PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of Park City, Utah will hold its Historic Preservation Board Meeting at the City Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah 84060 for the purposes and at the times as described below on Wednesday, July 17, 2019.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM.

I. ROLL CALL

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

II.A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from June 5, 2019.

June 5, 2019 Minutes

III. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

IV. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

V. CONTINUATIONS

VI. WORK SESSION

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

VII.A. PL-17-03702 1135 Norfolk Avenue – Historic Preservation Board Review for 1) Material Deconstruction and 2) Reconstruction of a Significant Historic Site. The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Significant Historic Site following Material Deconstruction of non-Historic concrete retaining wall and exterior stairs; circ. 1900s concrete foundation with non-Historic stone veneer; circ. 1900s brick interior foundation retaining walls; circ. 1900s roof forms and non-Historic roof form addition; circ. 1930s Inselbrick asphalt siding; non-Historic concrete garage, non-Historic shed; non-Historic slab-on-grade foundation addition; circ. 1989 window replacements; non-Historic doors; circ. 1900 floor structure with modern upgrades; circ. 1989 metal roof and structural upgrade; circ. 1989 horizontal wood siding; circ. 1989 porch and columns.

1) Public Hearing and Possible Action
2) Public Hearing and Possible Action

Staff Report.pdf
VIII. ADJOURN

A majority of Planning Commission members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the Planning Commission Chair Person. City business will not be conducted. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the City Recorder at 435-615-5007 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Wireless internet service is available in the Marsac Building on Wednesdays and Thursdays from 4:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Posted: See: www.parkcity.org

*Parking validations will be provided for Planning Commission meeting attendees that park in the China Bridge parking structure.
ROLL CALL
Chair Doug Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES
April 17, 2019

Board Member Holmgren referred to page 1 and corrected Chair Stephen to correctly read Chair Stephens.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to APPROVE the minutes of April 17, 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 expressed appreciation to the HPB for their assistance in getting the Design Guidelines approved by the City Council. The Guidelines are several hundred pages and the result of several years of work. Director Erickson reported that the City Council requested establishing a task force to clear up some of the anomalies. The task force will be headed up by Michele Downard, who was formerly with the Building Department. Ms. Downard will be responsible for clearly communicating Land Use regulations to the public.

Director Erickson introduced Caitlyn Barhorst, the new preservation planner. He noted that the Planning Department will have two other new planners before the end of the month. Director Erickson also introduced Jessica Nelson, the new Operations Manager in the Planning Department. Jessica was taking notes for the Minutes this evening.
Planner Tyler announced that due to the Fourth of July holiday, the next HPB meeting was scheduled for July 17th.

Board Member Hodgkins reported that the Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award to the City Council on Thursday, May 30th. The painting of the Glenwood Cemetery turned out really well and it was hanging in the Marsac Building. Director Erickson noted that the recipients had also received a State award for Stewardship for the project. Peggy Fletcher and two Board Members, Ken and Bob Martz, attended the Preservation Utah meeting where they were presented with the Stewardship Award.

Chair Stephens thought the public response to the award was more enthusiastic than in prior years.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. 1060 Park Avenue – Application to Remove a Significant Site from the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (Application PL-19-04197)

Carla Lehi and Sean Thompson, with the Elliott Work Group, were present this evening on behalf of the applicant.

Planner Hannah Tyler stated that 1060 Park Avenue was currently listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory. It was constructed around 1946 and the site has been established to be important to the period of significance for the Mining Decline and Emergency of Recreation Industry. It is in the Historic District HR-1. The applicant was proposing to remove this site from the Historic Sites Inventory, and if that occurs, the site would be delisted.

Planner Tyler stated that the house is a 1940s design, which is a cross gable roof form, typical of this period. Overall much of the form has remained the same based on available evidence of the structure over time. There have been no new window or door openings. The porch form is intact, and overall the alterations in general have been mostly cosmetic. Planner Tyler reported that new siding was installed over the concrete block; new windows were installed, and new front door. The decorative trim on the porch has been removed and the stone planter in the front was removed.

Planner Tyler presented four photos. Two photos on the left were current photos from the Intensive Level Survey. The other two photos on the right were screenshots of the structure from a 1950s film that the applicant had provided. Planner Tyler stated that the video itself is an hour, and although it shows other parts of Old Town, the video specifically highlights 1060 Park Avenue.
Tyler noted that additional photos were included in the Staff report; however, she thought the four presented provided a high level overview of what the house looks like now versus what the house looked like in the past. She remarked that the video moved quickly and they were not able to capture a screenshot of the entire house.

Planner Tyler noted from the photos that stonework was currently being done. It was still in progress, which is why the stonework did not wrap around the building. She pointed to another photo showing the decorative trim, the retro door, the changed windows, and the stonework.

Planner Tyler provided a document prepared by the applicant that was not included in the Staff report. The document identified the site, as well as the structures around it in the different eras. She noted that the structure was in the Lower Park Avenue area. It is one of three structures important to the Mining Decline and Emergence of the Recreation Industry. She indicated other structures in the area that are relevant to other eras in the HR-1 zone.

Planner Tyler commented on the Criteria. She clarified that the HPB was being asked to forward a recommendation to the City Council. The Council would then make the final decision.

Planner Tyler stated that the LMC sets forth criteria to remove a site from the Historic Sites Inventory. Per LMC 15-11-10(C), Any Owner of a Site listed on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory may submit an Application for the removal of his/her Site from the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. Planner Tyler remarked that the screenshots submitted by the applicant were considered additional information to support their determination that the structure is not compliant with the Code. Planner Tyler clarified that Criteria A did not apply because nothing else has been lost since designation; and Criteria B does not apply because the building has not been demolished. Criteria C is the appropriate criteria to review this application.

Planner Tyler stated that both the Staff and the applicant agreed that the site meets the Criteria for A and B. Criteria A is that the structure is over 50 years old since it was built in 1946; and it has been determined to be Significant through the Mining Decline and Emergency of Recreation Industry. Criteria B is whether the site has been recognized as part of a survey. Planner Tyler remarked that the site was part of the 2007 Reconnaissance Level Survey, which ultimately led to it being listed on the Historic Sites Inventory in 2009. It was also reviewed in the Intensive Level Survey in 2015.

Planner Tyler reviewed Criteria C and explained why the Staff believes the site complies with Criteria C. The Staff established that the site retains its historic scale, context, and materials in a manner and degree that can be restored to its
historic form. She reiterated that most of the alterations were cosmetic and could be removed or replaced with historic accurately materials. Planner Tyler stated that the new siding could be removed, and windows and a door could be installed that are more historically accurate.

Planner Tyler stated that the site itself is recognized for its significance with the Mining Decline and Emergence of the Recreation Industry, which is the period of significance that was established for the City of Park City. She noted that in their application, the applicant focuses heavily on the National Register District Criteria Boundaries. However, the criteria for Significant Sites does not rely solely on the National Register District Boundaries or the nomination itself. The Staff finds that in many ways the applicant misstates the criteria because it is more Landmark criteria. Planner Tyler emphasized that the site contributes to the local Historic District because of its scale, context, and the materials that have been retained; and the materials that have been lost could easily be replaced.

Planner Tyler stated that in talking about the two Historic Districts, one is the Main Street Historic District, which is geographically bound and part of Main Street. The other is the Mining Era Residence District, in which the structure must be a residential structure and built within the early Mining Boom Era. She pointed out that this structure does not meet either of those requirements because it is not on Main Street and it was not built during the Mining Boom Era. For that reason, the local districts were established to capture those other sites. In 2009, when the current HSI was created, the City cast a wider net to capture the Significant structures because Significant structures are not eligible for the National Register. Planner Tyler thought it was important to clarify the distinction because most Significant sites would not be a part of either of those Districts. If that criteria were followed, many Significant sites would be lost in the local district; and that was not the intent. Planner Tyler remarked that for this reason it was established as part of the Mining Decline and Emergency of the Ski Era period of significance.

Planner Tyler referred to Criteria D, which talks about whether or not the site is important to local or regional history. She reiterated that this structure is important to the Mining Decline and Emergency of Ski Industry period from 1931 to 1962. It is an established period of Significance for Park City as outlined in the Historic District Design Guidelines. The site was listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory, and the Staff found that nothing in relation to the site had changed to result in delisting from that specific period of significance.

Planner Tyler stated that the Mining Decline was a time of economic hardship and a steep population decline. As a result, many buildings were abandoned or demolished and few structures were built. Rather than focus on the lack of structures from this period, the Staff felt it was important to recognize that this structure was constructed, retained, preserved and only slightly altered since
1946. That can only be said for a few structures of this period of historic Significance.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board forward a negative recommendation to the City Council to keep this site on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Chair Stephens asked Planner Tyler if the descriptions for Significant Sites in the LMC refers back to the historic districts or to the zoning districts. Planner Tyler stated that the criterion is set up to identify each individual property as a site because some sites are not in a historic district. The criterion speaks not only to the building on the site but the entire site, including its context. Planner Tyler clarified the distinction that it is not on a National Register Boundary or Historic District itself. In this particular instance, the Staff believes it contributes to a historic district, which is part of what makes it a historic site.

Chair Stephens understood that the National Historic Districts are a federal designation, and he asked if it runs parallel in terms of how these matters are reviewed against the LMC.

City Attorney Harrington stated that for this analysis it is both site and district, but district with a small "d" meaning a local district; not either of the two national districts of Main Street or the Mining Era Residential. Chair Stephens clarified that in applying the definition of a Significant Site, the site does not have to be in one of the National Districts to comply. Ms. Harrington replied that he was correct.

Carla Lehigh stated that Elliott Workgroup was established in 2002 and they have done many projects in the Historic District. They are aware of the Codes and they are pro-preservation and pro-Park City. However, the Elliott Workgroup believes this site could be removed from the HSI.

Ms. Lehigh commented on the criteria for Significant sites, and the applicant agrees with many of the criteria. However, they disagree with some of the criteria. She highlighted some of the points included in a letter from the consultant. Ms. Lehigh stated that the applicant has already complied with the criteria, but they disagree with 2C, which asks if the site reflects the historical character of the District and meets the criteria for that era. Ms. Lehigh stated that the era is the Declining Mining Era at which time there was no activity in Park City, buildings were abandoned, and people were leaving.

Sean Thompson stated that the site needs to meet all the Criteria of A, B, C and D. He agreed that the site qualifies under C.1. However, they disagree with the Staff comment regarding C.2 that it reflects the historical and architectural character of the site. Mr. Thompson stated that in looking at the meaning, they
disagree with the application of the visual compatibility of the Mining Era Residences National Register District. He noted that C.2 directs compatibility with those, even though the site is not within the District. Based on that interpretation, the applicant did additional analysis in looking at the National Register to see how that criteria could be applied, because no criteria have been established for the Mining Decline period and how it relates to the visual compatibility of the Mining Era Residences. Mr. Thompson stated that criteria pulled from the National Register was part of the information the applicant submitted to the City. Mr. Thompson stated that while the applicant disagrees with the City on that issue, is it not the crux of the matter.

Planner Tyler handed the Commissioners copies of the criteria Mr. Thompson referred to from the National Register. Ms. Lehigh clarified that they were not looking at the as Code and they were not following it explicitly. She stated that the Historic Guidelines gives a description of that Era, but it does not provide a guideline to figure out if this house was part of this Era either architecturally or historically.

Mr. Thompson remarked that the issue is how this project actually conveys that Era and its significance. He read text from the Consultant’s analysis, “The City has provided context with the Mining Decline Era in the Design Guidelines, and it is sufficient to allow us to understand the significance of this site within that period, as described above”. Mr. Thompson stated that the applicant has not been able to find a determination or any guideline within that history or any of the Codes that conveys why this site is Significant. He pointed to a bullet point that was referenced in “as described above” regarding historic context. Mr. Thompson remarked that their application stated that the historic context was needed to evaluate the site’s significance within the Historic period, and that one has not been written. The response they received was that it was provided for in the History of Park City section of the Design Guidelines. Mr. Thompson stated that the verbiage in that section is sufficient to understand the significance. He explained that they understood the significance of the Era of Mining Decline and the Emergence of Recreation; but they were trying to understand how that actually applies to this structure and how this property conveys that. They could not see a connection or how it conveys that period.

Mr. Thompson referred to the bullet point stating that new construction was extremely rare, which means that almost any building dated in this Era is Significant, assuming it retains its essential historic form and conveys that significance. Mr. Thompson believed the key was that “almost any building dating to that period” can convey that significance.

Mr. Thompson stated that they read through this Era in the Design Guidelines, and it talks about the loss of jobs and it talks a lot about the struggles. It also
talks a lot about how United Park City was investing and looking at ways to bring the ski areas into being. In reading through it, Mr. Thompson could not see how this property conveys that area.

Mr. Thompson summarized that the applicant disagrees with the C.2 comment in that C.2 directly says the site has to be compatible. However, the Staff was saying they do not need to be compatible and the applicant was not applying the criteria correctly. Mr. Thompson remarked that D.1 says that almost any building can be Significant, assuming it retains its essential historic form, but conveys that significance. The applicant agrees that the building does retain its essential historic form; but there is no documentation of what makes this property significant either in the Historic Guidelines, the Era History or the Consultant’s report.

Mr. Thompson remarked that for all the reasons stated, the applicant respectfully requests that the site be delisted from the Historic Sites Inventory.

Ms. Lehigh stated that they looked to the National Register because they could not find a guideline for that historic district. She noted that the National Register has a document with criteria that outlines exactly how to define a place as Significant. That was document the Commissioners received during this presentation. Ms. Lehigh stated that the National Register criteria talks about an event. For example, if the house was particularly important into that Era. For Significance, the language states that association with a historic event or trend is not enough. The property’s specific association must be considered important as well. Ms. Lehigh did not believe this house was important for that Era. In terms of the people who lived in that house, Ms. Lehigh questioned how the Staff or anyone could determine whether those people were important. Based on the National Register criteria, the individual needs to be important within that historic context. She could not find that this site met that criteria.

Regarding the design and the construction, Ms. Lehigh noted that the structure must meet the type and period of construction, and is an example within that context. The applicant did not believe there was context. The house sits on Park Avenue and the exhibit shows that it is isolated on Park Avenue.

