



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2022**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Douglas Stephens, Alan Long

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Spencer Cawley, City Planner; Caitlyn Tubbs, Senior Historic Preservation Planner; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at 5:09 p.m. He conducted a roll call and confirmed the presence of all Board Members.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from November 2, 2022.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Minutes of November 2, 2022, as written. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board. Board Member Hutchings abstained from the vote as he was not present at the November 2, 2022 meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

A. Historic Preservation Board Chair Election.

Chair Scott reported that he has served as Board Chair for the past year and would be happy to continue in that role in 2023. He stated that there might be three meetings that he would be unavailable to attend in person.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to re-elect Chair Scott as Board Chair for 2023. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

Board Member Stephens asked Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington about appointing a Vice Chair. Mr. Harrington explained that the Code was changed to specify that Vice Chairs would be appointed only for meetings in which they are needed. He stated that they would proceed on an ad hoc basis based on if and when Chair Scott is unavailable for a meeting. The Board could elect by quorum any Board Member in attendance.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Consideration to Adopt Resolution 01-2022, a Resolution Authorizing Participation in Meeting by Electronic Communication.

Mr. Harrington explained that this is required following an amendment to State law that clarified the requirement of adopting an Electronic Meeting Resolution that specified eligibility as a quorum. All of the Boards, Commissions, and City Councils drafted the same Resolution. He advised that this Resolution made no substantive change to the Board's use of Zoom and instead does not allow a Board Member to be counted for purposes of a quorum if he or she uses a different methodology that does not allow for the specified interaction.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to ADOPT Resolution 01-2022. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

B. Consideration to Adopt Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2023.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ADOPT Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Dates for 2023. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

C. 517 Park Avenue - Modification of Approval - The Applicant Proposes Disassembly and Reassembly of the Front Bay Window of a Landmark Historic Structure Using Existing Historic Materials. PL-22-05452.

City Planner, Spencer Cawley reported that the Landmark Historic Structure on the subject property was constructed circa 1888 and is on the City's Historic Sites Inventory. An Italianate-style box bay window is located on the front of the cross-wing

with paired double-hung windows above. He presented a photograph submitted by the applicant showing the bay window. He reported that on July 6, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") reviewed a Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") application and unanimously approved the applicant's request for material deconstruction of a portion of the rear façade to accommodate a deck addition to the second story of the structure.

Planner Cawley reported that on July 28, 2022, the Planning Director reviewed and approved the HDDR application for the remodel of the Historic Structure. The applicant entered into an agreement with the City for a Historic Preservation Guarantee in the amount of \$279,200. The existing structural integrity of the bay window was compromised and not adequately attached to the front façade. The configurations of the wall framing and floor joists, which run parallel to the bay window, have resulted in this compromise. He added that the bay window is only held together by the windowpanes and was not otherwise attached to the wall framing.

Planner Cawley noted that replacement of the windows was approved with the HDDR application. He presented interior photographs of the bay window that showed the joists running parallel to the window and the bay window leaning toward the front of the structure. He commented that the applicant's engineer submitted a letter stating that during a site visit they reviewed the framing of the existing main floor bay window and highly recommended reconstructing the bay window with modern construction methods and materials while maintaining the historic appearance. The engineer added that the existing framing was in poor condition and not structurally adequate.

Planner Cawley stated that the applicant seeks to panelize the bay window and use the Historic materials to re-assemble the bay window. Staff recommended the HPB approve the disassembly and reassembly of a portion of the front façade to allow for structural upgrades to the bay window. Pursuant to Land Management Code ("LMC") Section 15-11-14, the HPB must find that the project complies with the following criteria:

- A licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Structure cannot reasonably be moved intact; and
- At least one of the following:
 - The proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Structure on the Site; or
 - The Historic Structure is found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Chapter 116.1 of the International Building Code; or
 - The HPB determines, with input from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official, that unique conditions include, but are not limited to:

- Problematic site or structural conditions preclude temporarily lifting or moving the building as a single unit;
- The physical conditions of the existing materials prevent temporary lifting or moving a building;
- The applicant demonstrated that panelization would result in preservation of a greater amount of Historic material; or
- All other alternatives were shown to result in additional damage or loss of Historic materials.

