

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 2018

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Puggy Holmgren,  
John Hutchings, Randy Scott

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Tyler, Polly Samuels  
McLean, Liz Jackson

---

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Lola Beatlebrox, Jack Hodgkins, and Alex Weiner

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

March 7, 2018

Board Member Scott referred to page 19, third paragraph, the first sentence, "Board Member Scott stated his agreement with Board Member Hodgkins and Hutchings that reorientation would enhance the preservation character". He corrected the sentence to read "...would **not** enhance the preservation character". Board Member Hutchings stated that he had planned to make the same correction.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 7, 2018 as corrected. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Anya Grahn reported that the Historic Preservation Board would have another meeting on Wednesday, April 18<sup>th</sup>. Several HDDR applications are in process and the Staff wanted to start bringing them forward so the HPB is not over-burdened all at once.

Planner Grahn reported that Marianne Cone was the artist selected for the Annual Historic Preservation Award. Planner Grahn would work with Ms. Cone, the HPB and the City Council to schedule a date to unveil the artwork. She anticipated sometime in May during Historic Preservation Month.

Planner Grahn provided a brief summary of the award ceremony for David White. She had attended the Heritage Awards Dinner put on by Preservation Utah. They give awards for different categories, and David White was honored for his years of service and his commitment to preservation in the Park City community. Mr. White was humbled and excited about his award. Preservation Utah also convinced Mr. White to join their Board of Directors.

Chair Stephens was pleased that Mr. White was recognized for his long-time service in Park City and his commitment to preservation. Board Member Holmgren noted that she had seen Mr. White at the post office and he was enjoying his retirement.

WORK SESSION – Code Enforcement Update – Presentation by Deputy Chief Building Official and Planning Director regarding current Coded Enforcement policies, Notice and Order Process, and Excavation Procedures for Historic Houses.

Mary McClaugherty, a Service Inspector with Code Enforcement, introduced Dave Thacker, the Chief Building Official; Michelle Downard, the Deputy Building Official; and Service Inspectors Gabe Jaramillo and Shelly Hatch. Ms. McClaugherty noted that Code Enforcement was under the umbrella of the Building Department.

Shelley Hatch stated that she does most of the Notice and Orders on Historic Home preservation projects. She handed out an example copy of a Notice and Order. Ms. Hatch pointed out that 90% of the Notice and Orders on historic homes are to repair. They try to preserve the homes as much as possible and discourage anything related to demolition. However, in some cases saving the home is not feasible due to hazards and other conditions.

Ms. Hatch explained that a Notice and Order is issued because of safety and health issues. They review the Criteria in Section 301 of the Uniform Code - Abatement of Dangerous Buildings. They review the criteria to see what has deteriorated on the structure and what needs to be fixed. The property has to meet all of the criteria. Once the owner is aware of the items that need to be fixed, they are given a timeline to accomplish the work. They are typically given 30 days, but if progress is being made an extension can be given as long as the work moves forward. If the owner stops the work or is not willing to work with the Building Department, the next procedure is to notify the owner that penalties will be imposed or the City will make the repairs and assess the homeowner in some way.

Ms. Hatch stated that she sends the Notice and Order to all the interested parties by certified mail, email, and a visible Notice on the home itself. She also works closely with the Planning Department throughout the process.

Chair Stephens asked if the City has ever had to step in to do the work and place a lien on the property. Ms. Hatch answered yes and commented on a situation where the City recently took over the property.

Chair Stephens asked if there was a consistent reason why these homes go into a state of disrepair. Ms. Hatch stated that the ones she has dealt with were clearly not livable or habitable. It is expensive to preserve a historic home, and often times the primary issue is financial. A second issue is that some owners do not make it a priority. Planner Grahn agreed. Most of the ones they see are a result of years of deferred maintenance.

