

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JUNE 5, 2013

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Puggy Holmgren, David White, John Kenworthy, Gary Bush

EX OFFICIO: Anya Grahn, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Pro Tem David White called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Marion Crosby, who was excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

April 3, 2013

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of April 3, 2013 as written. Board Member Bush seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Anya Grahn thanked the Board members for registering for the Camp Workshop on June 14th from (9:00-5:00 at the Treasure Mountain Inn. The topics would include preservations issues such as financial incentives, the goal of the HPB, design guidelines, and other matters.

Board Member Holmgren disclosed that she has known Sandra Hall, the applicant for 1149 Park Avenue, is a neighbor and she has known her casually for several years.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the Board needed to officially name a Chair for this meeting. Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that the Board appoint a Chair Pro Tem for this meeting. They were still short two members and the intent is to have two new people on the Board for the next meeting, at which time the Board would officially vote on a Board Chair. Patricia Abdullah reported that three candidates would be interviewed by the City Council and hopefully the City Council would appoint two of new members before the HPB meets in July. .

David White introduced himself as the Chair Pro Tem who was chosen to Chair the meeting this evening.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion/Public Hearing/Possible Action.

1149 Park Avenue – Grant (Application PL-13-01877)

Planner Anya Grahn reported that the applicant, Sandra Hall, is a long-time Park City resident and her daughter, Rebecca Mudson, has encouraged her to restore the façade of her 1904 house. The structure is a significant site that was built in the mature mining era. It is a hall and parlor plan with a simple roof form. Based on historic and current photographs, it was evident that the house has changed very little. Planner Grahn explained that the major changes to the house have been more through materials. The actual form of the house has been retained.

Planner Grahn reported that sometime in the 1960's historic double-hung windows were removed from the façade and aluminum siding windows were installed. At the same time asbestos siding was put on exterior of the property and some of the window dimensions were changed. Ms. Hall would like to replace the windows with wood windows on the exterior. She would also like to replace the more traditional double-hung windows on the façade.

Planner Grahn noted Ms. Hall also needs to remove the asbestos siding in order to restore the wood siding underneath. Asbestos removal is a new process and a definite issue relative to historic preservation. It is an expensive process that requires trained and accredited asbestos professionals or an abatement contractor just to do the procedure. It also requires significant public noticing. The property must be tented and the process is similar to removing lead paint. The siding must be kept wet and moist to keep the particles from becoming airborne. Due to the cost of removing the asbestos, the Staff recommended that Ms. Hall receive grant funds to help with the painting of the house.

Planner Grahn stated that the proposed work would provide a community benefit for preserving and enhancing the historic architecture of Park City, particularly in the Lower Park neighborhood where there are fewer historic structures.

Planner Grahn reported that the estimated costs were \$4,100 for the asbestos removal; \$16,400 for the wood siding restoration; \$2,210 for restoring the two front windows to their historic form and \$7,500 to paint the house, for a total of \$30,910. Since the grant only funds 50% of the costs, Ms. Hall was requesting \$15,435.

Planner Grahn stated that from 9th Street north is considered the Lower Park Avenue neighborhood. Funds have been set aside and allocated for grants in that area. Grant applications from the Lower Park Avenue neighborhood are much less than the grants requested for Main Street or other areas in Old Town. The last grant awarded in the Lower Park Avenue area was for 1101 Norfolk in the amount of \$18,000.

Board Member Bush asked if they knew the condition of the wood siding underneath and the type of siding they planned on using.

Lance Kincaid, the general contractor representing the applicant, stated that he was told by the people doing the asbestos removal that the original siding is never saved because the asbestos penetrates the wood. Mr. Kincaid stated that as a general contractor he could not touch any of the asbestos to see what is behind it. However, he had been informed that it was not necessary to tent the property to remove the asbestos.

Planner Grahn stated that she had contacted SHPO, the State Historic Preservation Office, to find out if asbestos has been removed in other projects and whether or not wood siding could be restored. SHPO forwarded her email to someone else and she had not yet received a response. She would continue to pursue an answer. Planner Grahn understood from her research that an encapsulated spray could be used to seal the fibers. It was understandable if the wood siding could not be restored due to health issues; however, if it could be salvaged they needed to make the best effort to do so to comply with the design guidelines.

Chair Pro Tem White stated that he has never had an experience with removing asbestos. Mr. Kincaid stated that this was his second asbestos removal. The first was at the Silver Star Mine, which was tented because it was a different type of asbestos. He was told that because the asbestos on the house was shingles it did not have to be tented. Mr. Kincaid explained that over time the wood draws moisture and pulls in the asbestos. For that reason the wood siding is never saved.

