

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF AUGUST 3, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Doug Stephens

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

The Historic Preservation Board had a site visit to 1259 Norfolk Avenue prior to the meeting.

Director Erickson noted that the Board had a quorum and could proceed with the meeting. However, David White was absent this evening and the Board needed to elect a Chair Pro Tem.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren nominated Doug Stephens as Chair Pro Tem. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

ROLL CALL

Chair Pro Tem Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except David White who was excused. Jack Hodgkins arrived later in the meeting.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Planner Anya Grahn reported that the Park City Library was listed on the National Register of Historic Places this past winter. An unveiling ceremony for the National Register Plaque that will be permanently displayed at the Library was scheduled for the following day at 3:45 as part of the City Council agenda. The Board members were invited to join the City Council at the Library.

Board Member Hewett had sent an email to the Planning Department regarding a concern she had from the last meeting. As they continue to look at sites that are being put on the Historic Site Inventory, she wanted to make sure they were being consistent with each of their determinations. Ms. Hewett referred to the house on Park Avenue that had several renovations done on it and the Board decided that it was not appropriate for the Historic Site Inventory. She recalled that the Board previously said that when making a determination, if it affects someone's valuation or something similar, the Board would visit the site before making a final decision because it is difficult to make a determination just from documentation and photos. She had not pushed that point at the last meeting but it was her memory. Ms. Hewett tried to think of ways to potentially make the

process more consistent and not have to start from scratch each time. She noted that different houses have different amounts of historic material, and the Board draws an arbitrary conclusion that is sometimes based on how it looks. For example, one structure could have a significant amount of historic material but it has been morphed into something that is not attractive versus a structure that has less historic material but looks more attractive. Ms. Hewett suggested that the Board discuss this issue and create more parameters to make the process more consistent.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff would schedule a work session discussion as soon as possible. The Board members could talk about it and the public would have the opportunity to listen to their discussion. He remarked that even though the rules are precise and technical, if they could condense it into five words or less so the general public could understand it, it would make it easier for everyone.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens thought it would be helpful if the Staff could share with the Boards the process they could through before it comes before the HPB.

Board Member Beatlebrox disclosed that she was newly employed by the State of Utah as the Budget Manager for the STEM mobile classroom throughout Utah. She did not anticipate any conflicts of interest but she wanted the Board to be aware.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that Ms. Beatlebrox amend her disclosure form on file with the City to add her new employer.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Nancy Davidson believed the email she had sent to the Board Members spoke for itself. Ms. Davidson stated that her husband had sat on this Board and she recognized the amount of time and thought the HPB devotes for the good of the community. She knows the energy they expend to make this community attractive to tourists via its historic past. A past that is reflected in the buildings and structures and the stories they tell. Ms. Davidson stated that she would not ask the Board take on the burden of being more involved in the approval process of building design if she did not feel it was important to the well-being of everyone. She stated that as the Historic Preservation Board they are the experts. They have the power and she would like them to regain the mandate. Ms. Davidson asked the Board to reconsider taking on a larger role in the process.

CONTINUATIONS – Public Hearing and Continue to date specified.

1. 1302 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-16-03181)

Chair Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Pro Tem Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the determination of Significance for 1302 Norfolk Avenue to September 7, 2016. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Board Member Hodgkins was not present for the vote.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1259 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-15-02645)

Planner Hannah Turpen reviewed the application for a determination of significance for 1259 Norfolk Avenue. She noted that this item was previously continued several times. The HPB last saw this item on May 4, 2016. At that time the Board requested a site visit, which was held today.

Planner Turpen provided a brief history of the house. She stated that the modified hall and parlor house was constructed around 1900. It first appears on the 1907 Sanborn map. A porch was added before 1929 to the south and east facades. Since the 1941 Sanborn map is the same as the 1929 Sanborn map it was not provided in the Staff report. Planner Turpen noted that the circa 1940 tax photograph shows the house prior to the modifications that occurred outside of the period of historic significance. These modifications included window alterations seen in 2001, partial enclosure of the porch, and loss of some the porch details just to name a few.

Planner Turpen reported that last week and early this week the property owner submitted a letter from herself and one from the designer of the 2002 project. Both letters included photographs of the work during construction, and the designer provided elevation drawings identifying the portions of the façades that were saved.

Planner Turpen noted that in previous meetings the property owner stated that the house was demolished; however, the Staff could not find evidence to support that claim in any of the HDC Staff reports, meeting minutes or action letter. In reviewing photographs and elevation drawings, the Staff determined that the house was panelized and not demolished. She pointed out that panelization is a recognized method of historic preservation in Park City as regulated by the Land Management Code and Design Guidelines. Planner Turpen stated that the

architect of the project had identified the panels that were saved, which were outlined in red.

Planner Turpen stated that it is typical to have portions of the façade which do not contain historic material. In this case it was where the windows were located prior to the 2011 renovation. They were save in order to make room for the new windows. Planner Turpen presented photos showing the panelization process. She explained how the panels were removed and stored on site.

As stated in previous meetings, the Staff finds that the house meets the criteria for designation. After receiving additional material in recent weeks, the Staff has now concluded that the house was not demolished, but rather it was panelized. The Staff finds that it meets the criteria because 1) it is at least 50 years old; 2) the historic form was retained through the panelization process; 3) it received grants for the restoration work; 4) portions of the house were restored to its historic appearance; 5) any of the new additions could be removed to restore the house to its original appearance; and 6) it is important to the mature mining era.

Malia Binderly, representing the property owner, noted that the panelization photos were provided by the property owner. Therefore, the Staff had not done any additional work. She found it interesting that Planner Turpen had not mentioned that fact. Ms. Binderly referred to the letter from Peter Barnes, the architect, and noted that he was very instrumental in many Old Town rebuilds at the time. She also referred to the record from the Historic District Commission at that time going back and forth between the Board, the architect and Derek Satchel, the historic planner. Ms. Binderly thought Mr. Barnes had addressed it clearly in his two-page letter. She stated that Mr. Barnes is very familiar with what historic preservation should be, what it looks like, and how it plays out. She recalled a question from the meeting in April of whether or not this house was a replica or historic preservation. Mr. Binderly thought the question was whether or not a small amount of historic material in a rebuild equates to historic preservation.

Ms. Binderly believed this structure was a replica because everything except for three panels were new. She pointed out that stitching rather than panelization is the technical term used in the architecture world; and there is nothing historic about stitching in historic preservation. Ms. Binderly suggested that the consult with Peter Barnes, because while the house retained some old wood, everything else about the house is a replica. The house was moved, the elevations were altered, the property was demolished. Ms. Binderly noted that Planner Turpen had not presented all the photos she had provided because some showed the equipment getting ready to demolish the house. She stated for the record that the information the Staff provided to the HPB did not include the letter she had submitted, even though the Staff report indicates that it was attached. She recognized that Mr. Barnes' letter was submitted too late for the Staff report, but

it was also not provided to the Board or the public this evening. Ms. Binderly pointed out that neither the HPB nor the public have the benefit of seeing what was actually submitted on behalf of the property owner. In addition, some of the photographs were omitted and she did not believe the Staff report told the whole story.

Director Erickson noted that the letter from Peter Barnes dated July 27th was handed out to the HPB prior to the meeting. Planner Turpen noted that the letter from the property owner, Maureen Moriarty, was Exhibit 3 in the Staff report. Ms. Binderly emphasized that pertinent information supporting her position was still missing. She thought the pictures the Staff chose to show could be taken out of context.

