

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Randy Scott, Alex Weiner

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

ROLL CALL

Chair Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

August 2, 2017

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 2, 2017 as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Members Weiner and Hutchings abstained from the vote since they were not present for the August meeting.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Grahn introduced John Hutchins and Alex Weiner as the new Historic Preservation Board Members. She asked them to provide a brief background and why were interested in being on the Board.

Alex Weiner stated that she and her husband moved to Park City last January for the Washington DC area. She was involved with the Historic Preservation Society of Chevy Chase, Maryland. She thought that being on the Historic Preservation Board in Park City would be a good way to get involved.

John Hutchings stated that he and his wife have lived in Park City for seven years after living in Washington DC. He is originally from Colorado. He wanted to be on the Historic Preservation Board because he has lived in a historic structure since coming to Park City and he loves all the historic structures in town. He thought being on the Historic Preservation Board was a good way to get involved in the community.

Planner Grahn introduced Liz Jackson and Laura Newberry, the new Staff personnel in the Planning Department. Louis Rodriguez had left Park City and Liz and Laura would be taking over some of his responsibilities, particularly Staff reports and noticing. The Board members should contact them with any questions.

Director Erickson requested that all the Board Members complete and submit their direct deposit form if they had not already done so.

For the benefit of the new Board Members, Director Erickson introduced Cindy Matsumoto, the City Council liaison to the HPB. He also introduced Deputy City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean.

Director Erickson commented on a new procedure. He explained that normally the HPB does not see Staff Communications reports. However, the Staff wanted to transmit an early draft copy of the proposed Grant Program to give the Board an opportunity to review it. Planner Grahn announced a joint meeting with the HPB and the City Council on November 16th regarding the Grant Program. She asked the Board members to let her know their availability. She would confirm that November 16th was the correct date and notify the Board.

Director Erickson announced that the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Compatible Roof Form LMC amendment at their last meeting. The only change was that the Planning Commission thought “primary” roof form was confusing and asked the Staff to change it. Director Erickson stated that the word “primary” was deleted and it is now called the “roof form” and “secondary roof”. The LMC Amendment was moving forward to the City Council.

CONTINUATIONS – (Public Hearing and Continue to Date Specified)

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

(Application PL-16-03379)

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing. There were no comments. There were no comments.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE 424 to a date uncertain. Jack Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. Design Guideline Revisions – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for New Commercial Infill Construction in Park City’s Historic Districts. Universal and Specific Guidelines will be reviewed for: Universal Guidelines; Site Design: Setback & Orientation, Topography & Grading, Landscaping & Vegetation, Sidewalks, Plazas, & Other Street Improvements, Parking Areas & Driveways; Primary Structures: Mass, Scale, & Height, Foundation, Storefronts, Doors & Windows, Roofs, Dormers, Balconies & Roof Decks, Decks, Fire Escapes, & Exterior Staircases; Gutters & Downspouts; Chimneys & Stovepipes; Architectural Features; Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems, & Service Equipment; Materials; Paint & Color; Additions to Existing Non-Historic Structures; Reconstruction of Non-Surviving Structures; Sidebars: Compatibility & Complementary, Masonry Retaining Walls, and Fencing. The Guidelines are incorporated into the Land Management Code in 15-13-2.
(Application GI-13-00222)

Planner Grahn reported that they were looking at the last chapter of the Design Guideline revisions, which is New Infill Commercial Buildings. The Board has already reviewed and revised Historic Residential, Historic Commercial and New Residential Buildings. Much of the presentation this evening would be repetitive of what was done in those previous chapters; however, it reflects the changes and amendments that were made in the past. The Staff requested that the HPB Board review these amendments, provide comments, and based on the discussion either continue these amendments to the next meeting or forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Planner Grahn explained that Design Guidelines were codified after the last HPB meeting, and because they are now part of the Code the Planning Commission also needs to review the changes.

Planner Grahn started the discussion with the Universal Design Guidelines. At the last meeting the Board had concerns with the styles that had appeared in the past in Park City, as well as how to be compatible within the context of a block. She presented the proposed changes that were made as found in the Staff report.

