

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
VISIONING SESSION  
OCTOBER 16, 2013

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Puggy Holmgren, Marion Crosby, Gary Bush, Hope Melville, Clayton Vance

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Anya Grahn, Ryan Wassum, Christy Alexander, Dick Peek, Polly Samuels McLean, Jessica Winter, Patricia Abdullah, Ruth Meintsma.

---

The Historic Preservation Board Visioning Meeting was called to order at 5:23 p.m.

Director Eddington asked everyone in attendance to introduce themselves. Hope Melville and Clayton Vance were the new HPB members. Christy Alexander and Ryan Wassum were the newest Staff members in the Planning Department.

Planner Anya Grahn showed the HPB a power point presentation that was given to the City Council a few weeks earlier. She noted that the City had directed the Staff to do a reconnaissance level survey.

Planner Grahn noted that the National Register outlines various criteria. Criteria A talked about the importance of events. Skiing has been a major event in Park City. It was used by early utility workers and miners to get around during heavy snow falls. By the 1920's skiing was a recreational sport. As early as 1923 the Park Record predicted that Park City would become a mecca for winter sports.

Planner Grahn reported that in 1958 the United Park City Mines conducted a feasibility study using federal funds, which helped Treasure Mountain Resort; now known as PCMR. In 1963 United Park City Mines received \$1.2 million in federal funds to construct Treasure Mountain Resort. The 1964-65 season ski was interesting because the Spiro Tunnel at the Silver King Consolidated Mine was used to transport skiers. In 1966 Park City was featured in Sports Illustrated because of its excellent ski slopes.

Planner Grahn stated that Criteria C looks at eligibility in terms of whether something has made a significant impact in history related to architecture, types and periods of construction. She pointed out that the A-frame emerged after World War II and it was considered the right shape at the right time. Due to its simple construction it could be adapted to different functions, geographies and uses. A-frames primarily became an icon of vacation homes and resort architecture. The first A-frames emerged around 1958. They were considered modern high-end architecture, yet the design was affordable because it was

simple to put together. A-frames also represented a new era of materials. There was a great housing demand after World War II and mass produced materials such as formica, vinyl siding, aluminum, etc., became part of the American dream because it was affordable.

Planner Grahn remarked that the National Register typically says that a structure has to be significant and it has to be above 50 years old. However, that is not necessarily the case. There are many cases where the 50-year-old threshold does not matter. The number was used as a way to evaluate historic significance because they thought it took 50 years to achieve that. Planner Grahn stated that a property might be eligible if it's of exceptional importance to the National Standard level. Therefore, the National Register came up with Criteria G, which is a test for historical significance for properties that are less than 50 years.

Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff researched other cities that were looking at their post-war architecture. She noted that Pueblo, Colorado came up with a Historic Context Study, an Architectural Guide and a Preservation Plan for the Ranch houses that were built between 1940 and 1982. They also have outreach and education in an effort to promote community pride and how to care for the materials on these properties. The result has been higher property values and higher taxes. Planner Grahn reviewed historic plans from Boulder, Colorado and Aspen, Colorado.

Planner Grahn reported that the Staff briefly discussed with the City Council the consequences of including the ski-era architecture in the current Historic Sites Inventory. It would preserve the 8 to 12 existing A-frames. It would require revising the LMC and the design guidelines to be specific towards these structures. There would also be unique development opportunities because of their shape and unusualness. Planner Grahn reiterated that the City Council directed the Staff to do a Recon Level Survey of skier architecture, which the Staff was currently working on. The Staff was looking at the LMC and other ideas regarding a voluntary designation, as well as outlining gives and gets if someone were to voluntarily designate their A-frame or other ski era building to the HSI.

Board Member Melville asked about the tree house pods on Empire. Planner Grahn stated that the tree house pods would be affected if they were in the ski-era. Board Member Bush asked about materials and how it would interface with what they have now. Planner Grahn replied that it would require a lot more research and analysis because it is more difficult to preserve formica or plywood compared to old wood and timber.