Ms. Lehigh pointed to the Barn site on the exhibit and noted that the Barn is important because it shows the period when the ski area and the commercial buildings started to be built. Ms. Lehigh remarked that the house at 1060 Park Avenue was out of context during that time period, and it is still out of context. Mr. Thompson commented on the Historic Sites Form that is filed with the Utah State Historic Preservation Office and noted that the property evaluation states that the property is ineligible and non-conforming.
Board Member Scott referred to Finding #21 on page 22 of the Staff report, and noted that the last sentence reads, “In 2000 the current applicant submitted a Determination of Significance for the Site, but the application was withdrawn by the applicant”. Planner Tyler stated that the current owner previously submitted an application to have the house removed from the HSI. The application was withdrawn, but she was unable to find a reason as why it was withdrawn in her research. No action was taken at that time, which is why it is back before the HPB this evening.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Planner Tyler had received an email with public comment that was forwarded to the Planning and submitted into the record. The Planning Commission had also received a hard copy of the same email. Chair Stephen noted for the record that the Planning Commission had received the written public input.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Scott asked if documentation from the Intensive Level Survey was included in the Staff report. Planner Tyler replied that the Intensive Level Survey was included as an exhibit. She clarified that it was a review for National Register eligibility. This structure is not National Register eligible, which is why it was shown as non-contributing. Planner Tyler explained that the Intensive Level Survey is included even for Significant sites that are listed as non-contributory because extra research was done through the ILS process.

Board Member Hodgkins had a question regarding National Register eligibility. He noted that currently the scattered site National Register for residential properties only incorporates sites within the Boom Era. Planner Tyler replied that he was correct. Mr. Hodgkins asked if it was possible to expand the time period of that same district in the way that the Main Street time period was recently expanded. Planner Tyler thought the idea could be considered. Mr. Hodgkins asked if it was considered, if there was any reason why this house would not be included at that time. He recognized that being old was not a reason to be considered or included. Planner Tyler replied that he was correct. Mr. Hodgkins stated that if the dates of the Historic District are ever expanded, he wanted to know if there was anything about this particular building that would cause it to be excluded from consideration. Planner Tyler replied that the structure has alterations as identified in the Staff report. However, the thematic districts allow structures that have lost some integrity to be listed simply because of their contribution to the context of the Era or other reasons. Planner Tyler stated that she was uncomfortable fully answering the question without confirming it with a consultant and doing a National Register review on this particular property.
However, she believed it would be considered and they would take close look at this structure because it was one of the few structures built in the Era.

Board Member Holmgren clarified that the house was built in 1946. Planner Tyler replied that she was correct.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the majority of the alterations were done within that same Mining Decline Period. Planner Tyler assumed from her research that the house was built in 1946 and after the owners had some money, they put the stone on a few years later. The same owner did the work and she thought the alterations would be considered within the historic period and the essence of this historic structure.

Chair Stephens understood there was no question that the structure is 50 years old, it has retained its form, etc. He thought the issue was the discrepancy between the Staff report and the applicant’s interpretation of how this site contributes to the Declining Mining Era. Mr. Thompson was unsure about contributing to the Era; and he thought it was more about how it conveys the Era. Chair Stephens stated that regardless of whether it conveys or contributes, the question is how the architecture and built structure relate to the Era. Mr. Thompson remarked that a better question would be how the existence of this structure helps tell the story of that period. At this point, they have found no guidance or benchmark for making that determination.

Chair Stephens clarified that based on the applicant’s interpretation, the structure would not comply with D.1. Ms. Lehigh stated that it does not comply with any of Criteria D: D.1, D.2 or D.3. Mr. Thompson clarified that the applicant had no issues with Criteria A and B. They disagreed on C.2, but it would still qualify under C.1. He believed D.1 was the real crux of their argument. Chair Stephens pointed out that in the LMC, Criteria D states “is important in local, regional history, architecture, engineering or cultural associated with an era of historic importance to the community. Mr. Thompson stated that without having specific criteria listed, they referenced to the National Guidelines which provides clear language. Just because a structure was built in the time period does not mean it is historic.

Chair Stephen stated that the LMC does not direct the HPB to the National Register Guidelines. Mr. Thompson agreed; however, the LMC also does not provide guidance. Ms. Lehigh stated that the LMC directs them to the Historic District Design Guidelines; and the Guidelines provide a description of that Era but nothing more.

Chair Stephens remarked that this always has more context that one individual house because it also becomes a discussion for future applicants. He pointed out that Criteria D in the LMC does not direct them to the National District Design
Guidelines or to the Historic District Guidelines. It was just a statement. Mr. Thompson stated that they were told to look to the Historic District Design Guidelines for guidance. The found that the Guidelines did not give any direction and in the absence of any guidelines they looked to another means of criteria for guidance.

Mr. Hodgkins noted that the LMC does not reference the National Register criteria as a method for determination of local structures. Mr. Thompson agreed.

Board Member Holmgren thought the structure was very significant for the time it was built. When she first came to Park City over 30 years ago that house was sitting there and it made her smile every time she passed it. It is like so many other homes she has seen across the Country and it was a cookie cutter house for that time. Ms. Holmgren thought it was very important for that timeline.

Board Member Scott stated that he walked around the structure yesterday and it is a cinder block home. Like it or not, it is a definite departure from how homes were built previously. That post-war era starts to define how homes were built. In his opinion, that construction method is unique, even though it did not last long in Park City.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the applicant talked about lack of context in the immediate surrounding area. He believed that one of the historic aspects is that there was a lack of context during this time period and not much has been built. The majority of the housing stock that the HPB reviews is from an earlier period. The Board rarely gets a chance to have much insight into the mind-set of the inhabitants during the Decline Period. Mr. Hodgkins stated that they tend to focus on the Boom Eras and the Ski Industry, which made Park City great. However, all of those are borne out of a need. Mr. Hodgkins questioned whether Park City would be the ski town it is today if they had not experienced the economic hardships of the Decline period. He felt the significance of the Decline period forced an economic solution for survival. Mr. Hodgkins stated that it is easy to say it is not important, but if they start losing historic pieces they begin to miss the true importance and significance of the current Ski Era.

Mr. Thompson understood what Board Member Hodgkins was saying, but he did not see how the structure actually conveys it. Mr. Hodgkins thought Mr. Thompson had said the construction was typical of the time period that was built in certain places. Mr. Thompson clarified that he had said he understood why they stopped building CMU in Park City. Board Member Holmgren thought the structure conveyed the era because it is exactly the type of home that was built across the Country in that time period.

Board Member Hutchings echoed the comments from the Board members. When walking down Park Avenue he feels the same as Board Member
Holmgren. It is a unique house and it conveys that Era in Park City littered amongst the mining era homes along the Street. Mr. Hutchings personally thought this was a very significant home on Park Avenue for that Era. Mr. Hutchings believed the structure met Criteria D, it is important to local regional history, architecture, engineering and culture of an era. He thought it was an important historical home.

Chair Stephens did not feel like the LMC was directing them to the National Park Service or to other Guidelines. He thought it met Criteria D.1 because it conveys historic important to the community for that Era. Chair Stephens thought Board Member Holmgren said it best, that it is a home that was built architecturally and structurally based on what was going on after World War II because limited resources were available. Chair Stephens thought the HPB would be going out of their purview to read anything more into D.1 that what was written.

City Attorney Harrington stated that because the Board was specific in their comments, he recommended that the HPB entertain a motion to modify the final Conclusion of Law where D is referenced. Since the Board was saying it complies with the era and noteworthy methods of construction, Mr. Harrington recommended eliminating Item 2, which references lives of important people. He preferred that the Board specify which criteria they are finding for compliance. It is unclear if all three are listed together. Mr. Harrington suggested that the Conclusion of Law indicate that the site complies with D(1) and D(3); consistent with their discussion.

Planner Tyler clarified that the HPB would be forwarding a recommendation to the City Council for June 29, 2019.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council on June 27, 2019 to DENY the proposed Determination of Significance application to remove the “Significant” Site at 1060 Park Avenue from the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, in accordance with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as amended. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1060 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1060 Park Avenue. The subject property was designated as a “Significant” Site on the Park City Historic Site Inventory (HSI) in 2009. The subject property is located within the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. On April 16, 2019, the applicant submitted an application for a Determination of Significance for this site to remove the subject property from the Park City
Historic Sites Inventory (HSI); the application was deemed complete on April 28, 2019.

3. 1060 Park is a WWII Era cottage that appears to have been modified. Built around 1946, the house is much more recent than many of the other houses in the neighborhood and, consequently, is very different in appearance when compared to those houses.

4. Some elements of the house are appropriate to the time in which it was built, and others appear to have been modified. The cross gable roof is noted as being sheathed with composition shingles. A brick chimney is seen at the peak of the roof. The walls are clad with board-and-batten siding and with stone veneer, especially towards the front of the house.

5. The areas in the gables are clad with aluminum siding. It is presumed that the stone veneer is a newer addition to the home.

6. There is a large fixed pane window in the porch area to the right of the door. A one-over-one double hung sash window sits on the left of the primary façade.

7. The porch is covered by the gable of the cross-wing and is supported by two fluted columns.

8. A two car garage exists on the property which is clad with aluminum siding and possibly roofed with metal shingles.

9. The Summit County Recorder notes this house as being built in 1946.

10. An owner of the house was Ray Wortley. When he purchased the property in unclear, but he sold it in 1946 to Albert Carter.

11. Ray Wortley, also known as Lawrence Wortley, appears on the 1940 census for Park City, living on Rossie Hill with his wife Edith. He worked as a miner, but nothing else is known of him or his family. The house appears to have been was rented by Alice Brennan, who lived there with her sons Melvin and Richard.

12. Albert Carter, the next owner of the house, appears on the 1940 census as well. He lived in another house on Park Avenue at that time, with his wife Cecilia and their two daughters. He worked as a carpenter for a mining company, and both of his daughters worked as waitresses.

13. The house has been bought and sold several times since the historic period, and is currently owned by Paula and Gary Winter.

14. The applicant obtained film footage from the 1950s and provided screen shots taken from the film footage. These are included below and in Exhibit B.

15. Based on the photographs submitted by the applicant, staff and the City’s Historic Preservation Consultant Anne Oliver of SWCA Environmental Consultants have concluded that the following exterior alterations have been made to the structure:

- New siding has been installed on top of the concrete block.
- New windows have been installed.
- The decorative trim on the porch has been removed.
- New front door has been installed.
- The stone planter in front of the porch has been removed.

16. The footage was taken during a period when staff believes the stone veneer was being applied to the structure. Because of this, the stone veneer appears
incomplete in the screenshot photographs. Overall, the form of the structure has remained the same. There are no new window or door openings, the porch is intact, and the alterations have been cosmetic.

17. In the early 2000s, Park City Municipal Corporation contracted Preservation Solutions, led by Dina Williams-Blaes, to refine and redefine Park City’s preservation policy. She completed a reconnaissance level survey in 2007. Her Site Form for 1060 Park Avenue found that the site contributed to the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry period (1931-1962).

18. On February 4, 2009, the Historic Preservation Board approved a resolution adopting the Historic Sites Inventory. 1060 Park Avenue was designated as “Significant”.

19. The site complies with the criteria to be designated as a Significant Site as outlined by Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A)(2).

20. The site complies with Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A)(2)(A) as the single-family dwelling was constructed in 1946 making the structure 73 years old. The site is recognized for its significance within a period of Park City history, including the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry period (1931-1962).

21. The site complies with Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A)(2)(B) as the site is currently listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as a Significant Site and was found to be significant on the 2007 Reconnaissance Level Survey. In 2000, the current applicant submitted a Determination of Significance for the site, but the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

22. The site complies with Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A)(2)(C)(1) as the single-family dwelling does retain its historic scale, context, and materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to Historic Form. Most of the alterations that have been made are cosmetic and can be removed and replaced with historically accurate materials. The Historic Form has remained unchanged.

23. The site complies with Land Management Code (LMC) 15-11-10(A)(2)(C)(2) as the site is recognized for its significance within a period of Park City history, including the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry period (1931-1962). The following analysis supports this finding:

• What we know about the Mining Decline period is that it was one of economic hardship and steep population decline. As a result, many buildings were abandoned (or sometimes demolished), sitting empty for...
many years as documented by the tax records and other sources such as census records, newspaper accounts, personal accounts, and photographs. New construction was extremely rare, which means that almost any building dating to this era is significant, assuming it retains its essential historic form and can convey that significance.

• Rather than focus on the lack of structures from this period within the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Period of Historic Significance, what needs to be recognized is the fact that this structure has been retained, preserved, and only slightly altered since its construction – this can be said for a few structures of this Historic Period of Significance.

25. On May 20, 2019, Legal Notice of this public hearing was published in the Park Record, according to the requirements of the Land Management Code. Staff also posted a public notice on the property and sent a mailing notice to the property owner and property owners May 22, 2019.

26. The analysis section of the staff report is hereby incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 1060 Park Avenue

1. The existing site at 1060 Park Avenue complies with all of the criteria for a Significant Site as set forth in LMC Section 15-11-10(A)(2) which includes:
   (A) It is at least fifty (50) years old or the Site is of exceptional importance to the community; and
   Complies.
   (B) It retains its Historical Form as may be demonstrated but not limited by any of the following:
      (1) It previously received a historic grant from the City; or
      (2) It was previously listed on the Historic Sites Inventory; or
      (3) It was listed as Significant or on any reconnaissance or intensive level survey of historic resources; and
      Complies.
   (C) It has one (1) or more of the following:
      (1) It retains its historic scale, context, materials in a manner and degree which can be restored to Historical Form even if it has non-historic additions; or
      (2) It reflects the Historical or Architectural character of the site or district through design characteristics such as mass, scale, composition, materials, treatment, cornice, and/or other architectural features as are Visually Compatible to the Mining Era Residences National Register District even if it has non-historic additions; and
      Complies.
   (D) It is important in local or regional history architecture, engineering, or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:
      (1) An era of Historic Importance to the community, or
(3) Noteworthy methods of construction, materials, or craftsmanship used during the Historic period.

Complies.