Chair Pro Tem White asked when Planner Grahn expected to hear from SHPO. Planner Grahn replied that she would make a phone call to remind them that she was waiting on an answer from the Architectural Historian. Chair Pro Tem White asked if the costs identified for wood siding was for all new siding and trim, which would match the existing profile. Mr. Kincaid replied that this was correct.

Ms. Mudson stated that they had driven around town to look at windows on other historic homes. She noted that the house with the same layout just above the fire station appears to have the same windows on the side. They believed those windows were installed originally. It looks like they took a double-hung window and turned it on its side and it became a sliding window. Planner Grahn noted that historically it was a common practice in Park City to use whatever materials could be found. She was not aware that it was an original window and would be comfortable if the HPB chose to approve funds to replace the window.

Sandra Hall, the applicant, stated that she has two windows on the side of her house that hung the same way. She pointed out that when the asbestos is removed, it would uncover a window on the back. She would probably install a wood window in the back where one was originally. Ms. Hall stated that she wanted to preserve the house but she wanted to make sure that all the asbestos was removed, and that included all the existing wood boards and nails.

Chair Pro Tem White understood that if they replaced all the siding, it would take the asbestos and the siding all the way down to the original structure. He asked if the original structure was 1x12 or studs. Mr. Kincaid replied that it was studs. Chair Pro

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 5, 2013

Tem White asked if they would remove everything down to the studs and replace it with sheathing and moisture protection and insulation. Mr. Kincaid answered yes.

Planner Grahn was not opposed to that approach if it was necessary. The intent is to preserve historic structures. Part of preservation is making a usable structure, and if the additional insulation would make it livable and less cost consuming, she agreed that it should be done.

Chair Pro Tem White asked if the Staff was looking for a decision this evening or if they needed to wait for a response from SHPO. Planner Grahn thought it would be fair to award the grant on condition of a response from SHPO to comply with the guidelines, and to make sure that the pattern of the siding uncovered under the asbestos is mimicked when it is replaced.

Ms. Hall stated that she has lived in the house since 1968 and she knows the lady she purchased the house from. She believed the asbestos was put on the house sometime in the 1950.

Board Member Holmgren noted that normally paint is considered maintenance and it would not be eligible for grant funds. However, because the wood siding has never been painted, she assumed this could be considered an original paint job.

Assistant City Attorney stated that painting is vague. It is not an automatic award, but there are exceptions to allow it. Planner Grahn noted that painting is typically considered a maintenance issue and they would not want to encourage people to apply for grants to paint their house. However, they also want to make sure the funds are awarded to projects that provide a community benefit of preserving and enhancing the historic architecture of Park City. They also want to make sure they reward long-time Parkites, such as Ms. Hall, who make the extra effort to restore their homes.

Board Member Kenworthy asked about the construction time frame. Mr. Kincaid stated that currently the asbestos removers were booked until July. Ms. Hall noted that she had submitted a paint sample with her original proposal. She was proposing a dark reddish color. Planner Grahn pointed out that the City does not regulate paint colors.

Chair Pro Tem White understood that in the past when someone comes in for a grant with a proposal to repair a historic structure, the HPB can approve grant money for painting the portion that has been repaired. In this situation, if the entire structure would be repaired with new siding, he believed the painting should be included in the grant request. Board Member Holmgren concurred.

Board Member Bush thought it was a difficult decision. Being the Historic Preservation Board, historic fabric is important. He preferred to wait for the asbestos to be removed and to hear what SHPO says. Board Member Bush assumed that health and safety would trump fabric, but he struggled with making a decision without having all the facts. Mr. Kincaid pointed out that the information he received was from an asbestos company and not an architect or designer. Board Member Bush replied that he puts more value in a SHPO evaluation than the opinion of the asbestos remover. He has seen asbestos removed on other houses and the original wood siding is still there. He would assume

the siding was sealed and safe, but he had no way to know that for sure. Board Member Bush would never want to suggest a health hazard and he was on the fence in terms of which direction to take.

Chair Pro Tem White favored the suggestion of approving the grant conditioned on a response from SHPO. Planner Grahn asked if the HPB wanted to revisit the issue after she hears back from SHPO. Chair Pro Tem White recalled that the asbestos company would not be able to start until July. He believed they would hear from SHPO within that time frame.

Planner Grahn offered to cc Mr. Kincaid on the email and put him in touch with the State Architectural Historian. Mr. Kincaid requested that she also provide the credentials of the SHPO Architectural Historian.

Ms. Hall stated that she would like to start her project right after the 4th of July. Mr. Kincaid noted that they would like to be able to order the windows. Board Member Bush thought the HPB could approve the windows because they would be installed regardless of whether the siding is new or existing. Mr. Kincaid stated that new sheeting and siding would make a difference on the width of the windows.

Board Member Kenworthy asked about the new siding if they determine that the existing siding could not be used. Mr. Kincaid explained how the new siding would be milled to replicate the existing siding.