Ms. Binderly stated that she was here this evening to answer the important question that was raised in April, which was whether or not the property is a replica. She explained why she believed the property is a replica in very sense. She noted that Peter Barnes is well-versed in historic preservation, and he shares her opinion based on his expertise.

Ms. Binderly addressed the issue of the historic grant. She stated that the historic grant that was provided to this home was provided for a completely different set of drawings. Those drawings were approved by the historic board at that time, but the Board later requested additional items. Mr. Barnes had to redraw the entire building at his own expense to satisfy the preservation board. She noted that because the Historic Preservation Board had already granted the homeowners the full rights to the \$16,500, and the process took an additional year and half after the initial approval, at the end of that period a whole new house was put forward and a letter was already written granting the \$16,500. For that reason, the homeowners proceeded with the historic grant. Ms. Binderly recalled telling the Board in April that if the homeowner knew that a \$16,000 grant would result in a long-term designation that would limit what they could do with their property, they would never have accepted the grant. She reiterated that there is a lot more information to the story that has not been presented. Ms. Binderly recognized that this was a completely different Board and the rules and regulations have changed; however, Mr. Barnes' letter specifically points out that there is no way that the house was forgotten or left off of the Historic Sites Inventory for so many years. He believed that previous historic boards throughout those years knew that it was not a historic home. Ms. Binderly noted that Mr. Barnes outlines that clearly in his letter. He was closest to the transaction and he is the only one who has insight as to what occurred during that time. Ms. Binderly stated that at the last meeting she said she would come back with the architect if she could find him and she did. She thought it would be worthwhile for the Board to hear from Mr. Barnes himself that this house is truly a replica.

Ms. Binderly stated that she was born in Park City and it is her hometown. She understands the feeling of the historic nature of Park City and that it is valuable to have these structures remain in the community. However, they cannot be arbitrary in their decision, and it is not right to just say that a small percentage of historic material left in a structure designates the historic status. The homeowner should not be punished because they were willing to keep the house in its original location and add some nice features. One example is that the door on the side of the ladies' parlor is not a real door because the homeowner cared enough to make the house look historic. However, that should not give the City the right to say that the house is historic when it was replicated to look that way. Ms. Binderly pointed out that in his notes Derek Satchel indicated that there was no evidence that the door existed historically. She pointed out that the historic designation was not right for the property owner or the community.

Board Member Hodgkins arrived.

Chair-Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, referred to the letter from Maureen Moriarty on page 99 of the Staff report. She noted that Ms. Moriarty states that this property is in fact a replica and not a preservation. Ms. Meintsma stated that Item 4 of the treatments is reconstruction, and a replica is actually reconstruction. She explained a building can be created where no historic material exists, but if there is evidence in terms of size, mass, shape and details, and the structure is brought back and contributes to the historic character of the town it can qualify as a contributing structure. Ms. Meintsma read from G-5 of the historic guidelines, "To preserve or reuse any remaining historic material." She pointed out that in a reconstruction if there are bits and pieces of historic material that can be saved it is encouraged, but it is not required for a reconstruction. Ms. Meintsma referred to the LMC and language regarding reconstruction. She noted that Items 1 and 2 talks about when a structure can be demolished. Item 3 reads, "Form, features, detailing, placement, orientation and location will be depicted". Ms. Meintsma pointed out that there is no mention of material in Item 3. She stated that as the structure currently stands, it does show form, features, detailing, placement, orientation and location, as well as historic material. Mr. Meintsma commented on panelization. There may not be a lot of historic material, but more than the material itself, panelization shows the history and the story of specific elements. In this case, is was evidence of the vertical double hung windows. It is more than just material. It is documentation of what that house was. Ms. Meintsma presented a photo of a house on Park Avenue where the entire house was raised. She noted that only the front panel of siding and under the porch was all the historic that was left, but that house is still on the Historic Sites Inventory. She had many other examples where form, size and mass elements were contributory to the history, even if the material was minimal,

Chair Pro Tem Stephens closed the public hearing.

Ms. Binderly felt they were moving backwards in time to the April meeting, where the issue was historical significance versus contributory. She understood that these were two different designations. Ms. Binderly asked if they had opened up the conversation regarding contributory. Planner Turpen replied that it was not talked about because there was a Determination for Significance on this home. Ms. Binderly thought they came back to the same issue each time; whether this is a significant property or a contributory property. She believed the public comment raised the issue of whether it was contributory or significant. Ms. Binderly remarked that the conversation is about whether this home is significant, but in her mind tiny, mining shacks and garages are significant. The location of their property is contributory because it is on a historic field; but that has never been discussed. She believed the house contributes to the nature of the community, but not as significant.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked Planner Turpen to clarify the differences between Significant and Contributory and the process that the Board would be undertaking. Planner Turpen stated that LMC changes last summer changed the criteria of Significant. They also added a new level of Contributory. If a structure is designated to be Contributory, it is eligible for demolition. The designation acknowledges that the structure contributes to the streetscape, but the level of protection is not as high for the structure as a Significant designation.

Planner Grahm explained that a Landmark building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places or is eligible for the National Register either individually or because it contributes to the District as a whole. If the structure is listed as Significant, it means Park City has found it to be historic even after panelization or reconstruction because it contributes to the history and the overall story of Park City. Planner Grahm stated that the Contributory designation applies more to A-frames or other structures that are yet to be reviewed, or buildings such as the Main Street Deli which is not historic but contributes to the historic look and feel of the street.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if a Contributory house could be demolished. Planner Grahm replied that Contributory can be demolished. A Significant house can only be demolished if it is removed from the Historic Sites Inventory through the DOS process or through a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, which has its own criteria in the Code.

Assistant City Attorney McLean thought the Board would find LMC 15-11-10A helpful, which identifies the requirements 1) Landmark Sites, Significant Sites, and Contributory Sites. Additional language states that any development involving the assembly of the construction of a Landmark Site or a Significant Site and is executed pursuant to Sections 15-11-14 and 15-11-15, which are the

panelization and reconstruction sections of the Code shall remain on the Park City Sites Inventory. Following the assembly of reconstruction, the Historic Preservation Board will review the project and determine if the work has required a change in the site or structure's historic designation from Landmark to Significant.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she has been in her home at 1209 Park Avenue for 27 years. She is very aware of the house in question. The person who lived there when she first moved in was known as Steakhouse. She stated that Steakhouse was a well-known partier but a very responsible person. He ended up selling the property and the lot was split so he could make more money.

Ms. Binderly disagreed with Board Member Holmgren's story because Steakhouse never owned the property. Ms. Holmgren stated that regardless of who owned it, her point was that in 1989 the house was there and looked almost exactly as it looks in the pictures. The house was not changed until 2002. Because she had never seen a panelization she watched it very closely and she found the process to be fascinating. Ms. Holmgren stated that she was unaware that Steakhouse did not own the property, but he and his dog were both positive parts of the community.

Board Member Hewett has a different opinion regarding the DOS. She recalled from the April meeting that this particular property is not currently surrounded by other historic properties. She noted that the HPB had a previous discussion about the fairness factor and what it means to be the last historic home in the neighborhood. Ms. Hewett stated that based on the information that was presented, the small amount of historic material left, and the surrounding properties; she agreed with the property owner that the structure should not be designated Significant.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked if panelization was a common method of restoration in 2002. Planner Grahn stated that she was not in Park City in 2002, but she assumed that panelization was used, but it may not have been a consistent method.

