

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF AUGUST 4, 2010

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Roger Durst – Chair; Ken Martz – Vice-Chair; Brian Guyer, Dave McFawn, Sara Werbelow

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

ROLL CALL

Chair Durst called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for David White and Adam Opalek, who were excused. Brian Guyer arrived later in the meeting.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – JULY 7, 2010

MOTION: Board Member Martz moved to APPROVE the minutes of July 7, 2010. Board Member McFawn seconded the motion.

Chair Durst referred to page 14, second to the last paragraph, and corrected “dorming unit” to read “dwelling unit”.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Board Member Guyer was not present.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, reminded the Board that the Chairperson sits as chair for one year and can serve as chair for two consecutive terms. Ms. McLean stated that typically a new chair is elected this time of year; however, she could not recall when Chair Durst became Chair of the HPB. She suggested that the Board members begin thinking about an election.

Board Member Martz did not believe it had been a year since Roger Durst was elected chairperson. Board Member Fawn recalled that it was after he was appointed in September or October. Director Eddington would research the records to find the exact date.

REGULAR MEETING – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

811 Norfolk Avenue – Ratification of Findings
(Application PL-10-01021)

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board ratify the findings for denial to remove the accessory building located at 811 Norfolk Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory, according to the findings of fact and conclusions of law. Director Eddington clarified that this action would ratify the decision the HPB made at the last meeting that the accessory structure at 811 Norfolk Avenue should remain on the HSI inventory.

Director Eddington suggested that the HPB conduct a public hearing to address concerns regarding the address of the accessory building.

Brian Guyer joined the meeting.

Chair Durst opened the public hearing.

Jeff Love, a resident at 615 Woodside, remarked that he is the current owner of the house at 811 Norfolk, however Rod Ludlow owns the garage. Mr. Love pointed out that the properties are independent at this time, and he requested that the Staff report reflect the correct ownership and the correct location. He noted that the garage had not yet been assigned a street address by the City Engineer, but he expected that would be done within the next day or two.

Chair Durst understood that the current owner of the garage was applying for that change of address. Mr. Love replied that this was correct.

Mr. Love stated that if the Staff report needed to reflect the street address, he would request that this item be continued to the next meeting when the address is assigned. Another alternative to the street address would be to reflect the Tax ID for that parcel, which SA-139-A, or using the plat which the property sits on. Mr. Love stated that currently there is no relationship between the garage and the house. The house is a landmark house and at the last meeting the HPB decided to keep the garage as a landmark structure. However, in his opinion, because the garage is owned by a separate person, it should have its own historic sites inventory listing. He noted that research outlined in a letter from Ms. Matsumoto-Gray from the July 7th meeting, indicates that the properties are independently owned by two separate owners and that the garage is no longer associated with the historic designation of the home at 811 Norfolk. Ms. Matsumoto-Gray had also indicated that the garage at 817 Norfolk, which is the address being applied for, stands alone as an example of Mining Decline construction.

Mr. Love believed that Finding #2, "811 Norfolk Avenue is listed as a Landmark Site containing a main building and an accessory structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory", was incorrect. He referred to Finding #13, "The accessory building at 811 Norfolk Avenue is historic and shall remain on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark site", and stated that it was also

incorrect because the garage is not located at 811 Norfolk Avenue. Mr. Love reiterated his request to continue this item until a street address has been assigned, or the findings could be amended to identify the property by the Tax ID or lot plat.

Rod Ludlow, owner of the garage structure, clarified that the garage would need to be added to the HSI with its own designation listed separately under the new address, rather than just remain on the HSI as reported by Director Eddington. Mr. Ludlow concurred with the suggestion to continue the ratification until a new address is assigned.

Board Member McFawn noted that the garage is listed as a structure associated with 811 Norfolk Avenue, dating back to the 1958 tax record provided in the documents provided at the July 7th meeting. He asked at what point between 1958 to present day the garage shifted to a different lot and address. Director Eddington stated that the Staff had never considered the garage as having a different address; however, that would be the case now that both properties are under different ownership.

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that the lot lines have always existed and the property was under the same ownership until it was purchased by Mr. Love and the lots were subdivided in June 2010. Mr. Love noted that the garage always had its own separate record. Ms. McLean stated that from a legal perspective it would be appropriate to add a finding stating the tax ID number for the lot. She noted that Finding of Fact #3 states that the accessory structure is associated with the main home at 811 Norfolk, although it sits on a separate lot.