Chair Stephens referred to the bottom of Page 54 of the Staff report and noted that the Staff requested discussion with regards to the context of each block. Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff was looking for feedback from the Board

because the Staff struggled with that issue. If someone built an enormous 1970s building on a block, they would not want to encourage similar buildings, but it is a part of the block. The question was how does the context relate.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that if an existing building does not fit the new Guidelines, that building should not be copied or used as a model of what is allowed on that block.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that as he read the Staff report he recalled previous discussions about neighborhoods. For example, Daly is different than Lower Woodside. In his mind, the answer is that the Guidelines apply without having to create different things for different neighborhood styles. He thought it fit.

Chair Stephens noted that they were looking for infill in the HCB District, and that can change from block to block. He did not want to put the Staff in the position that because there were larger buildings at the bottom of Main Street it would justify putting a large building next to smaller buildings at the top of Main Street. Chair Stephens favored the block by block analysis.

Chair Stephens referred to Universal Guideline #4. "New infill commercial buildings shall be differentiated from historic structures, but shall be compatible with historic structures in materials, size, scale and proportion". He asked if that was in conflict with the LMC and whether they would be able to restrict it differently than the LMC. He thought it could create an awkward situation.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Design Guidelines are codified. A provision in the Land Management Codes states that if there is any conflict the more restrictive shall apply. Because the Guidelines are now codified, it is no longer suggestive because it was adopted by Code. Chair Stephens understood, but he questioned how much it would impact the public if they were not aware of that provision. He was also concerned about property owners on Main Street that have been relying on the LMC for potential restorations.

Planner Grahn believed the next sentence in the language would help the Staff because a building could be visually broken up to look like two storefronts, as opposed to one large building, without having to break the wall plane. It breaks it up into volumes. Chair Stephens agreed on a property that is 50' wide. However, he noticed an inconsistency further into the recommendations that suggests that it might be difficult to meet the height restrictions in the LMC on a building next to a smaller building with a lower height.

Planner Tyler asked if Chair Stephens wanted to propose a specific change. Chair Stephens replied that it was not so much a change. The issue was how to restrict those property rights on Main Street. However, he was unsure whether

they wanted to go down that path. Chair Stephens stated that two-stories is the current height restriction on Main Street; but if they put it next to a one-story building is the intent to limit the two-story building. Planner Grahn explained that it was looking at the overall block, and in any block there will be historic buildings that are one, two, or three-stories tall. Finding a middle ground without engulfing the smaller historic building was a good approach. Planner Grahn stated that within the HCB, there is a specified wall height at the street and then it goes up a 45-degree angle to achieve the extra height. She believed that would naturally cause a step as well. Chair Stephens concurred; however, he thought it was important to review the guidelines to make sure that was clear.

Planner Tyler noted that the Steep Slope criteria listed in the LMC talks specifically about articulation. She asked if Chair Stephen would prefer that the language focus more on that because it implies that wall planes could be shifted, which would break up the mass. Planner Tyler clarified that the intent is not to prohibit two-story buildings, but rather suggest that the mass be broken up in ways such as shifting walls planes and adding articulation. Chair Stephens thought that could possibly work, but he believed it would work more easily on a frontage where there are multiple lots. His concern was primarily the single lots.

Chair Stephens wanted to know what problem they were trying to anticipate that would not be addressed by the current height restrictions in the LMC. Planner Grahn believed it was the massing. It is more the width along the street and less about the depth. Planner Tyler asked if it would work better if they tied it more to historic storefronts by respecting those widths and bringing those into the new infill route. She pointed out that someone could have a 300' wide building, but the issue is what it looks like in that 300 feet.

Chair Stephens agreed that it was better to address it in terms of the width. Director Erickson suggested that they eliminate the first sentence in #4 that ties it to mass, bulk, scale and size, and leave the second sentence, "The massing of the new infill commercial development shall be further broken up into volumes that reflect the mass", which is consistent with the storefront enhancement program. Chair Stephens thought the language change would give the Planning Department the ability to make judgment calls on variations with regards to wider, multiple lot combinations.