Ms. Binderly stated that Peter Barnes was the primary architect doing restoration in the community at that time. Chair Pro Tem Stephens pointed out that he was in the community at that time and there were a number of architects besides Peter Barnes who also did restorations. Ms. Binderly clarified that Mr. Barnes was doing four or five restorations at the same time theirs was being done, and she believed he would be a good resource to answer the panelization question.

Planner Grahn stated that since the success of the High West project in 2009 panelization has become a more acceptable method of preservation.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked if the \$16,500 grant was for the remodeling in 2002. Planner Turpen answered yes, and offered to provide the list of designated items. Assistant City Attorney McLean believed there was confusion regarding the grant for both the HPB and the public. She explained that in and of the fact that a structure received a historic grant does not automatically make it a Significant site. It is a condition that it retains its historic form in the way that it is defined; and it demonstrates that there is a historic form. Mr. Stephens understood that the issue was not that the grant automatically made it a Significant structure; but it indicated that the Historic District Commission who awarded the grant felt that it was a historic structure. Otherwise it would not have been eligible for a historic grant. Planner Grahm replied that he was correct. She noted that the minutes from the Historic District Commission meeting shows that the HDC spoke about it as a historic home.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the photos on pages 15 and 16 of the Staff report which showed this particular home in front of the football field. She pointed out that the windows are the same, the porch is the same, the placement of the front door is the same and the roof pitch is the same. The house was built in 1900. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that she would not want this particular home to be demolished because it is part of the rich history of the town. She had also brought the same information that Ms. Meintsma referred to about the reconstruction of an existing historic structure. She thought it was important to note that the reconstruction should include recreating the documented design of exterior features such as roof shape, architectural detailing, windows, entrances, and porches, steps and doors in their historic spatial relationships. Ms. Beatlebrox believed that was what happened to this house in 2002. She thought it was important for the Board to note that this house was reconstructed and that existing historic material was retained.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that in looking at the photos from 1947, he did not think the structure looked like it was part of the historic streetscape and that it stood by itself. In his opinion, the argument that the neighbors are not historic and therefore the structure no longer relates the way it used to does not matter because it stands on its own. Mr. Hodgkins asked if reconstruction qualifies as Significant. Planner Grahm answered yes. It would not necessarily qualify Landmark structures because they are looked at on a case by case basis. However, if a structure is reconstructed or panelized it is still considered historic and is listed as Significant.

Planning Director Erickson clarified that the Code makes a distinction between Landmark and Significant as to the historic integrity in terms of location, setting, and workmanship. He stated that this particular situation is complicated and he offered to help the Board members refer to specific sections of the Code to keep

their review focused on what the Code says and what LMC changes were made in March.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens understood from the houses that have gone through historic preservation processes in the last number of years, is that they go back to the period identified as the historic structure of the house that will be used for the preservation. He asked if that was the process the Planning Department follows. Planner Turpen answered yes. Mr. Stephens stated that during the site visit, he thought the most telling picture was the one presented by the applicant with regards to the restoration and remodeling process of what remained originally, which were the three panels on the front. He showed the photograph he was referring to and noted that it was also submitted with the letter from Peter Barnes. Mr. Stephens thought it was evident where the boards were taken out because of the windows that were put in. And the boards that were reinstalled under those panels were not new. He assumed they were pulled off of the house. It appeared to him that they were not newly nailed boards because the newly nailed boards on the rear of the house were not as aged as the other ones.

Ms. Binderly stated that she could only go by what she was told by the architect and the builder. Paul DeGroot had a woodworking shop at the time and according to Peter Barnes, Mr. DeGroot had nailed every board. Mr. Stephens stated that he knows Mr. DeGroot and Mr. Barnes, but it still appeared to him that the boards in those sections were not newly nailed boards. Ms. Binderly questioned why Mr. Stephens was not relenting when the people who did the work specifically told her what they had done. Mr. Stephens stated that he was not trying to argue with Ms. Binderly. He was only giving his observation from the standpoint of doing restoration and how old siding appears on the structure. Mr. Stephens believed the two panels on each end and the panels on the front clearly reflect what was the historic structure. If someone wanted to do a remodel on this home, they would be entitled to removed everything past those three walls. Mr. Stephens believed this house was a Significant home based on what was exhibited in the photo that was submitted by the applicant.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked where in the letter from Peter Barnes he said that the panels were not put back in place. Ms. Binderly replied that in the fourth paragraph Mr. Barnes states that the materials are limited to a few feet of siding backed by some original studs. Either side of the front door and on the gables on each side of the building. Everything else is new. Ms. Binderly noted that Mr. Barnes had redlined what he was talking about. It was roughly three feet on either side of the front door. There is another small portion 1-1/2 feet above. She stated that the gable on both sides was another five feet on either side. There is also an exposed portion of the gable that is covered by the roof line.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it looked like more than 50% of the façade was historic material. Director Erickson explained that material preservation is

not one of the criteria for Significance. The criteria set for Significance is essential historic form, important to regional history, and at least 50 years old. He noted that the same criteria apply to Significant sites in Park Meadows as well. Director Erickson stated that Planner Turpen had written her Staff report in accordance with the definition of Significance. The purpose of the HPB is to determine whether or not the structure meets the criteria for Significance.

Chair Pro Tem Stephen believed there was agreement that the structure was at least 50 years old, particularly the three walls in the front. The walls behind that were newer than 50 years old. Under the criteria that it retains its historical form which may be demonstrated but not limited to listed items, Mr. Stephens noted that home previously received a grant. In his opinion, it was more important that the Historic District Commission felt this was a historic structure in terms of awarding the grant. Mr. Stephens clarified that the structure was not previously listed on the HSI, and it was never part of any reconnaissance or intensive level surveys. Planner Turpen replied that he was correct. Mr. Stephens listed the remaining criteria and asked if the structure met any of those criteria. Planner Turpen stated that it was important to the Mature Mining Era because hall parlor was one of the first most popular housing types. In addition, this was one of the few houses constructed this far north in Old Town. It also reflected typical materials and construction methods.

Maureen Moriarty stated that the original owners of that house owned it for three generations. The person who did the new construction on that site was the great-granddaughter and she was able to provide a lot of information that they were not familiar with. She commented on the struggle that they went through and the time that it took for them to finally get the structure that exists today. Ms. Moriarty clarified that the historic grant that was given was not for the structure that exists today. They were able to apply the grant to this structure, but it was not the plan that was presented to the City at the time of the grant approval. She emphasized that the process became so convoluted and time-consuming that they ended up with a completely different structure than what was shown when the grant was approved. Ms. Moriarty wanted that to be very clear. The original plans were still available if they needed proof. She believed the original structure was approximately 666 square feet. The existing house is almost 1800 square feet. Mr. Moriarty stated that in his letter, Peter Barnes states that the fact that this building is not on the current Historic Inventory is not an accident. It was known and it was recognized at the time that a new blended re-creation of something that may look and feel like an old structure is not made significant.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to designate the house at 1259 Norfolk Avenue as a Significant site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, in accordance with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed 4-1. Board Member Hewett voted against the motion.