Director Erickson stated that in the normal course of events a Notice and Order is not the first step. The Preservation Planners and Code Enforcement observe the buildings over time before they reach the Notice and Order process. They know every house and which ones are deteriorating. Director Erickson understood that it also applies to mine structures. Planner Grahn noted that a few years ago the Planning, Building and Engineering Departments spent a Friday afternoon documenting all the mine structures and took photographs. Last summer, Code Enforcement, the Building Inspectors, and the Planning Department started to create a list of buildings to watch because they either had health and safety issues or deferred maintenance that would only get worse. Planner Grahn stated that more recently, many of the projects the HPB has reviewed have been Notice and Order projects.

Chair Stephens asked if the goal of historic preservation and the goal of public safety were in sync. Planner Grahn thought they were. She and Director Erickson have talked about looking into a demolition by neglect ordinance. Ogden and other places in Utah have been successful with that approach. However, Planner Grahn believed the current system in place with Code Enforcement was working well. Code Enforcement and the Planners look at things together to make sure they are not giving a Notice and Order to demolition. In the past, some homeowners thought a Notice and Order was permission to demolition. They have worked together to make the process as clean as possible so whoever is served with the Notice and Order understands the obligations for preservation.

Chair Stephens assumed that in Historic Park City they would eventually run out of inventory that was being neglected. Planner Grahn replied that they continue to find new structures. Ms. Hatch stated that her goal is to make sure that she works closely with the Planning Department to make sure they share the same thought process on fixing these homes.

Chair Stephens asked if there were issues with people breaking into these homes to live in. Ms. Hatch replied that it was a problem in the past, but they have not seen it recently.

Director Erickson pointed out that the Notice and Order process and the process that the Code Enforcement team goes through with the Preservation Planners is more proactive than the Strategic Code enforcement on the other sections of the LMC. In this case, they actually go out and look for a certain type of house and keep track of them. However, with the Strategic Code Enforcement, one portion is proactive activity and another portion is complaint based. Director Erickson pointed out that the Code Enforcement team is also responsible for the entire City; not just the Historic District.

Chair Stephens noted that when an applicant comes to the HPB to make the case that their plan should be approved because the structure has been neglected, the owner is already obligated through other parts of the LMC to make sure that house is maintained. The HPB should not consider that as part of their decision process.

Ms. Hatch remarked that it was wonderful to work hand in hand with the Planning Department to try to preserve the historic value of these homes. Sometimes a Notice and Order is the push a property owner needs to take care of the structure.

Planner Grahn stated that excavation is another issue regarding historic buildings. There are a number of historic houses on cribbing, and when driving around town they noticed that the cribbing was not always being installed per the requirements of the structural engineer. Soils are eroding and there are drainage issues. Planner Grahn noted that the Planning Department has been working closely with the Building Department because many times the HDDR or the Steep Slope CUP is the first step in the process before it moves on to the Building Department. The Staff has tried to create conditions of approval that are as succinct as possible to put owners on notice that once they reach the building permit stage they will have to meet certain requirements and obligations.

Chief Building Official David Thacker stated that they have been working extensively with conditions of approval based on lessons learned through some of the historic home lifts. Mr. Thacker remarked that some of the conditions directly relate to the excavation and how it can be done. In order to excavate underneath the home, they need to be able to lift it in place. They require the cribbing to be engineered by a structural engineer. The plans are reviewed and approved by the Building Department. They also require that the structural engineer who did the design inspect the cribbing itself to insure that it was built per the design. Inspection by the structural engineer is in addition to the