Planner Grahn noted that previously they had talked about whether they wanted to be completely different with infill within the Historic District, or whether they wanted a pattern to emerge that compliments the historic buildings. She agreed with Director Erickson suggestion overall; however, she thought they should leave the first sentence and eliminate any reference to size, scale and mass. That would still leave the reference to materials and features of the building being compatible with the historic buildings next door.

Chair Stephens pointed out that that would be consistent with what was done in the residential areas. Director Erickson agreed.

Planner Grahn moved to the next section and commented on Site Design. She stated that the Staff always tries to be proactive rather than reactive. They have done a good job of creating a street wall along Main Street, but the question is whether they need to protect against future developments that may be set back differently or create weird gaps in the smile on Main Street. She thought this was reflective of the residential guidelines, as well as the historic guidelines for commercial buildings. She asked if the Board had comments regarding setback and orientation or topography and grading.

Chair Stephens had a question on whether or not the HPB believes the Staff should address these unique conditions site design when it comes to block passageways. He asked if City-owned passageways go through the Planning Department for review. Director Erickson replied that it goes through the Planning Department but it does not go to the Planning Commission. Sometimes it has to go through the City Council if they use a platted unbuilt right-of-way. Director Erickson pointed out that the regulations require that all City projects must meet the Code and the General Plan, and he is the one who makes that Finding.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that in general she believed the revisions and additions were more specific and clear, which would help the architect or designer know what is actually needed. She commended the Staff on the revisions.

Planner Grahn commented on landscaping and vegetation. She noted that there is not a lot of landscaping and vegetation on Main Street because there is not enough room in the side or rear backyards to accommodate it. However, they do want to be prepared because there are some places where landscaping could be encouraged and put in. One suggestion from the consultant was to reference this section back to the residential Design Guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren thought the landscaping on Main Street was usually done by the City. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct. Board Member Holmgren noted that some of the planters on Main Street have rhubarb and other foods and she thought that should be encouraged. Director Erickson remarked that this may be a larger conversation going forward. As there is more infill on Main Street, and particularly the south end of Main Street, it is becoming more and more difficult to remove some of the inappropriate trees and/or the diseased or storm damages trees. They have been approached by the Arborist community to give it more thought. Director Erickson stated that the Staff may come forward when the Urban Forestry Plan is completed to talk about more historic planting in the District and less Aspen Blue Spruce. That will be discussed more when they

talk about neighborhood context. Director Erickson wanted the Board to be aware if they see tree removals due to storm damage.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she would like to have the City pay a bounty for every Box Elder that is removed because they are called sewer destroyers.

Planner Grahn commented on sidewalks, plazas, other street improvements and parking. She believed these changes were reflective of the previous changes that were made to the Main Street District. The Board had no comments on this section.

Planner Grahn moved on to mass, scale and height. The Staff had provided a number of examples of what works and does not work on Main Street, beginning on page 59 of the Staff report. Planner Tyler stated that she and Planner Grahn spent several days going down Main Street taking photos.

The first photo was on the 500 block. The red building on the left was a historic building. The adjacent purple, yellow and teal buildings were not historic. Planner Tyler believed that speaks to #4 on the Universal Guidelines in terms of whether the wide building was broken up. This was an example of how the mass, scale and height should be broken up in order for the infill to blend, but not necessarily mimic the historic structures.

The next photo was a building with a much larger scale, but it was broken up to make it seem smaller than what it actually is.

The next two photos were larger buildings. The first photo had a lower level that was set back with an over-arching portico that is taller than what is normally seen on Main Street. The columns were also too massive. Planner Tyler pointed out that those are the elements they need to hone in on in the Guidelines to manage expectations for the design community in terms of what is expected or can be done.

Planner Tyler asked if the Board had specific questions on the redlines.