Mr. Love stated that technically he had not subdivided the property because Park City was platted in very small parcels and these are legal lots of record. He noted that the lot line for both Lots 4 and 5 run under the garage, which consisted of two different tax IDs. The left hand side of the garage is Tax ID #A-138 and the right hand side is ID# SA-139-A. Mr. Love remarked that Lot 4 has been reassigned to SA-139-A, which is the parcel owned by Mr. Ludlow.

Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, a resident at 823 Norfolk, felt this was an interesting question. She was unsure if the definition of “associated structure” was addressed in the Historic District Guidelines, but this structure is historically associated with this site and has always been identified as one site. Now that the issues have changed due to change in ownership, she thought the meaning of “associated structure” was unclear. She asked if the “association of structures” was based on ownership, lot lines or the history of the people associated with the 811 site. Ms. Matsumoto-Gray felt this matter should be clarified.

Chair Durst closed the public hearing.

Board Member Werbelow inquired as to what the Board was being asked to do this evening. Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that at the last meeting the HPB determined that the garage structure was historically significant and should remain on the HSI list. That decision did not follow the Staff recommendation or the findings of fact and conclusions of law that were included in the July 7th Staff report. Therefore, new findings were drafted to substantiate the Board's decision. The Board was being asked to ratify that the findings of fact and conclusions of law reflect their discussion and decision from the last meeting.

Board Member Werbelow asked if any other "accessory structures" on the HSI were not related to a main structure. Board Member Martz recalled that Ms. Matsumoto-Gray had provided pictures of other structures in her presentation at the last meeting. He assumed those were on larger lots that could be subdivided. He recalled a few on Sandridge where the structure could be located on a separate lot from the main home. Board Member Werbelow thought it was a good question to be addressed, due to the implication of impacts to a particular structure over time if it is not associated with the main structure.

Chair Durst asked if the Historic Sites Inventory makes the association of structures regardless of the actual property. Director Eddington replied that the garage is listed currently on the HSI as an accessory structure to 811.

Board Member McFawn suggested that the Findings indicate that SA-138-A is still on the registry as a landmark structure and it is still associated with 811 Norfolk Avenue. He pointed out that the structure has been on a separate lot the entire time without any problems.

Chair Durst re-opened the public hearing to take additional comment.

Mr. Love strongly believed that the accessory structure needed its own separate inventory. He hoped Mr. Ludlow would be able to build a home on that parcel and if that occurs, the garage would be associated to the house behind it. At that point, there would be no relationship with the house next door. Mr. Love emphasized that the garage needed its own separate inventory. With respect to subdividing the parcels, Mr. Love stated that in 2001 he and his partner did something similar on Woodside. They tore down a non-historic structure that sat on two lots and built two houses on separate lots. He offered to provide additional examples of where this had occurred. Mr. Love remarked that if the Board wanted to keep an association between the garage and the house, they should make all the residents in Old Town replat their parcels to represent what exists. He stated that Park City was platted a 100 plus years ago in smaller parcels. The parcels are lots of record but they are not tied together.

Board Member Werbelow reiterated Board Member Fawn's suggestion that the findings of fact or conclusions of law indicate that the house stands alone and

has its own HSI listing. She clarified that the garage structure was analyzed on its own criteria, not specifically related to the home.

Ms. Matsumoto-Gray agreed that the garage stands on its own as a historic structure. However, the historic site currently includes undeveloped area, negative space, spacing between the homes, etc. If the site is separated, she questioned whether it would reflect the historic spacing of the neighborhood.

Chair Durst closed the public hearing.

Board Member Martz remarked that the decision the Board had made on the garage at the last meeting should stand. He thought it was appropriate to reflect the tax ID Code in the current situation. Board Member Martz stated that there would always be individual cases that could be addressed on a case by case basis. He did not believe the City would have to replat every lot.

MOTION: Board Member Martz made a motion to ratify the findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law to deny the removal of the accessory building located at 811 Norfolk Avenue from the Historic Sites Inventory, with the revision to Finding of Fact #3, to identify that a separate Tax ID# SA-139-A is associated with that structure. Board Member Werbelow seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 811 Norfolk Avenue

1. 811 Norfolk Avenue is within the HR-1 zoning district.
2. 811 Norfolk Avenue is listed as a Landmark Site containing a main building and an accessory structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The accessory structure is associated with the main home at 811 Norfolk, although it sits on a separate lot with a separate Tax ID #SA-139-A.
4. The 1929 Sanborn maps indicated that the accessory building did not exist in 1929. However, new information suggested that the accessory building was in existence by 1943.
5. The accessory building is at least fifty years old.
6. The accessory building retains its historic integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the National Parks Service for the National Register of Historic Places.
7. The accessory building is significant in local, regional or national history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with an era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history