Ruth Meintsma asked how many structures had obvious ski-era architecture. Planner Grahn stated that before Dina Blaes left she had her own ideas on the number of sites that could be included. She believed the Recon Survey would

show approximately 158 sites from the ski era; however, not all 158 would be worth listing or designating as historically significant. Ms. Meintsma stated that in walking around town there are a handful of structures that wanted to be saved. She suggested that the best way for the City and/or the HPB to approach it would be to make everyone who owns one of those structures feel lucky and privileged as opposed to being building restricted. It would be important for the City to back them on a level that makes them feel like they have an opportunity that no one else has. Ms. Meintsma recognized that it would be difficult, but she felt it was the best approach. She stated that per the design guidelines, historic houses are absolutely not allowed to be moved on their lot, but she believed a ski era structure was different because it does not imply the character of the historic town. Most of the structures are view oriented and she thought one criteria should be that the structure could be moved and shifted on the lot, allowing it to be added on to easily.

Director Eddington stated that when the Staff previously brought this idea to the HPB, the Board members present at the time unanimously thought the evolution of the Historic Preservation efforts should continue to occur. There was general consensus to look at ski era architecture. Since some of those Board members were no longer on the HPB and there were new Board members, he asked if that was still the general consensus.

Planning Manager Sintz stated that the Staff was pleased that the City Council was willing to move forward with a study to at least identify what they have. When the study is completed, the Staff would come back and report what was found. At that point they should have a better understanding of what is out there.

Board Member Crosby clarified that the Staff would do a Reconnaissance Study to catalog what they have. Planning Manager Sintz replied that this was correct. Board Member Bush asked if it would be added to the Historic District or if it would become something completely different. Director Eddington replied that it would be the next era in Park City history, and he assumed it would require a different set of guidelines. The intent at this point was to begin talking about whether or not to move into ski era architecture as part of their history.

Board Member Melville asked if the Staff sees this as a new planning era moving forward in the future. Director Eddington stated that there could potentially be something in the future, but that discussion was premature at this point. He remarked that in 20 to 40 years the City may look at the next evolution of architecture; however, what that would be could not be predicted at this time.

Director Eddington stated that when the Staff took this to the City Council, the Council was interested in looking into it; but they did not want to implement anything that would restrict property rights until they had the results of the Reconnaissance Level Survey. Ms. Meintsma asked about the process of the Reconnaissance Level Survey. Planner Grahn stated that Dina Blaes was

unable to do it because of other commitments. Therefore, the City would hire another outside consultant to work with the Staff. The process is a combination of being on the street and paper research. Ms. Meintsma volunteered to be on the street to help find structures for consideration.

Director Eddington noted that the Mining Era guidelines were quite strict regarding historic structures. He asked if the guidelines for the Ski Era should be more loosely structured for A-frames. He noted that the issue of property rights would be different because A-frames are not spacious and their second levels are lost. Director Eddington suggested that they would keep the historic fabric, but positioning of the structure on the property may not be as important and additions might be allowed. Planner Grahn thought it was important to recognize the distinction between the mining era and the ski era.

Board Member Crosby wanted to know if there would be a benefit to the owner to make them want to preserve the A-frame rather than tear it down to build something new. She thought there should be guidelines for a connector if an owner wanted to develop the back of the property. Planner Grahn replied that it would be similar to what was done in Aspen, Colorado in terms of a voluntary designation. Examples of benefits would be reduced setbacks, increased density or other incentives. Director Eddington stated that in the 1980's the average person who owned a historic structure did not see the advantage of keeping a historic structure. Board Member White reported that when he was on the Historic District Commission in the early 1990's, they mostly dealt with people who wanted to demolish the miners shacks. It was a big fight to save those structures.

Ms. Meintsma did not believe there were a lot of ski-era structures. The ones they should want to save are the ones apparent from the street. She thought the City could afford to give the owners advantages that they may not have with an empty lot. Because the A-frame style is unique, a separation between the original structure and an addition would not be as important. Ms. Meintsma outlined other benefits and advantages that would encourage saving the ski-era structures. Director Eddington stated that physical advantages such as decreased setbacks and increased density translate into money, which is an economic incentive. He believed that would be an important part of starting the next era of preservation. Director Eddington thought it would be difficult because many people do not believe in the evolution of historic preservation and some do not like the looks of the A-frame. Planner Grahn remarked that the old-time Parkites remember when the A-frames were built and they are not as interesting as the mining shacks or the mining history.

Planner Grahn presented examples of what Aspen, Colorado has done regarding benefits for the voluntary listing. The Staff did not particularly favor the individual benefits but they were looking at how it works for Aspen. Board Member Crosby stressed the importance of making the owner see the value of voluntary

preservation. She asked for the projected time to do the study. Planner Grahn stated that the City was quoted a six months time frame. She asked if the area of significance would be the entire Historic District. Planner Grahn thought they should start with the historic districts and also look at what the resorts have within their area.

