

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
VISIONING SESSION  
MARCH 16, 2010

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Roger Durst – Chair; Ken Martz – Vice-Chair;  
Brian Guyer, Sara Werbelow, David White, Adam Opalek

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Brooks Robinson, Katie Cattan, Kirsten Whetstone,  
Francisco Astorga, Liza Simpson

---

Planning Director Eddington welcomed the Board members to the visioning meeting, and recognized that the HPB has new members since the last visioning was held a year ago.

Director Eddington stated that he had spoken with Chair Durst and other Board members who provided suggestions for discussion topics. An agenda was created based on those conversations; but the meeting was open to a free discussion format.

Chair Durst suggested that they begin with the first agenda item and asked each Board member what they see as the future of the Board. Chair Durst felt the Board needed to be much more pro-active in order to fulfill the purpose of the HPB as identified in the Land Management Code. He was concerned about their limitations with regards to the design review process. Chair Durst noted that the HPB spent a considerable amount of time re-writing the design guidelines and it was a step in the right direction. However, he now has a problem with how the guidelines are being reviewed and evaluated. Chair Durst believed this was an area where the Board needed to be more pro-active.

Board Member White asked Chair Durst to clarify how they should be pro-active in the design review process and if he was suggesting that they should be involved in the design review on every project in Old Town. Chair Durst replied that it was what he was suggesting. Board Member White pointed out that this was done in the past, but it slowed down the process. He personally would not like to see the HPB involved in a way that could potentially back log the system.

Chair Durst felt HPB participation in the design review would be a starting point for getting the HPB concerned with the design impacts from either new construction or a renovation or restoration. Chair Durst was not bothered by the constraints of prescriptive remedies in the Land Management Code and the judgments made by the Staff. However, he thought it was important to have a historian and a member of the Building Department on the design review committee. He was gratified that Kayla Sintz was on the committee as an architect. Chair Durst stated that if he is called upon as a board member to review the determinations made by the design review committee, he did not think it was enough to give the City what it deserves.

Board Member White clarified that he was not against Chair Durst's intent, but it needs to be done in an efficient way. Chair Durst stated that he deals with this where he lives in Salt Lake City. It is a travesty to see what is happening to a very viable community in the historic districts.

Chair Durst remarked that the purpose of the HPB is to preserve the City's unique character, to encourage compatible design and construction, to identify and resolve conflicts between preservation and culture resources, and to provide input with regards to the heritage. Chair Durst did not believe the HPB was being given the opportunity to carry out what they were charged to do. He pointed out that the LMC states that they should participate in design review for City-owned projects. He could not understand why they were not able to participate in design review for any project in the Historic District. Chair Durst personally thought design review should be a City-wide process. He was not interested in slowing down the process and pointed out that there is always room for appeal. Chair Durst felt the HPB should have a say in matters related to the design of the City.

Board Member Martz stated that he and David White sat on the Historic District Commission and were involved in much of the design review. When he came to the Historic Preservation Board they worked on the guidelines for three or four years with guidance from the Planning Staff. In addition, they went through the entire inventory of historic structures and spent hundreds of hours on preservation and a set of design guidelines. Board Member Martz stated that during that period, there were times when he was concerned about oversight. However, over time the process was refined. He believed the HPB should wait to see how it all works together with the new guidelines and the Historic Site Inventory before they consider making major changes. He preferred to leave the design review process to the Staff and other experts. If the process does not appear to work, then the HPB could discuss changes.

Board Member Martz thought the HPB should be kept informed and updated on what was going on in the Historic District, but he could not see a need to be directly involved in the design review at this time.

City Council Member, Liza Simpson, explained that the HPB is not involved in design review because previous Board members chose to hold on to the appeal responsibility. She clarified that the Board cannot be both the review body and the appeal body. Council Member Simpson noted that the HPB has the ability to make a request to the City Council to change their responsibilities if there is agreement, but she was not prepared to say whether or not the City Council would grant that request.

Chair Durst asked if anyone had a vision for the Board separate from the design review issue.