2. 1057 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review
(Application PL-19-04208)

Planner Caitlyn Barhorst reviewed the application for the reconstruction of a historic garage at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The applicant, Bill Cregger, was present.

The Staff recommended that the HPB review and discuss the reconstruction of the historic single-car garage on this Landmark Site, conduct a public hearing, and approve the request to reconstruct the historic single-car garage at 1057 Woodside Avenue, pursuant to the findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Staff report.

Planner Barhorst reported that all the criteria had been met, as outlined in the Staff report. On April 4th a Notice and Order was issued on the shed as being unsafe and hazardous. The client submitted an HDDR pre-application. The Staff and applicant discussed the reconstruction and a full HDDR was submitted for reconstruction of the historic single-car garage.

Planner Barhorst presented photos to highlight the conditions before the structure collapsed over the winter. The applicant was proposing to reconstruct the structure to its historic form. Planner Barhorst stated that the garage was roughly built in the late 1930s; however, there were findings in the Intensive Level Survey that could date it as early as 1929. Planner Barhorst noted that the 1941 Sanborn Maps do not typically update the location of accessory structures.

Planner Barhorst stated that the structure was constructed as a single-car garage to accommodate an automobile as an accessory to the Landmark historic house. Due to the current conditions, the applicant was proposing to reconstruct the garage to all of the historic dimensions, and they were developing an accurate set of plans. The Staff will assess the material for preservation and reuse once the building permit application has been submitted to reconstruct.

Mr. Cregger stated that the building condition has become worse and the walls have bowed out further on the south side.

Planner Barhorst indicated a platted right-of-way on 11th Street at Crescent Avenue. It is important for this structure to be deconstructed and reconstructed for safety reasons.
Chair Stephens recalled visiting the site a few years ago. He asked if the garage is within the sideyard setbacks or whether there were issues with the right-of-way. Chair Stephens wanted to know if the structure would be reconstructed in its current position or if there were property line issues.

Mr. Cregger was not prepared to answer. It is a double lot so the house is on one lot and the garage is on the other lot. The setback is 5' on a double-lot.

Chair Stephens asked if the Board was looking at the material deconstruction as if the structure was still standing; and whether the HPB was being asked to address the reconstruction. Director Erickson replied that the material deconstruction would come after the Staff determines how much material will be removed.

Planner Tyler explained that because this was a deconstruction the Staff drafted a condition of approval that the Planning Staff and the Planning Director will assess the material once it is removed to determine if anything can be saved. She stated that before the structure collapsed much of the material was warped because the garage was leaning. She assumed it had warped even more in its current position. Part of the deconstruction is acknowledgement that the entire structure will be taken down, and through that process they will save as much material as possible. Conditions #4 and #5 address saving the materials.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Staff had discussed a two-year timeline for reconstructing the structure to its historic location, size, and form. Chair Stephens asked if the two-year timeline was from the beginning to completion and the final building permit approval. Planner Barhorst recalled that it was two years to apply for the building permit. Chair Stephens was concerned about the structure going through another winter and he asked if there was language that addresses the timeline with regards to making the structure safer. He assumed that was an issue for the Building Department to make sure the structure is safe before next winter.

Mr. Cregge stated that he would like to deconstruct the structure as soon as possible. He was willing to apply for a permit the next week so they could start to deconstruct and save as much material as possible. In terms of reconstruction, it was not financially feasible to reconstruct it right away.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the saved historic material is stored. Mr. Cregge stated that much of the material is cracked, dry rotted, and warped and the west facing wall is completely bowed as well. Chair Stephens remarked that the Planning Department would be able to make the determination on salvaging materials.
Planner Barhorst read from Exhibit J, the Notice and Order to Repair, “All required building permits shall be secured to repair the items listed in Paragraph 1; and work shall commence within 50 calendar days”.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the timeline needed to be included as a condition of approval. He thought two years was a long time out.

City Attorney Harrington stated that language could be included in the preservation guarantee. Planner Tyler remarked that before the garage can be deconstructed the City will require a financial guarantee, which is measured per square foot. The timeline is included in that language. She noted that typical projects have 18 months established in the financial guarantee. The financial guarantee for this project will give two years knowing the circumstances with the applicant and their willingness to take down the structure as soon as possible. The two-year clock will start from the time of deconstruction.

Board Member Scott stated that he walks by this house all the time and the metal piece on the top is his favorite part of the structure. Mr. Cregger noted that the metal piece was completely snapped. He commented on other classic elements and hoped they could keep as much as possible.

Mr. Hutchings agreed. The garage is in a unique location, primarily because it is next to the public right-of-way and it stands out.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, noted that the Guidelines stated that when historic panels are removed, the panels should be numbered in order before it is removed. She asked if that process would apply with this structure. For example, if all or part of some of the unique elements could be put back in the same place according to the number, and the replacement would go in between.

Chair Stephens preferred to let the Planning Department have that discussion on site when they assess the materials.

Ms. Meintsma asked if that would take place before the building is demolished. Chair Stephen thought it would be difficult to know the condition.

Director Erickson commented on the house on Deer Valley Drive that was currently being reconstructed. Those panels were numbered based on what they saw in the construction mitigation plan and the financial guarantee; and they will go back in the same order that they were removed.
Ms. Meintsma asked if that same process would apply for this garage. Director Erickson stated that he first needed to see what materials were salvageable. Anything unsalvageable will need to be new material.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know who approves the demolition or deconstruction. Director Erickson stated that there are criteria for altering a historic house and separate criteria for reconstruction of a historic house. In this particular case it is a reconstruction. Mr. Hodgkins assumed they were talking about a reconstruction based on the assumption that the garage was already down. Director Erickson confirmed that the structure was down and it had a Notice of Order from the Chief Building Official.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the reconstruction of the historic single-car garage on the Landmark site at 1057 Woodside Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Jack Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1057 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The property consists of Lot 15 and Lot 16, Block 9, Snyder’s Addition to Park City.
2. The historic site is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The house was originally constructed c. 1889, per the Historic Site Inventory (HSI) Form, and has undergone a series of alterations since.
4. Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City’s designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
5. In 1936, Robert J. Birkbeck, a shop foreman for a mining company, and his wife Lillian P. Langford Birkbeck purchased the property. The Birkbecks made a series of changes to the site including, the construction of the north addition to the single-family dwelling, the single-car garage and the storage shed.
6. The circ. 1940 tax photograph of 1057 Woodside Avenue documents the changes to the single-family dwelling. At the far right edge of the photograph, the corner of an outbuilding is visible; the front (east end) of this building is roughly aligned with the east face of the addition. In the background stands a large, rectangular outbuilding with a wood-shingled roof.
7. The ca. 1940 tax photograph of 1103 Woodside Avenue (Exhibit D), which is the property on the north side of Crescent Street, provides a better view of the two (2) outbuildings. The white-painted, board and batten building with a wood-
shingled roof is clearly the single-car garage in the same location on the property today.
8. On May 10, 2019, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1057 Woodside Avenue. After working with the applicant on the materials of their submittal, the application was deemed complete on May 16, 2019. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
9. The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Historic Single-Car Garage on the Landmark site at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The existing condition of the single-car garage is poor. The structural members of the single-car garage are compromised, the roof has buckled from the weight of the snow, the exterior siding material is deteriorating, and the building is leaning significantly to the South.
10. The proposal for Reconstruction complies with LMC 15-11-15(A)(1) as the representative of The Chief Building Official made a site visit on April 4, 2019. At that time, the representative of the Chief Building Official observed the conditions of the structures to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. The site was posted “Do Not Enter- Unsafe to Occupy” due to its general dilapidated and unsafe state on April 4, 2019. The hazardous or dangerous conditions observed included:
   - The Historic Garage structure has buckled from the weight of the snow.
   - This structure has been determined to be dangerous and uninhabitable.
11. Due to the instability and collapse of the garage’s roof structure system, the extent of the deterioration of the original materials, as well as the health concerns, the safest approach is to Reconstruct the Historic single-car garage.
12. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(A)(2) as the representative of the Chief Building Official found the building to be dangerous. Staff finds it apparent that there are unique conditions, specifically, the structural conditions, physical conditions of the existing materials, and the additional submitted reports by the applicant supporting the dangerous building finding. The Historic Building(s) cannot be safe and/or serviceable through repair. The Planning Director and Chief Building Official have found unique conditions of safety (outlined below) that warrant the proposed Reconstruction of the Historic single-car garage.
   - Safety conditions:
     a. The owners have reported pests infesting the structure.
     b. The structure is adjacent to a platted Right-of-Way.
13. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(A)(3) as the applicant has worked with staff to develop a Historically accurate set of plans for the Reconstruction. The Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be reassembled in their original form, location, placement, and orientation.
14. The proposal complies with LMC 15-11-15(B) as on May 10, 2019, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1057 Woodside Avenue. The application was deemed complete on May 16, 2019. Approval of the HDDR application is dependent on the Historic Preservation Board’s approval of the Reconstruction.
15. Staff and the Design Review Team find that Reconstructing the historic structure will not significantly change the context of the site, nor diminish its historical significance. The single-car garage is a contributing feature of the Landmark Site.
16. The applicant is proposing the removal of the non-historic garage door (modified to accommodate a human entrance) which will allow for the installation of a historically accurate garage door.
17. The specific techniques for Reconstruction will be approved as a part of the Historic District Design Review and Building Permit. A plan highlighting what historic material will be salvaged will be submitted prior to the approval of the application.
18. A Financial Guarantee will be required prior to Building Permit issuance. The Financial Guarantee will require that the single-car garage be reassembled within 18 months of Building Permit issuance. A Building Permit must be issued within one (1) year of approval of the Historic District Design Review application.
19. According to the licensed structural engineer (hired by the applicant), the structural integrity of the single-car garage is compromised due to inadequate structural members on the interior of the structure. The structural engineer has recommended demolition; however, the applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the single-car garage after Deconstructing the existing building.
20. The structure is not threatened by demolition.
21. Due to the poor condition of the building and its structural deficiencies, the building could not be temporary lifted or moved as a single unit. The physical conditions of the existing materials prevent the temporary lifting or moving of a building and the applicant has demonstrated that Reconstruction will result in a greater amount of historic materials to be salvaged and preserved.

Conclusions of Law – 1057 Woodside Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and regarding historic structure Deconstruction and Reconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 1057 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal received on May 10, 2019. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Project Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be
repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No historic materials may be
disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Project
Planner.
3. The applicant shall salvage and reuse any and all serviceable Historic
Materials. The applicant shall demonstrate the severity of deterioration or
existence of defects by showing the Planning Department that the historic
(131,662),(756,713)
 The Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

Approved by

Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board
Summary Recommendation:
Staff has prepared the following recommendations for (1) Material Deconstruction and (2) Reconstruction. There are two (2) separate sets of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditional of Approval (as applicable) at the end of this staff report for each respective recommendation:

1. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the Material Deconstruction at 1135 Norfolk Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval. This site is designated as Significant on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).

2. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and consider denying Reconstruction at 1135 Norfolk Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval. This site is designated as Significant on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).

Topic:
Address: 1135 Norfolk Avenue
Designation: Significant
Applicant: David R. and Bobbi L. Emmett, represented by Bill Van Sickle
Proposal:
1. Material Deconstruction of non-Historic concrete retaining wall and exterior stairs; circ. 1900s concrete foundation with non-Historic stone veneer; circ. 1900s brick interior foundation retaining walls; circ. 1900s roof forms and non-Historic roof form addition; circ. 1930s Inselbrick asphalt siding; non-Historic concrete garage, non-Historic shed; non-Historic slab-on-grade foundation addition; circ. 1989 window replacements; non-Historic doors; circ. 1900 floor structure with modern upgrades; circ. 1989 metal roof and structural upgrade; circ. 1989 horizontal wood siding; circ. 1989 porch and columns.
2. Reconstruction of the Significant Historic Site.
Background:
The property located at 1135 Norfolk Avenue is designated as Significant on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) (See Historic Site Form). The subject property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.

The Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1135 Norfolk Avenue was submitted on March 27, 2019 and deemed complete on April 18, 2019. On June 24, 2019, the applicant updated the HDDR proposal from lifting the Historic Structure in place, pouring a new foundation and restoring the Historic Structure to complete Reconstruction. The Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application has not yet been approved, as it is dependent on Historic Preservation Board’s (HPB) Review for Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction on the Significant Historic Site.

The applicant applied for a plat amendment extension on June 13, 2019. The applicant requested the extension for more time to complete the Conditions of Approval for recordation of the plat. The original approval (see Ordinance No. 2018-34) expired June 21, 2019. The extension approval has not been approved, as it is dependent on City Council’s review.

History of Development on this Site
Development on this property has spanned across three (3) of Park City’s designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962). The house was built between circ. 1900 and 1907. The owner at the time of construction was likely Ezra Workman, who owned the house from 1904 to 1921. During the 1920 census, Earl and Fern Haines were renting the house, and it is unknown if Ezra ever lived at the house.

Victor Sandstrom purchased the property in 1921, and owned it until 1923. The next owner, Minnie Clark, resided with her family at 1259 Norfolk Avenue and rented 1135 Norfolk Avenue. The occupants during the time of the 1930 census were Floyd and Marian Nash.

George Street purchased the property in 1939 and transferred it to his son, David, who lived there with his wife and children during the 1940 census. They owned the house until 1974. The property has changed owners many times since then, and is currently owned by Emmett David R Coo-Trustee.

The house first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L cross wing cottage style house with an east-west (front-rear) facing gable and south facing cross saltbox gable to the west with a single-story shed roof front porch.
The house remained unchanged from when it was built circ. 1900-1907 and the circ. 1941 Sanborn Map. There was a brick chimney as seen in the circ. 1940 tax photo which has since been removed.

Several changes occurred to the site after the end of the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). An accessory shed structure was built, approximately twelve feet (12’) southwest from the rear of the house. This structure is non-Historic with modern plywood and stud construction. A contemporary concrete garage, concrete retaining walls, concrete steps, and approximate 5ftx10ft rear addition with a shed roof were also introduced outside of the Historic period.