inspection performed by the Building Department. That inspection needs to be done within five days of the cribbing being installed and supporting the structure. Mr. Thacker stated that they have also been looking closely at the soils beneath those homes. They look at soil samples and make sure the cribbing is not only set on good soil, but that the footings are dug appropriately. Recently, in some cases they found expansive soils, which requires more excavation, and that creates challenges related to how far away it needs to be from the cribbing they do not compromise the soil the cribbing is sitting on. Mr. Thacker pointed out that it requires coordination between the contractor, the Building Department, and the Planning Department; and it also requires a geo-tech engineer to evaluate the soils. Mr. Thacker stated that soil concerns can lead to temporary shoring, concerns because in Old Town the lot lines are close to the homes and they have experienced sloughing and collapsing walls. Temporary shoring companies are brought in to coordinate with the geo-tech and the structural engineer to ensure that all of these items are being put into place appropriately and inspected. Mr. Thacker pointed out that it is a laborious process for the Building Department to follow through on all the pieces of the process, but it is worth it to make sure they have a safe and properly installed cribbing and engineered product.

Mr. Thacker stated that per the HDDR, they require that the homes only be lifted for a maximum of 45 days; unless an extension approval is obtained from the Planning Director. The process is extensive and challenging but they were encouraged by the steps taken and the processes in place. Mr. Thacker remarked that the process has created better coordination between the Planning and Building Departments, and Code Enforcement has been a great help as well. Mr. Thacker believed the process and the requirements provide a better outline for the product they were requiring from contractors, architects, and engineers.

Chair Stephens asked if procedures were in place when excavation occurs to protect the historic homes on either side of the property. He wanted to know at what point shoring becomes an issue. Mr. Thacker explained that generally when they do the plan review for the original building itself, they look at what that excavation will be. Most of the time they are looking at a 2:1 slope and those specifications will be in the geo-tech report or the soils report. As soon as they are unable to maintain the 2:1 slope they get the geo-tech involved and require that temporary shoring be put in place. He explained the process for the temporary shoring.

Board Member Scott asked if the 2:1 ratio was part of the math behind the fact that historic homes can only be raised 2 to 2-1/2 feet. Planner Grahn stated that 2' has more to do with the historic integrity in an effort to keep the structure as close to its original grade as possible.

Board Member Hutchings commented on the home on lower Park Avenue that was dropped in the hole. He wanted to know what happens when a house is dropped. Mr. Thacker stated that lessons are learned, and those situations drive some of the regulations. He stated that once the house is ready to be lifted, it is important to make sure the house is not up longer than 45 days. Another issue is how the house is structurally contained on the cribbing wall while it is in the air.

Chair Stephens asked if the structural integrity of the historic home being lifted comes into play before the house is lifted. Mr. Thacker replied that it is an element they look at in determining whether or not it is salvageable. In addition, they definitely have to make sure that the house is liftable and will stay intact.

Planner Grahn stated that a condition was added to the Steep Slope CUP that prohibits excavation from occurring between October 15<sup>th</sup> and April 15<sup>th</sup>. The slopes over 30% and significant excavation is required, which adds traffic and congestion to streets that could not handle it during the winter.

Gabe Jaramillo commented on construction mitigation plans. He explained that a construction mitigation plan is a document that is provided to the contractor when a permit is issued. The mitigation plan outlines all of the conditions that the contractor must adhere to. It can also have the conditions of approval from the Planning Commission. The construction mitigation plan basically covers containment of the site. There is a rule in Old Town that requires a six-foot chain link fence. It also requires appropriate erosion control measures to keep soil on site; posting of company signs with contact information; a porta-potty on site; and a dumpster or dumpster trailer on site. Mr. Jaramillo stated that before a permit can be issued for anywhere in town, there needs to be a limits of disturbance inspection by Code Enforcement to make sure the fencing is on their property and that they have erosion control, the sign, the dumpster and the porta-potty. Once they pass the inspection a permit is issued and the contractor has to adhere to the rules on the construction mitigation plan.

Director Erickson noted that the construction mitigation plan is posted on-site with the permit. Mr. Jaramillo explained that when the permit is issued the contractor also receives a yellow card in the packet that has sign offs on it; and the mitigation plan goes into that same sleeve.

Mr. Thacker stated that construction mitigation is as much for the neighboring properties as it is for the construction site itself. It mitigates impacts that the neighbors might feel related to noise, traffic, etc. Chair Stephens believed that parking and deliveries were missing bullet points.