Board Member Vance wanted to make sure that more relaxed guidelines for preserving the A-frames would not compromise historic preservation of other structures in the historic districts. Planner Grahn agreed that they would not want to lose the mining era by trying to preserve the ski-era. Board Member Vance thought there should be great latitude and flexibility with the materials since formica and other materials from that period were not the best materials.

Jessica Winters stated that one difference between Aspen and Park City is that TDRs are a major economic incentive in Aspen. In 2008 a 300 square foot TDR was selling for \$200,000. She understood that Park City was just beginning to talk about TDRs but she thought that was an interesting fact to consider.

Planner Grahn outlined the common tools in a preservation tool box, such as the revolving loan fund, TDRs, and conservation easements. She pointed out that Park City has a grant program instead of a revolving loan fund.

Ms. Meintsma stated that the City should make it so advantageous to have one of these properties that the people who tore them down will wish they had kept it.

Board Member Bush understood Ms. Meintsma's point; however, he thought that point should remain the objective for the mining era buildings as well. He was concerned that sometimes they impose economic hardship on home owners. Ms. Meintsma agreed that there should be support for people who own mining structures.

Director Eddington asked if the Board thought incentives such as tax abatement and more money allocated to the grant program was the general direction to take. The majority answered yes. Board Member Melville noted that they currently have individuals who voluntarily want to keep a historic structure to the benefit of the City. However, when they change their minds or they sell to someone who is not interested in keeping the structure, there is a lot of pressure to keep it. She believed an economic incentive would help encourage preservation. Director Eddington concurred. He stated that it was difficult to work with Summit County and the State, but they would like to begin pursuing the opportunities.

Director Eddington asked if the group had ideas for economic incentives. Patricia Abdullah noted that approximately \$45,000 is spent on the grant program each year. They have been stricter with the Main Street RDA from Daly to 9<sup>th</sup> Street, primarily because it is the most common grant and the funds are low.

There are two types of grants. One is more for minor improvements and the average is around \$15,000 to \$18,000. The second is more major and those grants average \$50,000 plus. If the Main Street RDA had more available funds, she believed they would have seen more grant projects on Main Street over the last two or three years.

Ms. Meintsma remarked that every renovated landmark structure starts in the \$50,000 range. She noted that the City asks much of the people with historic properties but gives them nothing in return. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that they continually talk about the need for more funding for the RDA, but it never moves forward.

Board Member Bush asked about the funding resource. Director Eddington replied that the funds come from local property taxes in the redevelopment areas. Property taxes are frozen at a certain level and for the duration of that time any increase in property tax is collected at that increment. In the Main Street area the majority of that increment is used to pay off the parking garage, leaving a lesser amount for the historic preservation grants and other projects. Director Eddington stated that more grant money was available from the increment for the Lower Park Avenue RDA because they were not paying on a major debt in that area. The Lower Park Avenue RDA gets approximately \$225,000 per year. The funding for the Main Street RDA was significantly lower. State law prohibits transferring funds from one RDA to the other.

Board Member Crosby asked if it was possible to borrow from one RDA fund if the money was paid back. Assistant City Attorney McLean did not believe that was allowed under the State Code.

Ms. Meintsma stated that the community favored the matching grant funding and she wanted to know what it would take to achieve a higher number. Director Eddington replied that the Staff would do an in-depth analysis with the HPB and report the results to the City Council. He noted that the City Council supports the concept of increased grants and funding, but the Staff and the HPB had not provided the detailed information to start the discussion. Director Eddington remarked that they needed to look for opportunities for that area other than the Main Street RDA because most of those funds were allocated. He did not anticipate much more going into the Main Street RDA because the City still needs to pay down the garage debt.

Board Member Bush felt that the community would find a way to preserve historic structures; however, unless the City gives a carrot to lead them to preservation, people would succeed in demolishing historic structures by neglect or physical demolition. Director Eddington pointed out that under the new Design Guidelines there was no longer demolition by neglect. He agreed that it was still occurring in some places but the guidelines allow an opportunity to prevent it. Board Member Bush noted that previous Planning Directors said the same thing 10 and 20 years

ago. Director Eddington remarked that prior to the rewrite of the Design Guidelines in 2009 there was no mechanism to control or prevent it. Board Member Bush thought the issue went beyond demolition. Non-compliance on items such as windows, facades, siding, etc., was affecting historic structure. If the City places a barricade, people still find ways around it. He thought offering a carrot was a better way to achieve preservation.