James F. Steinmetz purchased the home in 1979 and received a Historic District Grant in 1989 for $5,000. The building permit dated August 4, 1989 was for the “roof, siding, windows, porch.” This scope of work most likely included changing the window openings as seen in the photos above dated 1982 and 2019, rebuilding the porch to remove the decorative metal columns and middle gable, and re-doing the roofing with some interior structural upgrades. The siding likely was changed at this time too from the wider-width horizontal siding seen in the 1982 photo to the current siding.
Figure 1 Photo of 1135 Norfolk Avenue from the circ. 1940 tax assessment

Figure 2 Photo of 1135 Norfolk Avenue from Ellen Beasley’s 1982 Reconnaissance Level Survey

Figure 3 Photo of 1135 Norfolk Avenue from the applicant’s submittal dated 2019
PROPOSAL NO. 1 – MATERIAL DECONSTRUCTION
The Historic Structure has remained largely unchanged from the original except for the small rear 5ftx10ft addition, window openings, siding, and roof material. The applicant is proposing to construct a new foundation with basement level garage, and construct an addition to the rear of the Historic Structure. Staff is recommending approval of all proposed Material Deconstruction.

1. SITE DESIGN:
This site is a fairly flat lot except the +/- eight foot (8ft) grade change from the street to the entrance of the house. The circ. 1940 tax photograph shows grass in the front yard with wood retaining walls and a wooden staircase with landings leading to the house on a concrete foundation. The wood retaining walls were replaced with concrete, and the foundation was faced with stone by circ. 1995. The existing retaining walls on the front and rear of the property, side rail-tie retaining walls, as well as the concrete garage will be removed as part of the plat amendment Conditions of Approval.

Staff has found the shed in the rear of the property to be non-Historic and constructed of typical modern plywood, 2x4 studs, and corrugated metal siding. The non-Historic shed will be removed. The back south corner of the house is a non-Historic addition and will be removed as a part of the new addition. No existing landscape will be removed. The proposal includes adding a driveway to the site. The existing site items to be impacted are highlighted in red in the Figures 4 and 5.

Figure 4
The applicant proposes to remove these non-Historic additions in order to redevelop the site.

Staff finds that the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Structure as these additions do not contribute to the Historic integrity of the Site. Staff has provided the following analysis of compliance based on the Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A) and applicable Design Guidelines:

**Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:**

3. The proposed scope of work is to remove non-Historic site additions and does not damage or destroy the Historic character of the Site.
4. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic elements of the Site and these features do not contribute to the visual character.
5. The applicant is not proposing to remove any Historic structures located on the property.
6. The additions that the applicant is proposing to remove are all non-Historic.

**Design Guidelines:**

- **Universal Guidelines:**

1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features. *The applicant is proposing to remove the non-Historic site additions and use it as it was historically.*
2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved. *The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic changes.*

- **Specific Guidelines:**

A. Site Design
A.1.1 Maintain existing front and side yard setbacks of Historic Sites. The applicant is not proposing to alter the existing location.  
A.1.2 Preserve the original location of the main entry, if extant. The applicant is not proposing to alter the location of the entry.  
A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant. The applicant is proposing to construct new steps as the existing are non-Historic and unsafe.  
A.5.3 The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built or unpaved space. The proposed scope of work of the driveway will not substantially change these proportions.

2. ROOF
The Historic roof form is T/L cottage style with an east-to-west (front-to-rear) facing gable and south (side) facing cross saltbox gable. As the re-roof was done in 1989 per the Historic District Grant, the structure was most likely upgraded at that time with new rafters and vertical strut support. The Historic Preservation Planner and Chief Building Official (CBO) made a site visit on June 26, 2019 and determined the majority of the Historic board panel sheeting remains (see Exhibit F for the CBO Determination Letter).

**Figure 6 Existing interior roof structure**

The applicant is proposing to rebuild the roof using the salvageable Historic materials. The applicant is not proposing to change the Historic roof form.

The limited interior exploratory demolition completed by the applicant did not provide a clear determination of the existing condition of the roof as the assessment was done from the attic roof vent from the exterior of the house. It is unclear whether or not the
existing Historic roof structure could be structurally stabilized from the interior or if a complete reconstruction of the roof structure is necessary. The structural engineer’s report (Exhibit G) notes “there is noticeable bow and sag in the ridge of the house.” Because of this, Staff has added Conditions of Approval to ensure the protection of the Historic Structure while the roof is constructed:

#3 The applicant shall maintain the original T/L cottage style roof form.
#4 Should reinforcing the roof structure from the interior not be possible due to the existing condition, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Chief Building Official and Planning Director and/or Historic Preservation Planner to evaluate the condition of the roof structure and assess the salvageable Historic material. The applicant shall prove the defects in the roof that prevent the new reinforcing structure to be added from the interior.
#5 If the scope of work requires a full reconstruction of the roof structure, the applicant shall update the Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan to provide documentation of the existing Historic roof structural members highlighting their condition, location, and size.
#6 The reconstructed roof form shall re-use all salvageable Historic material in their original location, if possible. Where the Historic materials cannot be used, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish.
#7 Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.

Staff finds that the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Structure as the applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic roof form. Staff has provided the following analysis of compliance based on the Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A) and applicable Design Guidelines:

Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:
2. The Material Deconstruction of the roof is required for the restoration of the Structure.

Design Guidelines:
-Universal Guidelines:
5. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced. The applicant is proposing to re-use the salvageable Historic materials. Conditions of Approval were added to ensure the protection of the Historic roof form.

-Specific Guidelines:
B. Primary Structures
B.1.1 Maintain the original roof form, as well as any functional and decorative elements. The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic roof form.
3. **CHIMNEY**
The circ. 1941 tax photo shows a chimney, removed prior to the 1982 photo. The applicant did not discover any Historic chimney with the limited interior demolition and is not proposing Reconstruction of the chimney.

Staff has added the following Condition of Approval to ensure no Historic materials are removed unnecessarily, and to ensure the potential restoration of the original chimney.

> #8 The applicant shall salvage the existing chimney bricks if found during demolition. Any bricks that can be made safe and/or serviceable shall be reused to reconstruct the chimney in its original location. The applicant shall provide construction details documenting the Historic chimney at the time of the building permit. The reconstruction shall exactly match the historic chimney and its detailing in size, material, profile, and style.

4. **EXTERIOR WALLS**
The house was originally constructed circ. 1904 with vertical stud framing and 1x12 (approximate) horizontal boards. There has been many window openings changed and re-framed throughout the period post circ. 1941-2019 evidenced through the photos in Figures 1-3. The siding also changed post circ. 1941 and 1982, and was changed again circ. 1989 to the current material.

Based on the Photos (Exhibit I) submitted by the applicant, the photos of the limited interior demolition show Historic framing material. Not all interior wall finishes were uncovered by the applicant and the majority of the non-Historic exterior siding remains. Further demolition would be necessary to determine the extent of existing Historic material. The applicant is proposing to re-use all salvageable Historic material.

Approximately 25 linear feet of the west (rear) elevation as well as the 5ft x 10ft addition will be removed in order to accommodate the new addition. Staff finds the proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the Historic Structure. Staff has highlighted in red the back sections proposed to be removed.

**Figure 7**
Staff finds the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Structure as the scope of work is limited to the tertiary (rear) façade of the Historic Structure that has been altered previously. Staff has provided the following analysis of compliance based on the Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A) and applicable Design Guidelines:

Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:
2. The proposed Material Deconstruction is required for the renovation of the Historic Structure.
3. The proposed exterior changes do not destroy the exterior architectural features which are compatible with the character of the Historic site as the rear (tertiary) façade has been altered previously.

Design Guidelines:
- Universal Guidelines:
  6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.

- Specific Guidelines:
  B. Primary Structures
  B.2.1 Primary and secondary façade components should be maintained in their original location on the façade. The applicant is not proposing to alter the façade.

To ensure the restoration of the Historic Structure, Staff has added the following Condition of Approval:


#9. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.

5. **FOUNDATION**

The applicant is proposing to construct a new concrete foundation with a basement and basement-level garage. The existing condition of the foundation is highlighted in the structural engineer’s report (Exhibit G) as:

“The foundation of the structure follows three different design patterns, refer to photos 1-3. The outline of the Historic building is placed on a concrete frost wall above an unexcavated crawl space. The addition at the rear of the house is placed on a slab on grade. The interior section of the foundation has been excavated to accessible depth and the crawl space soil is retained by a brick wall, which has collapsed in at least one location.”

To ensure that no damage shall occur to the Historic Structure should a new foundation be installed, Staff has added the following Conditions of Approval:

#10 The Preservation Plan must include a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.

#11 An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.

#12 A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.

#13 Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.

#14 Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.

#15 The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing
and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.

#16 The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.

Staff finds the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Structure and is necessary for restoration as the existing foundation is in need of repair. Staff has provided the following analysis of compliance based on the Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A) and applicable Design Guidelines:

Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:
2. The proposed Material Deconstruction is required for the renovation and restoration of the Historic Structure.
3. The proposed exterior changes do not damage the compatible Historic features of the Site.
4. The proposed foundation work mitigates the possible compromise of the structural stability of the Historic Structure as Staff has included Conditions of Approval #10-16. The current foundation is in need of repair.

Design Guidelines:
-Specific Guidelines:
B.3 Foundations
B.3.1 A new foundation should not raise or lower the historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation. The applicant is not proposing to lift the structure more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.
B.3.2 The original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building should be retained. The applicant is not proposing to change any of these features.

6. PORCH
The Historic porch has been reconstructed previously, both prior to- and post-1982. The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the porch using Historically accurate columns and wood decking over the porch foundation cap. To ensure the proper restoration of the porch, Staff has added the following Conditions of Approval:

#17 Should any Historic material be discovered while deconstructing the porch, The Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of the porch structure and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Historic Preservation Planner.

Staff finds the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Structure as the existing porch is non-Historic and the applicant is proposing to construct the porch to the Historic form. Staff has provided the following analysis of compliance based on the Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A) and applicable Design Guidelines:
Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:

3. The proposed exterior changes do not destroy the exterior architectural features which are compatible to the Structure as the applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic porch roof form.

Design Guidelines:
- Universal Guidelines:
  4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. The applicant is proposing to restore the porch to the Historic form.
- Specific Guidelines:
  B.1 Roofs
    B.1.1 Maintain the original roof form, as well as any functional and decorative elements. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the Historic porch form.

7. MECHANICAL, UTILITY, AND ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS
There are no existing Historic mechanical, electrical or utility systems. The applicant is not proposing to re-use any existing systems.

8. DOORS
There are no Historic doors on the home. The door on the east (front) elevation has been replaced by a hollow-core door with three stepped rectangular windows. The south (side) elevation has a door on the non-Historic addition. The applicant is proposing to replace the front door to match what is seen Historically in the District.

#18 The applicant shall submit for written approval from the Historic Preservation Planner prior to installation of the selected replacement door.

Staff finds that the proposed replacement complies with the following Design Guidelines:

Specific Guidelines:
B.4 Doors
  B.4.1 Maintain historic door openings, doors, and door surrounds. The applicant is not proposing to alter these elements.
  B.4.2 New doors should be allowed only if the historic door cannot be repaired. Replacement doors should exactly match the historic door in size, material, profile, and style. The applicant is proposing to replace the non-Historic door with one that will match what is seen Historically in the District.

9. WINDOWS
There are a total of ten (10) windows, with three (3) currently missing frames. All windows have been replacement at a time outside the Historic period. The Physical Conditions Report notes the seven (7) existing windows are in fair condition and will be replaced.
As seen in Figures 1-3, the windows and window openings have been altered and are non-Historic. To ensure the restoration of the Historic Structure, Staff has added the following Conditions of Approval:

#19 The applicant shall work with the Planning Department to determine the Historic window openings, sizing, and detailing prior to issuance of the Building Permit. Should the Historic openings differ from the current, the applicant shall update the plans to include replacement windows to be installed in the Historic location determined by the Historic Preservation Planner.

Staff finds the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Structure as the existing windows are non-Historic. Staff has provided the following analysis of compliance based on the Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A) and applicable Design Guidelines:

Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:
2. The proposed Material Deconstruction of the non-Historic windows is required for the renovation of the Historic Structure.
3. The proposed exterior changes do not damage the Historic exterior features.
   Staff has added Condition of Approval #19 to determine the Historic window openings.
4. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts of the visual character of the neighborhood, Historical significance, and architectural integrity as the existing windows are non-Historic.

Design Guidelines:
-Specific Guidelines:
B.5. Windows
   B.5.1 Maintain historic window openings, windows, and window surrounds.
   There are no existing Historic windows. The applicant is not proposing to alter the window openings. Staff has added the Condition of Approval to determine the Historic window openings, sizing, and detailing.

Analysis: Historic Preservation Board Material Deconstruction Review Checklist (Exhibit A):
Criterion 1: The proposed work is not Routine Maintenance.
Criterion 2: The proposed Material Deconstruction is required.
Criterion 3: The proposed work does not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features.
Criterion 4: The proposed work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood; Historical significance of the Structure; architectural integrity of the Structure; and structural stability. All proposed Material Deconstruction complies with applicable Design Guidelines.
Criterion 5: The proposed work will not compromise the historical importance of other structures on the property and on adjacent properties. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic features.
Criterion 6: All non-Historic additions and site features are proposed to be removed and are non-contributory.
PROPOSAL NO. 2 – RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC SITE
The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Significant Historic Structure. Staff is recommending denial based on the following analysis:

Analysis:
Proposals for Reconstruction are subject to Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-15 RECONSTRUCTION OF AN EXISTING HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE. Staff has determined compliance with LMC 15-11-15 based on the following (LMC language is in bold and staff analysis is in italics):

LMC § 15-11-15 RECONSTRUCTION OF AN EXISTING HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE It is the intent of this section to preserve the Historic and architectural resources of Park City through limitations on the Reconstruction of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Sites.

A. CRITERIA FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HISTORIC BUILDING(S) AND/OR STRUCTURE(S) ON A LANDMARK SITE OR A SIGNIFICANT SITE.
In approving an Application for Reconstruction of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark Site or a Significant Site, the Historic Preservation Board shall find the project complies with the following criteria:

1. The Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) are found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code; and
   Does not comply. The Chief Building Official made a site visit on June 26, 2019 and did not find the Structure to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. See Exhibit F for the determination letter.

