

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2, 2019

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Douglas Stephens, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, John Hutchings, Jack Hodgkins, Randy Scott, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Mark Harrington

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

August 21, 2019

Board Member Hodgkins referred to page 2, second paragraph, and noted that it only said Board Member disclosed. Board Member Holmgren stated that she had made the disclosure. The Minutes were corrected to reflect that **Board Member Holmgren disclosed** that she sits on the HCPA Board....

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 21, 2019 as corrected. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson stated that the next regularly scheduled HPB meeting would be Wednesday, November 6th.

WORK SESSION

Park City Community Vision 2020 Update

Jed Briggs, Budget Operations and Strategic Planning Manager provided an update on the 2020 Community Vision. He noted that the City was undergoing a community visioning process; and they were working with a facilitator, Future IQ, who does this type of visioning all over the world.

Mr. Briggs stated that it is typical for cities to do community visioning. The last Visioning that was done in Park City was in 2009 with an update in 2015. The idea behind visioning is to gather as much community input and feedback as possible. The City has a Strategic Plan and a General Plan, and both of those guiding documents help the City to make better decisions and to help lead conversations with the City Council. Mr. Briggs remarked that the City always looks for feedback from the community; however, they make a pro-active effort every ten years through Visioning to make sure they have the right information and are moving in the right direction.

Mr. Briggs stated that at the last Visioning, they crafted a Vision Statement of Keeping Park City Park City; as well as creating core values: sense of community, natural setting, small town, historic character. He noted that the core values helped organize the General Plan.

Mr. Briggs stated that the Strategic Plan uses these core values as the baseline for setting goals and priorities. In using the tree graphic, the core values are the roots or base of the strategic planning effort. Once they understand the community's values, they can begin to create goals and priorities and the desired outcomes.

Mr. Briggs noted that the Visioning process started in June with the consultants, Future IQ; and it is typically a seven or eight month process. An extensive survey was put out to the community. It contains open-ended questions where people can express concerns, issues, or opportunities. At this point, more than 450 people have done the survey. Mr. Briggs encouraged the Board Members to take the survey if they had not already done so. The survey provides information and data as they try to craft a new vision for the future. The survey was on the website.

Mr. Briggs stated that from the survey results and from a Think Tank that took place in July with a group of 35 individuals from a cross-section of the community, they were able to craft different scenarios that look at Park City Futures ten, 20 and 30 years out. They created a matrix to help with the conversation. The matrix is a framing device to narrow the focus on the things they specifically want to emphasize and address.

Mr. Briggs stated that currently the City was in the process of doing engagement. They met last month with several different contingents of the community, including the high school, the seniors, and Staff. The plan to do weeklong session next well as well. He explained that after gathering community input, they were looking at the matrix to make sure they understand the different scenarios of the future.

Mr. Briggs stated that the Think Tank will be reconvened in November after all the engagements sessions to make sure they crafted the idea of what the Matrix looks like, and to start developing strategic pillars to help guide decision-making in the future. The next step would be focus groups who will look at the strategic pillars to make sure they are moving in the right direction. The goal is to have a deadline of January 2020.

Mr. Briggs presented a screen shot of the webpage. People can go onto the webpage and see all the data from the survey results and the individual comments. The data can be filtered by demographics, age, gender, ZIP Code, etc.

Mr. Briggs presented a slide showing what the engagement workshops were working on and what the consultants would be doing next week. The conversations ask the question of Where have they been; what have been the successes; what have been the failures, and how that can be leveraged into a future conversation. The focus for 2030 is what they want the future of Park City to look like.

Mr. Briggs presented some of the data currently collected from the survey. The categories from the open-ended questions that show opportunities facing the City over the next five or ten years. The ones with the most votes are Transportation solutions, Strategic Development, Environmental Initiatives, and Affordable Housing.