Director Erickson noted that this presentation was also given to the Planning Commission and the City Council. The Planning Commission wanted to make sure there was a better way of communicating the construction mitigation plan to

the public. They wanted to find opportunities to make the construction mitigation plan more visible to the public so the neighbors would understand what was going on. The Commissioners also wanted a way to let the neighborhood know how many projects would be happening in any one location. Director Erickson stated that they were working to accomplish those goals. The new permitting system would go in mid-summer, which would allow all the permits to be seen online, including the construction mitigation plan. Director Erickson stated that based on responses from the City Council, at this time they prefer that the public contact either the Planning Department or Code Enforcement rather than go to the contractor directly. If the City is not made aware of the problem, they cannot track the problem or the solution.

Board Member Hutchings referred to the language, “protecting historic materials” and asked if that comes out of the HDDR process and conditions set by the HPB. Planner Grahn answered yes. Sometimes the conditions are what the HPB set and other times what the Staff sets. Occasionally, it relates to the Steep Slope CUP. All of the conditions added were done with the intent of protecting the historic building.

#### REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 424 Woodside Avenue – HDDR Review for Reorientation - Reorientation (rotation) of a “Significant” Structure towards Woodside Avenue and lifting of the Historic Structure 7 feet 7 ¾ inches. The primary façade of the Significant Structure is currently oriented towards Main Street and the applicant is proposing to rotate the structure 180 degrees so that the primary façade is oriented towards Woodside Avenue. Upon reorientation, the Historic Structure would be lifted 7 feet 7 ¾ inches.  
(Application PL-16-03379)

The HPB held a site visit at 424 Woodside Avenue prior to the meeting.

Planner Hannah Tyler reported that the HPB discussed this item at length at the March meeting. At that time the applicant requested that the Board continue the item to facilitate a site visit. Planner Tyler noted that after the action to continue was taken, the applicant asked her in the hallway if it could be continued to a date in May due to reasons with the applicant and with their legal counsel.

Planner Tyler stated that the applicant was requesting that the HPB continue the item this evening. She explained that a Section in the Code, which was included in the Staff report, gives the Board the discretion to decide whether or not to continue the item again. To date, the applicant has requested three continuations, and at there was no discussion at those meetings. Two other meetings took place with significant discussion and the HPB continued the item.

Planner Tyler suggested that the Board discuss what they saw on the site, and then determine whether or not to continue.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she was already familiar with the site and found nothing different when she visited the site today. Board Member Hutchings felt the same way. Board Member Scott thought it was helpful to walk around the site. Chair Stephens stated that he had been to the site several times but never down on to the property. This was the first time he had seen the addition without snow next to it.

Director Erickson clarified that four members of the Historic Preservation Board visited the site with the project architect. They walked on to the site using the stairway on the north property line. They took the opportunity to look at the east façade of the historic building and the addition. They generally identified where the previous historic door was located. They went back on the street and looked at the distance from the street and the condition of the curb and gutter and retaining walls.

Board Member Scott clarified that looking at the west side, which is the road facing side, there is an enclosed porch. He asked if the porch was done in a historic period and whether it was considered a historic renovation. Planner Tyler stated that in the historic period they kept adding on to that rear. At one point they added on a screened porch, and during that same period the screened porch was then enclosed with full walls.

Chair Stephens asked if the siding and the finish on the west side on the screened porch that is now finished off as a room was done when the remodel was done in the 1990s. Jonathan DeGray, representing the applicant, stated that the siding appears to be the same as the side of the house. The older siding could be seen inside the porch.

Chair Stephens requested feedback from the Board regarding a continuation to May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. DeGray clarified that the applicant was requesting a continuance because neither the owners nor their legal representative, Joe Tesch, were able to attend this evening. Chair Stephens pointed out that the Staff report contained letters from the applicant and from Joe Tesch with that explanation.