Planner Cawley referenced Exhibit E in the Packet, which is a letter from the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director recommending disassembly and reassembly of the bay window.

Staff also recommended the following Conditions of Approval:

- The applicant is to reassemble the bay window using the original materials that are found to be safe and/or in serviceable condition. Otherwise, the applicant must supplement with new, comparable materials. The bay window shall be reassembled in its original form, location, placement, and orientation.
- Disassembly and reassembly shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
- Measured drawings of the element to be disassembled and reassembled shall be completed and provided to Staff prior to the work being done on the bay window.
- The applicant will provide the Planning and Building Departments with a plan that details the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures prior to updating the Building Permit.
- In order to minimize the loss of historic fabric, the bay window shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
- To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the building, structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall

be removable or shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when reassembled.

- Important architectural features of the historic building or structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the structure or element of the structure is disassembled.
- The process of disassembly of the bay window shall be recorded through photographic, still, or video means.
- As each component of a historic building is disassembled, the physical condition shall be noted, particularly if it differs from the condition stated in pre-disassembly documentation. When a component is too deteriorated to remove, it shall be carefully documented with photographs and written notes on its dimensions, finish, textures and colors to facilitate accurate reproduction.
- The large panels shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly, storage, and reassembly process.
- Disassembled components such as trim, windows, wall panels, and roof elements shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer, or off-site in a garage, warehouse or trailer until needed for reassembly.

Staff requested that the HPB determine whether the applicant should retain the non-Historic trim paneling at the base of the bay window that was added around 1994. He presented a photograph of the trim paneling for the Board's review. He referenced the 1994 remodel of the structure and presented photographs of the home showing where the additional trim was added. Several other small details were also added in 1994. The applicant proposed to remove the trim detail as part of the panelization.

The Design Guidelines encourage maintaining and preserving Historic window openings, windows, window surrounds, and decorative window features; however, he noted that this detail would also not detract from the Historic character. He reported that Staff did not receive any public input prior to this meeting. He offered that the Board might approve panelization of the bay window, deny the panelization, and direct Staff to make findings for that denial, or may request additional information and continue the discussion to a date certain.

Board Member Stephens asked if this really involved a panelization or whether it would be removed in pieces. It was noted by the applicant, Jeff Love, that most of the bay window is window and there is not much structure. It was added that it would involve cataloging the moldings and reusing those. Board Member Stephens asked about the materials used during the restoration in the 1990s and whether the applicant wanted to

remove those materials. Mr. Love stated that they could either leave it the way it currently looks or take it back to the pre-1990s design.

There was a comment that as part of the 1990s refurbishment, the owner added a structural component on the bottom of the window that cantilevered out to try and catch the bay window. The trim on the bottom just hides the additional structural element and would no longer be needed after the proposed work.

Board Member Beatlebrox assumed that the applicant would like to make the bay window look as it does now, as opposed to the pre-1990s remodel. Mr. Love confirmed that to be the case, and noted that other than the addition at the bottom, the window looks very similar to how it looked pre-1990s.

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

Chair Scott noted that the Board needed to consider the non-Historic paneling. Board Member Stephens noted that if there would be no architectural benefit to having the trim at the bottom of the window, he would recommend going back to the pre-1994 addition. Board Member Hutchings agreed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Modification of the Approval for 517 Park Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as follows:

Findings of Fact

1. The property is located at 517 Park Avenue.
2. The site is in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
3. The property is listed with Summit County as Parcel number PC-73.
4. The property contains a T/L cottage constructed circa 1888 and is on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
5. An Italianate-style box bay window is located on the front façade.
6. On July 6, 2022, the Historic Preservation Board unanimously approved Material Deconstruction for a portion of the rear façade of the Landmark Structure and approved the removal of a non-historic porch on the south elevation.
7. On July 28, 2022, the Planning Director reviewed and approved a Historic District Design Review application to remodel the Historic Structure and remove the non-historic porch that encroaches onto the neighboring Lot (PL-22-05118).

