replied that the guidelines do not address historic facades in terms of color. She understood that the building was not finished and suggested that Ms. Melville wait to see if that was the final color of the exterior. Ms. Sintz thought it was possible for Ms. Melville or the HPB to reach out and make the owners aware of their concern. Ms. Sintz stated that if the Board was in agreement, they could also consider historic identity as a potential revision to the Design Guidelines moving forward.

WORK SESSION

2014 HPB Award

The Board discussed the annual preservation award. Planner Grahn reported that the premise of the award is to promote adherence to the 2009 Design Guidelines. Is it not meant to compete with any awards given by of the Historical Society. The projects are selected based on adaptive reuse, infill development, excellence in restoration, sustainable preservation, embodiment of historical context, or connectivity of the site.

Planner Grahn reviewed potential nominations as outlined in the Staff report.

260 Main Street - It is a beautiful building and Planner Grahn thought they had done a nice job with the mass and scale. She noted that the project was approved under the 2006 guidelines and completed in 2010.

819 Empire Avenue - This is a very large house that was built over three lots. Planner Grahn thought this project had also done a good job breaking up the mass and scale to keep the structure from appearing too bulky.

Board Member Holmgren stated that 819 Empire was recently completed in 2014; not 2004 as indicated in the Staff report.

575 Park Avenue - Planner Grahn noted that 575 Park Avenue was designated as a Landmark site in 2009 when the City adopted the Historic Sites Inventory. In 2010 a second story addition was approved above a non-historic rear addition. When the Historic Preservation Board re-reviewed the project it demoted the Landmark status to Significant status.

101 Prospect Avenue - This was the little garage at the top of the hill. It is a Landmark site associated with the bungalow style home. The garage was constructed in 1925 on timber and pylons. However, because it was structurally unstable it received a grant in 2012 to be reconstructed. The owners put in a concrete basement underneath the garage for additional storage. Planner Grahn noted that this project was completed in 2014.

Board Member Melville asked if the house was redone as well. Planner Grahn replied that they only did the windows on the house.

Silver King Mine Site - Planner Grahn stated that at one time this was one of the most extensive silver mine sites in the State. It still embodies much of the historic character, and the buildings maintain a sense of the activity that occurred and what life looked like in that mine camp.

562 Main Street – Planner Grahn stated that this property had a façade easement on it. The Staff and the applicant worked closely with the City Council on panelizing it because it was structurally unsound. She understood that the project would be completed prior to Sundance.

Planner Grahn requested that the HPB choose one nominee to receive the award this year. She also asked if three Board members would volunteer to form the artist selection committee. She noted that last year they put out a request for proposals and the selection committee interviewed the artists. One artist was selected to paint the project.

Chair Kenworthy stated that the Preservation Award was a great opportunity for the HPB to get exposure and to reach out to people who made an effort and did the extra work. It also gets more people involved with preservation.

Chair Kenworthy asked each Board Member to give their two favorite selections.

Board Member Holmgren liked 575 Park Avenue and 101 Prospect. She thought both projects had done a really good job. She particularly thought the garage at 101 Prospect fits in with the neighborhood.

Board Member White questioned Planner Grahn's comment that the garage had been reconstructed. Planner Grahn replied that in her research she found that it had been reconstructed. Board Member Holmgren stated that the garage was lifted and moved to put in the basement and then it was moved back. Board Member White clarified that the garage was not reconstructed. It was braced and craned across the street. Once the footing and foundation was built, it was craned back.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that only the garage and not the house was being considered; and that it was essentially an outbuilding. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Board Member White liked 575 Park Avenue and 562 Main Street.

Board Member Crosby asked why they were only giving one award this year. Planner Grahn replied that it was primarily due to available funding. Another reason was that when the program was first developed it was intended to be one award each year. Ms. Crosby commented on the different types of historic preservation that goes on and she thought it would be beneficial to award more than one category each year. She suggested that it might be a budgetary question for next year.

Board Member Crosby favored 101 Prospect and she was torn between 575 Park Avenue and 562 Main Street. She chose 562 Main Street as her second choice because it was closer to the commercial category.