8. According to the Summit County 1958 tax records, the accessory structure at 811 Norfolk Avenue was constructed in 1943 tax records, the accessory structure at 811 Norfolk Avenue was constructed in 1943 during the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
9. The main home at 811 Norfolk Avenue was built during the Nature Mining Era (1894-1930) of which the site is associated.
10. Accessory structures located in the front yard are typical during the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era.
11. Based upon tax cards, tax photos and the Sanborn maps, the accessory structure had been built at least with some indication of being built by 1943.
12. The main building at 811 Norfolk Avenue is historic and shall remain on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site.
13. The accessory building at 811 Norfolk Avenue is historic and shall remain on the Park City Historic Site Inventory as a Landmark site.
14. There are three historic eras included in the Historic Sites Inventory including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era, (1894-1930) and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry (1931-1962).
15. Sites listed on the Historic Sites Inventory may include historically significant structures that were built during one or more historic areas.
16. The discussion in the Analysis section above is incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 811 Norfolk Avenue

1. Additional Information (1929 Sanborn Maps) indicate that the accessory building at 811 Norfolk Avenue does comply with the criteria set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(1) and therefore the accessory structure may not be removed from the park City Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The accessory building complies with the criterion (c) set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(1) as it is significant in local, regional or national history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with an era of historic importance to the community.

416 Park Avenue - Historic District Grant (Application #PL-10-01012)

Planner Kirsten Whetstone reviewed the request for a grant at 416 Park Avenue for a one-story, pyramid house listed as a landmark structure on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. She noted that in 1989 the applicant received a grant to rebuild the front porch. The work was done and the grant was paid.

Planner Whetstone reported that the applicant was requesting a grant amount of \$1750 to restore and replace damaged and sagging soffits, to add soffit vents around the perimeter as described in the application, and to add attic vents to decrease ice buildup and prevent damage to the roof. Planner Whetstone noted that the Board is allowed to grant up to 50% of the total cost. In this case \$1750 is the total estimated cost of the proposed work.

Planner Whetstone provided an update on the RDA funds. This grant request would come from the Main Street RDA. Some funds are allocated and may be ready to expire, but at the present time the total remaining budgeted funds in the Main Street RDA was \$8861. In addition, there was also \$60,000 in the CMP fund and \$208,000 in the Lower Park RDA.

Planner Whetstone remarked that the HPB is allowed to contribute up to half of the total cost of a project, which was \$1750 for this application.

Because this is a landmark structure, the Staff recommended that the building permit be conditioned to require notes on the plans that describe how the historic materials such as soffits, vents, siding, trim, etc, would be protected during the repair and construction work. The Staff also recommended that the building permit be conditioned to require that any replacement elements and materials be re-milled to match the historic elements. Planner Whetstone noted that all repair work must comply with the Park City Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission consider awarding the applicant a grant of up to \$1750.

Board Member Werbelow stated that she had not received Exhibit B, the breakdown of repair costs. Patricia Abdullah pointed out that the breakdown and bid were included on page 104 and 105. Planner Whetstone replied that the actual bid was put on to the application. The soffit vents are \$900; the plywood replacement is \$2100 and the roof vents are \$5 each for a total of \$500.

Chair Durst asked if Mr. Case is a licensed V1 contractor. He noted that the bid identifies asphalt paving and roofing, but a significant amount of carpentry work is involved with this proposal. Board Member McFawn agreed and asked if this contractor was able to do the type of work within the recommended parameters. He was concerned that the costs may be higher once the project is started.

Planner Whetstone explained that the applicant would have to request additional funds through the HPB. She noted that the Building Department requires that a contractor meet specific requirements when applying for a building permit.

Director Eddington understood that the concern was whether the contractor is capable of doing this type of historic preservation. He noted that the work is

considered maintenance and would not require a formal Historic District Design review; however it must meet the design guidelines. The applicant would work with Planner Whetstone on a pre-application and she would recommend what needs to be done to meet the guidelines. Director Eddington stated that if for some reason the actual cost was higher than the bid, anything additional over \$500 would come back to the HPB.