8. The Applicant proposes to disassemble/reassemble the bay window to address structural issues.
9. Public notice was posted to the property on November 22, 2022. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on November 22, 2022. Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public notice website on November 23, 2022. The Park Record published notice on November 23, 2022.
10. The findings in the Analysis section of the Staff Report are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.2, Historic Residential (HR-1) District and LMC § 15-11-14, Disassembly and Reassembly Of A Historic Building or Historic Structure.
2. The proposed Use, as conditioned, is compatible with the surrounding structures, in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of any difference in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the modified plans approved on December 7, 2022, by the Historic Preservation Board. Any changes, modifications, or deviations may result in a stop work order.
- 2.
3. The Applicant shall reassemble the bay window using the original materials that are found to be safe and/or in serviceable condition, otherwise supplement with new materials. The bay window shall be reassembled in its original form, location, placement, and orientation.
4. Disassembly/reassembly shall be done using recognized preservation methods.
- 5.
6. Measured drawings of the element to be disassembled/reassembled shall be completed.
7. The Applicant shall provide the Planning and Building Departments with a plan detailing the disassembly and reassembly steps and procedures.

8. In order to minimize the loss of historic fabric, the bay window shall be disassembled in the largest workable pieces possible.
9. To ensure accurate reassembly, all parts of the building, structure, or element shall be marked as they are systematically separated from the structure. Contrasting colors of paint or carpenter wax crayons shall be used to establish a marking code for each component. The markings shall be removable or shall be made on surfaces that will be hidden from view when the structure is reassembled.
10. Important architectural features of a historic building or structure shall be removed, marked, and stored before the structure or element of the structure is disassembled.
11. The process of disassembly of the bay window shall be recorded through photographic, still or video, means.
12. As each component of a historic building is disassembled, the physical condition shall be noted, particularly if it differs from the condition stated in pre-disassembly documentation. When a component is too deteriorated to remove, it shall be carefully documented — with photographs and written notes on its dimensions, finish, texture, color, etc.— to facilitate accurate reproduction.
13. Large panels shall be protected with rigid materials, such as sheets of plywood when there is a risk of damage during the disassembly/storage/reassembly process.
14. Disassembled components such as trim, windows, wall panels, roof elements, etc., shall be securely stored on-site in a storage trailer or off-site in a garage/warehouse/trailer until needed for reassembly.
15. All Conditions of Approval from the July 6, 2022, Historic Preservation Board hearing still apply.
16. All Conditions of Approval from the July 28, 2022, Historic District Design Review hearing still apply.

Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

There was a request to allow public comment during the Work Session.

Board Member Holmgren commented that the Packet provided to the Board was very well done.

6. CONTINUATIONS

A. Parking on Driveways in Historic Districts Work Session Has Been Continued to a Date Uncertain.

7. WORK SESSION

A. Discussion Regarding Lot Combinations in Historic Districts.

Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that the Code contains Lot Standards, including Lot Minimum Sizes, Lot Minimum Widths, and Maximum Building Footprints. These standards were the result of a deliberate and involved public process in the early 2000s. At that time, the Planning Commission and City Council approved LMC Amendments with a new calculation formula that replaced a more restrictive floor area ratio maximum. In 2014, the City updated its General Plan, which recommended maintaining smaller lots within Old Town in keeping with the historic character of the Miner-boom era and encouraging smaller building footprints. Traditionally, lots in Old Town were platted at 25' wide by 75' deep.

Planner Tubbs noted that the HPB, the Planning Commission, and City Council asked Staff to begin public stakeholder outreach in order to discuss potentially updating these Lot Standards and start the public process for any potential LMC Amendments for lot consolidations. When Staff returns to these bodies, they would include the Staff Reports previously drafted and presented to provide context on the reasoning behind the Maximum Building Footprint formula that currently exists in the Code.

Planner Tubbs presented a map showing the various Historic Zoning Districts. These Districts are primarily found in Old Town and along segments of Deer Valley and range from Historic Residential-Low Density to Historic-Commercial Business Centers. The uses for each zone vary in intensity depending on location within the City. Staff was currently examining the lot consolidations or Maximum Building Footprints in the Historic Residential Districts, which are HR-L, HR-1, HR-2, HR-M, and potentially HR-C.