Board Member Holmgren was uncomfortable making a decision this evening considering that three Board members were absent.

Board Member Scott was comfortable with his ability to make a decision this evening based on the assumption that there would be no new information. However, he thought Ms. Holmgren made a good point about the absent Board members.



Board Member Hutchings stated that from reading the letters he derived three reasons for a continuance. One was that the applicants were not present. Second was that at least two other Board members were not present. Third, that an engineering study was being done. He asked about the study. Mr. DeGray explained that Alliance Engineering was looking at the drain issue that was raised at the last meeting.

Board Member Hutchings stated that he was inclined to grant a continuance because the applicant was not present. However, he struggled with the idea of waiting for the Board members who were absent because often times Board members miss a meeting for various reasons. Mr. Hutchings stated that if they were only talking about rotating the house, he was curious as to how the engineering study would provide additional information to help them make a decision. Mr. DeGray stated that the applicant was contesting the unique conditions of the site that were determined by the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director. In order to do that, they sought the opinion of a qualified civil engineer to strengthen their argument that the conditions are unique.

Mr. Hutchings stated that if the applicant was contesting the determination and seeking new information, that was a reason to continue to May 7<sup>th</sup>. They should have all the information before making a decision.

Chair Stephens questioned whether they would get much new information, but he would like the applicant to be personally involved in the process even if the outcome is the same. Chair Stephens informed Mr. DeGray that the applicant should expect a decision on May 2<sup>nd</sup> and that there would not be another continuation.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 424 Woodside Avenue to May 2, 2018. Board member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. Design Guideline Revisions – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for New Commercial Infill Construction in Park City’s Historic Districts: Specific Design Guidelines for Sustainability and Sidebars: Landscaping and Vegetation. The Guidelines are incorporated into the Land Management Code in 15-13-2. (Application PL-17-03730)

Planner Grahn requested that the Board review the revisions to the Design Guidelines before they go to the Planning Commission. The Staff had been working with the Sustainability Department to amend the LMC to reflect solar and

other sustainability measures. Planner Grahn noted that the Design Guidelines currently have a section about sustainability and the Staff was proposing to address eco-friendly materials, windows and daylighting. There is also a guideline for green roofs, but they need to make sure it does not affect the visual character of the Historic District.

Planner Grahn reported that on April 25<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission will be discussing ways to regulate solar panels in the LMC outside of the Design Guidelines.

Chair Stephens asked if recycled plastic and/or Trex could be considered eco-friendly materials. Planner Grahn stated that eco-friendly material is encouraged as long as it appears similar in scale, texture and finish to the materials on historic structures. She thought that would be sufficient for new construction. For historic construction she suggested that they add language “and is found not to detract from the historic building”. For example, Trex on the front porch of a historic structure would not be acceptable, but it might be used on a back porch or a new addition. Director Erickson stated that they would align this more with the prohibition of vinyl in other locations. They would also require greater than 50% of the material to be of post-consumer recycled materials.

Director Erickson assured the Board that there was very little consensus for bending the regulations. However, they were trying to achieve the sustainability goals set by the City Council while insuring protection of the Historic District.

Chair Stephens remarked that this was also about construction techniques. A properly constructed and installed straight grain flooring material on an exterior deck will last longer than a Trex deck. Director Erickson noted that there have been problems with Trex deck because they heat faster and retain heat longer, which contributes to the urban heat island. However, Trex off-gases less than virgin vinyl. People are sensitive to the off-gasing of the polyvinyl chlorides. The Staff did the research and tried to figure out how to make this work without having those issues raised.

Planner Grahn noted that the Planning Department was seeing less over-the-counter requests for Trex in the Historic Districts. She was told by many contractors that the sunlight in Old Town causes the glue in the Trex to disintegrate and the material breaks down. Chair Stephens thought the cost of Trex could also be a factor.