Board Member McFawn clarified that he generally favored this grant request; however, he wanted to know if the Building Department believes the soffit work would help with the ice problem, as stated on the bid. Planner Whetstone noted that a pre-application meeting was held on June 30th, at which time the Building Department was represented and indicated that this work should help with the ice problem. The Building Department verified that the work was only maintenance and repair, but that a building permit was required. She explained that the Planning Department would sign off on the building permit to make sure the recommended conditions are included on the permit.

Board Member Martz stated that he had taken a close look at the structure and it was evident that the soffits are warped and damaged from ice.

Board Member McFawn recalled that the HPB had previously dealt with a situation where an application was submitted for matching funds after the work was completed. He asked if the Board had made a determination on whether or not to accept an application once the work is done. Board Member Martz clarified that the work for this application had not been started. Board Member McFawn wanted to know what would happen if the grant is approved and the work is started, but then they come requesting additional funds. Board Member Werbelow recalled that the Board made the decision to address those situations on a case by case basis. However, as a general rule, once a project has been completed, it is not under review.

Director Eddington explained that if the work is started prior to requesting additional funds, the applicant would be at risk.

Board Member Werbelow asked if cornice repair was synonymous with roof repair. Board Member Martz replied that the request was for soffit repair. Board Member Werbelow noted that the guidelines specifically mention cornice repair, but it says nothing about soffits. Chair Durst believed it was part of the roofing component.

Planner Whetstone pointed out that ineligible improvements are listed, but not limited to those items. The eligible items include cornice and trim, and she agreed that soffits were part of those roofing components.

MOTION: Board Member Martz made a motion to APPROVE the grant request for 416 Park Avenue in the amount of \$1750 for soffit repair, roof repair and weatherization; with the recommended conditions as stated by Planner Whetstone and for those conditions to be followed specifically as listed in the recommendation. Brian Guyer seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

Legal Training/Overview

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, explained that State Law requires annual training for the Open and Public Meetings Act. She also intends to do additional trainings with the HPB to address specific issues and answer questions.

Ms. McLean stated that the purpose of the Open and Public Meeting Act in Utah is to make sure that all decisions made by public bodies are done in public. This means that a Board or Commission acts openly, makes decisions openly, and deliberates openly. Ms. McLean stressed the importance of the process in terms of building public confidence.

Ms. McLean remarked that the State of Utah defines a meeting as having a quorum present, which is four members for the HPB, and the Chair can vote. Once a quorum is established, decisions are made by a simple majority. Ms. Mclean clarified that a public body cannot conduct any business without a quorum, including work sessions or site visits. A meeting is convening and not a chance meeting at a function. Ms. McLean stated that if the Board members are gathered at the same place for a function, they should be careful not to talk about pending HPB matters.

Ms. McLean stated that emails must be read into the record. In the past Board and Commission members have been advised to limit email distribution to scheduling matters to avoid the situation of a meeting through email. She noted that Adam Opalek had sent an email to the HPB regarding 811 Norfolk. That email should have been read into the record when the item was discussed so the public and the Board would have had the benefit of his comments. Ms. McLean recognized that not submitting the email was an inadvertent error on her part.

Ms. McLean remarked that emails from anyone from the public are similar to ex parte communication. If a Board member is approached in a supermarket by someone who wants to engage in a conversation about a particular project, the Board member should disclose that encounter to the entire Board so everyone has the benefit of that same information in making their decision. Chair Durst asked if that is the case, regardless of the source. Ms. McLean replied that this

was correct. The HPB needs to make their decision based on substantial evidence, and the evidence that exists is whatever is on the record. If the Legal Department is tasked with having to defend one of their decisions, the court would look to the materials and information presented at the meeting. As long as the decisions are not arbitrary and capricious, there should be no problem. Ms. McLean emphasized that for this reason, it is important that all their decisions are made during an HPB meeting in Chambers.

Ms. Werbelow understood that the arbitrary and capricious nature of the decision is why the conclusions of law are key in the process. Ms. McLean offered an example. If the HPB is asked to make a determination of significance for a historic structure and all that was on the record was their opinion that it looked historic, that would not be enough to substantiate their decision. That is the reason why the Staff lists specific criteria and findings for the HPB to use in their review and decision making. Ms. McLean remarked that evidence includes the Staff report, Staff report, photos, public input, input from outside sources such as the Historical Society, and a Board member's personal experience based on what they see and how it relates to the criteria.

Board Member Martz requested a more canned agenda for their meetings in a format similar to what was done for 811 Norfolk. He felt it was important to thank the public for their attendance and comments so the matter ends on a positive note, regardless of the decision. Board Member Martz thought it would be helpful to have more feedback on motions to make sure the motion addresses the correct issues. He felt this was particularly important for a quasi-judicial agenda item. He reiterated that a canned agenda with a set format would keep the process flowing more efficiently.