Planner Tubbs referenced the options for consideration by the Board that were included in the Staff Report. The first option was to require any prospective applicant to survey the existing lots and determine the average lot size along the subject lot face; thereafter, the average could be set at the Maximum Lot Size for any new lot combinations. She explained that one of the benefits of Option 1 would be that it would be highly tailored to a specific neighborhood or section of the City; whereas with Option 2, the City would just adopt a zone-wide Maximum Lot Size that would not be tailored to a specific area and would apply to areas where lots might be either much smaller or much larger than the proposed maximum.

Option 3 would be to re-examine the Maximum Building Footprint formula. Planner Tubbs explained the Maximum Building Footprint as set forth in the Staff Report. She recognized that the current formula was somewhat daunting and stated that if the HPB recommended the facilitation of LMC Amendments, Staff would include prior Staff Reports to provide context of how this formula was derived.

Planner Tubbs referenced a table in the Staff Report and the normal Maximum Building Footprint that could be achieved under the existing formula. She pointed out that as the lot sizes get larger, the reduction also would also increase. She commented that the intent of the formula was to keep the buildings in scale with the existing neighborhoods. She presented a table as an example of what would occur if the City decided to change the Maximum Building Footprint to facilitate further reduction in building size and impact the Maximum Building Footprints. She highlighted the differences in calculations if the formula used a multiplier of .8 instead of the current multiplier of .9. She stated that this discussion would be very high level at this time and Staff did not have any proposed LMC Amendments for the Board's consideration. Staff was responding to the direction of the Board, Planning Commission, and City Council.

Staff requested that the Board indicate whether it would support amending the LMC to further restrict Maximum Building Footprint in Historic Residential Districts. If there was support, she asked the Board to define its preferred amendment option out of the three outlined in the Staff Report or any other option. Planner Tubbs added that in the HR-M Zones, the LMC does not currently have a Minimum or a Maximum Lot Size; therefore, there are no Maximum Building Footprints for that zone. She queried whether standards should be implemented in the HR-M Zone.

The last question posed by Planner Tubbs was whether the HR-L Zone should continue to require larger lots. She referenced the background of the HR-L Zone detailed in the Packet and advised that the Minimum Lot Size was required to be double the traditional lot size found in Old Town. Therefore, lots in the HR-L zone were required to be at least 50' x 75', as opposed to the traditional lot size of 25' x 75'. Per the Ordinance, the purpose of the larger lot requirement in HR-L Zones was to minimize the amount of development on the streets that the Ordinance recognized as not having the same capacity as other streets in Park City.

Chair Scott allowed Mr. Love to provide comment pursuant to his request made after conclusion of the Regular Agenda.

Jeff Love stated that he has been in Park City for 28 years and owns various properties in Old Town. He has been involved in over 50 applications to the City related to those properties. He expressed frustration with the proposal because he felt that the problem was not well defined. He noted that the information in the Staff Report proposed to change Maximum Building Footprints on all parcels, even a 25' x 75' lot that would not require a Plat Amendment. He questioned why all lots would be included.

Mr. Love commented that none of the options are good and stated that the regulations are not broken and do not need to be fixed. The Building Footprint has worked for 20 to 25 years and the formula is more restrictive as lots get larger. He referenced the question about HR-L Zoning Districts and commented that 89 King Road was redeveloped 3 to 4 years ago. It has a non-Historic Structure and consists of three Old Town lots. The current owner purchased it because HR-L has a Minimum Lot Size of two Old Town lots and the owner was forced to combine all three parcels and build a larger home. He added that the property owner would rather have had 2 ½ lots with two single homes; however, the LMC required them to do something they likely did not want to do. The Minimum Lot Size is two, and the owner had three lots that they could not subdivide or re-plat it into 2 ½ lots.

Mr. Love noted that subdividing into three lots would result in a loss of a considerable amount of footprint versus two independent lots. He reiterated that the current footprint formula works and predicted that the Board will receive a lot of pushback on amending this part of the Code. He stated that the impact of the proposed amendments would be substantial. He referenced the purposes defined in the Staff Report, and specifically highlighted the fourth purpose, which was “to encourage single-family development on combinations of 25’ x 75’ historic lots.” He stated that people have been doing this, but now it was not what the Council, Planning Commission, and the Board wanted in the community.