Board Member Werbelow was happy that the HPB was having this visioning session and suggested that visioning occur more often than once a year to refine the goals. Board Member Werbelow expressed other interests outside of design review where she would like to be involved. She thought it would be beneficial for the HPB to have more liaisons with other boards and commissions. She asked if it was possible to have one HPB member be actively involved with design review rather than the HPB as a whole.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff is still tweaking the design review process based on the new guidelines. He would keep the HPB updated on how the process unfolds over the next few months.

Planner Cattan explained that when the Staff first started with the process, they were asking the applicant for a lot of details. Many were upset because they were incurring a large expense before knowing whether their project could move forward. In addition, the Staff was frustrated because they were perceived as the “bad guys”. Planner Cattan stated that the Staff cut back on what was required for a pre-application review and waits to request the additional information in the final application process. She explained that once an applicant has gone through the pre-application process and received direction, the requirements are much stricter and more documentation is required before a project can be reviewed. Planner Cattan stated that the biggest hurdle under the new guidelines is enforcing the new application requirements.

Board Member Werbelow asked if anyone outside of the Staff looks at the design review application. Director Eddington replied that Roger Evans and others participate in the review. Chair Durst asked if the Building Department conducts their review separately or with the Staff. Planner Cattan replied that the review is done collectively.

Planner Whetstone explained the application process for design review in the Historic District.

Board Member White stated that as an architect in Park City, he finds the pre-application process to be helpful and useful and it saves the designer a lot of time. With the pre-application, he is more comfortable having a project go to the DRT.

Board Member Werbelow noted that there is no aesthetic review under the review process, with the exception of Dina Blaes. Chair Durst was not comfortable with having Dina Blaes make those judgments. He has the highest regard for what she does with historic preservation, but her work does not relate to this issue. Chair Durst thought Dina Blaes should sit on the design review team and provide historic perspective, but the National Standard Guidelines do not apply to these matters. He believed Park City should be making history and not just holding on to it. It is evident that things change and how it changes is what they need to look at.

Chair Durst felt the Staff does a good job evaluating the design guidelines in terms of scope and scale, but it takes design out of context. They need a broader view. He could design a structure that meets all the guidelines, but it could be a disaster that is not compatible with the town.

Board Member Brian Guyer stated that he agreed more with Board Member Martz. He is not a designer and if the HPB became a design review board, he would not have the capacity or expertise to participate. He preferred to wait and see how the guidelines work under the current review process.

Board Member Werbelow stated that she was interested in education, communication, tourist, visitor, locals, and incentive programs. She is a history major who has lived in Europe and she would like to contribute some of that knowledge. Board Member Werbelow was interested in forming a relationship with the Historic Society so they could share ideas and become a unified force.

City Council Simpson commented on a discussion with City Council over a year ago about expanding the role of the HPB. At that time the City Council told the HPB to look at their purview under the LMC and move with it. She felt it was important to understand

that the Historic Society and the HPB have different roles, and they need to be careful about stepping over the boundaries of the Historical Society. City Council Simpson agreed that there could be more collaboration between the HPB and the Historical Society. She suggested that public outreach was another example where the HPB could be more involved. They could also get involved with grants and funding programs.

Board Member Opalek expressed an interest in getting more involved with the funding process. The Board and the Staff discussed funding options. Director Eddington noted that there was still a fair amount of money in the Lower Park Avenue RDA that has not been allocated. He noted that a lot of the Main Street money has been allocated for the Garage bonds.

Board Member Martz stated that when he was on the old Historic District Commission in the 1990's, they awarded 30 and 40 grants every year for small projects. It created a mini-renaissance and provided incentives for people to keep up their houses. Since he has been on the HPB, they only see grant requests every three or four months and most of the requests are for large amounts. Board Member Martz pointed out that in the 1990's more people lived in their homes full-time and they were more involved. Today, many of the homes are second homes and there is not the same activism.

Board Member Werbelow asked if anyone knew the ratio of primary residences in the historic district. Director Eddington replied that it was one of the numbers they were researching for the General Plan. It used to be 60/40 but now it is closer to 40/60.

Board Member Werbelow stated that even with a higher percentage of second homes, the homeowner still has an interest in upgrading and taking care of their investment, because the time has passed for other opportunities with those properties.