Chair Stephens referred to B.1.5 on page 61 of the Staff report. "New Buildings shall not be significantly taller or shorter than adjacent historic buildings with special consideration of the neighborhood historic buildings". He was unsure what scenario that referred to. Planner Tyler noted that the language in black was already there. Chair Stephens thought they were dealing with it in the whole block scenario. Planner Tyler asked if he preferred to revise the language to put it more in the block context instead of calling out specific buildings. Chair Stephens believed that might be a better approach, because in one place they call for the block context, but here they were saying the adjacent building context. He thought it was difficult on Main Street because there are not many situations

where this would even apply. Planner Tyler pointed to the blue structure with the moose next to it is a very tiny building. It is probably one of the smaller one-story buildings. Chair Stephens replied that it is a one-story structure, but there is a historic building on each side of it, which protects it in that sense. Planner Tyler agreed; however, if those historic structures were not there, they would have to deal with the infill and the repercussions of saying that it was next to a one-story building. Planner Tyler thought it was important to have that discussion now.

Chair Stephens thought that an architect could deal with the height issue developed by the infill by minimizing how the height appears by massing and architectural features. They were looking at the actual height, but he believed it was more a design issue and the Staff needs the ability to address it.

Planner Tyler asked if Chair Stephens had any suggestions on how to address that. She believed his comments related to what the Staff was trying to do. Chair Stephens replied that it still comes back to the mass and the scale, and what is adjacent. The architect should be sensitive to the surrounding buildings, but that is not always the case.

Board Member Hodgkins questioned the first statement in B.1.5, "New buildings should not be significantly taller or shorter than..." He thought that was vague. He understood that they were talking about a maximum of two stories. Therefore, if it is a story taller, the next paragraph says, "Primary façade shall be limited to one to two stories in height. Special consideration would be given to the wall heights of neighboring adjacent historic structures". He thought that would address what they were trying to accomplish. Planners Tyler and Grahn agreed and suggested that they delete B.1.5.

Chair Stephens believed someone could design a two-story building next to a short, little building and the two-story building would look too tall. He clarified that his intent was to make sure that the Planning Department has the necessary tools to address those issues when they arise. He pointed out that a façade could be broken up to make the building seem shorter by adding a porch overhang and changing the window configuration. He thought the language as redlined was all about numerical height.

Planner Grahn suggested that they remove the first part of B.1.5 because they would be able to catch it with the facades.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the language needed to be very blunt considering the pressure that a building owner or developer feels for getting the most square footage in the least amount of space. She did not believe they should remove the first sentence in B.1.5. Ms. Beatlebrox thought the language "New buildings should not be significantly taller or shorter" was clear and blunt.

Director Erickson noted that the strike-out eliminates the “should” and it becomes a “shall”. He pointed out that “should” gives some flexibility, but “shall” is more rigorous.

Board Member Holmgren asked how they would handle “significantly”. Planner Grahn thought it would be a case by case basis depending on the design and the perceived mass and scale. Board Member Weiner believed that “significantly” was the wiggle room.

Director Erickson asked Planner Grahn about the Code change for Historic District Design Reviews on commercial buildings in terms of Appeals. Planner Tyler replied that Appeals do not come before the HPB. Since the Design Guidelines were incorporated into the LMC, she believed all the Appeals go before the Board of Adjustment or the City Council. Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the Appeal process was delineated in Chapter 1. She recalled that Appeals of Design Reviews would go to the Board of Adjustment.

Planner Grahn commented on foundations and how much should be visible. The Staff determined 8” on the primary façade. The Board had no concerns or comments.

Planner Tyler commented on storefronts. She presented examples of structures that contributed to a cohesive Main Street, and others that did not. She stated that the Staff was trying to hone in on breaking up facades to be consistent in the streetscape and the block context. It specifically talks about the components of storefronts and what they look like. Planner Tyler noted that the LMC was changed to require a maximum of a 50’ width for storefronts on Main Street, which was part of the Storefront Enhancement Program. She noted that there are protections in the LMC that were included in 2017 to create more appropriate storefronts. The Board no concerns or comments.

Planner Tyler believed the section on doors and windows were similar to the storefronts in making up the components of not only the whole building, but also crucial to what makes up the storefront. The Board had no concerns or comments.

Planner Grahn commented on roofs. The commercial buildings are almost always a flat roof or a shed roof. She asked if the HPB had any concerns with what they were proposing. The Board had no comments or concerns.