As someone who has developed property in Park City, Mr. Love expressed frustration and felt that the City was a constantly moving target. He stated it is difficult to know what can and cannot be done. He referenced the Staff Report on his own Plat Amendment for 517 Park Avenue where Planner Cawley discovered that the Historic Structure was 42 square feet above the allowable Building Footprint for the parcel size. He noted that the structure also did not comply with Setbacks, nor could it ever comply with Setbacks, and added that the structure is seven feet higher than the zone height of 27 feet. He stressed that he owns a 130-year-old Historic home that he could not replicate if he had a vacant lot because the home does not comply with the current LMC Guidelines. Under this proposal, another 20% of the footprint would be taken away.

He mentioned several addresses along Park Avenue (139, 305, 325, 339, 351, 421, 424, 445, 455, 517, 543, The Washington Schoolhouse Hotel, and 703). Included in this list of addresses were the Catholic Church House and the Blue Church which were never residences but which are very large structures built in a residential neighborhood. Mr. Love stated that the homes for the other addresses listed are all on oversized lots, with 11 of them being Landmark Historic Structures and two as Significant Historic Structures.

Mr. Love commented that all of the homes listed likely exceeded the height limit. He stressed that there are large, historic homes in Old Town and he did not see an issue with someone building a new home that is larger than a miner’s cottage. He felt that the LMC was restrictive enough and they did not need to go any further. Many of the larger,

non-compatible buildings in town are large condominium buildings that were constructed in the 1980s that could never be built again as a result of changes to the LMC. He next addressed real estate values and noted that the General Plan includes statements regarding maintaining property values within Historic District destinations. He observed that this indicates that the City cared about property values.

Mr. Love referenced additional points in the General Plan that state that Historic District destinations have a number of neighborhood benefits, including that these destinations decrease investor uncertainty and insulate property values from wild swings in the housing market. He stressed that the Staff Report created a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the market. Anyone who owns a vacant lot, a Historic house that has not been redeveloped, or a non-Historic house that sits on multiple lots could never sell until the issues raised in the Staff Report were resolved. Mr. Love posited that if the issues were resolved as proposed by Staff, 20 to 30 percent of the property value would be taken away from the property owners.

Mr. Love stated that he has a real estate license and works in Park City. He noted that 587 and 593 Park Avenue are two vacant lots. He and his partner represented the sellers and those lots sold on November 20 for \$3,450,000. The buyer would like to combine the parcels and build a single-family home. The current allowable footprint in Old Town is 1,519 square feet; however, as proposed, the footprint would be reduced to 1,200 square feet, which is a 20% reduction in what is currently allowed. He noted that this reduction would result in a reduction of 319 square feet of Building Footprint. He opined that in Old Town, new construction is worth between \$5,000 and \$7,000/square foot. One square foot of footprint equated to approximately 2 ½ to 3 feet of living space, depending on the design; therefore, the home would shrink by 957 square [sic] feet if the Building Footprint was reduced by 319 square feet.

Mr. Love added that a home off of Main Street recently closed at \$2,159/square foot. Applying this to a 957-square-foot reduction would result in a loss of \$2.1 million in value to someone who just paid \$3,450,000 for the vacant lot. He noted that the people who just purchased those vacant lots were upset at the prospect of these changes to the LMC, and would not have purchased the lots had they known about the proposed changes. He commented that on a single Old Town Lot, the reduction from an 844 square-foot Building Footprint to 750 square feet would be a 94 square-foot reduction, or 11%. Mr. Love stated that the irony was that Setbacks or Building Heights would not change and on a 75' x 25' Lot, there is only space for a 19-foot-wide home. With the Building Footprint reduction, square footage would be taken off the back of the house.

Mr. Love again questioned what would be fixed as a result of this proposed change. He requested to know what the problem was that they intend to fix with the changes and asked for full transparency for the public as to what was going on because this would be extremely impactful and probably the most impactful change to the LMC that he has seen in 28 years. He urged the Board to leave this issue alone because the current Code works. The proposed changes would create uncertainty.