Board Member Beatlebrox believed 562 Main Street has been a huge project and a major improvement over what was there. She also liked 575 Park Avenue.

Board Member Melville did not think 260 Main Street and 819 Empire were good selections for the Historic Preservation Board. She would like the HPB to consider a separate award for compatible infill. For example, 819 Empire does a wonderful job of blending in with the Historic District while still being different and modern. Ms. Melville would like to recognize and encourage that type of effort through an award or honorable mention that is parallel to the Historic Preservation Award. Board Member Hewett suggested using ribbons like they use to show that a house is historical. Chair Kenworthy concurred.

Board Member Melville liked 575 Park Avenue and 101 Prospect. Ms. Melville also liked 260 Main Street and recommended that they consider that as a nominee for next year.

Board Member Hewett favored 101 Prospect and the Silver King Mine site. She asked if there was a reason why the others had not chosen the Mine Site as their top two.

Chair Kenworthy asked what had actually been done to the Mine Site. Planner Sintz stated that its selection was more about the importance of mine sites. It was included in the list because it was a nice way to kick off a campaign for the preservation of mine sites. Board Member Melville noted that a few things had been done to the site including stabilizing the Silver King water tanks. They are looking at stabilizing the other two water tanks that are above the electrical building. The towers were worked on this summer by taking the trees out that were pushing over the towers.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that her concern with giving an award to a site that has not had considerable work done to it was that it could be a de-incentive for new owners to do a lot of good restoration work. Board Member Hewett thought one reason for consideration was that the buildings have not been torn down and the owners have maintained the site even though it is on valuable real estate property. It was the right thing to do and she believed an award would encourage others to do the right thing.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the mine site property was accessible to the public. Planner Grahn believed it was accessible through skiing and the trails system.

Chair Kenworthy wanted to do whatever they could to inspire the owners. He recalled from their last meeting that as a preservation board they would like to reach out to Talisker and Vail and encourage them to keep their eyes and their money on preserving these sites.

Chair Kenworthy favored 575 Park Avenue and 101 Prospect Avenue.

Chair Kenworthy noted that based on their choices there was a tie between 575 Park Avenue and 101 Prospect. He asked the Board members for their first choice. Board Members Holmgren, White, Crosby, Hewett and Kenworthy chose 101 Prospect. Board Members Beatlebrox and Melville chose 575 Park Avenue.

Chair Kenworthy thought they were all great projects and they should all be reconsidered next year.

Board Members Kenworthy, Holmgren and Beatlebrox volunteered for the artist selection committee.

Board Member Melville suggested that they contact Patricia Smith when they solicit artists.

Design Guideline Revisions

Planner Grahn introduced Hannah Turpin, the new Planner in the Planning Department. She and Hannah had created an outline of the Design Guideline revisions for the Board to consider and provide feedback.

Planner Turpin stated that the purpose of the design guidelines is to provide guidance in development proposals in the Historic District and Park City Old Town. The Staff would like the Guidelines to be a living document that can change with the evolution of the City.

Planner Grahn noted that the Guidelines were adopted in 2009 and she did not believe it had been revised since its adoption, with the exception of the annual scrubbing of the Historic Sites Inventory.

Planner Turpin remarked that the Guidelines provide standards and direction for rehabilitating historic structures, including alterations and additions. They also help the Staff with compatible infill for development on historic sites. The Guidelines also allow Park City to maintain its National Historic Listing.

Planner Grahn clarified the difference between the National Register of Historic Places and what Park City does locally. She explained that the National Register is controlled by an advisory committee in Washington, DC, and it's for buildings all across the Country. If someone has a building that is listed on the National Register, they would use the Secretary of Interior Standards, which talks about how different materials are supposed to be treated. Most often preservation projects of National Register structures are given tax credits.

Planner Grahn stated that the Park City Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior Standards. She noted that periodically they have a situation where they reference the Secretary of Interior Standards, but on a daily basis the Staff relies on the Design Guidelines. The Guidelines address general design and technical recommendations. The City enforces the Design Guidelines but not the Department of Interior Standards.