Ms. Hall asked the Board members to consider what they would do if this were there house and how they would choose which boards had asbestos and which ones did not. In her opinion, keeping some of the boards would negate the asbestos removal process.

Board Member Holmgren pointed out that this house is identified as a Significant historic structure. She would be more cautious if it was listed as a Landmark structure. She understood that previous changes were the reason why it did not classify for the Landmark designation. Planner Grahn replied that this was correct. The changes had to do with the materials. Board Member Holmgren believed safety was a significant reason for not requiring the applicant to keep any of the existing siding.

Board Member Kenworthy pointed out that the HPB would not make the decision on whether or not to remove the boards. Board Member Bush remarked that even if an expert makes the decision to keep the boards, Ms. Hall has to live there and be safe. He did not want to be responsible for another person's health.

Board Member Holmgren commented on the trash and cleanup. Planner Grahn apologized for not mentioning the \$1,000 for trash and cleanup in her presentation. Mr. Kincaid stated that \$1,000 for trash and cleanup was part of helping to remove the waste off the walls.

Chair Pro Tem White opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, was pleased that there was so much money in the fund for the ability to grant this request. She believed the HPB should

grant Ms. Hall funds for everything she was asking. Ms. Meintsma stated that once they remove the asbestos siding they may find unforeseen problems, and she would like Ms. Hall to have the ability to come back and request additional funding if they do encounter other issues. Ms. Meintsma had researched the asbestos situation and found that per the Air Quality Section of the State Code, the contractor and/or the homeowner can remove the siding in a 3 x 3 area to access the siding and the layers. She had also researched online and found many blogs of people who renovate historic houses. Specific steps are following and in many cases they had to deal with asbestos siding. In every situation the original siding was kept, except when the condition of the siding was too deteriorated to be saved. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that these were homeowners who were blogging online, which limits the relevance. She remarked that SHPO is the National Historic Register and Don Hartley is the State representative. She has dealt with Mr. Hartley in the past and if he is given a scrap of material he will go in-depth and identify the good and the bad. She felt it was important to depend on his opinion as to whether or not the siding can be saved.

Ms. Meintsma stated that this house has Significant designation, however, it is so much in its original format. She believed that there was a little bit of mis-information because it was considered “non-contributing”, but that was determined at the very beginning of the entire analysis of historic houses. She believed the analysis improved as they went along, but they were still not good at it. Ms. Meintsma thought the house could be taken back to Landmark status because there are no additions. Only the aesthetic details are changed. If the siding could be saved the category of the house may change to Landmark. Ms. Meintsma had attended several City Council meetings and the goal is to move more Significant houses to Landmark.

Ms. Meintsma referred to page 30 of the Staff report, which states, “Given the toxicity of asbestos it is likely that the majority of wood siding would not be salvageable.” In asking the city for money she thought it would be good if the labor and material were listed separately. She suggested that the wood should have a per foot cost so if the siding can be saved generally but requires replacement in some areas, the cost may be reduced. Regarding the paint, Ms. Meintsma remarked that if Mr. Hartley at SHPO determines that the wood can be saved, the paint may be a process of saving the wood. Ms. Meintsma stated that the siding is actually cement asbestos. Asbestos becomes friable, which means that it breaks down and becomes powdery. Cement asbestos is very resistant to friability so it is not the bad kind of asbestos.

Ms. Meintsma referred to the statement on page 30, “The amount of salvageable wood siding will be determined after removal.” She noted that the grant application process goes through a range of inspections by building inspectors. She suggested that once the asbestos process is completed, and before any of the siding is touched, she thought the Preservation Specialist should be the one to assess, take photos and do most of the determinations. If she needed backup she could consult with Don Hartley at SHPO.

Ms. Meintsma encouraged the HPB and the applicant to slow down and take it carefully to do this right rather than take a hurry up and get it down done approach. She thought Mr. Hartley could also coach the contractor on the methods of saving the siding and replacement.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of June 5, 2013

Chair Pro Tem White closed the public hearing.

Ms. Hall stated that this is a very small house. The asbestos siding also acts as insulation. If that is removed and the existing siding is kept, she would lose that insulation because she would not be able to have the sheeting and insulation that is planned with the new siding.

Board Member Kenworthy reiterated his comment that the HPB would not make the determination on existing siding vs. new siding. If there was evidence of any health issue he would support the decision to remove the siding entirely, but that decision was out of their purview. However, he thought the HPB could make the decision on whether or not to award the grant.

Board Member Holmgren liked the proposal and the fact that a house on Park Avenue would be made to look more attractive.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the grant request for the historic home at 1149 Park Avenue in the amount of \$16,392. Board Member Kenworthy seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Holmgren requested that Planner Grahn update the Board on the results after the work is completed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Approved by: _____
David White
Historic Preservation Board