Rory Murphy agreed with Mr. Love's comments and was not sure why these changes were being proposed. He felt that the Code works and has worked for several decades. He remarked that the proposed changes will cause significant impacts and with the recent real estate surge, people have purchased these lots at a tremendous premium. The reductions in home sizes and footprints would be significant at the smaller end and staggering at the higher end. He opined that the charm of Old Town was in the variation and everything works. To arbitrarily conclude that everything should be smaller did not make sense. He noted that there were not many lots remaining in Old Town and changing the rules now would be fundamentally unfair. Mr. Murphy appreciated the work being done but did not understand why they were going in this direction.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked Mr. Murphy if the second proposal that would require an average based on neighboring properties would appeal to him. Mr. Murphy expressed that the Code was not broken but acknowledged that the second option would make a lot more sense than just implementing a mathematical formula. He understood the concern about neighborhood compatibility and felt that was always something that involved a fair application of the rules in Old Town. To arbitrarily impose a formula to reduce Building Footprint would create a significant impact to those who have bought lots within the last year. He reiterated that it was a matter of fairness. Mr. Murphy felt that compatibility would be a fair way to look at things.

Andrew Cross reported that he purchased 339 Park Avenue in May 2022 with the intention of obtaining a Plat Amendment to allow him to renovate and expand the Historic home on that lot. He was unsure whether he would be impacted by these proposed changes. He agreed with Mr. Love's comments and mentioned that his intent was to build a single-family home for his family; if the objective was to get single-family homes into Old Town he questioned how he could pencil his house out given the cost of construction. He added that if the Code were changed, he would lose a lot of value and questioned whether he would even make the renovations. He reiterated the question of what these changes were intended to solve. He questioned whether they were trying to preserve the historic character of the Town by reducing the home size or if the changes were simply to reduce the value to create more affordable housing.

Mr. Cross corrected his address to 161 Park Avenue, which is the blue house by the Church.

Chris Goff echoed the comments of the previous speakers. He was interested in the driving force behind the proposed changes. From a valuation standpoint, he noted that he has multiple lots in Old Town that would be affected. He also mentioned the architectural and design impacts that would result and commented that an 800-square-foot building footprint would result in an unattractive home with no design character. He added that many of these homes already did not have much in terms of design character and would be further restricted by these changes.

He questioned the basis behind the change in the formula from .9 to .8 as a multiplier. Mr. Goff observed that these changes would not just impact new construction but also remodels. He felt it would ultimately hurt the property owners. He noted that Park City is a mining town and lauded the preservation efforts that create the historic feel of the town; however, Park City was a poor mining town that is now the #1 destination in the United States. He recognized that they want to keep the historic feel but they also have to recognize that the time has passed. He expressed concern with the proposed changes and was not in favor of them. He hoped that this would go through the entire process so that the public and the Board could understand both sides.

Chair Scott noted that the beauty of what they do is the public process. He reminded those present that this is a Work Session and no decisions would be made. The Board consists of residents of Park City who want to ensure that they have a good understanding of this issue. He expressed appreciation to those who made comments because it provides the Board with feedback and information to help them make a good decision.

Board Member Stephens felt that this discussion was going to be about lot combinations and observed that footprint reductions did not seem to have anything to do with lot combinations. He requested clarification from Staff as to the issue before the Board.

Planner Tubbs stated that the proposed amendments began as lot combinations pursuant to the City Council's direction; however, when Staff looked into the LMC and the existing regulations, they discovered that the Maximum Building Footprint formula had a significant impact on the overall size and design of incoming structures. As a result, they included the Building Footprint formula as an option for any LMC Amendments.

Board Member Long observed that anyone who wants to construct an addition to the back of a home in one of the Historic Districts would be held to the new formula. Planner Tubbs confirmed this and stated that the LMC formula exists currently and would apply to any additions. If the City chose to amend the formula, remove it, or otherwise change it then the regulations would change at that point.

Board Member Stephens asked if the intent was to reduce the mass of the buildings in Old Town and mentioned the issue of building massing that the Board addressed a few years ago that resulted in LMC Design Guidelines for Old Town. He felt that the City had been addressing the massing issue, and aside from the valuation issues, Board Member Stephens expressed concern about the unintended consequences of the awkward architecture that these changes could create on a 25-foot lot. He added that the massing issues on lot combinations of a single lot and double lots were already addressed through the Setbacks and Building Heights. He noted that they had seen examples where that was not implemented very well and suggested that perhaps they

needed to look at that again. If they wanted to look at lot combinations of three or more lots, then there might be some issues regarding Building Footprint that they might need to address; however, the regulations have been in place on single and double lots for quite a while and it seemed to work.