Chair Durst stated that his response to a public contact outside of an HPB meeting is to acknowledge that person's concern and suggest that they attend the public meeting and make their comments to the entire Board. He asked if Ms. McLean was suggesting that the Board members would be remiss in not disclosing the comments from that encounter as a contact. Using the example she had used earlier, Ms. McLean stated that the Board member should disclose those circumstances so everyone has the same information. When the Board is discussing a decision, any Board member who had a conversation on the matter outside of the meeting should disclose the name of the person who provided the information and their comment. However, she recommended that the best way to handle the situation when approached is tell the person that you are interested in what they have to say, but it would be best for them to attend a meeting and make their comments so everyone can benefit from their observations.

Board Member Martz pointed out that before he knew that 811 Norfolk was going to be on the July agenda, he was at a function with Katherine Matsumoto-Gray when she started talking about the accessory building. Once he realized that it was on the agenda, he disclosed his conversation with Ms. Matsumoto-Gray at

the July meeting. Ms. McLean stated that he had followed the proper procedure. She noted that disclosures help to avoid potential legal pitfalls in Utah.

In response to the request for a canned agenda, Ms. McLean pointed out that the Chair typically leads the agenda. She noted that the Planning Commission was given a "cheat sheet" to help them move the meeting along. She offered to distribute that "cheat sheet" to everyone to help them understand what to expect in terms of procedure. Board Member Martz felt that would be helpful.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that a meeting must be consistently scheduled at the same place, unless there is a site visit or the regularly scheduled meeting occurs elsewhere for a specific reason. Consistency allows the public to know where and when the meeting takes place.

Assistant City Attorney McLean commented on noticing. She noted that the Open Public Meetings Act requires 24 hours notice of the agenda. In order to take action on any item, there must be at least 24 hours notice. Ms. McLean stated that Park City has additional noticing requirements that go well beyond the State requirement in terms of being more restrictive. For example, Determination of Significant requires 7 days notice. Ms. McLean stated that if someone makes public comment on an item that has not been noticed on the agenda in the appropriate time frame, the Board can discuss the matter but they cannot take action.

Board Member McFawn asked if it was possible to email the Board members the formal announcement that goes out with the agenda, since there has been confusion in the past as to when meetings are being held. Ms. McLean suggested that when the notice is sent to the newspaper it could also be emailed to the Board members. She remarked that there are two notices. One is the legal notice, which is published two weeks prior. A second notice, which includes the agenda, is sent to the newspaper the day before the Board is notified that the packets are ready. Ms. McLean pointed out that the agenda is also posted on the website.

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained the definition of public comment and open meeting. Under State law, an open meeting means that the public has the right to attend the meeting and see the Board's deliberations. It does not necessarily require a public hearing. Ms. McLean stated that in her experience the HPB has always been willing to hear from the public. However, she wanted it clear that the Board has the choice of whether or not to take public input, unless a public hearing is mandated by the Code on a specific item. Ms. McLean remarked that public comment is given in an orderly fashion and disruptive behavior is not considered public comment. She noted that sometimes people ask questions in their public comment, but the Board is not obligated to answer questions.

Chair Durst asked if there would have been any reason to open a public hearing for the grant application that was approved this evening, if the applicant had been present. Ms. McLean replied that the applicant always has a right to speak on their own behalf. However, if a neighbor had attended and wanted to make comment, the HPB had the choice of whether or not to take that comment.

Board Member McFawn understood that regardless of whether the applicant is present, the HPB could decide whether or not to hear public comment. Ms. McLean replied that this was correct.

Board Member Werbelow asked if some Boards were not as open to hearing public comment. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that all the Boards and Commissions in Park City are very open, much more than many other jurisdictions. The direction from the City Council is responsiveness to the public. Board Member Martz pointed out that the Board has the purview to put a time limit on public comment. Ms. McLean replied that this was correct. The public hearing belongs to everyone and it is not fair for one person to take up most of the time.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that minutes are required to be taken under the Open Public Meetings Act and they must be approved by the Board. It is important for each Board Member to read the minutes because they are the official record of the meeting. If the written minutes say something different than the recording, the written minutes control. She clarified that the Board members cannot change the language to reflect what they wish they had said instead of what they actually said, but they can correct their statement if it was inaccurately reflected. All corrections must be noted before the minutes are approved.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that if the Board members intentionally or knowingly violate the Open Public Meetings Act, they could be guilty of a Class B Misdemeanor and the action taken in the meeting is voidable. The Attorney General, County Attorney, or a private citizen who was denied their right could enforce the Open Public Meetings Act.