Planner Grahn moved to dormers, and noted that dormers are rarely seen on Main Street. She presented an example of one building with dormers as an example of using dormers incorrectly. Planner Grahn pointed out that if someone intends to use a dormer, the Guidelines should specify how to use it correctly. The Staff incorporated the same language that was used for

residential structures. Chair Stephens believed dormers were limited by the LMC and the height restrictions. If someone added a dormer it would be far back. Planner Grahn remarked that it could also be on the Swede Alley side or the Park Avenue side, depending on which way the back of the building faces.

Chair Stephens had a question on roof materials, page 68 of the Staff report. He noted that they often see a galvanized roof in the residential, which appears to work fine because when it rusts it drips onto that property. However, when a galvanized roof rusts on Main Street, he questioned where that would drip and whether it would drip onto the granite that was just installed. Chair Stephens did not believe a galvanized roof was appropriate on Main Street.

Director Erickson pointed out that the galvanized material does not rust. The rusted Core 10 Steel will rust. He was not opposed to prohibiting Core 10 on Main Street. Chair Stephens noted that anything that would rust would leave stains wherever it drips. Planner Grahn removed rusted steel from the list of materials.

Planner Tyler commented on balconies and rooftop decks. She noted that previously there were no Guidelines that specifically addressed decks or rooftop decks. The Staff wanted to have specific guidelines that address what appropriate decks would look like, given the number of requests. The goal is for the balcony or deck to be cohesive with the street and to be more historically appropriate, even though they are on infill.

Chair Stephens understood that decks or balconies could not go over the public right-of-way. Planner Grahn explained that if a balcony were to extend over the right-of-way, it would require City Council approval and the owner would have to enter into an encroachment agreement with the City. Planner Tyler clarified that it could occur, but it is addressed under a separate process.

Chair Stephens noted that the former City Engineer would not allow balconies on the property if the posts went down into the sidewalk. He asked if that restriction was still in place. Planner Grahn assumed it would be on the Main Street façade, but she was unsure. She offered to look into it and report back with an answer. Chair Stephens recalled that it was primarily a snow removal issue. He assumed that it was still in place.

Board Member Holmgren asked if these proposed changes were also for Swede Alley. Director Erickson answered yes.

Planner Tyler commented on fire escapes and exterior staircases. She noted that the guidelines did not specifically address these items. They were talked about broadly in the last Guidelines, but the Staff wanted to make sure

they were addressed in this rewrite. She pointed out that the Guideline discourages fire escapes and exterior staircases on the front façade.

Planner Grahn commented on downspouts and gutters. She recalled that the last time the HPB talked about this, they removed where the water should run. The Guideline is simple and only says to keep it away from architectural features and make sure it is visually minimized.

Planner Grahn commented on architectural features. She noted that the intent is to stress simplicity. With the push for mountain modern they are not seeing a lot of people try to do ornate, Victorian looking infill, but if that changes they want to be prepared.

Planner Grahn remarked that the guidelines for mechanical equipment was the same as the previous guideline, but with a few new rules regarding where to put it so that it is visually minimized.

Director Erickson asked how the Staff addressed concrete as a primary wall material. Planner Grahn thought it might be addressed in the next section about materials.

Planner Grahn noted that she and Planner Tyler looked at materials the same as they did with the residential structures. They wanted to make sure they were similar and complimentary of the historic buildings. She pointed out that there is one board form historic concrete building on Main Street. If someone wanted to do something similar, the Staff would have to take a closer look.

Chair Stephens asked how they addressed synthetic building materials. He recalled that in the past synthetic materials were only appropriate up to a certain height because of weather issues. Planner Grahn noted that a good hardy board that has the rustic looking wood that would be seen on a historic house is usually allowed. However, the Staff always asks for a sample first to make sure it does not look like vinyl siding. She pointed out that the hardy board would be allowed on the entire building as long as the building is not historic. Chair Stephens asked if they look at the trim more closely, because the construction on the trim is more difficult using hardy board. Planner Grahn agreed. She stated that they look at that when it goes through the HDDR process and the applicant presents samples. She has not seen any bad examples, but asked Chair Stephens or the other Board members to let them know if they know of a bad example.