2. The Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair; and
   Does not comply. The applicant has completed limited interior exploratory demolition. Chris Reeves, E.I.T. at Epic Engineering completed a report on the condition of the building on June 11, 2019 (Exhibit G) explaining the structural observations of the existing foundation, floor framing, walls, and roof framing.

   The structural engineer’s report highlights the concerns of the proposed work:
   “Considering the observations of the sag in the floor joists and the haphazard placement of beams and shims in the basement level, there are concerns that the structure by itself lacks the stiffness necessary to lift or move it as an independent unit.”

   The applicant has not provided sufficient information proving the structure cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair. The Chief Building
Official Determination letter states the Structure can be made safe and/or serviceable through repair.

3. The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation and location of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be accurately depicted, by means of new construction, based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current or Historic photographs. 

Complies. The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Significant Historic Site to the Historic form as is indicated in the proposed plans (Exhibit C).

B. PROCEDURE FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HISTORIC BUILDING(S) AND/OR STRUCTURE(S) ON A LANDMARK SITE OR A SIGNIFICANT SITE. All Applications for the Reconstruction of any Historic Building and/or Structure on a Landmark Site or a Significant Site within the City shall be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board pursuant to Section 15-11-12 of this Code.

If an Application involving the Reconstruction of Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on a Landmark Site or a Significant Site also includes relocation and/or reorientation of the Reconstructed Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the original Site or another Site, the Application must also comply with Section 15-11-13 of this Code.

Complies. On March 27, 2019, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1135 Norfolk Avenue. The application was deemed complete on April 18, 2019. The applicant updated the proposal on June 24, 2019. Approval of the HDDR application is dependent on the Historic Preservation Board’s approval of the Reconstruction.

Staff finds that the proposal for Reconstruction does not comply with LMC § 15-11-15 RECONSTRUCTION OF AN EXISTING HISTORIC BUILDING OR HISTORIC STRUCTURE.

LMC § 15-13-4(3) Guidelines for Reconstruction:

a. Reconstruction of a historic building or structure is allowed when the Chief Building Official determines the structure to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to section 116.1 of the International Building Code, and when the building cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair.

Does not comply. The Chief Building Official made a site visit on June 26, 2019 and did not find the Structure to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. See Exhibit F for the determination letter.

b. Reconstruction shall be guided by documentation and physical evidence in order to facilitate an accurate re-creation.

Complies. The applicant is proposing to reuse any salvageable Historic material in the Reconstruction. No proposed alterations will impact the accuracy of re-creation.
c. Reconstruction shall not be based on conjectural designs or on combinations of different features from other historic buildings.
   **Complies.** The proposed work does not include any conjectural designs.

d. Reconstruction shall include recreating documented design of exterior features such as roof shape, architectural detailing, windows, entrances and porches, steps and doors, and the historic spatial relationships.
   **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Historic Structure to the Historic form including all features.

e. Reconstruction shall include measures to preserve and reuse remaining historic materials found to be safe and/or serviceable.
   **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to reuse all salvageable Historic material.

f. A reconstructed building shall accurately duplicate the appearance of the historic building in materials, design, color, and texture.
   **Complies.** The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic Structure’s appearance.

g. A reconstructed building shall duplicate the historic building, and shall reconstruct the setting, placement, and orientation of the original structure.
   **Complies.** The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic Structure’s setting, placement, or orientation.

h. A reconstruction shall re-establish the historic relationship between the building or buildings and historic site features.
   **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic alterations and site additions.

i. A building may not be reconstructed on a location other than the original site, unless approved by the Historic Preservation Board pursuant to LMC § 15-11-13.
   **Complies.** The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic Structure’s location.

Staff finds that the proposal for Reconstruction **does not comply** with LMC § 15-13-4(3) Guidelines for Reconstruction.

**Process:**
The HPB will hear testimony from the applicant and the public and will review the Application for compliance with the following sections of the Land Management Code (LMC):
- LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.
- LMC 15-11-15 Reconstruction Of An Existing Historic Building Of Historic Structure
The HPB shall forward a copy of its written findings to the Owner and/or Applicant.

The Applicant or any party participating in the hearing may appeal the Historic Preservation Board decision to the Board of Adjustment or City Council. Appeal requests shall be submitted to the Planning Department thirty (30) days of the Historic Preservation Board decision. The appellant has the burden of proving that the land use authority erred. The appeal authority shall review factual matters de novo, without deference to the land use authority’s determination of factual matters. The appeal authority shall determine the correctness of the land use authority's interpretation and application of the plain meaning of the land use regulations, and interpret and apply a land use regulation to favor a land use application unless the land use regulation plainly restricts the land use application.

Notice:
The complete application notice mailing was sent on April 19, 2019 notifying of the first public hearing on May 3, 2019. On June 29, 2019, Legal Notice of this public hearing was published in the Park Record. Staff sent a mailing notice of this public hearing to property owners within 100 feet and posted the property on July 3, 2019.

Recommendation:
1. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the Material Deconstruction at 1135 Norfolk Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval. This site is designated as Significant on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).
2. Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and consider denying Reconstruction at 1135 Norfolk Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval. This site is designated as Significant on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory (HSI).

PROPOSAL NO. 1 – MATERIAL DECONSTRUCTION

Findings of Fact:
1. The property is located at 1135 Norfolk Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The Site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On March 27, 2019 the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1135 Norfolk Avenue; it was deemed complete on April 18, 2019.
4. On June 24, 2019 the applicant updated the HDDR proposal from lifting the Historic Structure in place, pouring a new foundation and restoring the Historic Structure to complete Reconstruction. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB’s Review for Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction on the Significant Historic Site.
5. The applicant applied for a plat amendment extension on June 13, 2019 in order to complete the work required on the original approval (see Ordinance No. 2018-34)
expired June 21, 2019. The extension approval has not been approved, as it is dependent on City Council’s review.

6. The Structure was constructed between circ. 1900-1907. The Historic Site Form has identified this site’s era of historical significance as the Mature Mining Era, 1894 to 1930.

7. The house first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L cross wing cottage style house with an east-west (front-rear) facing gable and south facing cross saltbox gable to the west with a single-story shed roof front porch.

8. The first known photograph of the house was taken as part of the circ. 1940 tax assessment. The photograph shows circ. 1930s Inselbrick asphalt siding, wood retaining walls and stairs leading to the concrete foundation.

9. Prior to now, an addition to the south (rear) of the Historic Structure was constructed with a shed roof. There was also a shed in the rear of the property and concrete garage at the front of the property added outside of the Historic period.

10. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic site additions and construct new retaining walls, steps, and foundation with a basement level garage addition. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the Historic significance of the Site.

11. The applicant proposes to Reconstruct the roof using salvageable Historic material. Staff has determined there is existing Historic material in the roof structure. The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic roof form.

12. There is no existing chimney found by the applicant.

13. The applicant is proposing to remove 25 linear feet of material on the south (rear) wall of the Structure for the construction of an addition.

14. The applicant is proposing to construct a new foundation with a basement addition and garage entrance. The construction of a new foundation is required for the restoration of the Structure.

15. The existing porch is non-Historic and the applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the porch to the Historic form and detailing.

16. There are no existing Historic mechanical, electrical or utility systems. The applicant is not proposing to re-use any existing systems.

17. There are no Historic doors on the home. The door on the east (front) elevation has been replaced by a hollow-core door with three stepped rectangular windows. The south (side) elevation has a door on the non-Historic addition. The applicant is proposing to replace the front door to match what is seen Historically in the District.

18. There are a total of ten (10) windows, with three (3) currently missing frames. All windows have been replacement at a time outside the Historic period. The Physical Conditions Report notes the seven (7) existing windows are in fair condition and will be replaced.

19. The windows and window openings have been altered and are non-Historic.

20. The HPB found compliance with the following applicable Design Guidelines:

   A. Universal Guidelines:
      1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features. The applicant is proposing to remove the non-Historic site additions and use it as it was historically.
2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic changes.

3. The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved. The applicant is not proposing to alter any Historic features.

4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. The applicant is proposing to restore the porch to the Historic form.

5. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced. The applicant is proposing to re-use the salvageable Historic materials. Conditions of Approval were added to ensure the protection of the Historic roof form.

6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.

7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. The proposed work does not change the appearance of the site.

8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. No chemical or physical treatments are proposed.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the size or building. The proposed work complies.

10. New additions and related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored. The proposed work mitigated any impacts on the historic site.

B. Specific Guidelines:
   A. Site Design
      A.1.1 Maintain existing front and side yard setbacks of Historic Sites. The applicant is not proposing to alter the existing location.
      A.1.2 Preserve the original location of the main entry, if extant. The applicant is not proposing to alter the location of the entry.
      A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant. The applicant is proposing to construct new steps as the existing are non-Historic and unsafe.
      A.5.3 The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built or unpaved space. The proposed scope of work of the driveway will not substantially change these proportions.
   B. Primary Structures
      B.1.1 Maintain the original roof form, as well as any functional and decorative elements. The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic roof form.
B.2.1 Primary and secondary façade components should be maintained in their original location on the façade. The applicant is not proposing to alter the façade.

B.3.1 A new foundation should not raise or lower the historic structure generally more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation. The applicant is not proposing to lift the structure more than two (2) feet from its original floor elevation.

B.3.2 The original placement, orientation, and grade of the historic building should be retained. The applicant is not proposing to change any of these features.

B.4.1 Maintain historic door openings, doors, and door surrounds. The applicant is not proposing to alter these elements.

B.4.2 New doors should be allowed only if the historic door cannot be repaired. Replacement doors should exactly match the historic door in size, material, profile, and style. The applicant is proposing to replace the non-Historic door with one that will match what is seen Historically in the District.

B.5.1 Maintain historic window openings, windows, and window surrounds. There are no existing Historic windows. The applicant is not proposing to alter the window openings. Staff has added the Condition of Approval to determine the Historic window openings, sizing, and detailing.

21. The HPB made the following findings with respect to Material Deconstruction Review Checklist Criterion:
   a. Criterion 1: The proposed work is not Routine Maintenance.
   b. Criterion 2: The proposed Material Deconstruction is required.
   c. Criterion 3: The proposed work does not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features.
   d. Criterion 4: The proposed work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood; Historical significance of the Structure; architectural integrity of the Structure; and structural stability. All proposed Material Deconstruction complies with applicable Design Guidelines.
   e. Criterion 5: The proposed work will not compromise the historical importance of other structures on the property and on adjacent properties. The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic features.
   f. Criterion 6: All non-Historic additions and site features are proposed to be removed and are non-contributory.

Conclusions of Law:
1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to 15-2.2 Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for Material Deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval:
1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal submitted on June 24, 2019. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made.
3. The applicant shall maintain the original T/L cottage style roof form.
4. Should reinforcing the roof structure from the interior not be possible due to the existing condition, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Chief Building Official and Planning Director and/or Historic Preservation Planner to evaluate the condition of the roof structure and assess the salvageable Historic material. The applicant shall prove the defects in the roof that prevent the new reinforcing structure to be added from the interior.
5. If the scope of work requires a full reconstruction of the roof structure, the applicant shall update the Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan to provide documentation of the existing Historic roof structural members highlighting their condition, location, and size.
6. The reconstructed roof form shall re-use all salvageable Historic material in their original location, if possible. Where the Historic materials cannot be used, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish.
7. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction.
8. The applicant shall salvage the existing chimney bricks if found during demolition. Any bricks that can be made safe and/or serviceable shall be reused to reconstruct the chimney in its original location. The applicant shall provide construction details documenting the Historic chimney at the time of the building permit. The reconstruction shall exactly match the historic chimney and its detailing in size, material, profile, and style.
9. Where the Historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to removing and replacing Historic materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No Historic materials may be disposed of prior to advance approval by the Planning Director and Historic Preservation Planner.
10. The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.
11. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to issuance of a building permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
12. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of building permit application.
13. Within five (5) days of installation of the cribbing and shoring, the structural engineer will inspect and approve the cribbing and shoring as constructed.
14. Historic Structures which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of the date the building permit was issued.
15. The Planning Director may make a written determination to extend this period up to 30 additional days if, after consultation with the Historic Preservation Planner, Chief Building Official, and City Engineer, he determines that it is necessary. This would be based upon the need to immediately stabilize an existing Historic property, or specific site conditions such as access, or lack thereof, exist, or in an effort to reduce impacts on adjacent properties. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department if changes are made. If the cribbing and/or shoring plan(s) are to be altered at any time during the construction of the foundation by the contractor, the structural engineer shall submit a new cribbing and/or shoring plan for review. The structural engineer shall be required to re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.

16. The applicant shall also request an inspection through the Building Department following the modification to the cribbing and/or shoring. Failure to request the inspection will be a violation of the Preservation Plan and enforcement action through the Historic Preservation Financial Guarantee or ACE could take place.

17. Should any Historic material be discovered while deconstructing the porch, The Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of the porch structure and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Historic Preservation Planner.

18. The applicant shall submit for written approval from the Historic Preservation Planner prior to installation of the selected replacement door.

19. The applicant shall work with the Planning Department to determine the Historic window openings, sizing, and detailing prior to issuance of the Building Permit. Should the Historic openings differ from the current, the applicant shall update the plans to include replacement windows to be installed in the Historic location determined by the Historic Preservation Planner.

20. Prior to removal of any Historic material, the applicant shall document their location and condition in order to facilitate in their reuse, if applicable.

PROPOSAL NO. 2 – RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC SITE

Findings of Fact:
1. The property is located at 1135 Norfolk Avenue in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zoning District.
2. The Site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. On March 27, 2019 the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1135 Norfolk Avenue; it was deemed complete on April 18, 2019.
4. On June 24, 2019 the applicant updated the HDDR proposal from lifting the Historic Structure in place, pouring a new foundation and restoring the Historic Structure to complete Reconstruction. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB’s Review for Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction on the Significant Historic Site.
5. The applicant applied for a plat amendment extension on June 13, 2019 in order to complete the work required on the original approval (see Ordinance No. 2018-34)
expired June 21, 2019. The extension approval has not been approved, as it is dependent on City Council’s review.

6. The Structure was constructed between circ. 1900-1907. The Historic Site Form has identified this site’s era of historical significance as the Mature Mining Era, 1894 to 1930.