Mr. Briggs stated that the challenges facing Park City over the next five or ten years include Traffic and Transportation, Growth Management, and Housing Affordability. Mr. Briggs presented a graph showing the importance of different topics. They were not open-ended questions, but instead categories that people could vote on. Some of the most important topics from the survey were water resources, multi-modal transportation, preserving the City's charm and character.

Another question on the survey was How Good a Job was Park City Municipal doing. The top answers included recreation opportunities, the resort reputation; open space.

Mr. Briggs stated that the idea of the Matrix is to help frame conversations for the engagement sessions. There are two basic continuums. One is development trajectory which is opposite ends of development. The top was Architects of the Future and the idea is that Park City is being very proactive in terms of growth, infrastructure, planning, water resources, etc. The bottom was the idea that Park City is more passive and gets absorbed by growth whether in the City limits or outside the City limits. Mr. Briggs stated that the next continuum was community evolution. On one side was iconic destination mountain resort, which is the idea that Park City is focused on the resort economy and tourism. The other side

focused on being an inclusive society and a diverse community, looking at social changes and social demographics and being able to retain people who want to live and work in Park City.

Mr. Briggs stated that during the engagement session people are able to vote; and as they vote, the information is gathered. They vote on the expected future outcome over the next ten years, and the preferred future outcome. The idea is to find the strategies that help plot the course to go in the preferred direction.

Mr. Briggs stated that at the end of the process they will produce a Strategic Planning Document filled with these strategies.

Director Erickson reported that this went to the Planning Commission and it was determined that the Planning Commission, the Vision 2020 Group, and the Staff need to synthesize a policy direction that the City Council could analyze. It is the same with the HPB. The Historic Preservation Board will have a direct role in establishing policy for the future of the Historic Preservation areas. Director Erickson stated that this process is good in statistical science, but he believed that Mr. Briggs data accurately captures the 450+ people who have responded to the survey and the task force work. He thought Mr. Briggs was on target with the data he had. Director Erickson stated that the mission of the HPB is to attempt to respond and form policy with respect to how they see historic preservation going forward. It will range from controlled decay to adaptive reuse. It will also be how to fit historic preservation into these other community goals going forward.

Director Erickson encouraged the Board to look at the data. He pointed out that there were very few line items for historic preservation and they need to make sure that historic preservation is balanced out in the resources they have in the community. Director Erickson asked the Board members to take the survey to make sure their voices are heard. When it comes times to synthesize the policy direction at the end of November through first quarter 2020, they will have the opportunity to frame how they deal with the Historic District Guidelines going forward and with the Grant Program; and how they respond to growth pressures, and sustainability initiatives.

Chair Stephens asked if the data and the responses were in conflict with the core values, or whether it was based on the core values of historic character, small town, etc. Mr. Briggs stated that one of the areas they talk about is retaining Park City's small town character, charm, and history. It does not necessarily say preservation, but preservation is implied. Mr. Briggs acknowledged that they could change the core values, but he was not certain they would change. The point of the visioning process is to determine whether Park City needs to change course or whether they feel good about the current direction. In his opinion, he thought the data showed that they felt good about what they were doing, but they

needed to be more aggressive in certain areas. He did not anticipate a dramatic shift.

Board Member Scott stated that he and Ruth Meintsma were in the Think Tank and he thought it was a great process. He did not believe the questions were answered with the core values in mind. People answered the questions based on how they feel. He encouraged the other Board members to take the survey because the third top priority dealt with charm, character and history. He believed that most residents take the history for granted as charm, but they cannot have it without historic preservation. However, it was the second from the bottom in terms of how they were doing. Mr. Hodgkins stressed the importance of preservation being a part of this and having it heard. He urged the HPB to take the survey and to take this seriously because they will have a role in the first quarter of next year.