Board Member Stephens was nervous about how the proposed changes will impact the 25-foot lots, the single lots, and two combined lots. He felt it might be more of a Design Guideline issue as opposed to building footprint issue.

Chair Scott stated that the new Design Guidelines have only been in effect for two years. He was open to having conversations about this issue but felt that the examples of scaling in the packet were dated. He would like to see examples of what they were trying to solve with these proposed changes, as he did not see any examples of where the current Design Guidelines gave them something that impacted character, size, and scale.

Board Member Holmgren commented that her home is on a Lot Line. She felt that the issues regarding mass had already been addressed and they need to reach more of a compromise.

Board Member Beatlebrox mentioned Mr. Murphy's point about compatibility in the neighborhood. She stated that they do not want to see a huge, modern structure that would be incompatible with a neighborhood. She liked the idea of looking at each neighborhood and evaluating what makes sense. She also urged them to look at the issue of 1½ lots out of three and felt that would be a great compromise.

Board Member Hutchings did not see that there was a problem with the Building Footprints and felt it was more about the design and whether it fits in with the neighborhood. He mentioned the home built on the southeast corner at 10th and Woodside, which was a nice house that did not fit in with the neighborhood. He was also sympathetic to Mr. Cross' comments that the current regulations provided enough challenges without further limiting them. He felt that if the City wanted to encourage families to come to Old Town, they should make the miner's cabins livable. He did not agree with a reduction but agreed with trying to maintain compatibility within neighborhoods.

Board Member Stephens suggested that they look at this issue more closely in the HR-L and HR-M Districts. He felt that they could get a much better architectural product on 1½ lots than they could get in three single lots. From an applicant's standpoint, he was nervous about making an applicant do a survey of the other properties on the street. He felt that in Old Town they should be able to come up with something in the table that would be clearer to allow an applicant to know what to expect. He felt that a survey could be a costly endeavor and recognized the uncertainty of property owners wishing to purchase property and build in Old Town.

In response to an inquiry regarding the scope of the proposed survey, Board Member Stephens noted that currently an applicant is required to submit a streetscape and show that the proposed architecture complies with the existing streetscape. He understood that the Staff Report states that applicants would be required to survey the actual footprints of surrounding properties and take the average from those to arrive at a compatible footprint. He felt they could probably come up with something to allow three lots to be combined into two lots and have the Setbacks consistent with other homes in Old Town.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the basis for the City Council's direction to look at these issues. Director Milliken responded that there had been some concern expressed by the public to the City Council that the homes appear to be getting larger and owners are maximizing square footage in Old Town. There was a feeling that this was getting out of control and these large homes are coming into the neighborhoods.

Director Milliken added that currently there was no limitation on how many lots could be combined, so the Council asked Staff to look at this issue.

Mr. Harrington added that narrower questions had also been expressed by the Planning Commission in response to a couple of partial lot combinations that had come through. The question arose as to why the City would allow any lot combination that allowed anything larger or any addition to be built. He felt that part of this exercise involved re-education on the Historic regulations and existing Purpose Statements on Building Footprints. He commented that he heard solid input tonight on where there was room for improvement but did not hear support for restricting Historic homes to their original Building Footprint.

Mr. Harrington explained that they would have to spend more time with the Planning Commission and City Council to explain why they allow additions to historic structures; however, Staff wanted to begin these discussions with the HPB on some of the threads from the General Plan and long-term planning.

Board Member Stephens noted that the complaints referenced by Director Milliken were valid and mentioned the new style of construction and flat roofs that make homes appear larger. They tried addressing this previously by requiring the height restriction to be measured by the top plate. He suggested they might want to look at how they measure Building Height to address the massing issue. Director Milliken appreciated this feedback and added that the comment that some of these issues could likely be addressed through the Design Guidelines was another way to address the massing issues.

It was noted by Chair Scott that the homes that appear larger do not have a traditional roof and the development was done to maximize the square footage because there is value in every square foot that can be constructed. He agreed with the comments that each neighborhood had its own look and feel and it made sense to make sure

development in each neighborhood would be compatible with the immediate neighborhood.

Chair Scott closed the Work Session.

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Beatiebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board