Planner Grahn moved to the next item in her presentation. She outlined the job duties of the HPB as defined by the LMC, which included preserving the City's historic character, identifying and resolving conflicts between preservation and land uses, provide input to the City Staff, Planning Commission and City Council. The HPB has the ability to recommend to the Planning Commission and City Council ordinances that encourage historic preservation. They communicate to the City Council the benefits of development incentive programs and funds for preservation incentive programs. The HPB also hears all appeals on actions taken by the Planning Department. Planner Grahn noted that additional duties listed in the LMC include design review on City-owned projects, and recommendations to the Planning Commission and the City Council on various issues.

Board Member Melville asked if the HPB would review the Library project. Planner Grahn believed the HPB would have some input. Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that the additional duties are the ones that the City Council asks the HPB to do. Director Eddington recalled that the City Council asked for HPB input during the Council's work session for the Library. Board Member Holmgren stated that she has attended the meetings on the Library and she was very impressed with the designs.

Planner Grahn stated that the HPB is also tasked with providing advice and guidance to property owners and applicants about landscaping, alterations and restorations. She asked the Board to share their thoughts on how they see the future of the HPB.

Ruth Meintsma commented from the standpoint of a non-Board member. She commended the Board and stated that she attends most of the meetings because she is always impressed by the work they do and the serious decisions they make. Ms. Meintsma suggested that the Board members go through the guidelines page by page for a better understanding and to discuss them collectively. She pointed out that sometimes a project comes up and the HPB is not exactly sure how the guidelines read. Ms. Meintsma thought it was important for the Board members to understand the guidelines word by word. The guidelines are gray and highly suggestive and if the Board was more familiar with the guidelines they would be better able to address the issues when projects are reviewed.

Board Member Holmgren stated that this was the most cohesive HPB Board that she has ever had the pleasure to work with. At every meeting the comments are thoughtful, concise and respectful. This particular Board was very close-knit. Even when they disagree it is with respect. They listen to each other's ideas and everyone brings something to the table. Without exception, it was the best HPB she has served on.

Planning Manager Sintz was interested in hearing the expectations from the new members. She noted that Board Member Melville and her husband have attended many HPB, Planning Commission and City Council meetings and she was curious to know how she would play into the overall vision.

Board Member Melville replied that she was too new to know how she would contribute to the vision. She believes that historic preservation is important because it is a valuable asset to the town. There is a lot of pressure to undo what was geared towards historic projects, and it changes the character.

Board Member Vance stated that he loves historic preservation. He believes the biggest challenge was looking towards the future and deciding what they should continue to preserve 50 years from now. He noted that malls built in the 1970's were significant and historic, but the question was whether or not to preserve a shopping mall that is completely dilapidated and unusable. In terms of a philosophical standpoint for the HPB, it was important to understand the true underlying premise and what they were trying to do. Board Member Vance appreciated the discussions he has had with Board Member Melville because she always comes back to the economic benefits of historic preservation and what it does for the entire character of Park City. Board Member Vance stated that preserving who they and where they came from was important, but it was also important to generate future development in a more cohesive character that harkens back to the mining era. He believes there are many ways to preserve the entire character of the town through architectural design and construction. Board Member Vance was pleased to be on the Board but he was uncertain of the vision for the future. He fully supported the A-frame preservation. He believed the HPB sets a precedent in the decisions they make.

Board Member Crosby thought Mr. Vance had made some good points, particularly regarding the Main Street Mall.

Director Eddington agreed that right now they do not know the next generation of preservation. Even in looking at A-frames and ski era architecture, they were only looking at significant structures. Out of 158 structures built in the 1960's and 1970's, not all would be considered significant. Director Eddington stated that with regard to research with the Department of Interior, they have taken advantage of the fact that history is evolutionary. What may not appear significant today could be significant 50 years from now.



Based on their comments, Director Eddington summarized the vision to include looking at the guidelines, protection of the mining era architecture and acceptance to examine A-frames and ski era architecture. He asked if the Board had other ideas or areas where they would like to be involved.