Planner Grahn stated that the Historic Sites Inventory is a local list of Landmark and Historic Structures. Typically, a Landmark building is either eligible for or already listed on the National Register. However, not everything on the Historic Sites Inventory that is designated as Landmark or Significant is on the National Register.

Planner Turpin stated that the proposed revisions change the layout and organization of the Design Guidelines to make it easier to use. They also created separate sections for the commercial and residential infill.

Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff struggles with situations where an applicant wants to add a new building on a historic site that is not an addition to the historic structure. As currently written, they need to flip back and forth between sections in the Guidelines to check for compliance with the proposed plan. Part of the goal of the revisions is to keep the Guidelines concise and to make it easier to determine which Guidelines should be referenced.

Planner Grahn commented on proposed language for residential structures to address backyard accessory structures such as gazebos, etc. She noted that the Guidelines do not address decks, and there is nothing specific regarding restoring porches or chimneys. There is only one guideline for gutters and downspouts. There are all small details but they add up and affect the historic character of the house.

Planner Turpin stated that like the residential section, many parts of the commercial section are not very specific. For that reason, they proposed adding a storefront section that calls out individual elements of the storefront that were missing from the current guidelines.

Planner Grahn remarked that treatment of historic materials was another revision they believed would be helpful for anyone using the Design Guidelines. This particular guideline would not necessarily be enforced but it would provide guidance on how historic materials such as rotted wood should be treated.

Planner Turpin asked the Board for input on the new layout compared to the existing layout.

Board Member Melville asked if they were talking about specific sections. She thought the idea of separating commercial from residential made sense. In addition to re-arranging the layout and adding some additional language, Ms. Melville asked if they were proposing any significant changes.

Planner Grahn stated that they have been researching Design Guidelines from other cities to see where the Park City Design Guidelines fall short in terms of better wording. Another problem with the current Guidelines is that the intent is not always clear or understandable in terms of how to apply it. She believed a few additional guidelines could provide a better understanding of what needed to be done.

Planner Grahn clarified that the intent this evening was to review the outline. The Staff would come back in a few months to review each section individually.

Chair Kenworthy liked the way the layout was broken down and he favored the proposed additions.

Board Member Melville could see where a few things had been eliminated from the Guidelines. She specifically referred to page 34 of the current Guidelines, Detached Garages. Planner Grahn stated that they would roll that into the section on Accessory Structures. It would apply to historic structures as well as any new construction. Board Member referred to page 45 of the existing Guidelines, New Construction, Section A2 lot coverage; and page 46, B1 Mass, Scale and Height, and asked if those were being eliminated. Planner Grahn replied that they were not eliminated but they were being called something different. It might deal more with street patterns, building setbacks and orientation and the look of the streetscape. Board Member Melville noted that added to each section was the street pattern or streetscapes. Planner Turpin stated that it addresses what the entire street would look like. If its infill it would be looking at the entire street on a street-wide scale. She reiterated that nothing was eliminated but some things were moved around and named something different.

Board Member Melville stated that one of the new sections she was particularly interested in was the treatment of historic materials. She asked what materials would be covered. Planner Grahn replied that wood would be covered, as well as architectural metals and architectural glass. She remarked that the Guideline talks about using the best preservation methods for certain materials. Planner Grahn stated that in addition to brick they also have stone buildings. They have to be careful, especially with brick, in terms of the type of mortar because it can crack and break easily.

Board Member Melville commented on sections related to relocation, disassembly, and reconstruction that were moved to the end of the outline. She understood the rationale because it probably applies to everything. She asked if that language was being revised. Planner Grahn thought it would be helpful to have more of a step by step process that would help the Planner identify which Guidelines would apply to a project. They were suggesting expanding the section and making it more specific.

Board Member Holmgren asked when they could expect a more in-depth discussion. Planner Grahn anticipated January or February.