7. The house first appears on the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L cross wing cottage style house with an east-west (front-rear) facing gable and south facing cross saltbox gable to the west with a single-story shed roof front porch.

8. The first known photograph of the house was taken as part of the circ. 1940 tax assessment. The photograph shows circ. 1930s Inselbrick asphalt siding, wood retaining walls and stairs leading to the concrete foundation.

9. Prior to now, an addition to the south (rear) of the Historic Structure was constructed with a shed roof. There was also a shed in the rear of the property and concrete garage at the front of the property added outside of the Historic period.

10. The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Significant Historic Site at 1135 Norfolk Avenue.

11. The proposal for Reconstruction does not comply with LMC § 15-11-15(A)(1) as the Chief Building Official made a site visit on June 26, 2019 and did not find the Structure to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code.

12. The proposal does not comply with LMC § 15-11-15(A)(2) as the representative of the Chief Building Official found the Structure can be made safe and/or serviceable through repair.

13. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-11-15(A)(3) as the applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Significant Historic Site to the Historic form as is indicated in the proposed plans (Exhibit C).

14. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-11-15(B). On March 27, 2019, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 1135 Norfolk Avenue. The application was deemed complete on April 18, 2019. The applicant updated the proposal on June 24, 2019. Approval of the HDDR application is dependent on the Historic Preservation Board’s approval of the Reconstruction.

15. The HPB has made the following findings with respect to LMC § 15-13-4(3)

   a. **Does not comply.** The Chief Building Official made a site visit on June 26, 2019 and did not find the Structure to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code. See Exhibit F for the determination letter.

   b. **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to reuse any salvageable Historic material in the Reconstruction. No proposed alterations will impact the accuracy of recreation.

   c. **Complies.** The proposed work does not include any conjectural designs.

   d. **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to Reconstruct the Historic Structure to the Historic form including all features.

   e. **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to reuse all salvageable Historic material.
f. **Complies.** The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic Structure’s appearance.

  g. **Complies.** The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic Structure’s setting, placement, or orientation.

  h. **Complies.** The applicant is proposing to remove all non-Historic alterations and site additions.

  i. **Complies.** The applicant is not proposing to alter the Historic Structure’s location.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The proposal does not meet the criteria for Reconstruction pursuant to LMC § 15-11-15 Reconstruction of an Existing Historic Building or Historic Structure.

2. The proposal does not meet the criteria pursuant to LMC § 15-13-4(3) Guidelines for Reconstruction.

**Exhibits:**

Exhibit A – HPB Checklist for Material Deconstruction
Exhibit B – [Historic Sites Inventory Form](#)
Exhibit C – Plans, updated July 9, 2019
Exhibit D – Physical Conditions Report + Historic Preservation Plan
Exhibit E – 1982 Reconnaissance Level Survey, done by Ellen Beasley
Exhibit F – Chief Building Official Determination Letter
Exhibit G – Epic Engineering report
Exhibit H – Exterior Photos
Exhibit I – Interior Photos
Historic Preservation Board Material Deconstruction Review Checklist:

1. Routine Maintenance (including repair or replacement where there is no change in the design, materials, or general appearance of the elements of the structure or grounds) does not require Historic Preservation Board Review (HPBR).
2. The material deconstruction is required for the renovation, restoration, or rehabilitation of the building, structure, or object.
3. Proposed exterior changes shall not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.
4. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the visual character of the neighborhood where material deconstruction is proposed to occur; any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the buildings, structures, or objects located on the property; any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the buildings, structures, or objects located on the property; and any impact that will compromise the structural stability of the historic building.
5. The proposed scope of work mitigates to the greatest extent practical any impact to the historical importance of other structures located on the property and on adjacent parcels.
6. Any addition to a Historic Building, Site, or Structure has been found to be non-contributory to the historic integrity or historical significance of the structure or site.
Exhibit B

Historic Sites Inventory Form
## 1 IDENTIFICATION

**Name of Property:**

**Address:** 1135 Norfolk Avenue  
**AKA:**

**City, County:** Park City, Summit County, Utah  
**Tax Number:** SA-183

**Current Owner Name:** James Steinmetz  
**Parent Parcel(s):**

**Current Owner Address:** PO BOX 843, Park City, Utah 84060

**Legal Description (include acreage):** ALL LOTS 8 & 9 AND S ½ LOT 10, BLK 17, SNYDERS ADDITION TO PARK CITY; 0.10 ACRES.

## 2 STATUS/USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Category</th>
<th>Evaluation*</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ building(s), main</td>
<td>☑ Landmark Site</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Original Use: Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ building(s), attached</td>
<td>☑ Significant Site</td>
<td>Permit #:</td>
<td>Current Use: Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ building(s), detached</td>
<td>☐ Not Historic</td>
<td>☐ Full ☐ Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ building(s), public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ building(s), accessory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ structure(s)</td>
<td>*National Register of Historic Places: ☑ ineligible ☐ eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>listed (date: )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3 DOCUMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos: Dates</th>
<th>Research Sources (check all sources consulted, whether useful or not)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ tax photo:</td>
<td>☐ abstract of title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ prints:</td>
<td>☐ tax card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ historic: c.</td>
<td>☐ original building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ sewer permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Sanborn Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ city directories/gazetteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ census records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ biographical encyclopedias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ newspapers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliographical References (books, articles, interviews, etc.)** Attach copies of all research notes and materials.

- Carter, Thomas and Goss, Peter. *Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940: a Guide*. Salt Lake City, Utah:
  University of Utah Graduate School of Architecture and Utah State Historical Society, 1991.

## 4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION & INTEGRITY

**Building Type and/or Style:** T/L cottage type  
**No. Stories:** 1

**Additions:** ☑ none ☑ minor ☑ major (describe below)  
**Alterations:** ☑ none ☐ minor ☑ major (describe below)

**Number of associated outbuildings and/or structures:** ☐ accessory building(s), # _____; ☐ structure(s), # ______.

**General Condition of Exterior Materials:**

**Researcher/Organization:** Preservation Solutions/Park City Municipal Corporation  
**Date:** 12-2008
☐ Good (Well maintained with no serious problems apparent.)
☐ Fair (Some problems are apparent. Describe the problems.): 
☐ Poor (Major problems are apparent and constitute an imminent threat. Describe the problems.): 
☐ Uninhabitable/Ruin

Materials (The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration. Describe the materials.): 
Site: Concrete retaining wall runs along frontage. Concrete garage at street front.
Foundation: Concrete and stone veneer.
Walls: Clapboard siding.
Roof: Cross-wing form - standing seam metal material.
Windows/Doors: One-over-one double-hung sash type.

Essential Historical Form: ☑ Retains ☐ Does Not Retain, due to:

Location: ☑ Original Location ☐ Moved (date __________) Original Location:

Design (The combination of physical elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style. Describe additions and/or alterations from the original design, including dates--known or estimated--when alterations were made): The one-story frame T/L cottage has been altered over time. The 1907 Sanborn Insurance map shows a T cottage with a stem-wing that was quite a bit shorter than what is seen today. Further, the tax photo shows a break in the roofing material between what is likely the original stem-wing and the extension of that stem-wing to the northeast. In the tax photo, the siding material does not show a juncture because the entire house is clad in brick-tex. The more recent photographs--1995 and 2006--show an uninterrupted field of clapboard siding. The grouped double-hung windows in the gable end appear to have replaced a set of paired windows that are visible in the tax photo. The extension of the stem-wing is a common practice seen on many mining era homes in Park City when the site constraints allowed. The changes diminish the site's original character, but the addition is not as significant as the change in window openings and the loss of the original siding material.

Setting (The physical environment--natural or manmade--of a historic site. Describe the setting and how it has changed over time.): The setting has not been significantly altered. A concrete garage appears to be located where a frame garage was located (the frame garage is not seen in the Sanborn Insurance map, but is seen in the tax photo. Also, the steps from the roadway to the front porch are repeated in newer materials today--concrete rather than wood.

Workmanship (The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during a given period in history. Describe the distinctive elements.): Much of the physical evidence from the period that defines the typical Park City mining era home has been altered and, therefore, lost.

Feeling (Describe the property's historic character.): Though the siding has been altered, the physical elements of the site, in combination, convey a sense of life in a western mining town of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Association (Describe the link between the important historic era or person and the property.): The "T" or "L" cottage (also known as a "cross-wing") is one of the earliest and one of the three most common house types built in Park City during the mining era; however, however, the extent of the alterations to the main building diminishes its association with the past.

The extent and cumulative effect of alterations to the site--which could be reversed--render it ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
5 SIGNIFICANCE

Architect: ☐ Not Known ☐ Known: (source: )  Date of Construction: c. 1905

Builder: ☐ Not Known ☐ Known: (source: )

The site must represent an important part of the history or architecture of the community. A site need only be significant under one of the three areas listed below:

1. Historic Era:
   ☐ Settlement & Mining Boom Era (1868-1893)
   ☑ Mature Mining Era (1894-1930)
   ☐ Mining Decline & Emergence of Recreation Industry (1931-1962)

   Park City was the center of one of the top three metal mining districts in the state during Utah's mining boom period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and it is one of only two major metal mining communities that have survived to the present. Park City's houses are the largest and best-preserved group of residential buildings in a metal mining town in Utah. As such, they provide the most complete documentation of the residential character of mining towns of that period, including their settlement patterns, building materials, construction techniques, and socio-economic make-up. The residences also represent the state's largest collection of nineteenth and early twentieth century frame houses. They contribute to our understanding of a significant aspect of Park City's economic growth and architectural development as a mining community.2

2. Persons (Describe how the site is associated with the lives of persons who were of historic importance to the community or those who were significant in the history of the state, region, or nation):

3. Architecture (Describe how the site exemplifies noteworthy methods of construction, materials or craftsmanship used during the historic period or is the work of a master craftsman or notable architect):

6 PHOTOS

Digital color photographs are on file with the Planning Department, Park City Municipal Corp.

Photo No. 2: Accessory building - not associated with the historic building, 2006.
Photo No. 4: East oblique. Camera facing west, tax photo.

---

1 The structure appears on the 1907 Sanborn Insurance map, though the Summit County Recorder dates the building to 1908.
2 From “Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination” written by Roger Roper, 1984.
Exhibit C

Plans, updated July 9, 2019
June 24, 2019

Park City Planning Department
445 Marsac Ave
Park City, UT 84060

1135 Norfolk Historic Preservation Plan

Planners and Historic Preservation Board,

Our original intention was to raise the home, pour a new foundation and set it back down. We have investigated the home on 1135 Norfolk further and have come to the following conclusions.

We would like to materially deconstruction the home and reconstruct it to the same original historic specifications.

The homes original exterior looked like brick. After some exploratory demolition we have concluded that the exterior was an asphalt material that looked like brick. The exterior sheathing material is a 1x4 and 1x6 material. Some of it is salvageable but a lot of it needs replacement.

The roof needs repair as large sections of it are sagging and need bracing. The floor structure is failing in several spots and when standing in the home the floor is sagging nearly 12” across a single room. The previous owner has done some blocking of the floor in the crawl space to help support this floor but needs full replacement.

The existing foundation is some block material, some concrete and some sandstone. See the structural engineers report. This will need to be fully replaced.

The existing siding is new non-historic material and has not been properly maintained or stained/painted. This has allowed for rot of the new siding material. We will remove and salvage what we can and reuse it in the reconstruction of the home.

The windows on the home are newer construction and non-historic and our intention is to replace them with new wood windows that match the historic home.
With the material deconstruction we will salvage as much of the home as possible to use in the rebuilt. We would like to use the true 2x4 walls studs as part of the material on the reconstruction of the home and will use them as part of the new deck areas or wherever we can so as to minimalize and site waste as we deconstruct this home and build it back. The sandstone foundation rocks we would like to use in the construction of the new exterior living area as part of the landscape and patio elements.

After the structural analysis on this home coming back recommending we deconstruct the home and that there will likely be a loss of any components being able to be saved in trying to lift and repair and set back down, we would like to propose reconstructing the home to appearance of the historic structure all while reusing as many materials as we can to preserve the nature of the historic home and use as many of the existing elements in the new construction, giving recognition to the historic nature of this home.

Thanks,

Bill Van Sickle
801.694.9683
bill@vansickledesigned.com
Exhibit D

Physical Conditions Report

And

Historic Preservation Plan
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

For Use with the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application

For Official Use Only

PLANNER: __________________________ APPLICATION #: __________________________
DATE RECEIVED: __________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION

NAME: __________________________
ADDRESS: 1135 N. 12TH AVE. AVE

PARK CITY LOT 84660

TAX ID: SA-183 OR
SUBDIVISION: SNY0605 ADDITION TO PARK CITY OR
SURVEY: SA-183 LOT #: 89, 90, 10 BLOCK #: 17
HISTORIC DESIGNATION: ☐ LANDMARK ☑ SIGNIFICANT ☐ NOT HISTORIC

APPLICANT INFORMATION

NAME: David R. & Bobbi L. Emmett
MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 841, Camp Verde, AZ 86322

PHONE #: 602-405-9559 FAX #: ( )
EMAIL: emmettsemall@yahoo.com

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION

NAME: Bill Van Sickle / Van Sickle Design + Drafting, LLC
PHONE #: (801) 691-9683
EMAIL: bill.drafting@gmail.com

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 815-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

This is to certify that I am making an application for the described action by the City and that I am responsible for complying with all City requirements with regard to this request. This application should be processed in my name and I am a party whom the City should contact regarding any matter pertaining to this application.

I have read and understood the instructions supplied by Park City for processing this application. The documents and/or information I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that my application is not deemed complete until a Project Planner has reviewed the application and has notified me that it has been deemed complete.

I will keep myself informed of the deadlines for submission of material and the progress of this application. I understand that a staff report will be made available for my review three days prior to any public hearings or public meetings. This report will be on file and available at the Planning Department in the Marsac Building.

I further understand that additional fees may be charged for the City’s review of the proposal. Any additional analysis required would be processed through the City’s consultants with an estimate of time/expense provided prior to an authorization with the study.