Board Member Bush requested more discussion among the Board members by applying the guidelines to a project in practice, or just talking philosophical about the direction they were trying to go with the guidelines. To Board Member Vance's point, would they want to preserve everything 50 years or older, or would they want to create a theme or a character for the town. He understood why the Legal Department does not let them talk after a meeting, but he believed that was the most beneficial time for the Board to discuss the issues to get a better understanding.

Board Member Bush remarked that the Planning Commission went through a process where the height restrictions were applied to a number of projects on uphill lots and downhill lots in hypothetical scenarios. He thought the exercise was beneficial to the Planning Commission and to the public in attendance. He requested that the Staff do something similar for the HPB when they struggle with a particular guideline.

Planner Grahn stated that the next item for discussion was better communication regarding the activities of the different Boards. She asked if the HPB wanted to appoint a liaison to attend Planning Commission, City Council and/or Board of Adjustment meetings. The liaison would represent the HPB if called upon to explain a decision or point of view. The liaison would also update the HPB on matters discussed at those meeting that might be of interest to the Board. Planner Manager Sintz noted that the Planning Commission has a liaison to the Board of Adjustment.

Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that the Board members think about the idea of a liaison and discuss it at the next meeting. She noted that the Planning Commission has many agenda items that involve the Historic District, and the City Council would be hearing an item tomorrow regarding a plat amendment in the HRM zone. Ms. McLean thought it would be helpful for the HPB to have a representative attend who could report back to the Board.

Planner Grahn commented on the next big projects that would come before the HPB. Revising the Design Guidelines was a primary project. It is important to make sure the guidelines are updated and that they can be applied to the current development demands. Planner Grahn stated that they also need to look at incorporating new design guidelines to address new trends. She noted that the Secretary of Interior Standards incorporated an entire section related to sustainability. She believed Park City should begin to look at sustainability. Other projects included the ski era structures and blight.

Planner Grahn noted that she and Director Eddington met with individual Board members to discuss their visions. During those meetings they heard a lot about improving public participation and understanding and making the public more aware of the resources that exist. Other items mentioned included public education programs such as walking tours, trivia and service projects. Some suggestions were radio spots or trivia at the transit station and information and brochures. Planner Grahn noted that the Historic Society already does most of those things, and she suggested that they could get more involved with those programs. Planner Grahn commented on the possibility of having an App that people could touch on their phone and it would provide the history of the structure they were near.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she is on the Main Street Historical Society and they were currently working on a crumb trail where people can go from spot to spot. She suggested that Planner Grahn contact Alison Butz for more information. Planner Grahn offered to research to see where the Historical Society needed volunteers so they could try to participate and build a relationship with the Historical Society.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that initially the Historical Society has a liaison. Board Member Melville replied that she was the Historical Society liaison.

Planner Grahn commented on the Annual Preservation Award. She explained that the HPB selects a building as the award recipient and determines the artist. She recalled that last year the HPB chose the building in November or December and in January they selected an artist for the painting. She recommended that they do an RFP for the painting this year to avoid negotiating issues like the ones they experienced last year. An RFP would allow them to agree on the size, price and specific details prior to commissioning the painting.

Planning Manager Sintz reported that the High West Building was the first recipient of the award and last year the recipient was the Washington School. The paintings of both buildings were displayed in City Hall.

Board Member Melville asked if the award had to be given every year or only when there was an appropriate recipient. Planner Grahn thought that was something for the Board to discuss. She noted that the Utah Heritage Foundation has an award and they can nominate individuals, buildings or contractors. She suggested that the HPB could consider changing the award where some years they could award the building with a painting, and other years it could be a plaque.

Board Member Crosby stated that if there was not a project such as the Washington School, the award could be diverted to a materials award. Ms. Meintsma thought it would be good to nominate a contractor who did an

exceptional job on a historic structure. Board Member Crosby stated that it could also be an architect.

Planning Manager Sintz stated that the award was set up to be the purview of the Board without any restrictions. It could be a site, a wall or anything else. Planning Manager Sintz remarked that in past years the HPB took a walking tour and a van tour to come up with nominating ideas. A small task force group met and narrowed the nominations to a small group for the Board to choose from. She stated that the HPB could craft the program to make the award be exactly what they wanted.

Board Member Crosby stated that she sits on the Summit County Heritage and Landmark Commission and last year they took a bus tour of all the sites being considered for the Landmark Commission Award. They also toured the small towns in Summit County and looked at the sites under consideration. Board Member Crosby favored the idea of bus tours.