Joint Meeting with City Council

Chair Durst stated that the HPB was granted a work session with the City Council months earlier, at which time they discussed his concern regarding the exercise of design review. Chair Durst understood that the City Council would look at two possible potentials in order to make the HPB more responsive in fulfilling their commission. One was to look at the potential for a member of the HPB to sit either ad hoc or as a contributing member when the design review team meets. The second was the possibility of an HPB member serving in the same capacity when the Planning Commission meets.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recalled that design review was a thornier issue and she needed to look back at her notes. She offered to have a definitive answer for the next meeting. As for having a Board member attend the Planning Commission meetings, there is no legal reason why they could not attend. Ms. McLean recalled from the joint meeting that a suggestion was made for an HPB member to be a liaison with the Planning Commission, particularly on items where the Planning Commission requests an HPB review.

Board Member Martz understood that a follow up session with the City Council was going to be scheduled. Director Eddington stated that he would schedule a follow up meeting in early Fall.

Walking Tour

Board Member Durst noted that the HPB was scheduled for a walking tour this evening. He recalled two initiatives that the Board had previously discussed. One was an awards program. He recalled that the Board had discussed initiating that awards program in conjunction with the walking tour. He suggested that each member of the Board come up with two or three awards candidates as a result of the walking tour, or from their own personal feelings on a project. Chair Durst remarked that the idea is to make the public more aware of the virtues of Park City's historic legacy.

Chair Durst stated that the second initiative was get an audience through the Park Record, TV, or on the radio, to publicize comments regarding significant developments in the City that have to do with preservation of the historic legacy. He has been particularly interested in a few houses on Deer Valley Drive, which he calls Miners' Village, and he plans to initiate an article in that regard.

Chair Durst noted that Adam Opalek and David White were interested in the walking tour and asked that the Planning Department provide them with a copy of the tour with pictures. Both indicated that they would personally do the tour once they have that information. Chair Durst pointed out the time and uncertain weather, and asked how long the tour would take. Director Eddington estimated approximately one hour. He noted that they had talked about starting at the north end. Director Eddington suggested that they could do half the tour this evening and the other half at a subsequent meeting.

Chair Durst was willing to begin the walking tour this evening, but since it was the end of a working day and the end of a meeting, preferred to reschedule for a Saturday morning. He requested that the Board consider the awards program and be ready to present two or three candidates that could be considered for awards.

Director Eddington pointed out that the structures on the walking tour list were ones identified by Staff and have gone through design review. Some represent

very good design review and others represent areas for improvement in design review. He clarified that most of the structures on the list were done prior to the new design guidelines. They represent opportunities and areas that should be improved with the new guidelines. The Staff was prepared to explain and identify the changes on the tour.

Ruth Meintsma expressed an interest in taking the tour with the Board. She has been working on 147 Ridge Avenue and has many photos from different sources. Ms. Meintsma wanted to present the before photos while the Board is looking at the structure to indicate her concerns. She believed the project is completed and the community seems to like the results. However, she had concerns and the best way to show the Board her study is to take the tour with them. Ms. Meintsma noted that she has obligations every Saturday morning and would not be able to do the tour if it is scheduled in the morning. She would make herself available any other time.

After further discussion regarding scheduling, Assistant City Attorney McLean remarked that it would be appropriate for the Staff to send an email to the Board members with a number of dates for the tour, particularly since two members were absent this evening. Board Member McFawn suggested that the tour be scheduled on a Wednesday from 3:00-4:00 p.m. Each Board member could choose a date within the next three or four weeks. Whichever date the majority could attend would be scheduled. Director Eddington stated that Patricia Abdullah could initiate the email as one central contact.

Ms. Meintsma thanked the Board for trying to accommodate everyone, including herself. She remarked that if the Board believes she has something to offer, she would be available to accompany individual Board members to 147 Ridge Avenue if they need to go at separate times. Ms. McLean stated that if individual members go on different dates, it would not need to be noticed unless there is a quorum.

Board Member Martz understood the difficulty in getting everyone together, but he felt it was important to take the tour together to hear the explanation and comments from Staff and for the Staff to hear feedback from the Board. Individuals taking the tour alone would not have that benefit.

Director Eddington offered to be available for two tour dates.

The meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

Approved by _____
Roger Durst, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