Signature of Applicant: ________________________________
Name of Applicant: David R. & Bobbi L. Emmett
Mailing Address: PO Box 841, Camp Verde, AZ 86322
Phone #: 602-405-9559 – Fax #: ( ) –
Email: emmettsemail@yahoo.com
Type of Application: ________________________________

AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action. I further affirm that I am aware of the City policy that no application will be accepted nor work performed for properties that are in tax delinquency.

Name of Owner: David R. & Bobbi L. Emmett
Mailing Address: PO Box 841, Camp Verde, AZ 86322
Street Address/ Legal Description of Subject Property: 1135 Norfolk Avenue

Signature: ________________________________ Date: 3/7/2019

1. If you are not the fee owner attach a copy of your authorization to pursue this action provided by the fee owner.
2. If a corporation is fee titleholder, attach copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing the action.
3. If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership.
4. If a Home Owner’s Association is the applicant than the representative/president must attach a notarized letter stating they have notified the owners of the proposed application. A vote should be taken prior to the submittal and a statement of the outcome provided to the City along with the statement that the vote meets the requirements set forth in the CC&R’s.

Please note that this affirmation is not submitted in lieu of sufficient title evidence. You will be required to submit a title opinion, certificate of title, or title insurance policy showing your interest in the property prior to Final Action.

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
This page intentionally left blank.
PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT

Detailed Description of Existing Conditions. Use this page to describe all existing conditions. Number items consecutively to describe all conditions, including building exterior, additions, site work, landscaping, and new construction. Provide supplemental pages of descriptions as necessary for those items not specifically outlined below.

1. Site Design

This section should address landscape features such as stone retaining walls, hillside steps, and fencing. Existing landscaping and site grading as well as parking should also be documented. Use as many boxes as necessary to describe the physical features of the site. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature:</th>
<th>Stone Retaining Walls, steps to the front porch, landscape in general.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This involves:</td>
<td>□ An original part of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ A later addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date of construction:</td>
<td>1980's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe existing feature:

Along the front of the site, there is a retaining wall in place that is non historic but is in fact in the right of way. Removal of this wall is part of the plat amendment conditions and will be done at the time of construction, just prior to recording the plat and prior to pulling a building permit.

The stone and concrete steps to the front porch are in dilapidated condition. The stepping is uneven and some of the steps have broken and are in need of replacement.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor

The stairs are in need of replacement. The existing stone and concrete steps leading up the home are broken in some areas, have settled in other areas and need to be removed and rebuilt. As they are currently they are not fit to use as an access staircase.

Photo Numbers: ___________________________________________ Illustration Numbers: ____________________________

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
2. Structure

Use this section to describe the general structural system of the building including floor and ceiling systems as well as the roof structure. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: Roof, Walls, and Floor framing

This involves: □ An original part of the building
□ A later addition

Estimated date of construction:

Describe existing feature:

The framing of this home is in poor condition. See also the structural engineering report from John Riley and Epic Engineering. The floor framing is 2x6 at 16" o.c. and the wall framing is true 2x4 studs @16" o.c. The roof framing is 2x4 top and bottom chords and vertically braced at 4' o.c. each way.

Describe any deficiencies: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor

The floor framing is sagging in several places and is a state of structural failure. The wall studs are in decent shape but have been cut and replaced in several locations throughout the home. There is 1x material over the exterior of the studs and an asphalt layer on the exterior to protect the 1x sheeting. The 1x sheeting is failing and broken in several areas.
The roof framing is sagging and is in need of repair. The 2x4 rafters at 24" o.c. have a 1x8 collar tie that is broken on several and in need of repair throughout.

Photo Numbers: ___________________________ Illustration Numbers: ___________________________
3. Roof

Use this section to describe the roofing system, flashing, drainage such as downspouts and gutters, skylights, chimneys, and other rooftop features. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

**Element/Feature:** Roof, soffit and fascia

This involves:  
- [ ] An original part of the building  
- [x] A later addition

**Estimated date of construction:** 1980's

Describe existing feature:

The roof material is a non historic metal finish. Original roof on the home has been replaced. The silver metal was added in the last renovation and has not been maintained and is in need of replacement.

Fascias are 2x wood, single step.

Soffit is wood 1x6

Describe any deficiencies:  

**Existing Condition:**  
- [ ] Excellent  
- [ ] Good  
- [x] Fair  
- [ ] Poor

Roof material: Valley and ridge areas have sagged and separated and are in need of replacement and repair.  
Fascia: The fascia on this home was painted with the last remodel but has not been maintained and this has allowed the fascia to rot and is in need of replacement.  
Soffit: The soffit on this home is missing in some areas and the under side of the roof sheathing is exposed. The other areas of soffit are painted plywood and the paint is peeled and plywood is delaminating.

Photo Numbers: ___________________________  Illustration Numbers: ___________________________
4. Chimney

Use this section to describe any existing chimneys. One box should be devoted to each existing chimney. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: **No existing chimney on building at it sits.**

This involves:

- [ ] An original part of the building
- [ ] A later addition

Estimated date of construction: ____________

Describe existing feature:

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition:  [ ] Excellent  [ ] Good  [ ] Fair  [ ] Poor

Photo Numbers: _____________________________  Illustration Numbers: _____________________________
5. Exterior Walls

Use this section to describe exterior wall construction, finishes, and masonry. Be sure to also document other exterior elements such as porches and porticoes separately. Must include descriptions of decorative elements such as corner boards, fascia board, and trim. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Exterior walls

This involves:  
■ An original part of the building
■ A later addition

Estimated date of construction: ____________________

Describe existing feature:

Exterior wall: construction is nominal 2x4 construction with 1x4 and 1x6 slats on the exterior acting as exterior sheathing. There is an asphalt under-layment on the exterior and a brick looking asphalt under-layment.

Exterior horizontal siding: the primary finish on the exterior of the home is a 4" horizontal wood siding ship lap.

Exterior Masonry: The only exterior masonry on the home is under the front porch on the foundation.

Describe any deficiencies:  

Existing Condition:  □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor

The exterior wall framing is in ok shape but the 1x sheathing on the exterior is broken and is in poor shape and in need of repair.

-Exterior siding needs painted, repaired, or replaced in some areas around entire home

-Porch masonry is in historic and we intend to replace it

Photo Numbers: ______________________________________  Illustration Numbers: ____________________________
6. Foundation

Use this section to describe the foundation including its system, materials, perimeter foundation drainage, and other foundation-related features. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: Foundation

This involves: ☑ An original part of the building
☑ A later addition

Estimated date of construction: ______________

Describe existing feature:

Existing Foundation is made up of 3 different types of construction. We did some exploratory demo and found it is block in some areas, stone stacked in some areas and concrete in same areas.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: ☑ Poor

Block: The stacked block has collapsed in some areas. It is new reinforced block and needs removed and replaced.

Stone: The stacked stone will be removed and replaced.

Concrete: We will demo the concrete tie it to a new foundation.

Photo Numbers: ____________________  Illustration Numbers: ____________________
7. Porches

Use this section to describe the porches. Address decorative features including porch posts, brackets, railing, and floor and ceiling materials. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: Concrete porch cap, Stone veneer, Columns

This involves: ☑ A later addition
☐ An original part of the building

Estimated date of construction: 1890's

Describe existing feature:

Concrete porch cap: The porch is comprised of a concrete porch cap & 3" thick. This will need to be replaced with the new foundation.

The historic structure shared this element as wood.

Columns: The 4th wood columns are new & our historic.

Describe any deficiencies:

Existing Condition: ☑ Poor ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair

- Porch Cap: we will be replacing this with a new porch cap & 3" will need to match the original historic structure.

- Columns: original columns will be replaced to match.

Photo Numbers: __________________________ Illustration Numbers: __________________________
8. Mechanical System, Utility Systems, Service Equipment & Electrical

Use this section to describe items such as the existing HVAC system, ventilation, plumbing, electrical, and fire suppression systems. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: HVAC & ELECTRICAL

This involves: ☑ A later addition

Estimated date of construction: ____________________

Describe existing feature:

- AN OLD FURNACE IS IN THE CRAWL SPACE BUT IS PART OF THE NEWER REMODEL DONE IN THE 80'S
- ELECTRICAL SYSTEM IS METEORED AS PART OF THE 1980'S REMODEL BUT THE INTERNAL WIRING IS NON GROUNDING AND IS NOT UP TO CODE

Describe any deficiencies: Existing Condition: ☑ Excellent ☑ Good ☑ Fair ☑ Poor

- THE HVAC SYSTEM WILL BE REPLACED & A NEW UNIT LOOK INSTALLED
- NEW WIRING WILL BE INSTALLED TO ENSURE HOME

Photo Numbers: ____________________________ Illustration Numbers: ____________________________
9. Door Survey

Basic Requirements

1. All door openings on the exterior of the structure should be assigned a number and described under the same number in the survey form. Doors in pairs or groupings should be assigned individual numbers. Even those not being replaced should be assigned a number corresponding to a photograph or drawing of the elevation, unless otherwise specified specifically by the planner.

2. Describe the issues and conditions of each exterior door in detail, referring to specific parts of the door. Photographs depicting existing conditions may be from the interior, exterior, or both. Additional close-up photos documenting the conditions should be provided to document specific problem areas.

3. The Planning Department’s evaluation and recommendation is based on deterioration/damage to the door unit and associated trim. Broken glass and normal wear and tear are not necessarily grounds for approving replacement.

4. The condition of each door should be documented based on the same criteria used to evaluate the condition of specific elements and features of the historic structure or site: Good, Fair, Poor.

Don’t forget to address service, utility, and garage doors where applicable.
# Door Survey Form

Total number of door openings on the exterior of the structure: 2

Number of historic doors on the structure: 0

Number of existing replacement/non-historic doors: 2

Number of doors completely missing: 0

*Please reference assigned door numbers based on the Physical Conditions Report.*

Number of doors to be replaced: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door #:</th>
<th>Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)</th>
<th>Describe any deficiencies:</th>
<th>Photo #:</th>
<th>Historic (50 years or older):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>ODD IS WARPED AND NON HISTORIC (FRONT ODD)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>ODD IS MISSING PART OF IT (SOUTH ELEVATION)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
10. Window Survey

Basic Requirements

1. All window openings on the structure should be assigned a number and described under the same number in the survey form. Windows in pairs or groupings should be assigned individual numbers. Even those not being replaced should be assigned a number corresponding to a photograph or drawing of the elevation, unless otherwise specified specifically by the planner.

2. Describe the issues and conditions of each window in detail, referring to specific parts of the window. Photographs depicting existing conditions may be from the interior, exterior, or both. Additional close-up photos documenting the conditions should be provided to document specific problem areas.

3. The Planning Department's evaluation and recommendation is based on deterioration/damage to the window unit and associated trim. Broken glass and windows that are painted shut alone are not grounds for approving replacement.
### Window Survey Form

Total number of window openings on the exterior of the structure: 10

Number of historic windows on the structure: 0

Number of existing replacement/non-historic windows: 7

Number of windows completely missing: 3

Please reference assigned window numbers based on the Physical Conditions Report.

Number of windows to be replaced: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window #</th>
<th>Existing Condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)</th>
<th>Describe any deficiencies</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Historic (50 years or older)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair, EAST ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair, EAST ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair, EAST ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fair, EAST ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair, SOUTH ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fair, SOUTH ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair, SOUTH ELEV.</td>
<td>Wood frame non-hist. will be replaced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fair, WEST ELEV.</td>
<td>Window is missing, will be replaced 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fair, NORTH ELEV.</td>
<td>Window is missing, will be replaced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fair, NORTH ELEV.</td>
<td>Window is missing, will be replaced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
11. Interior Photographs

Use this section to describe interior conditions. Provide photographs of the interior elevations of each room. (This can be done by standing in opposite corners of a square room and capturing two walls in each photo.)

Element/Feature: **Interior Walls, Floors, & Cabinets**

This involves:  
☐ An original part of the building  
☐ A later addition  

Estimated date of construction:  

Describe existing feature:

- THE INTERIOR WALLS ARE DAMAGED AND WORN.
- FLOOR IS CARPET & VINYL
- CABINETS ARE PARTIALLY STILL THERE MOST DOORS ARE BUCKED OR MISSING

Describe any deficiencies:  

EXISTING CONDITION:  
☐ Excellent  
☐ Good  
☐ Fair  
☐ Poor

- INTERIOR PLASTER WALLS HAVE A LOT OF DAMAGE AND WILL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH NEW CONSTRUCTION
- CARPET WILL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED
- CABINETS WILL BE REPLACED

Photo Numbers:  
Illustration Numbers:  

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN
For Use with the Historic District/Site Design Review Application

For Official Use Only

PLANNER: __________________APPLICATION #: __________________

DATE RECEIVED: __________________

PLANNING DIRECTOR
APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS: __________________CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL
APPROVAL DATE/INITIALS: __________________

PROJECT INFORMATION

☐ LANDMARK ☑ SIGNIFICANT DISTRICT: ______________

NAME: 1135 NEFOLK DRIVE

ADDRESS: 1135 NEFOLK DRIVE

PARK CITY UT 84060

TAX ID: [SA-183]

SUBDIVISION: SUMMERS ADDITION TO PARK CITY OR

SURVEY: [SA-183] LOT #: [89, 53, 12, 10] BLOCK #: [17]

APPLICANT INFORMATION

NAME: DAVID R. & BOBBI L. EMMETT

PHONE #: [602-405-9559] FAX #: [_____] [____]

EMAIL: emmettsemail@yahoo.com

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
Site Design

Use this section should describe the scope of work and preservation treatment for landscape features such as stone retaining walls, hillside steps, and fencing. Existing landscaping and site grading as well as parking should also be documented. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Landscape + Site Features

This involves:

- Preservation  ☐ Restoration
- Reconstruction  ☑ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

- The existing conditions of the site are the house, an now historic garage, a shed, concrete + stone staircase, and concrete retaining wall.
- We are required for flat conditions to remove
  - Retaining, garage, and shed in rear yard
- We will the relandscape the site with new construction

Structure

Use this section to describe scope of work and preservation treatment for the general structural system of the building including floor and ceiling systems as well as the roof structure. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: house walls and floors

This involves:

- Preservation  ☐ Restoration
- Reconstruction  ☑ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

- We are planning to do a material deconstruction for this site, we will re-use as many materials as possible as part of both the architecture and the structure. We can not lift this house to repair it without destroying it. See engineering report.