Findings of Fact – 1259 Norfolk Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 414 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 222 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites. This site was not included on the 2009 HSI based upon the older criteria.
2. In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be significant sites.
3. The house at 1259 Norfolk Avenue is within the Recreation Commercial (RC) zoning district.
4. The structure is not currently designated as a Significant or Landmark site on the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory.
5. The structure was originally constructed at 1259 Norfolk Avenue in c.1900, which makes the structure approximately 116 years old.
6. The structure appears in the 1907, 1929, and 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps.
7. The structure can be found in a 1940's tax photograph.
8. The structure is not currently designated as a Significant or Landmark site on the Historic Sites Inventory.
9. The original hall-parlor was constructed within the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) and is historic.
10. In 2001, a grant was awarded by the Historic District Commission in the amount of \$16,500 for a new foundation; structural, electrical, plumbing and mechanical improvements; replacement doors and windows; re-roof; and exterior siding and trim repairs, prep, and repainting.
11. The lower level garage addition and new foundation were added in 2002 and are non-historic.
12. The house was moved to the southeast as a part of the 2002 renovation to accommodate the subdivision of the existing three (3) parcels into two (2) legal lots of record.

13. The house is surrounded by both historic and non-historic sites. The site still retains its context and spatial relationship with the historic baseball field located directly across the street.

14. The lower level garage and concrete foundation were added in 2002, but they do not detract significantly from its Historic Form when viewed from the primary public Right-of-Way.

15. The change in material to board and batten on the lower level garage portion of the house creates a clear delineation between the historic portion of the house and the new lower level garage addition.

16. In 2002, the Historic District Commission determined that the garage shall be recessed under the front porch in order not to create a visual and architectural distraction.

17. The new rear addition is located behind the historic dwelling and is subordinate to the historic portion of the house in terms of mass, height, and scale.

18. In 2002, the applicant demolished the historic northwest rear shed addition located at the northwest corner of the dwelling in order for the structure to fit onto its newly created lot.

19. The historic northwest rear shed addition is visible in the circa 1940's tax photograph (Figure 3), but not on the 1941 Sanborn Map (Figure 1).

20. The Historic District Commission determined that the historic northwest rear shed addition was not integral to the overall building's historic integrity and that the historic south addition was more important to the historic integrity of the building because it was incorporated into the historic porch.

21. The roof was repaired in 1996, but the repair did not alter the historic roof form. The historic portion of the house retains the historic roof form.

22. In 2002, the new rear addition incorporated a cross gable roof design with the intent to minimize the massing of the new rear addition.

23. In 2002, the porch was restored according to historic documentation available, including the 1940's tax photograph.

24. The current location of the entrance stairs is not consistent with that found in the circa 1940's tax photograph.

25. At the time of the 2002 renovation, the steps were in their current location.

26. The historic location of the entrance steps was centered on the front of the house, directly in front of the front door.

27. In 2002, the Historic District Commission determined that the repositioning of the steps into their historic location would result in an encroachment into the front yard setback.

28. In 2002 renovation, the historic one-over-one double hung windows (visible in the circa 1940's tax photograph) were brought back on the north, south, and east elevations of the house.

29. In 2002, the transom above the front door was incorporated into the design after being lost in an out of period alteration.

30. In 2002, the historic horizontal lap-siding was exposed beneath non-historic siding. The historic siding was repaired and painted.

31. The architectural detailing including fascia boards, cornices, and brackets were reintroduced or restored as a part of the 2002 renovation.

32. The structure is a hall-parlor typical of the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

33. The site meets the criteria as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory.

34. Built circa 1900, the structure is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.

35. Though the structure's historic integrity has been diminished due to the out-of-period addition and alterations to its historic materials, it has retained its Historical Form in that the hall-parlor form is still clearly identifiable from the public right-of-way. The lower level out-of-period addition to the east elevation and rear addition on the west of the structure do not detract from its historic significance as these are clearly delineated from the historic hall-parlor form. Further, the 2002 renovation restored many of the historic details that had been lost previously including porch details, historic window openings, and the original siding.

36. The introduction of a lower level basement and foundation and rear addition does not detract from the Historic Form.

37. The house retains its Historic Form, reflects the Historical Character, and still maintains its historic site context despite the presence of a non-historic addition and surrounding non-historic infill development.

38. The structure is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) and its noteworthy method of construction, materials, and craftsmanship of the Mature Mining Era.

39. The front façade of the structure was altered sometime after 1947. The circa 1940 tax photograph and a 1947 photograph show the unaltered historic front façade, whereas the 1950 and 1961 photographs show alterations to the front windows.

40. The site does not meet the criteria as Landmark on the City's Historic Sites Inventory in that the house is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places due to the cumulative changes to its design, out of period additions, materials, and workmanship that have diminished its historic integrity.

Conclusions of Law – 1259 Norfolk Avenue

1. The existing structure located at 1259 Norfolk Avenue meets all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes:

(a) It is at least fifty (50) years old or the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and

Complies.

(b) It retains its Historical Form as may be demonstrated but not limited by any of the following:

(i) It previously received a historic grant from the City; or

(ii) It was previously listed on the Historic Sites Inventory; or

(iii) It was listed as Significant or on any reconnaissance or intensive level survey of historic resources; or

Complies.

(c) It has one (1) or more of the following:

(i) It retains its historic scale, context, materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to Historical Form even if it has non-historic additions; and

(ii) It reflects the Historical or Architectural character of the site or district through design characteristics such as mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, cornice, and/or other architectural features as are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era Residences National Register District even if it has non-historic additions; or

Complies.

2. Legislative—Consideration of an ordinance amending the Land Management Code Section 15, Chapters 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5 regarding roof pitches and the use of roof decks. Staff recommends amending the LMC to treat decks over enclosed living spaces as roofs, disallowing roof decks as part of the primary roof structure, and limiting decks constructed above enclosed living spaces to 30% of the total roof structure.

Planner Grahm reported that flat roofs were being reviewed due to several factors. In the past the HPB, the Planning Commission and the City Council have expressed different concerns regarding flat roofs, green roofs, and contemporary decks. The HPB has also expressed concern about contemporary architecture and how it fits in the Historic District. Flat roofs are a big part of that form. Planner Grahm stated that they have been taught to protect the neighborhoods and to be consistent with the Land Management Code and the General Plan. They always look at cross canyon views to determine the character defining features of the town and what fits within the streetscapes.

Planner Grahm explained why the Staff has not proposed banning flat roofs. Some of the best transitional elements on historic homes are flat roofs, and some of the nicer additions have flat roofs. Commercial structures have flat roofs.

Planner Grahm noted that page 110 of the Staff report summarized what the Staff hoped to accomplish with the proposed amendment for flat roofs.

A flat roof may be the primary roof structure, but it is permitted by the LMC only if it is a green roof. Without a definition for primary Planner Grahm assumed it would be the majority of the roof structure. The Staff proposes that hot tubs, outdoor cooking areas, or heated seating areas are not allowed on green roofs. A green roof should be vegetated to be a true green roof. Planner Grahm pointed out that a problem with green roofs is that the vegetation turns brown because it is difficult to maintain and water the vegetation. Flat roofs often become unpermitted decks, which raises the question of whether it complies with the design guidelines or meets the intent of the Code.

Planner Grahm stated that space over living space, such as a first floor garage or living room, is considered a deck and not a roof structure. The Staff believes it is more compatible to the Historic District if the amount of decks over living space is limited to 30%. The deck should not be above the second level of the structure, and in the case where the garage sits at the streetscape and the house sits quite a distance above it, the area above that garage could become a deck.

Planner Grahm referred to page 108 of the Staff report. She stated that the Staff has been trying to figure out how flat roofs contribute to the District and how they

fit in. The Staff requested discussion from the HPB on the points outlined on page 108. If the HPB feels that flat roofs do not belong in the Historic District and that a ban needs to be created, she suggested that they have that discussion at a future meeting. Planner Grahm asked the Board to focus their discussion this evening on green roofs and rooftop decks.