Board Member Toly asked how they chose the people for the Think Tank; and whether it would be the same Think Tank in November. Mr. Briggs thought it would be the same people because the idea was to start with one group as the people who would help frame the conversation. They will bring it back after they take it to the community and test some of the assumptions and ideas. Mr. Briggs explained that the Think Tank was done with an application process and it was open to everyone. He believed they accepted most everyone unless they live outside the City.

Board Member Toly understood that everyone could take the survey and not just those who live inside the 84060 Zip Code. Mr. Briggs replied that she was correct. Board Member Toly noted from the demographic that approximately 50% of the respondents did not live within the City limits. She asked if some are second homeowners or people who live in Summit County or Kimball Junction. Mr. Briggs stated that people outside the City limits who took the survey were primarily Snyderville Basin area residents. He estimated that 30-40% are outside the City limits, but within Summit County. Mr. Briggs wanted to focus more on the Park City residents, which is why they made sure to filter out the information by residents and by those living outside the City limits.

Board Member Hutchings asked if families with younger or middle-school age children were participating in the survey. Mr. Briggs stated that they were trying to get the survey out to as many people as possible; but he did not believe there was a question on the survey as to whether the participant had young children or family size. Mr. Briggs thought it was a good segment to consider.

Chair Stephens thought Mr. Hutchings made a good point because in talking about livability in a small town, the dynamics of a family change the character of the town.

Director Erickson stated that while history and historic preservation show up on line 4 of the survey under What is most Important, he thought there were underpinnings they needed to put a box around; including historic neighborhood protections. Director Erickson again urged the Board members to take the survey and to contact him if they have questions or just want to talk about the process. He believed the visioning will inform the General Plan and help form the historic preservation plans going forward.

REGULAR AGENDA

VII.A. 1135 Norfolk Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Historic Preservation Board Review for Disassembly and Reassembly of a Significant Historic Site – Applicant is Proposing the Disassembly and Reassembly (Panelization) of the Significant Historic Site. (Application PL-17-03702)

Planner Caitlyn Barhorst noted that the HPB previously reviewed this application. At the last meeting on August 7th, the discussion related to the proposal for reconstruction. Since then, the applicant withdrew that proposal after the Planning Commission discussed potentially exploring panelization as an option.

The Staff had prepared an analysis based on the criteria for disassembly and reassembly. A main criteria is the input of the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official. Dave Thacker, the Chief Building Official, was present to answer technical questions.

Planner Barhorst reported that after the interior demolition it was evident that the original T-shape of the house was added on to in the 1930s and 1940s, and there is no original siding left. The applicant had updated the panelization proposal taking that into consideration.

Planner Barhorst stated that Criteria 1 is that a licensed structural engineer has certified the historic buildings and their structures cannot be reasonably moved intact. She noted that the Staff report highlights the existing conditions of the structure that caused concern with either rehabilitation technique. Exhibit G was the full Existing Conditions Report.

Criteria 2 states at least one of the following: (A) that the structure is not threatened by Demolition. (B) that the structure has not been found to be hazardous or dangerous pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. (C) that if the Historic Preservation Board determines that the input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official that any conditions in the quality of the historic preservation plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Staff analysis was based on interpretation of the Code, as well as the Chief Building Official and Planning Director's determination, and the report by the structural engineer.

Planner Barhorst requested discussion by the Board to determine the best preservation method; taking into consideration the criteria for panelization.

Cam Shiedel, representing the applicant, noted that it had been a few months since the Board discussed this particular property. She stated that the issue this evening is the difference between renovating the house by lifting it versus panelization. Ms. Shiedel thought it came down to how much historic material could be preserved during the process. She noted that the Staff report indicates that the roof and the floor have been approved to be replaced. Ms. Shiedel pointed out that they were only talking about the walls of this structure and how they retain the historic material in the walls. She believed this was a unique situation. While other historic homes in Old Town may have been in similar or worse condition, those homes may have had more historic material.