Director Erickson informed the HPB that the Staff would be starting the review on the Brew Pub parking lot garage, and they were proposing some board form. If the City makes external changes to China Bridge the board form concrete would come into play. He recalled that some was being used on the Kimball. It would all go through the HDDR.

Planner Grahn noted that paint and color were not regulated by the Design Guidelines; however, they wanted to make sure that people do not paint brick or start trends that are not consistent with the Historic District.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the focus has been on breaking up large spaces with different setbacks, etc. However, if the building is painted all one color it still looks big, as in the Mall. She asked if it would be worth suggesting that different colors or shades of the same pallet be used for different planes of the buildings. Planner Grahn thought that could be incorporated. She recalled that the Staff talked about that when they looked at additions to historic buildings. They encourage the additions to be a different color than the historic structure to keep it from being one mass.

Board Member Holmgren thought different colors work on additions to historic buildings, but when they start talking about adjusting the colors on the building, she anticipated a fight. Planner Grahn suggested using “should” or “consider”, to leave it a little flexible and open. She agreed that it would create problems if it was required. Chair Stephen thought the different planes could be broken up in the HDDR process through different materials.

Planner Tyler commented on additions to non-historic buildings, and stated that the Staff has been getting a number of requests to remodel existing non-historic buildings. They wanted to make sure there were guidelines to address that specific request. The proposed guideline would insure that they have compatible additions to historic structures, as well as any other modification to the historic building, to make sure that it does fit in with the context of the street. Planner Tyler pointed out that the intent is consistent with everything else they talked about this evening. It was just specifically directed to existing buildings.

Chair Stephens clarified that if someone came in to redo a building that was built in the 1980s or 1990, it would give the Staff the tools to have the storefront facades redone.

Planner Tyler commented on the reconstruction of non-surviving structures. She stated that the changes were minimal and the primary change was to make the grammar consistent throughout the document, and lining it up with the LMC.

Planner Grahn remarked that the side bar about compatibility and complimentary was already included in the other reviews, and that has not changed.

Director Erickson asked Planner Grahn to explain the blue pages for the benefit of the new Board members. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff report redlines the changes that were made. The blue document was the clean version, and the Staff includes those as Exhibits because it is easier to read than the redlines.

The Board commended Planners Tyler and Grahn for doing a great job.

Director Erickson asked the Board which guidelines needed to come back and which ones could be moved forward this evening. Paint was the only item.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, thought the amount of work the Staff had put into these revisions was amazing. She has seen the Staff in process and it is a full time job. These revisions add amazing depth to the rules and regulations that have been difficult to enforce in the past. She thought it would go a long way in saving things that have been lost previously.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins thought it could be a tool to project out to other historic communities that are where Park City was five years ago.

Chair Stephens thanked the Staff. He thought the benefit is that there has not been significant construction on Main Street, and it is nice to be ahead of the curve before that comes starts to occur. He asked if the Staff felt like they have the tools already in place to address historic buildings on Main Street. Planner Tyler replied that it was the lessons learned that helped guide this document. They tested these guidelines against some of those applications to see what would have been different. She gave Director Erickson credit for that input. Planner Tyler believed these guidelines would help guide future development in the direction that they all find is appropriate.

Chair Stephens noted that there is pressure on the historic buildings on Main Street to increase in size. He asked if this document would come into play to address those structures. Planner Grahn replied that it would not for the specific building they talked about this evening, but overall, she thought it would go a long way for both residential and commercial when people actually come in to rehab those Main Street buildings. Chair Stephens believed it was a Catch-22. They want to have the tools in place, but at the same time they want to encourage restoration of historic buildings on Main Street.

Director Erickson stated that unless the Board wanted to see these revisions again, he recommended that they forward a positive recommendation for the changes to the design guidelines as presented this evening, with the amendments that the Historic Preservation Board has proposed, with the exception of the section on paint, which the HPB will revisit at the next available opportunity.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
October 4, 2017

Chair Stephens thought the Board had discussed the revisions sufficiently and was prepared to move forward.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins made a motion to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council on the Design Guidelines as presented this evening; with the exception of the section on paint, which the Board will revisit at a later date. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Approved by _____
Stephen Douglas, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

APPROVED