Director Erickson clarified that this would be a Code amendment going forward; and not a pending ordinance like the changes that were made to the Historic District in March. For example, if someone has submitted an HDDR application, it would be reviewed under the current Code.

Planner Turpen clarified that “deck” and “porch” is not defined in the LMC. Decks and porches are very different elements. Porches are a traditional feature of historic houses in the Historic District; whereas decks are a newer element, and that would be addressed in the new construction design guidelines. Planner Turpen emphasized that the Staff definitely wanted clarity.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if this applied to residential properties, or whether it also incorporated commercial properties. Planner Grahm replied that currently it would only amend the LMC sections for historic residential properties where there is existing co-language regarding 7:12, 12:12 roof pitch and include the criteria for the green roof. She noted that there might be a few commercial structures in the HR Historic Residential Zones, but for the most part it does not address the Historic Commercial Business District.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why they would want to allow green roofs in historic neighborhoods. Planner Grahm noted that she had summarized the history of this issue on page 107 of the Staff report. She explained that the Staff was trying to come up with a way to make the roof forms more compatible with the historic roof forms of the District. A 7:12, 12:12 roof pitch was proposed and as the Staff was reviewing the criteria for a Steep Slope CUP with the City Council the wording was revised to meet the Council goal for being sustainable. Anything lower than a 7:12 or 12:12 roof pitch could be a flat roof, but only if it is a green roof and vegetated.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens opened the public hearing.

Planner Grahm reported that David White had provided comment on this issue since he was unable to attend this evening. She also handed out additional public comment that was received.

Ruth Meintsma, 305 Woodside Avenue, referred to page 116 of the Staff report, Section 15-2.2-5 - Building Height. She noted that Item (C), says the primary roof pitch must be between 7:12 and 12:12. It also says that “a green roof can be part of the primary roof pitch.” Ms. Meintsma understood that to mean that

the primary roof pitch cannot be a flat roof. She used the triplex at 537 Woodside as an example. She noted that the primary roof is a flat; and she was unsure how that was allowed to happen because it was done after the Code was amended, and it does not meet Code. Ms. Meintsma reiterated that flat roofs are not allowed as a primary roof pitch. She further read Code language, "In addition, a roof that is not the primary roof pitch may be below the required 7:12". She understood that to mean a roof in the back that is not seen predominantly can still be a 5:12. It is not a flat roof but it is close to being flat. Ms. Meintsma stated that one reason why the roof pitch was changed from 5:12 to 6:12 and made it a minimum 7:12 is because 5:12 and 6:12 added mass. She noted that a 5:12 roof pitch looks bulkier from the street. At 7:12 roof pitch can be allowed in the back because it is not visible right away.

Ms. Meintsma referred to the visual on page 108 of the Staff report and noted that it was on flat lots. Image B was the most egregious example because the primary roof pitch looks flat but it actually curves in. Ms. Meintsma imagined how different it would look with a 7:12 or 9:12 pitch as the first read on the house. She stated that even if a flat roof is not allowed in the back, the Code allows a 5:12, which is still a lot of bulk and mass. Ms. Meintsma believed this was a complicated subject and many things needed to be clarified. She thought the Code was open to different interpretations.

Ms. Meintsma stated that decks are different than porches and she pointed out that there were a number of definitions outlined in the Staff report. She thought there needed to be a size definition for a deck and porch. It is possible to have a porch on the third or fourth floor outside a bedroom with a door to walk outside. That would actually be a deck rather than a porch; however, the definition sounds more like the porch definition. She suggested that they clarify the definitions and include size.

Ms. Meintsma referred to page 110 and the Code language regarding roof pitch. She read, "A structure containing a flat roof shall have a maximum height of 35' measured from the lowest floor plan". She thought "lowest floor plan" was an error and that it should be "lowest finished floor". Ms. Meintsma realized that it seemed like a minor discrepancy, but she has seen the correct verbiage misinterpreted in a recent application. She believed there was a lot of language about primary roof, flat roof, and secondary roof; and how the flat roof compares to a 5:12 pitch in terms of incompatibility in a smaller structure. Ms. Meintsma remarked that a lot of the language needs to be clarified so it can be interpreted more straightforwardly.

Ms. Meintsma believed there needed to be further discussion regarding green roof versus flat roof with a hard surface; green roof versus flat roof heated; and green roof versus a flat roof that percolates. She remarked that a flat roof would not mitigate problems with storm water and runoff, but a percolating roof is more

like a green roof. Ms. Meintsma believed a number of issues needed to be considered and it will take a lot of time and work. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that there are flat roofs currently that are completely appropriate in certain areas, such as the houses on lower Woodside that back up to open space.

Sean Kelleher, a resident at 409 Echo Spur, stated that they have built a number of flat roof homes in Old Town. Echo Spur is on the edge of the HR-1. They spent a lot of time working with the Planning Department over the past few years to help develop the strategy of what to do. He has a lot of experience with flat roofs and green roofs. Mr. Kelleher was unsure what Ms. Meintsma was reference in terms of primary roofs not meeting Code. He stated that they were either wildly out of Code or flat roofs are acceptable for what they were doing.

Ms. Kelleher commented on items in the initial presentation. He believed the information given was done hastily, and he thought they needed to look closely at inconsistencies in the ordinance that are simple to correct, and should be corrected from the standpoint of consistency. Mr. Kelleher referred to the streetscape schematic on page 108 of the Staff report. He thought it was true for a flat lot that those would be the exact heights. In looking at a steep slope lot, the flat roof sits several feet below where the peak would be on a standard 7:12 pitch house. Mr. Kelleher noted that Echo Spur was lower with their roof lines than they would be if they did not have flat roofs.

Mr. Kelleher stated that in thinking of the challenges of what is appropriate for HR-1, the City Council has made strong statements about sustainability. He noted that the homes they built will all be LEED Platinum, and will use 80% less carbon energy than a standard house. In addition, they use 20% less water. Therefore, their flat roofs are green roofs that will capture all the snow melt and all the rain, which dumps into a cistern that is buried into their patios. That water is pumped back up to the roof and to the landscape around the house and provides free water for all outside irrigation. Mr. Kelleher stated that flat roofs do great things in terms of sustainability and creating more green space, but they also have valuable money saving elements for homeowners. However, a green roof that is not usable or accessible is an extremely expensive proposition. He would think twice about having done a green roof if he was not able to use it. Of all the sustainability elements they did, he believed the green roof had the most community benefits. Mr. Kelleher noted that many cities across the Country actually allow green roofs on historic buildings. He agreed with Ms. Meintsma that it is a complicated issue with a lot of variables that not only impact the historic viability of the Historic Districts, about also the goal for sustainability.

Mary Wintzer, a resident at 320 McHenry, stated that she has lived in Old Town for almost 45 years, and she is an old town warrior. Ms. Wintzer stated that she has nothing against flat roofs and thinks green roofs sound wonderful. Her issue is with the aspect of turning them into active decks. If the only way a green roof

works financially is to be an active deck, as an Old Town resident she would have say that unfortunately for the developer they should forego the green roof. Ms. Wintzer commented on a personal experience. McHenry is on the top of Rossi Hill and there are two active decks that are either in or going in. One is Echo Spur. She stated that in 1981 the residents created a community park. When Echo Spur went in with a flat roof, in their vista they see and hear people laughing and walking on the roof. It is a visual impact and a noise pollution. Ms. Wintzer remarked that the second active deck is being built, and the woman who lives next door to that house will have people at her bedroom level ten feet away because it is an active deck. She lives across the street from the deck being built, and for the first time in 40 years they will have to decide whether or not to get curtains that will stay closed because people will be having parties. Ms. Wintzer stated that it is an intrusion, but it does not have to be. Because the developer can put the activity level on the top level, they build to the maximum which results in a bigger footprint, because they do not have to allow for yard space or side deck space. They maximize the footprint and put everything on top. Ms. Wintzer requested that the HPB hone in on the aspect of active decks.