Ms. Shiedel recalled from the first meeting that a primary question was how much historic material remained on this property and what they were trying to preserve. She stated that they already know they are not preserving the roof or preserving the floor. The owners firmly believe that in an effort to save the walls, panelization will do the least amount of damage to the historic materials in the renovation process.

Garrett Strong, representing the applicant, believed this was a unique property and situation because the floor and the interior walls will be removed. Only the exterior walls would be lifted if they choose that method. Mr. Strong stated that the walls would need to be supported to keep them from falling onto themselves. It would require significant horizontal bracing on the interior and exterior of the structure, and the bolts could damage the exterior veneer of the home. Mr. Strong pointed out that there is always a chance that the structure will not stay up during the lifting process. In this situation, removal of the floor makes it even more likely that damage could be done during the lifting process.

Mr. Strong understood the concerns regarding storing historic panels off-site, but storing off-site minimizes damage that could be done to the structure on-site with machinery working around it and the structure being lifted. Mr. Strong stated that if lifting is done, the structure would be brought back at a fairly early date during construction after the excavation is completed and the main floor of the old house is rebuilt. The structure would not be stored for a long length of time.

Ms. Shiedel presented a diagram so the Board could visually revisit the property to see which walls have historic siding on the exterior. The red portion denoted

the historical portion of the house. She indicated where the new addition would be located and noted that the greater part of the rear wall will be removed and replaced. Ms. Shiedel indicated a wall with historic siding, as well as a couple of short walls with historic siding. She stated that no historic siding existed on any of the other walls in the diagram outside of the portion highlighted in red.

Ms. Shiedel reiterated that the floor and roof would be removed. The shoring and drilling into the historic siding to brace the walls would cause more damage to the historic material in comparison to panelizing each of those walls. For that reason, she felt this was a unique situation and different from other houses that have been lifted. Ms. Shiedel echoed Mr. Strong's comments about better protecting the walls by storing them off-site. She believed panelization was the best approach to retaining the historic elements.

Bill Van Sickle, the project architect, noted that a significant amount of historic siding was found within the interior of the home, and they would try to reclaim some of that material to repair other areas. Mr. Van Sickle stated that the applicant was proposing to panelize the entire exterior, less the rear of the home where they will put on a new addition. They will preserve as much siding found inside the home as possible and use it to bring the front of the house into some of its original historic state.

Mr. Strong stated that if panelization were to be approved, the Staff report outlines certain requirements such as photography during deconstruction and labeling, and states that documenting the deconstruction would be better for the project. Mr. Strong was willing to do the required documentation.

Board Member Holmgren read from page 34 of the Staff report under (B), "The applicant shall complete the disassembly and reassembly using recognized preservation methods". She asked if there was a specific standard and requested more information. Planner Barhorst stated that under each letter A through L, the Staff had recommended a Condition of Approval per the Design Guidelines for disassembly and reassembly if the HPB directs the Staff to make Findings for approval. Planner Barhorst stated that the language could be expanded for clarification.

Board Member Hutchings asked about the square footage that would be lifted or panelized. Planner Barhorst replied that per the plans, the existing main level is 865 square feet.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for clarification of the framing structure of the house and whether it was previously determined to be non-historic. Planner Barhorst replied that the framing structure is historic. It was added in the 1930s or 1940s. The Sanborn map dated 1941 still has the shortened T-cross gable. Per the photographs the addition was added with the roof most likely around the

same time as the Bricktex asphalt siding was put on, since there is no horizontal lapsiding on that part. Planner Barhorst clarified that it is historic, but it was not the original form.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it would be helpful to walk the HPB through the two engineering reports. The reports were conflicting and she wanted to understand both perspectives. Mr. Strong asked if Ms. Beatlebrox was referring to the difference between what the Chief Building Official found in terms of lifting the house versus the structural engineer report. Ms. Beatlebrox answered yes. She asked to be walked through the Epic Engineering report and also to have Dave Thacker, the Chief Building Official, to walk them through his report.