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
Roof

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for the roofing system, flashing, drainage such as downspouts and gutters, skylights, chimneys, and other rooftop features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Roof Material

This involves:  
☐ Preservation  ☑ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

THE ROOF IS A NEW HISTORIC WE WILL BE REBUILDING THE ROOF AS PART OF THE NEW CONSTRUCTION WITH A SIMILAR METAL ROOF.

Chimney

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for any existing chimneys. One box should be devoted to each existing chimney. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features.

Element/Feature: Not Applicable

This involves:  
☐ Preservation  ☐ Restoration  
☐ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

NO HISTORIC CHIMNEY CURRENTLY ON SITE.
Exterior Walls

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for the exterior wall construction, finishes, and masonry. Please describe the scope of work for each individual exterior wall, use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: Structure

This involves: □ Preservation □ Restoration
☑ Reconstruction □ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

"The existing exterior wall will be reconstructed and re-use of the material for new architectural & structural elements."

Element/Feature: Siding

This involves: □ Preservation □ Restoration
☑ Reconstruction □ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

"The siding on the home is non-historic and we intend to remove it and re-use it as much as possible."

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
Foundation

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for the foundation including its system, materials, perimeter foundation drainage, and other foundation-related features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  

- [ ] Preservation  
- [ ] Restoration  
- [x] Reconstruction  
- [ ] Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

- the existing foundation is block, stone, and concrete. We intend to remove and rebuild the foundation to meet code. We will build the new foundation out of concrete.

Porches

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for all porches. Address decorative features including porch posts, brackets, railing, and floor and ceiling materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element/Feature: Porch Cap &amp; Columns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This involves:  

- [ ] Preservation  
- [ ] Restoration  
- [x] Reconstruction  
- [ ] Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

- we intend to re-build the porch cap over the new foundation with a wood decoring over the roof to closer match the historic original.
Doors

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for all exterior doors, door openings, and door parts referenced in the Door Survey of the Physical Conditions Report. Please describe the scope of work for each individual exterior door, use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: 

This involves:  
☐ Preservation  ☐ Restoration  
☒ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation  

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

THE EXISTING DOORS ARE NOT HISTORIC AND WILL BE REPLACED WITH DOORS THAT ARE TYPICAL OF THE HISTORIC TIME THAT THE HOME WAS BUILT.

Element/Feature: 

This involves:  
☐ Preservation  ☐ Restoration  
☐ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation  

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:
Windows

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for all exterior windows, window openings, and windows parts referenced in the Door Survey of the Physical Conditions Report. Please describe the scope of work for each individual exterior window, use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: ALL EXTERIOR WINDOWS

This involves: □ Preservation    □ Restoration
              □ Reconstruction    □ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

THE WINDOWS NOW IN THE HOME ARE NOT HISTORIC. WE INTEND TO REMOVE AND REPLACE THEM WITH NEW WOOD FRAME WINDOWS THAT MATCH THE HISTORIC TIME IN WHICH THIS HOME WAS BUILT. THE MISSING WINDOWS WILL BE REPLACED IN THIS SAME MANNER.

Element/Feature:

This involves: □ Preservation    □ Restoration
              □ Reconstruction    □ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:
**Mechanical System, Utility Systems, Service Equipment & Electrical**

Use this section to describe proposed scope of work and preservation treatment for items such as the existing HVAC system, ventilation, plumbing, electrical, and fire suppression systems. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: **HVAC SYSTEM**

This involves:  
☐ Preservation  ☐ Restoration  
☑ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

**THE EXISTING HVAC SYSTEM WILL NOT BE RE-USED AS IT IS IN UGLY AND NON-FUNCTIONAL CONDITION. WE INTEND TO REPLACE IT WITH NEW.**

**Additions**

Use this section to describe the proposed scope of work for any additions. Describe the impact and the preservation treatment for any historic materials. Supplemental pages should be used to describe additional elements and features. Use supplemental pages if necessary.

Element/Feature: **ELECTRICAL SYSTEM**

This involves:  
☐ Preservation  ☐ Restoration  
☑ Reconstruction  ☐ Rehabilitation

Based on the condition and deficiencies outlined in the Physical Conditions Report, please describe in detail the proposed work:

**THE ELECTRICAL METER WILL BE REPLACED.**

**THE WIRING IS NOT GROUNDED AND WILL BE REPLACED WITH NEW GROUNDED WIRE FOR SAFETY.**

If you have questions regarding the requirements on this application or process please contact a member of the Park City Planning Staff at (435) 615-5060 or visit us online at www.parkcity.org. Updated 10/2014.
4. PROJECT TEAM
List the individuals and firms involved in designing and executing the proposed work. Include the names and contact information for the architect, designer, preservation professional, contractor, subcontractors, specialized craftspeople, specialty fabricators, etc...

Provide a statement of competency for each individual and/or firm listed above. Include a list or description of relevant experience and/or specialized training or skills.

Will a licensed architect or qualified preservation professional be involved in the analysis and design alternatives chosen for the project? Yes or No. If yes, provide his/her name.

Will a licensed architect or other qualified professional be available during construction to ensure the project is executed according to the approved plans? Yes or No. If yes, provide his/her name.

5. SITE HISTORY
Provide a brief history of the site to augment information from the Historic Site Form. Include information about uses, owners, and dates of changes made (if known) to the site and/or buildings. Please list all sources such as permit records, current/past owner interviews, newspapers, etc. used in compiling the information.

6. FINANCIAL GUARANTEE
The Planning Department is authorized to require that the Applicant provide the City with a financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan. (See Title 15, LMC Chapter 11-9) Describe how you will satisfy the financial guarantee requirements.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY
I have read and understand the instructions supplied by Park City for processing this form as part of the Historic District/Site Design Review application. The information I have provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature of Applicant: ___________________________  Date: 3/7/2019

Name of Applicant: ___________________________
Exhibit E

1982 Reconnaissance Level Survey,

Done by Ellen Beasley
Physical description: One-story wood residential building; L-shape with intersecting gable roof; attached porch supported by wrought iron columns; single entrance; large aluminium window openings.

Features of interest:

Building materials: Wood/synthetic  Building type/style: vernacular L
Modifications: None to minor  siding: Moderate  Major

Explain: Openings altered; synthetic siding; porch details

Condition: Excellent  Good  x  Fair  Deteriorated

Comment:

Present use: residential  Original use: residential

SIGNIFICANCE OF PRIMARY STRUCTURE

Individual landmark  Typical example  x  Contributes to district

Comment: If some alterations were reversed, would be contributing
Exhibit F

Chief Building Official Determination Letter
July 2, 2019

1135 Norfolk Avenue
Park City, UT 84060

CC: 1135 Norfolk Avenue Structural Determination

NOTICE OF CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL DETERMINATION:

Project Address: 1135 Norfolk Avenue
Project Description: Chief Building Official Determination for integrity of structure
Date of Action: June 26, 2019

ACTION TAKEN BY CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL

The Historic Site at 1135 Norfolk Avenue has been designated as Significant on the City’s Historic Sites Inventory. It is deemed to be in the interest of the citizens of Park City, as well as the State of Utah, to encourage the preservation of Buildings, Structures, and Sites of Historic Significance in Park City. These Buildings, Structures and Sites are among the City’s most important cultural, educational, and economic assets. In order that they are not lost through neglect, Demolition, expansion or change within the City, the preservation of Historic Sites, Buildings, and Structures is required.

The Chief Building Official, based on the submitted engineering report and after visiting the site with the Historic Preservation Planner on June 26, 2019, finds the structure at 1135 Norfolk Avenue can be made safe and/or serviceable through repair. The Historic Structure is not hazardous or dangerous pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code.

If you have any questions regarding this determination, please don’t hesitate to contact the Building Department at 435-615-5100.

Sincerely,

Dave Thacker
Chief Building Official/Fire Code Official
Exhibit G

Epic Engineering Report
June 11, 2019

Mr. Bill Van Sickle
4838 Foresdale Road Suite 205
Park City, UT 84098

Via e-mail: bill.draftmaster@gmail.com

Re: Panelization or Retrofit of an Historic Residence
Structural Assessment of Visible Structure

Dear Mr. Van Sickle,

The purpose of this report is to render an engineering opinion after evaluating the condition of the historic residence located at 1135 Norfolk Avenue, Park City, UT. This engineering opinion is based on the photos and observations taken during a site visit performed by Epic Engineering on June 5th, 2019.

BACKGROUND

The Emmette family, the new property owners of the Norfolk Avenue historic residence, wish to build a modern extension and addition to the existing structure in the back-yard of the property. They also wish to excavate below the existing building to accommodate a new street level single-car garage by removing the existing roof and pouring a new foundation to replace the old.

There are several modern smaller structures or additions on this property that fall outside the scope if this report as shown in Figure 1, including a detached shed, a slab-on-grade addition to the house, and a detached street level concrete garage.

OBSERVATIONS

Photographs taken during the site visit are attached at the end of this report and illustrate the following observations.

The foundation of the structure follows three different design patterns, refer to photos 1-3. The outline of the historic building is placed on a concrete frost wall above an unexcavated crawl space. The addition at the rear of the house is placed on a slab on grade. An interior section of the foundation has been excavated to accessible depth and the crawl space soil is retained by a brick wall, which has collapsed in at least one location.

The floor framing consists of 2x6 joists supported by rough sawn beams of varying dimensions (in one case a felled tree). These beams are resting on posts that are not always positively connected to the foundation wall below it, and rely on friction to hold them in place. Two corners of the house exhibit noticeable sag in the floor joists, refer to pictures 4-6.

The walls consist of original 2x4 true sawn stud walls. The exterior siding of the house is placed over 1x slats of varying height which are then attached to the studs; there is a protective asphalt layer between the slats and the exterior siding.
The roof appears to be younger than other portions of the structure, and consists of 2x4 rafters at 24 inches on center with 2x6 reinforcement along the long dimension of the house. The long dimension is supported by a pony wall several feet from the ridge line of the house, and each rafter pair is tied near the top with a 1x8 collar. This supports slatted sheathing and a metal deck. There is a noticeable bow and sag in the ridge of the house.

**DISCUSSION**

Two options for salvaging the historic nature of the structure include retrofitting the existing structure or panelization of the existing structure. The panelization technique would include demolishing the majority of the structure and preserving as much of the exterior wall framing as possible in order to retain the historic quality of the structure. Both techniques require that the house be shored and lifted and a new foundation poured and that the stud walls be shored and stiffened to allow for the demolition and removal of the roof.

**Structural Retrofit**

In order to return the building to a serviceable condition, a jack-and-lift approach would allow for the construction of a new foundation to support the existing structure; the building would then be lowered and reattached to the new foundation. This would require an incremental excavation of the crawl-space below the house while shoring the existing floor joists and beams against collapse.

The excavation would begin by placing jacks in the already excavated portion of the basement to support the bearing beams of the floor near the points in the basement where shims currently serve as structural columns. Shoring would be placed to restrain the brick wall while it is slowly removed. The crawl space would then be excavated and removed carefully while adding jacks as necessary to prevent any inward collapse of the floor and wall assembly. This excavation would proceed to the outer frost wall of the house. The existing foundation at the perimeter would then be demolished, and re-poured following modern conventions and provisions for reinforcement and retained depth limitations. This would be done by hand as there is no feasible access for heavy machinery.

In order to retrofit the floor structure, floor joists would either be replaced or sistered to new reinforcement joists to meet loading requirements and address floor sag. The spans of these joists would require intermediate beam support to address deflection and strength concerns. This beam (or multiple beams if required) would bear on the exterior foundation wall or a column/footing assembly that would have to be poured.

To retrofit the walls, structural sheathing capable of resisting lateral forces would have to be installed on the studs at the interior of the house in order to preserve any historical exterior façade. This interior lateral sheathing in combination with 4" of wall space could present problems for mechanical, electrical, and plumbing design and insulation requirements.

**Panelization Technique**

The panelization technique involves salvaging structural exterior bearing walls by rehabilitating the walls in place, transporting them away from the construction process, then reinstalling the walls as non-bearing façade walls. This process allows reusing as much of the existing historic structure as possible.

Shoring the walls to allow for the removal of the roof may cause potential damage to the walls that panelization is attempting to save. Without the stiffness of the roof helping to hold the exterior walls up, unpredictable forces and stresses may develop in roof and walls during the roof removal process.
uncertainty could lead to unsafe working conditions, and put more strain on the floor assembly than it is currently subjected to. The existing sag of the floor and lack of stiffness in the floor assembly implies that the walls are currently out of plumb, further complicating the safe removal process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the observations of the sag in the floor joists and the haphazard placement of beams and shims in the basement level, there are concerns that the structure by itself lacks the stiffness necessary to lift or move it as an independent unit.

With this and the issues presented earlier in this report, it is my engineering opinion that construction required to retrofit or panelize the structure presents safety issues in either rehabilitation technique. Without direct access for heavy machinery, the time-frame needed for workers to perform the required stiffening and excavation would be extended and leave the structure vulnerable in its weakened state to the elements or unforeseen shifts and settlements as forces redistribute throughout the structure.

Additionally, it is my engineering opinion that due to the reasons stated above, it is economically unfeasible to panelize the exterior walls or rehabilitate the structure without damaging the historic portions of the structure.

LIMITATIONS

All observations were visible in nature and based on photos taken by Epic Engineering during a site visit.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office at 435-654-6600 with any questions.

Respectfully,

Chris Reeves, E.I.T.  
Epic Engineering, P.C.

Reviewed By:

John Riley, S.E.

Chris Reeves, E.I.T.  
Epic Engineering, P.C.

RECEIVED  
JUN 24 2019
PARK CITY  
PLANNING DEPT.
Figure 1: Scope of Report
Photo 1: Excavated Basement with Collapsed Brick

Photo 2: Inaccessible Crawlspace
Photo 3: Exterior Concrete Frost Wall

Photo 4: Sagging Floor Corner and Historical Studs/Slats
Photo 5: Sub-Floor Shimming

Photo 6: Sub-Floor Beams and Joists
Photo 7: Roof Assembly

Photo 8: Ridge Sag and Joist Bow
Exhibit H

Exterior Photos
External Photos
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Exhibit I

Interior Photos