Ms. Wintzer noted that green roofs came to the City Council without having gone through the Planning Commission. She thought the City Council was swayed because green roof sounds eco-friendly; but the problem is the active deck factor, which is wrong for a residential community and for historic Old Town.

Charlie Wintzer, an Old Town resident and former Planning Commissioner, thought the biggest issue with the Historic District came from the preservation consultant, Dina Blaes, 15 years ago when she said they were losing Park City's historic district because of the mass and scale they were building. He sees that everywhere he goes. Every project that comes through gets bigger and bigger. Mr. Wintzer did not believe that flat roofs are green roofs. He thinks flat roofs encourage larger structures because it allows the ability to take the deck space out of the footprint. Mr. Wintzer pointed out that if they can take deck space and make it 360 degrees they do not need a deck on two sides of the house to get in and out of the sun. Having built flat roofs in the Ironhorse District, Mr. Wintzer challenged the statement that a green roof or a flat roof is more expensive to build. It is a cheaper roof to build, it is less complicated, the snow loads are not any greater, and in fact, probably less because there are no ice stands. Mr. Wintzer agreed that flat roofs are a good way to get the water back into the water system. However, if someone is saving water because of the roof he would like to see the facts. Ms. Wintzer believed this issue had gone beyond the reach of what the City Council envisioned when they passed green roofs. He pointed out that it never went to the Planning Commission for a definition of a green roof. Mr. Wintzer thought it was starting to change the character of Old Town, it was increasing the mass of Old Town, and it was definitely making it hard to live there.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that the Staff was only asking for input and direction with regards to flat roofs. He asked if the Staff also wanted the HPB to look at design guidelines changes. Planner Grahm answered yes. However, if the Board felt that flat roofs needed more discussion and analysis, they could continue it for further review. Mr. Stephens assumed the Board had questions for the Staff and they would probably want to continue this item. He agreed with public comment that flat roofs are a complicated issue with a number of moving parts and many different opinions.

Sean Kelleher responded to some of the public comment. He explained that the homes at Echo Spur were put together with a lot of guidance from the previous administration. They worked closely with what the City wanted to see and worked through a lot of different options and ideas. What they see on those homes is a function of cooperation. Mr. Kelleher wanted to continue that same kind of cooperation to figure out what people want up there. He clarified that his comments were meant to be objective. He was not saying that they needed to build flat roofs. Mr. Kelleher noted that they were stymied for a long time in trying to get anything done with this project, and they ended up following the City's direction. Mr. Kelleher remarked that they did a \$10,000 water study on how to manage storm water for their homes, and that data was given to the City. He explained how they keep water in their tanks and how the water is recycled each day. Mr. Kelleher pointed out that he was still using the snow melt from January.

Vice-Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to the images on page 108. She thought the drawing was please because there were so many different shapes. She was concerned with the idea of having an area with all flat roofs. Ms. Beatlebrox understood the problems associated with having parties on top of roofs, but she went to one recently and it was delightful. She could understand why people would want to have a top deck. Ms. Beatlebrox favored the idea of green. She was interested in knowing what the National Trust says about green roofs and historic buildings, because it is very important for the future. Ms. Beatlebrox stressed the need for a work session to really focus on studying this issue.

Jack Hodgkins believed that Old Town and its historic nature is defined by its rooflines as it sits on the hill up and down. He thought they needed to think carefully about that aspect. Mr. Hodgkins would not recommend allowing a loophole to have multiple flat roofs without controlling the amount and size of the roofs. He was interested in seeing the net carbon between a green roof and a slope roof that is white or some other color. He thought there may be other ways to achieve sustainability goals without green roofs and decks in Old Town residential. In terms of the National Trust and recommendations, Mr. Hodgkins noted that there are many neighborhoods throughout the United States where the historic buildings are 100% flat. He would not be surprised if there were

recommendations for flat roofs. Mr. Hodgkins reiterated that Old Town is defined by its pitch roof and not flat roofs. Regarding the mix of roof styles, he pointed out that they were only talking about residential areas, and they will have flat roofs in some of the commercial areas. Mr. Hodgkins thought they needed to be careful in how they define a pitch roof if the intent is to maintain the historic look, because any architect could get creative with a slope roof. A lot needs to be considered for the end goal and he wanted to make sure they achieve that goal.

Board Member Holmgren struggled with a roof becoming a deck. A green roof is a roof, but now it is suddenly a deck. She thought they needed to better clarify the terminology and how things are described. Ms. Holmgren stated that she would be upset if her next door neighbor decided to do a green roof and it was a party deck.

Board Member Hewett liked the idea of having a work session because she could think of a number of different variables to discuss.

Vice-Chair Stephens agreed with Board Member Hodgkins. He also agreed with comments by Mary Wintzer about allowing something that increases the living activity. He noted that people buy or build their home based on the existing Code at the time. Mr. Stephens thought they needed to consider how this impacts that expectation. The impacts would not affect every structure, but it would in some cases. He suggested that there might be a difference between uphill lots and downhill lots, but they would not know that without further discussion. Mr. Stephens agreed with the comments about mass of the structure and how it appears from the street. He believed that the architecture should reflect the current architecture of the day because they should not try to imitate what existed in the past. However, an architect that is creative will design and build a home that is reflective of the built environment around it. It goes back to a discussion the HPB had a number of months ago about whether the new contemporary architecture reflects the historic architectural forms that are going on in the historic district. A building that is totally contemporary with a flat roof and other materials may not do that. Mr. Stephens agreed with Mr. Hodgkins that the town is made up of pitched roofs. That does not mean they would only see pitched roofs, but they need to determine how the flat roofs and pitched roofs work together to reflect that honor and heritage, and helps blend new architecture and the built environment together. Mr. Stephens thought this should come back as a work session item where they could banter ideas back and forth in a less formal format.

Director Erickson agreed. He commented on a previous exercise the HPB had gone through where they reviewed a large number of existing historic structures and commented on what they thought was or was not appropriate for the Historic District. He suggested that the Staff could bring back those photos to help with

this discussion because it affects all of the residential districts that the HPB is charged with protecting.

Director Erickson noted that Commissioner White had provided comments on this particular item and his comments would be included in the record.

Vice-Chair Stephens thought it would be helpful to reach out to the design community and invite them to participate. Since Commissioner White was the only architect on the HPB, he thought it would be beneficial to have additional design input.

Planner Grahn requested that the Board continue this item to the first meeting in October to allow the Staff time to compile the necessary information for their discussion. Director Erickson recommended scheduling a work session the first meeting in October. In the meantime, the Staff will reach out to the design community to get input from other architects. He believed that most of the architects who practice in the HR-1 District knows that the HPB is having these discussions because the Staff informally reaches out to them as they go through the process.