Dave Thacker, the Chief Building Official, stated that he was not the engineer of record, but he could give his interpretation of what the Engineer submitted. Mr. Thacker stated that the engineering report from Epic Engineering goes through in detail how the building can be lifted or how the building can be panelized. The report goes on to say that neither process is recommended because it is economically infeasible. Mr. Thacker did not believe the report provided specifics in terms of what can be done with the structure. He did not disagree with the applicant that without a roof and without a floor, lifting the structure becomes much more challenging and more bracing is required. However, the majority of homes that are lifted that do have the roof removed, are lifted prior to the roof or floor being removed. It allows the building to remain intact and assist in the required bracing.

Mr. Thacker stated that the part of the Code that he is asked to interpret as they look through this, is the International Building Code Section 116.1. That Section determines whether or not a building is safe. It is not necessarily to say it is safe to lift or safe to panelize. The intent is to determine whether or not it is a safe structure. Mr. Thacker remarked that based on the criteria of that section, it was determined that the building is safe enough to be inhabited. Some elements would need to be mitigated to make the structure 100% Code compliant; but the structure was determined to be safe. Mr. Thacker stated that one of the sentences of the Code that was important to note for this and future structures, says "Structures shall be taken down if they're considered unsafe and removed; or made safe. He remarked that the caveat "to be made safe" is what they look at in a lot of the historic structures, especially those that are not necessarily determined to be structurally unsafe. Mr. Thacker did not believe that the engineering report submitted gave any indication that this building was structurally unsafe, but it could be made safe enough to be lifted and/or preserved as a historic structure.

Board Member Beatlebrox clarified that Mr. Thacker had said that both panelization and lifting were expensive. Mr. Thacker replied that it was noted in the Epic Engineering report; and that report went into detail on how to do each

method. The report included a recommendation section from the Engineer that states neither method lifting or panelization is recommended because of economic infeasibility.

Mr. Strong pointed out that the engineering report does not address the damages caused by lifting versus panelization. He believed that issue needed to be considered as well.

Board Member Toly noted that the Staff report states that the Staff finds that panelization will cause additional loss of historic material compared to the method of lifting. She asked why the Staff felt that more historic material would be lost during panelization. Planner Barhorst stated that it was due to the order of things being taken apart and lifted. The roof will be reconstructed in its form, but it would not be removed until the house is back down on the new foundation. In terms of amount of material, Planner Barhorst stated that the method of taking the walls apart on this structure is not required for rehabilitation because there are other methods. She agreed that there would need to be cross beams and shoring, but that could be mitigated.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why the house needed to be taken off the foundation. Mr. Strong stated that the house would be lifted to put a foundation underneath it to accommodate a new lower level. The floor needs to be replaced because it is a hodge-podge of framing and uneven pieces. Mr. Van Sickle explained that part of the existing structure is sitting on a tree log that was jammed under the house to support it. The intent is to replace the bits and pieces of materials underneath the house with something more structurally sound.

Ms. Shiedel noted that the engineer report showed a 12" difference in different portions of the floor. When they talk about the floor sagging, they are talking about a difference of a foot or more. Board Member Beatlebrox recalled the sagging floor from the site visit.

Chair Stephens understood the comments about floor needing to be replaced. He thought Mr. Thacker made a good point about not removing the roof before the home is lifted. It would remain intact for lifting and then the roof would be removed when the home is on the foundation. In terms of design, the applicant has the prerogative to remove the floor. Chair Stephens thought the structure could be lifted more effectively if it were left intact.

Mr. Strong agreed that the house could be lifted in one piece; but he disagreed that the floor did not need to be replaced. Chair Stephens asked if they were talking about the framing for the floor, or the floor itself. Mr. Strong replied that it was the framing for the floor. Chair Stephens stated that when he read the engineering report from Epic he did not see any reference to the floor framing

needing to be removed. Mr. Strong stated that it has to do with the logs holding up the structure and the floor is not up to current standards. Chair Stephen thought the log was a foundation and support issue rather than a framing issue for the floor.