Planner Grahn suggested that the HPB discuss the award at their next meeting and decide whether they wanted to nominate and award buildings annually or change the program. The Board should come prepared with a nomination if they feel something is worth nominating.

Board Member Melville asked if the Planning Department had any suggestions. Planning Manager Sintz stated that in the past Patricia Abdullah provided a list of everything that went through the HDDR and the task force sifted through the list. The Staff would then provide additional analysis or information on any item the task force thought was worthwhile. Director Eddington suggested that the Staff could pare down the list of projects that were completed in the last year and bring it back to the HPB.

Board Member Crosby asked if they would also be including projects that had grants approved by the HPB. She did a walking tour of the China Bridge steps last weekend and noted that she had never seen 335 Woodside until then. She thought it would be beneficial for the HPB to do follow-up tours on grants they approved to see the results. Planning Manager thought that was a good idea.

Planner Grahn asked for general comments on other issues.

Board Member Holmgren thought there needed to be additional involvement by the Planning Department to ensure that a project is built as agreed to in the terms of the HDDR. Director Eddington clarified that Board Member Holmgren was suggesting that the Staff follow-up on an HDDR project post-construction. He explained that a new policy was implemented recently with the Building Department, whereby the Planning Department would do a final inspection to catch things that were missed by the Building Department inspectors. The Planner who worked on that particular HDDR would inspect the property prior to

the Building Department permit inspection, and again for final inspection, to make sure windows, fascia board and other details were in accordance with the HDDR.

Board Member White suggested three inspections by the Planning Department. Director Eddington replied that currently the Planning Department does individual site visits. They do a formal four-way inspection when the studs go up, as well as a final inspection. He noted that the Planners are always informally looking at projects as they walk or drive around. Planning Manager Sintz stated that the person who pulls the permit and the owner have the responsibility to make sure they are building in accordance with the regulations. It is not the responsibility of the Planning Department to enforce compliance. Board Member White pointed out that with some contractors it is necessary for the architects to visit the site every day for construction observation.

Board Member Bush remarked that it goes back to his previous comment about giving incentives and carrots to lead the applicant in the direction they want them to go. If the City puts up barricades, people will find a way around it. He believed they would have more success by leading people as opposed to blocking them.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board thought the Planning Department was providing enough resources or whether they should be doing more.

Board Member Bush stated that the HDDR process is intimidating and expensive and a lot of work needs to be done. Board Member White concurred. He remarked that the documentation alone is significant. Board Member Holmgren agreed with Board Member Bush because she had that same experience when she went through the process. It was very intimidating.

Director Eddington agreed that it was a challenge to get a HDDR approval. The process includes financial guarantees, the Historic District Design Guidelines and the Land Management Code. However, since 2009 the City has implemented the pre-application HDDR, which is a free application. The applicant meets with Planner Grahn, the historic preservation consultant, and the Building Department and they try to help and guide the applicant before they spend time and money on the wrong design. The pre-application HDDR is conducted every Wednesday and Director Eddington thought it was successful. Board Member White agreed that the pre-application HDDR has been a great addition to the process.

Director Eddington noted that the pre-application does not eliminate the costs for the actual HDDR, but he was unsure how they could avoid it unless the City provided economic incentives. Board Member Bush pointed out that in the past there were no permit fees or application fees for historic projects. He believed that under the current process, owners who are interested in doing something with their historic structures look at the cost and determine that it is not an option. Director Eddington stated that on the other side there are many who have the

money and prefer to skip the pre-application and move forward with the HDDR. Planner Grahn remarked that when someone comes in with a historic structure the Staff informs them of any financial resources that are available. However, not everyone takes advantage of the resources because they do not want to follow the requirements associated with a particular funding resource. Board Member Bush pointed out that the applicant still has to do the design work and documentation without knowing whether the project would be approved or denied for funding.

Planning Manager Sintz suggested that the HPB could discuss the possibility of expanding the grant program to give funds for historic documentation. Board Member Bush suggested that the Staff could document the building as part of the inventory. Planning Manager Sintz stated that it is difficult to get the right to enter someone's home. Ms. Meintsma thought people would be willing to allow it if it resulted in required documentation at no cost to the property owner. Director Eddington emphasized that even if it results in a benefit to the property owner, most people do not want the Staff going through their house.