MOTION: Commissioner Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the flat roof discussion to October 5, 2016. Board Member Beatlebrox 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 Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings. Universal and Specific Design Guidelines will be reviewed for: Site Design; Primary Structures: Foundations; Exterior Walls; Roofs; Store Fronts; Doors (Not included in Storefronts); Windows (not included in storefronts); Gutters & Downspouts; Historic Balconies/Porticos; Decks, Fire Escapes, and Exterior Staircases; Chimneys and Stovepipes; Architectural Features; Mechanical Equipment, Communications, and Service Areas; Paint & Color; Additions to Primary Structures: Protection of Historic Sites and Structures; Transitional Elements; General Compatibility; Scenario 1: Rooftop Additions; Scenario 2: Rear Additions; Basement Additions; New Storefronts; New Balconies; New Decks; Handrails; Awnings; and Reusing Historic Houses as Commercial Structures. The Board will provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB).

Planner Grahn noted that this item was continued from the last meeting. The HPB had continued the discussion regarding roofing materials for historic residential structures. There was a strong interest to make sure there were wood shake roofs. The Planning Staff keeps work with the Building Department to determine the best way to accommodate these roofs.

Planner Grahn reported that in talking to the Building Department and the Fire Marshall, the City Council recently adopted the 2006 Utah Wildland Urban Interface. The Staff had provided the Board with a summary by the Building Department. She explained that it requires a wood shake roof to be a Class A roofing material, and meeting those Class A requirements can be difficult at times. The Building Department has said that wood shake shingles will have to be reviewed on a case by case basis because they have to evaluate the flammability of the roof. Whether or not something is Class A is based on the slope of the lot, the proximity of existing vegetation, different roofing materials, the roofing material grading and other aspects. The Building Department is adamant that a wood shake roof would not be approved if it does not meet the Class A requirements.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff was continuing to recommend the design guideline on Page 123 of the Staff reports, which read, "A wood shingle roof is encouraged on a historic structure where feasible. Architectural shingles or multi-tab shingles made of fiberglass or asphalt composition are encouraged over standing seam metal roofs on the historic structure. Metal roofs may be appropriate on those historic structures that historically had a metal roof". She noted that not many historic structures have metal roofs, at least not as the primary roofing material, but the Staff wanted to keep the language in the Design Guidelines so in rare cases where there was a metal roof they could have it brought back.

Chair Vice-Chair Stephens advocated for wood shingles. He was fine moving with the guideline, but he still wanted to better understand the Building Department's issues. Mr. Stephens noted that there are so many synthetic materials that are absolutely prohibited in the Historic District, such as vinyl siding, vinyl window, specific synthetic siding materials, etc. He believed a wood shingle roof on the historic portion of the house is an easy and effective way to keep the historic nature of the home, and differentiate it from any additions to the home. Mr. Stephens asked about the fire classification on an asphalt shingle. Planner Grahn assumed that it was Class A, but she did not know that for certain.

Board Member Hewett asked when people quit using wood shingle roofs, and whether it was mandated at the time they started migrating away from wood shingle roofs. Planner Grahn believed it primarily had to do with maintenance. Also, there was a period in Park City history where people could not afford to

make repairs. When asphalt shingles came into the market with a lifetime warranty, people moved towards that direction. The same was true with siding. People did not want to maintain the wood siding and it was replaced with aluminum siding. Planner Grahn did not have the exact timing for when asphalt shingles appeared in Park City.

Planner Grahn noted that they were backing historic commercial building out of the Design Guidelines. They updated the Universal Guidelines to be more reflective of the Secretary of the Interior Standards; as well as to match the Universal Guidelines that were created for the historic residential structures. She pointed out that those were previously reviewed by the HPB.

Planner Grahn stated that she and Planner Turpen had spent a lot of time internally going through the guidelines, and they have worked closely with the preservation consultant to come up with the best solution for these historic buildings and how to handle the issues. However, if the Board felt that some things were missed, the Staff was happy to go back to the drawing board to make sure they get it right. She noted that the HPB would be using these Guidelines when doing their design reviews.

The Board had no comments. Board Member Beatlebrox thought the Staff had been very thorough.

Planner Turpen commented on setbacks and orientation. She noted that there was not a specific section in the existing Guidelines that addresses site design for commercial structures. The intent is to talk about that more in-depth in the new Guidelines as they split residential from commercial.

Planner Turpen stated that most buildings were built with no setback from Main Street. The relationship between the grade of the street and the setback has created a stepping effect and pattern on the street. The intent is to create guidelines that encourage that. She presented two photos that show the stepping as the grade goes down on Main Street. The drawings were from the 1980's guidelines, and they were trying to bring that back and add more visuals to the current set of guidelines. The photo will be included to help give the user a good idea of what the City is looking for and it makes them easier to apply.

The Board had no comments on setback and orientation.

Planner Turpen moved on to topography and grading. She noted that clarity was added to make sure the natural topography is maintained. The previous language was vague and the new language makes it easier to apply. Planner Grahn stated that in recent applications for Main Street there has been more interest in landscaping and vegetation features; however, currently, there is no specific guideline to address landscaping and vegetation. The Staff created

language that addresses the issue and also helps people understand that Park City is a unique climate and how to include xeriscaping in their design.

Board Member Holmgren reiterated her consistent opinion that people should be encouraged to plant roses and fruit trees to replace the ones that have been taken out. Instead of box elder trees they should encourage trees that are not so trashy.

There was consensus from the Board to encourage fruit trees.

Planner Turpen noted that there have been concerns expressed about trees blocking signs, and the HPCA might have issues with planting fruit trees. Ms. Holmgren pointed out that the hanging planters on Swede Alley block the signs. Director Erickson stated that from the point of view of historic preservation, he believed the Staff could look into vegetation and preservation of the cultural landscape of the Historic District. It would be a long policy discussion, but this issue would fit in that discussion.

Board Member Holmgren noted that in looking at older photos, roses, lilacs and fruit trees grow well in Park City.

Planner Grahm suggested that the best way to approach the matter is through sidebars. Compiling a list of plants that were historically located in Park City would be a useful way to educate people about what previously existed and what grows well in this environment. Providing that list in the Guidelines would be helpful.

The Board had no further comments on vegetation and landscaping.

Planner Grahm stated that the next section, Sidewalks, Plazas and other streetscape improvements was new in the Design Guidelines. The guidelines are minimal and reflect a lot of what is going on in the current Main Street Improvement project as far as changing the paving pattern on crosswalks, or making sure furnishings garbage cans do not detract from the historic buildings.

Board Member Holmgren remarked that the crosswalks are nearly invisible because the white markings disappear. She was unsure of a solution, but something needed to be done to make the crosswalks on Swede Alley and Main Street more visible.

Board Member Hewett thought it might open the conversation for having Main Street become pedestrian only.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the benches and other elements are modern looking and the colors are different, but she finds them compatible. She

believed the improvements being done fits with the Historic District without being a replica of a historic bench. Planner Grahm agreed. It is not the goal of the Design Guidelines to encourage cutesy historic wood and cast iron benches.

Planner Grahm reviewed the next section, parking and driveways. She pointed out that the intent is to keep parking to a minimum. In areas where parking lots are needed, they should be visually screened to avoid being the centerpiece of the Historic District. Planner Grahm stated that these were similar to the historic residential design guidelines.

The Board had no comments on the parking and driveway section.

Planner Turpen commented on primary structures. The first item was the foundation. The Staff added clarity to the existing guidelines that address foundation, and they added additional guidelines that talk specifically about protecting the historic foundation and adding foundations that are compatible. It also addresses the regrading after work is done, and how that relates to the importance of the foundation to a structure and how it helps the form.

In terms of regarding, Board Member Hodgkins thought it could be interpreted several ways and he was unsure whether it achieves to what they discussed. He recalled from their conversations that the goal was to make it less visual on impact and more about the landscape.