Board Member White thought the outline was fine. He thought expansion needed to be done on a number of things, with significant expansion on the question of panelization, disassembly, and raising intact. Mr. White clarified that he was speaking not only as a preservationist but also as an architect. He personally would like to see those issues tightened down a little more.

Board Member Melville noted that the HPB has had several discussions about whether the Planning Department should get input from a knowledgeable engineer on what could be done when someone wants to raise or disassemble a historic structure. She asked if the Staff was making progress on getting that policy in place. Ms. Melville recalled that one idea was to include the cost as a fee as part of the HDDR.

Planning Manager Sintz stated that whenever the City hires its own engineer to verify validity it becomes a liability issue. She believed it required a broader discussion with the City Council. Ms. Melville stated that she was only suggesting that they get an opinion from an engineer on whether or not it could be done.

Board Member White stated that when he has a question of panelization, reconstruction or raising a structure, he always involves a structural engineer. He tells the engineer what he plans to do and asks how it can be done. Mr. White believed that most of the engineers in town follow the architect's direction to do it and do it right.

Planner Grahn commented on the process for revising the Design Guidelines. She suggested breaking the document into sections and review one or sections at each meeting.

Board Member Holmgren asked if this review would be open to the public like it was in 2009. Planning Manager Sintz thought public input would be helpful.

Planning Manager Sintz suggested that they begin their discussion with panelization and reconstruction, because those also might have LMC changes and the revisions could be concurrent.

Board Member Crosby stated that in constructing the outline, she suggested adding the options in italics to help the Board and others who might review the packet understand what they were trying to accomplish. Ms. Crosby referred to pages 53-55 under Primary Structures for New Construction in Historic Districts. She noted that porches were listed under primary structures. She asked if it was better to list porches/balconies/decks. That would need to be repeated under commercial sites and infill residential development. She suggested adding compatibility with existing street alignment. On page 56, Ms. Crosby suggested adding portico. Planner Grahn offered to provide visual examples when they discuss this section.

Chair Kenworthy called for public input.

Ruth Meintsma, 305 Woodside Avenue, referred to pages 54 and 55 of the Staff report regarding street patterns and streetscapes. She stated that she hesitates at street patterns because if you use the existing street pattern on Woodside to create a new structure, it would be a larger structure. She noted that some streets have the majority of larger or more current houses. If those are used as examples, it justifies building other larger houses. Ms. Meintsma suggested a neighborhood pattern as opposed to street pattern, but the Staff disagreed because it is actually the street that you look at. Ms. Meintsma stated that she referred back to the General Plan and the strategy for preserving the historic character, "Influencing streetscape through lot size, setback and parking. The tests, the General Plan talks about smaller lots and high density. The actual word used is "adverse effects" on the historic pattern and aesthetic of the Old Town neighborhood. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the language talks about the pattern of the neighborhood. The General Plan also identifies two tools that helps keep the historic pattern. The first one is lot combination. In talking about development patterns, the General Plan refers to the pattern of the neighborhood and the historic development pattern. She remarked that the pattern the City is trying to maintain is lost on some of the streets. Ms. Meintsma stated that the Guidelines say to consider the street that the house is being built on. It may throw things off in a way that is not desirable. Ms. Meintsma suggested that neighborhood patterns and streetscape should be considered instead of street patterns and streetscape.

Chair Kenworthy noted that many homes are approved and the landscaping is beautiful. However, a few years later the home is remodeled and the landscaping is removed and it becomes one massive driveway. He asked if the City has a mechanism for enforcement. Planning Manager Sintz stated that it became such an issue that the Building and Engineering Department started to require flatwork permits. She recommended that the HPB have a robust discussion on that issue when they review the parking section and see if additional language could be included.

Jim Tedford stated that he has become familiar with the Historic District Guidelines over the past few years, specifically addressing Main Street. He completely agreed with the comment about the importance of public input as they go through this process. As the process moves forward he was certain that he and Ms. Meintsma would stay involved and provide input.

Chair Kenworthy looked forward to their comments.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
December 3, 2014

Approved by _____
John Kenworthy Chair
Historic Preservation Board