Chair Durst stated that given the current economic climate, this was a good opportunity to catch their breath. In the past a lot was going on and it was intense. He thought the HPB should initiate a recognition program for not only significant restorations, but also for smaller items such as front porches or doors. It is important to recognize that small projects make a contribution to the historic legacy. He felt it should also carry over to contemporary designs that that are complimentary and respect the type of scale, massing, form and nuance of design. Chair Durst suggested that the HPB devise an annual recognition program for the people who make contributions and respect Park City's historic legacy. Board Member Werbelow agreed.

Planner Whetstone agreed with Chair Durst about the contributions of contemporary design and pointed out that half of the design guidelines are dedicated to new construction. It is not just about new construction but also additions that preserve and compliment the historic form.

The suggestion was made to use the City owned property on Park Avenue as a visual model for what the City expects.

Chair Durst stated that he has had conversations with the Assistant City Attorney regarding the role of the HPB and the appeal function. He noted that Assistant City Attorney McLean made a legal argument that the HPB could not serve on the design review team because of the apparent conflict with the appeal process. He did not understand her argument. As a first step, he believed an HPB member should be invited

to sit on the design review committee. Chair Durst felt strongly that the Board should have a member present and that the HPB should be involved in the process. They do not have to speak but they should be allowed to participate.

Planner Francisco Astorga stated that any member of the HPB was welcome to sit in on the design review; but if for any reason an application is appealed and a Board member was present, that member would have to recuse himself from hearing the appeal.

Board Member Werbelow asked if they could try to have an HPB member attend the weekly DRT meeting to see how it works. Director Eddington replied that it would not be an issue. However, he believed one section in the LMC would need to be amended to add the HPB as a participating member.

Chair Durst stated that he would entertain a motion from the Board to request that a representative from the Historic Preservation Board be included at a DRT meeting. Board Member White pointed out that the motion would have to be made during the regular meeting the next evening.

The suggestion was made for HPB members to informally participate with the DRT for a trial period before making a formal request to amend the LMC. The Board discussed the process and Chair Durst questioned why the applicant or the project architect were present during the design review. Planner Cattan noted that applicant participation was written into the design guidelines. Chair Durst felt that the architect or designer would have a design bias.

Planner Whetstone clarified that in the pre-application review the Staff provides information on the guidelines that apply and make suggestions, but they are not critiquing a design. Board Member White noted that the applicant is not present during the design review meeting. Director Eddington clarified that the pre-application meeting and the DRT review is the same meeting. The purpose is to help an applicant understand the process and what is required before they spend a lot of money. A project is not fully designed at that point.

Director Eddington was unsure if the LMC prohibits an HPB member from attending a design review meeting. The language states that the applicant or the applicant's representative shall be required to attend a pre-application process with representatives of the Planning and Building Departments for the purpose of determining the general scope of the proposed development and to identify impacts, etc. Director Eddington stated that if an HPB member was present for a design review, it would need to be documented and that person would need to be recused in the event of an appeal. He offered to explore the possibility of having a participant from the HPB on a trial basis.

Chair Durst stated that he thinks of visioning as projecting five or tens into the future and what can be done to sustain the historic as the City changes with development.

Chair Durst asked how the HPB could interface with the impacts of a current project in the Historic District and whether it was part of their obligation and duty and purpose. He was told that it was within their purview only if a project is appealed. Director Eddington pointed out that occasionally the Planning Commission forwards projects to the HPB for review and input.

The Board discussed ways to involve the HPB in the re-write of the General Plan. Board Member Werbelow wanted to be involved from the standpoint of interfacing with the community and understanding what they want.

Director Eddington estimated that the General Plan re-write would take approximately two years. They intend to look to the HPB for input, particularly on the historic preservation element. Director Eddington stated that they would also look to the HPB for input on land use, economic development, and historic preservation as a form of economic development. They would also be asked to provide input on environmental issues. Director Eddington offered to send the Board members the agenda for the Planning Commission General Plan meeting, which is the fourth Wednesday of every month. He invited the Board to attend those meetings and provide input. He noted that some of the Board members have signed up for subcommittees and they will be contacted to participate in a subcommittee meeting to help prepare specific elements of the General Plan.