Vice-Chair Stephens asked if the Staff was trying to address a specific issue that they noticed on Main Street that could have been better handled. Planner Grahm believed the Staff had been handling it well, but it would help to have a guideline to support the Staff. She noted that when 562 Main Street was redone, they proposed to lift the building two feet, which was allowed, but it would have left two feet of concrete exposed, which would be visually jarring along Main Street. Even though they had concrete two feet up, boards were put over the top to mimic the panel pattern that existed on the store fronts. The question is whether another applicant would be willing to do the same, or whether a guideline would force them to do it.

Planner Turpen pointed out that upper Main Street has a more drastic grade. The Imperial Hotel and other structures are on a steep lot; and the concern would be that the grade would change so much that it would change the relationship of the foundation. It is less of a concern on Lower Main Street. Director Erickson noted that more people are asking about infill or changing things around with the building. This affects new construction and historic restoration. The Staff was thinking ahead and trying to be prepared. The Guidelines should give them the power they need.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the guidelines for foundations also applies to the Swede Alley side. He was told that it did.

Planner Turpen noted that the changes for exterior walls was primarily to add clarity. Two guidelines were added to address the use of synthetic materials and also historic materials.

The Board had no comments on exterior walls.

The next item was roofing. Planner Turpen noted that some of the changes added clarity; however, the existing guidelines did not address snow melting devices or dormers. The Staff added specific criteria for those elements in the Guidelines.

Planner Grahm stated that storefront was another new section. The current design guidelines do not address storefronts specifically, but they do have quite a few components that together creates a character defining feature that is very noticeable on these commercial buildings. The Staff created this section to protect the windows, doors, kick plates, the transoms and the entire bottom section of the building that creates the commercial area. Planner Grahm noted that they had put an emphasis on preserving the recessed entry as an important feature of the historic front, and that it should be retained and preserved.

The Board had no comments on storefronts.

Planner Grahm noted that the section on doors and windows address areas on the sides, the rear of the building or the second level. The guideline was similar to the residential window and door section. It is to basically maintain what exists, to restore the existing windows, and to try to avoid introducing new openings.

Vice-Chair Stephens referred to the architectural definition of the door, and asked if it is the slab or the opening. When he hears door and reads the guideline, he thinks of slab. Planner Grahm replied that the reference to "door" is the actually door that opens. Mr. Stephens recommended that Planner Grahm double-check how it is defined in the LMC. Planner Grahm replied that she would check with Code, and if there is not a definition she would find one. Mr. Stephens clarified that the door may be new, but what they want to preserve is the door opening and its relationship to the front of the building.

Board Member Hewett asked if they have had issues with ADA compliance. Planner Grahm replied that very rarely is there an issue with compliance because most of the door openings have been expanded. A lot of the Main Street buildings are fortunate enough to connect through Swede Alley and have a secondary entrance. Planner Grahm stated that a bigger issue is the need for double doors or wider doors on the 1980s commercial buildings.

Planner Turpen noted that currently there was not a guideline for gutters and downspouts. The Staff added a section similar to what was written for residential.

The Board had no comments on gutters and downspouts.

Planner Turpen noted that balconies on Main Street must be approved by the City Engineer with an encroachment with City Council. Most of the balconies on Main Street are not historic. The Staff would like to encourage reconstruction of some of the historic balconies that have been lost. She presented a photo of 463 Main, which showed that at one time the historic building had a wrapping balcony. The Staff would like to see something like that to be brought back. They added guidelines that would address the reconstruction of a deck.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it would be nice to bring that back. She thought it looked more like the Old West than how historic Park City normally looked.

Vice-Chair Stephens commented on the language regarding 50% recycled or reclaimed material. Planner Grahn asked if they wanted to keep that language or remove it and return to cedar. Mr. Stephens preferred wood, particularly since they do not allow composite materials.

Vice-Chair Stephens commented on issues related to snow removal where the balconies extend into the sidewalk. Planner Grahn pointed out that it is currently allowed in the LMC. The intent is to regulate it through the guidelines. Planner Grahn stated that she spoke to the City Engineer and he did not have an issue with it because it is controlled by the LMC. The City Engineer did request the opportunity to review the drainage more specifically.

Board Member Holmgren noted that the store owners are responsible for taking the snow from their door to the curb, which is where the balcony poles would be located.

Planner Turpen stated that guidelines were added regarding decks, fire escapes and exterior staircases. They are currently not addressed, but with the increasing density on Main Street and new residential units, they will start seeing a higher demand and the Staff wanted to have some regulations in place. It basically talks about what they need to look like and their impact on the historic structure. It also addresses placement.

Board Member Holmgren thought it was obvious that they should make sure the the steps should be made safe. Director Erickson asked if expanded metals steps would be allowed in a fire escape as part of the design guidelines. Planner

Grahn stated that a fire escape is more of a utilitarian use and metal steps would probably be allowed. Director Erickson suggested that they confirm it in the guideline.

Vice-Chair Stephens stated that the question is whether it detracts from the historic nature of the building. If a steel structure on the outside of a historic building detracts from it, it would give the Staff the leeway to say yes or no. Planner Grahn thought that was addressed in the second guideline where they talk about the visual impact of the deck or fire escape shall be minimized by limiting the size and scale. They would also introduce language about materials.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that if they made it too substantial or required significant materials, it would detract more than something that looks more contemporary.

Planner Grahn commented on chimney and stovepipes and architectural features. They were the same as the residential design guidelines.

Regarding mechanical and utility equipment, Planner Grahn noted that there is a wide variety in town. When they work with Rocky Mountain Power they do not also have an option as to where to place the equipment. The Staff has been working more with property owners to identify early on where transformers and other equipment will so they can find a way to shield it. The guidelines address location, shielding, and protecting it from different views.

Planner Grahn noted that paint colors are not regulated; however, they want to make sure that historic materials are protected. She anticipated a more extensive discussion when they start looking at the treatment of different historic materials.

Planner Turpen commented on the additions to primary structures. She noted that this section specifically talks about protection of historic sites. The only change was to add clarity. The second part talks about whether it is appropriate to put on an addition and if all other efforts had been exhausted.

Board Member Hodgkins had another commitment and left the meeting.

In terms of general compatibility, Planner Turpen recalled that Planners Scarff and Grahn done the work session on residential structures. Planner Turpen noted that these were similar to the residential. She presented a photo and stated that on the question of compatibility they look at the width of the structures. She presented a drawing from the 1980s, and noted that historically the facades are generally 25' to 50' wide facades. If it becomes larger the compatibility issue comes into play. The intent is to keep the rhythm and scale of

the streetscape as it steps down the street because it is important to keeping the integrity of the street.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that additions to historic sites on Main Street is an important topic and she thought they should consider looking at this section by itself at a future meeting.

Vice-Chair Stephens understood that this set of guidelines would help the Staff regulate construction on larger lots. He explained why he preferred not to use the new 333 Main Street building as an example. It was a remodel of an existing building and he thought it was misleading. The architect was only able to do what they could do based on what they had to work with. He suggested that use something that not a remodel. He preferred to show something that was a mistake that was made several years ago.

Board Member Hewett agreed. Based on what was there before, the remodel at 333 Main Street is a huge improvement.

Planner Turpen requested that the HPB Continue this section when they take action this evening. Planner Grahn suggested that everyone walk up and down Main Street before the next meeting to get a better idea before discussing this section on additions.

Due to the late hour, the HPB agreed to Continue the remaining design guideline items to the next meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the discussion of pages 144-176 to September 7th, 2016. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board