Mr. Van Sickle reiterated that the floor was a hodge-podge of different materials created to make the floor for the addition. In order to lift the house, they would need to build a new floor within that existing floor to give it the rigidity it needs to be lifted.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, commented on the process of house lifting. After reading the Engineer's report she went back in her files and looked at photos of houses she had photographed when lifted. She noted that the professionals make it look easy and it occurs very fast and efficiently. Ms. Meintsma stated that she had images of 17 different houses in her files and all 17 houses were lifted whole with the floors and the roofs. Based on her photos, it looked like all the structures had rebuilt roofs and some of the floors were rebuilt with historic material. Ms. Meintsma favored lifting the house intact. She noted that sistering and joist is very basic for structural stability.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hutchings was struggling with how this project is unique in Old Town. He thought the pictures looked like many other projects. He commented on his own project that was done in 2016 on his house. It was very similar to this project. His home was built in a series of five additions and there was a hodge-podge of things everywhere. He explained what the builder did in every room to support the house before it was lifted. Mr. Hutchings stated that the process was complicated and involved but lifting the house was possible. He did not believe his project was unique and he did not think this project was unique based on other projects in Old Town.

Board Member Scott thought Ruth Meintsma's process of taking photos was interesting and he has done the same thing. There are a lot of opportunities to watch homes being lifted in Old Town, and he has learned a lot because he is fascinated by it. He read through the Minutes from the August meeting where the Board discussed the application for reconstruction/deconstruction of this house. At that time there was a lot of discussion about the potential for panelization and they also discussed lifting. The Board did not focus on the difference between the two methods because that was not the application before them. Mr. Scott spent time researching the criteria for lift versus panelization. He noted that the Board has voted to panelize a few homes, but those were very

unique circumstances. Mr. Scott clarified that he was not able to say that this project was incredibly unique.

Board Member Holmgren had read through the Engineer's report. She also has watched a few houses being lifted and she thought it was a cleaner and easier method.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed with the Engineer's report that both approaches are expensive. However, she did not see the difference between panelizing and deconstruction. Ms. Beatlebrox believed the applicant definitely needed to panelize the interior so it could be used on the exterior. She did not understand why the house could not be lifted.

Tana Toly agreed with all the comments. She could not see any difference between lifting and panelization.

Chair Stephens agreed with Mr. Hutchings. The Board needs to look at the precedent they would be setting for other homes in similar situations. The few times that panelization was approved, there were very unique circumstances. Chair Stephens could not find the unique circumstances in this situation. Panelization is an invasive process and they tried to avoid using that method unless it is extremely necessary to save a structure.

Director Erickson understood that the approval to lift the structure was already complete. Planner Barhorst replied that it was approved on July 17th during the material deconstruction approval. The HDDR application, which includes the design, was still pending approval per the discussion this evening. Planner Barhorst stated that the HPB needed to make a decision on approval or denial this evening; and direct the Staff to make findings based on their action.

Director Erickson referred to page 37 of the Staff report, bullet point #2, which he believed was what the HPB was addressing this evening based on their comments. He explained that the Board should direct the Staff to make findings for their decision, and the Staff would come back with the Findings to be ratified by the Board.

Director Erickson stated that the Board needed to articulate what findings they were making; however, for the most part, lifting is a less damaging practical alternative than panelization. The Board could decide whether or not less historic material is potentially at risk through lifting versus panelization activities.

Chair Stephens understood from the comments that the HPB would be denying the disassembly and reassembly. He wanted to know when the findings of fact come into play.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the HPB could direct the Staff to return with a modification of the Findings of Fact consistent with the discussion that there are no unique circumstances; and that the prior two criteria are not met.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to DENY the disassembly and reassembly at 1135 Norfolk Avenue; and to direct the Staff to make Findings for this decision. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board