City Council Member Simpson stated that there would be public hearings on the General Plan, but the vital involvement by the public already occurred during the community visioning. That visioning drives the General Plan and the Land Management Code. Board Member Werbelow clarified that her particular interest was a more hands on interface with the community.

Director Eddington reported that the Staff would be presenting general grant information to the HPB at their next meeting. He noted that there is still money available in the Main Street RDA and the Lower Park Avenue RDA and he requested that the Board discuss how they would like to utilize that money in the future as the funds dwindle.

Board Member Martz wanted to look at varying the criteria and the percentage for grants to encourage property owners who do not have a lot of money to restore their home or save a structure. He suggested that the City allow more flexibility in allocating grants on a need based situation. Director Eddington stated that the Staff would be prepared at the next meeting to address some of their concerns regarding grants.

**City Council Member Simpson left the meeting.**

Chair Durst commented on the agenda for their meeting the next evening and the structures that the HPB were being asked to determine as historically significant. He believes they are losing a number of historic treasures by benign neglect. He asked if it was possible to use RDA grant money and establish a non-profit corporation to restore these properties so they could be sold. He was not interested in the City making a profit, but he was anxious to salvage some of the properties that are being lost.

Board Member Martz commented on a project that was done by the Historical Society. He believed there were things that could be done to preserve certain structures or at least keep them from deteriorating.

Director Eddington asked if the HPB was comfortable with the information they were receiving in their Staff report. Board Member Martz remarked that floor plans and other exhibits included in the Staff report were difficult to read or understand on an 8-1/2 x 11 sheet of paper. He suggested that the Staff not include those exhibits and wait to present them with an explanation during the meeting. Planner Whetstone asked if the

Board would like the exhibits on 11x17 sheets. Board Member White thought that 11x17 was a much better size. Board Member Martz still preferred to wait until the meeting to see the exhibits as a way to reduce the size of the Staff report and the amount of paper.

In terms of overall information, Board Member Martz wanted to receive more information in terms of what is happening in Old Town. It does not have to be written but he would like a verbal report at each meeting. He felt it was important for the Board members to be informed and aware when they are approached by the public on certain items. Director Eddington suggested that the HPB check the website for the Planning Commission or City Council agendas. If they find something that interests them, they could ask the Staff for an update or explanation on that specific item.

Director Eddington recalled a previous concern from Board Member McFawn about the timing of the Staff report and whether it could be available earlier. Board Member Opalek thought it would be helpful if the Staff report could be available Friday afternoon rather than Monday or Tuesday. Director Eddington stated that currently the Staff reports are delivered on Friday. Planner Whetstone noted that the Staff report is also posted on the website on Friday. Therefore, if a Board Member is out of town or does not receive their Staff report, they could access it on the website. Director Eddington stated that they would try to have the Staff report printed by noon on Friday and the Board members could pick it up from the Planning Department if they do not want to wait until it is delivered.

Chair Durst asked when the Planning Commission would hold the next General Plan meeting. Director Eddington replied that a General Plan meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, March 24th, at 5:30 p.m. The Bonanza/Park District is the topic for that discussion.

Chair Durst requested that Board Members volunteer for various topics discussed this evening, such as working with the Historical Society, to reach out and create an awards or incentive program, to find ways to seek more publicity, and other ways to become more pro-active within the community. Director Eddington suggested that the Staff could outline a list of items for the Board to discuss during a work session and members could volunteer for a subcommittee to work with a planner. Planner Whetstone remarked that the Staff could compile a list of projects that were approved in the Historic District in the past year. The HPB could discuss the projects and nominate the ones they think are appropriate for an award.

Board Member Martz thought the Board should have a field trip to the Museum for a tour and overview of how the Museum works. Planner Whetstone offered to schedule a meeting at the Museum in May or June.

Director Eddington thanked the Board members for their input this evening and encouraged them to email the Staff with other thoughts or ideas that could be scheduled for discussion at a work session.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Roger Durst, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board