Director Erickson noted that the Preservation Planners had visited Portland to review how solar panels are installed in a historic district. Planner Grahn stated that and Planner Tyler went to Portland to learn about post-war housing styles. While there they met with representatives from Restore Oregon, which is the state-wide historic preservation non-profit; as well as people in the Portland City

Planning Department. They talked about solar, wind, and other sustainability efforts they were putting into the Historic District. She pointed out that downtown Portland has taller buildings, which makes it easier to hide elements on the rooftops and not visible from the rights-of-way. As they walked through the neighborhoods they could not see the sustainability elements because they were on the backs of houses or accessory buildings. Chair Stephens remarked that it would be difficult to do in Park City's historic neighborhoods. Planner Gran thought it would be difficult but not impossible. There are ways to accomplish it.

Chair Stephens asked if there was flexibility within the regulations. Director Erickson answered yes. He stated that if they go on Google earth and look at the Historic District they would be surprised at how many houses have solar panels that are inconspicuous. The new way of handling it above the first level and having criteria would continue to protect the Historic District; and at the same time, increase the sustainability goals. Planner Grahn commented on the number of agencies and cities they researched to make sure they were balancing the demands for more sustainable energy systems, and to make sure they maintain the integrity of the District. Planner Grahn acknowledged that the Guidelines were slightly looser, but the Land Management Code amendments will provide more regulations.

Planner Tyler pointed out that no one knows what the Tesla solar shingles will look like. Until they know what that product looks like, it could be a great alternative for some of the structure in Old Town. Chair Stephens agreed that technology was changing and as new items come along it is important for the Planning Department to have the necessary tools and criteria to judge them against.

Board Member Scott remarked that the climate in Portland is different than Park City and he questioned whether green roofs were realistic in the Historic District. Director Erickson replied that green roofs are realistic, but it requires having faith in people. Maintaining the green roof above KPCW is labor intensive. He was not aware of the results of the green roofs on Echo Spur. The question is whether they can rely on owners not to rip out the green roof after a few years and install a hot tub. Director Erickson pointed out that green roofs in the Historic District are not big enough to affect storm water runoff, which is a main purpose for having them on large industrial buildings. He liked the way green roofs were handled in the new LMC amendments, and he believed it would be effective in maintaining district integrity.

Board Member Hutchings pointed to the wood turbine bullet point and questioned whether if it was strong enough. He thought the first bullet point that relates to solar panels was stronger in terms of making sure they are not visible from the public right-of-way. If that is the same goal for turbines, he suggested that they modify the language. Planner Grahn thought it was a good point. They have not

had a request for wind turbines, but the intent is to be prepared if they do. Mr. Hutchings asked if the goal is keep wind turbines from being visible from the street. Director Erickson replied that the Staff would prefer not to think about turbines in the traditional sense in the historic district. However, a small home vertical access turbine could be done on a small scale. The results of the wind studies in the late 2000s determined that Park City does not have enough wind to consistently make a difference. Board Member Hutchings favored strengthening the language for wind turbines.

Planner Grahn commented on ADA compliance. In this section the language was cleaned up to match the other sections in terms of changing “should” to “shall”. They also added a few requirements to make sure that on historic buildings the ramps do not detract from the historic building.

Board Member Holmgren noted that the City has made Swede Alley and Main Street more ADA friendly but those areas are never kept clean. Planner Grahn offered to pass on that information.

Chair Stephens understood that most of the ADA implications would apply to commercial buildings on Main Street. He expected to see more requests in the future as the economic dynamics of Main Street change. Planner Grahn noted that they have seen an uptick in ADA requests for residential development for historic homes, or people designing ADA friendly houses on steeper areas in town.

Planner Grahn thought exterior lighting was self-explanatory. They offered warm tones instead of cool tones because LEDs have a blue hue that does not compliment the Historic District. Regarding seismic upgrades, the Staff had looked at the guidelines in other communities doing seismic. Nothing had changed, other than to be more clear that seismic elements are discouraged, especially on historic buildings.