Planning Manager Sintz suggested that the possibility of awarding up to a certain amount for a physical condition report and as-builts as part of the grant process, as a way to entice people to seek funding. Board Member Crosby understood that Ms. Sintz was only suggesting locally within Park City, and not federal or state. She was told that was correct. Board Member Crosby asked why there could not be a local subsidy that would subsidize that component of the process. She recognized that a subsidy would require additional money from the City budget.

Director Eddington replied that it would be a conversation to have with the City Council because it involved budget issues. He pointed out that allocating money from the budget for a subsidy program might reduce the money allocated for the grant program.

Board Member Vance stated that preserving historic structures makes the City more economically strong overall. For that reason, he believed an allocation of resources for that purpose was a better investment and would benefit Park City as a whole.

Planner Grahn commented on issues related to the quality of the physical conditions report. Director Eddington stated that the City did not have that resource available, however, he understood that the Board was suggesting that the City could hire a consultant to do the physical conditions report. He believed that was something the City could begin to look at as a possibility in the future.

Planning Manager Sintz suggested that it could be an approved list of people qualified to do a physical conditions report. Board Member Crosby agreed and thought a person should have to be pre-qualified to be on the list. Board Member

Melville assumed the City would absorb the cost. She was told that the City would cover the cost through the grant program.

Board Member White thought the City should generate an approved list of contractors for historic structures. However, he believed it would be challenging to try and do that in Utah. Planner Grahn noted that the State Historic Preservation Office already has a list of approved architects and contractors. She suggested that the City could encourage the Park City contractors and architects to get approved on the State's list.

Director Eddington encouraged the Board members to reach out to him or Planner Grahn with any concerns or ideas. He stated that their eyes on the street were essential, and if they see any infractions or issues, they should contact the Planning Department or the Building Department Code Enforcement.

Board Member Crosby thanked Ruth Meintsma for attending this session. She liked her suggestion about the Board familiarizing themselves with the HDDR guidelines. Board Member Crosby stated that she would have a problem representing the HPB to the Board of Adjustment or sitting in as a liaison to any of the municipal entities without knowing and understanding the guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she and Board Member White were on the Board during the re-writing of the Historic District Guidelines and she recalled dreadful situations throughout the process. The point that was continually driven was the fact that the Historic District Guidelines are not cast in concrete and it is a living document. Board Member Holmgren thought it was a good idea to review the guidelines on a regular basis to identify areas that need to be updated.

Board Member Crosby suggested that the Board could review a section of the Guidelines as a work session item at their regular meetings. Assistant City Attorney McLean thought it could be done in conjunction with revisiting the guidelines to identify hot spots where the guidelines may be difficult to apply, or other problems. It would help the Board members learn about the Guidelines and improve on them at the same time. Board Member White thought they were approaching a time period where the Board should revisit the entire Design Guidelines document page by page because they already know of some hot spots.

Board Member Crosby believed that a better understanding of the Guidelines would help them understand the purview of the HPB and their role and responsibilities. She wanted to know at what point they would become an auxiliary board as opposed to a board that hears appeals and gives grants. As they volunteer in the community it would keep them from doing something contradictory, or potentially cause a Board member from having to be recused from a certain item. Board Member Crosby asked if a liaison from the HPB to

another municipal entity would have to be recused if the project came before them on an appeal.

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that the HPB only has appeal authority on Staff decisions on HDDRs. The Legal Department has always recommended that a member from the HPB should not attend HDDR meetings because that person would have to recuse in the event of an appeal. Ms. McLean explained that the appeal process was changed within the last few years. Under the current process, any appeal of an HDDR decision goes directly to the HPB and an appeal of that decision goes to District Court.

Ms. Meintsma asked if a non-Board member could be a liaison to the HDDR to take factual notes but not participate in the process, and then provide a report to the HPB and to the Museum. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that it would still be a conflict because the Board acts as a judge on an appeal. Therefore, they could not hear a report or update, even if the information is factual. Ms. McLean suggested that the Staff could provide an annual or bi-annual update to the HPB on HDDR approvals that occurred during that time period, but after the appeal period. That would keep the Board updated on what projects to expect throughout the Historic District. Board Member Melville liked the idea of an HDDR update by Staff.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the Board should be prepared to elect a Chair at the next meeting. Planner Grahn announced that the next meeting was scheduled for November 11, 2013.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
David White, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board