Board Member Hutchings asked for an example of a seismic upgrade. Director Erickson used the Kimball building as an example of seismic upgrades. New concrete shear wall was placed inside the brick rather than on the outside. Planner Grahn explained the seismic upgrade that was done on the silos at the Barn. Chair Stephens noted that the seismic upgrades on the Marsac building were done on the interior as well. He commented on other methods to keep the seismic upgrading hidden.

Planner Grahn commented on request to bring back the fruit trees and some of the more traditional plantings back to Old Town, but they were unsure how to regulate it. They met with Director Erickson and the City landscaper and compiled a list that could be used as a reference that encourages people to plant some of the varieties outlined in the Staff report. They were assured by Maria,

the City Landscape Gardner, that these plants would grow in Park City and help to preserve the greener look of Old Town. Board Member Holmgren noted that Cinnamon Ferns also grow well in shade.

Chair Stephens asked if the City still looks at landscape plans for projects. Director Erickson stated that they look closer at landscape plans now than they have in the last five years. He has instituted new regulations and new policy for landscape plans. Director Erickson noted that they had recently completed an entirely upgraded drought tolerant plant list that would be incorporated as part of the Land Management Code changes. There is an approved list of plant materials, and anything not on the list has to be approved by Director Erickson.

Chair Stephens asked if they were looking at ratios of landscape to hardscape. Director Erickson replied that they will start allowing a small area of gravel in close proximity to the home, particularly areas affected by wildland fire interface zones and underneath decks. It would be somewhere around 5% and most likely not in the front yard. Director Erickson stated that there will be new regulations for artificial turf, consistent with other things they are looking at for the Historic Districts. A limitation is already in place regarding the area of irrigation of the lot. He could not recall if the Historic District was exempt from that limitation.

Director Erickson was pleased with the new plant list and the selections. They would add Cinnamon Fern to the list. Chair Stephens favored the idea of being able to have plantings down the side and in the front yards to reduce the hardscape. The Staff spends a lot of time making sure the architecture is historically compatible, but then it gets lost in the hardscape and softscape in the front yards and down the sides.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, referred to ADA compliance for historic structures and asked if the listed criteria were only for ADA structures. She was specifically talking about "Historic doors that do not conform to building and/or accessibility codes should be rehabilitated to conform". She asked if that was specific to an ADA compliant structure.

Planner Grahm replied that this comes into play a lot when trying to upgrade the historic structure to be ADA. It was carried over from the previous design guidelines; and in her time with the City she has never seen a situation where a historic door needed to be upgraded to be ADA compliant. They can usually find a way to put it in the back of the house. She did not believe there were any historic doors left on Main Street.

Chair Stephens noted that ADA compliant is not optional. He asked when it would ever be required for residential. Director Erickson replied that apartment

and condo units must be ADA compliant in terms of handrails, a specific size door, and specific dimensions of hallways. He did not believe it applies to private residential homes. He thought the Chief Building Official has regulatory discretion inside historic buildings for ADA compliance. It has to be fair but it does not necessarily have to be the same.

Chair Stephens clarified that the regulations are for ADA commercial aspects and not private residential homes. Planner Grahn thought it applied to both residential and commercial, but she would change it to only the commercial side. Chair Stephens thought the ADA compliant portion needed to remain because it defines what Director Erickson had mentioned. Planner Tyler thought it should be left in the residential piece because people have come in requesting ADA access for family members. Chair Stephens suggested that they modify the language for clarification, but keep it for both commercial and private residential.

Director Erickson thought the National Trust has publications that the Staff could review and bring it back at the next meeting for informational purposes only. Chair Stephens thought they should be pre-emptive on Main Street and historic commercial buildings, and how those might be affected by the ADA Act. Planner Grahn offered to work with the Building Department to address the issue.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council for the Design Guideline revisions as discussed this evening. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen Douglas, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board