

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 2019

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

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Liz Jackson, Mark Harrington

Jessica Nelson with the Planning Department explained the new sound system that was recently installed; and new technology related to presentations by the Staff or applicants. She noted that the meetings will all be live streamed.

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

October 2, 2019

Board Member Beatlebrox referred to page 13, first paragraph at the end and changed sistern to correctly read **sistering**.

Board Member Hodgkins referred to page 4, first full paragraph and noted that he was incorrectly given credit to the Think Tank. Randy Scott stated that he was the one who participated in the Think Tank.

Regarding the Visioning, Board Member Holmgren had attended some of the meetings at the Library and she thought they were very well done.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the minutes of October 2, 2019 as corrected. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson stated that this was the only HPB meeting in November. The next meeting was scheduled for December 4, 2019. The HPB would only have one meeting in December.

Director Erickson reported that the following evening the City Council would be conducting a study session on the first draft of the historic preservation plan prepared by Flagstaff Development. Following the study session, the Council will review the historic preservation plan and return it back to the HPB. Director Erickson remarked that funding mechanisms need to be addressed before it comes back to the HPB for Work Session. The Planning Commission will also need to take action because it amends the Technical Report for Flagstaff Development. Director Erikson noted that the preservation plan would go back to the City Council for the funding mechanism approvals. Director Erickson offered to brief the HPB on the City Council Study Session as quickly as possible.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the Board Members could attend the City Council Study Session. Chair Stephens answered yes.

Board Member Holmgren disclosed that she is a member of the Elks Club and they held a social session a few weeks ago. Someone found out she was on the HPB and they grilled her on various matters. She did not have the name of the person but offered to find out and submit it as a disclosure. Ms. Holmgren stated that she told this person to contact the Planning Department and discuss their issue with Planner Tyler. She told this individual several times that she was not able to have a one-on-one discussion outside of a Board meeting.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she would be absent from the December meeting. Board Member Hodgkins stated that he would also be absent from the December meeting.

CONTINUATIONS – (Public hearing and continue to date specified.)

#### 5.A. The Historic District Grant Program

Director Erickson reported that Planner Barhorst and her team had completely revised the Grant Program. They were working through one final issue with the Legal Department on the basis of the grant program from the early 1960s. Once that issue is resolved the Staff will bring it to the HPB as quickly as possible.

MOTION: Randy Scott moved to CONTINUE the Work Session for the Historic District Grant Program to a date uncertain. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### REGULAR AGENDA

#### 6.A. 526 Park Avenue – Historic District Design Review Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction of a Significant Historic

Structure – The Applicant is Proposing to Rehabilitate and Restore a Historic Structure back to its Original Use as a Garage. Applicant is Proposing to Impact the Following Materials Including Non-Historic Railroad Tie Retaining Walls; Non-Historic Covered Entry and Patio; Non-Historic Exterior Stairs; Non-Historic Stone Retaining Walls; Post-1929 Concrete Foundation; Post-1929 Floor Structure with Modern Upgrades; Post-1929 Original Roof Pitch and Shape; Post-1968 West Wall used to Cover Original Garage Doors; Non-Historic Wood Shingle Siding; Non-Historic Front (West) Porch; Post-1968 Rear (East) Enclosed Deck; Post-1995 Skylight Window; and Non-Historic Windows and Doors Replacement. (Application PL-18-03966)

Chair Stephens noted that a number of items were non-historic materials; and he suggested discussing those items together. If the Board had questions on any of the non-historic items, those issues could be addressed separately.

Chair Stephens summarized the items as the non-historic covered entry, the non-historic railroad tie retaining walls, the non-historic exterior stairs, the non-historic stone retaining walls, the post-1968 west wall used to cover the original garage doors, the non-historic wood shingle siding, the non-historic front porch post; the 1968 rear enclosed decks, and the 1995 skylight window and non-historic windows.

The Board had no concerns or issues related to the non-historic items.

Planner Liz Jackson noted that Kevin Horn, the project architect, and Dave Baglino, the contractor, were present to answer questions.

Planner Jackson stated that the applicant would like to change the structure back to its original use of a garage rather than its current use as a house. She noted that there were very few historic images of the structure; however, in the 1940 tax assessment photo of the structure next door at 528 Park Avenue, the historic garage can be seen with a metal standing seam roof and vertical wood siding, along with the historic doors.

Planner Jackson reported that in the recent past the garage was converted to a home and entirely covered in shingles. The Sanborn map of 1941 calls it out as being an automobile wood structure with a metal roof. At some point the lower level was added, as well as the enclosed deck.

Planner Jackson stated that in terms of material deconstruction, the HPB would be looking at the wood shingles, restoration of the roof, and the front façade being taken back to the garage doors rather than the new façade that was constructed at some point with windows and a front door.

Chair Stephens asked if the shingles were on a façade in front of what was the original structure. Planner Jackson clarified that at some point the shingles covered the doors. Kevin Horn noted that the opening was closed in, two windows were added, and the rest was covered completely with shingles.

Planner Jackson presented a photo showing the structure as it currently exists. The structure was covered with shingles, a door and two windows were added, as well as a little front porch.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the vertical siding would still be there if they pulled off the shingles. Mr. Horn answered yes. When they looked behind from the inside, they saw the backside of the vertical siding.

Chair Stephens asked if the Board had questions regarding the west façade or removing the shingles. There were no questions.

Planner Jackson commented on the post-1929 floor structure and the original roof pitch and shape. Based on the tax photo, she thought the roof shape had been maintained. In terms of the actual floor structure, Planner Jackson stated that the applicant will maintain the current house size for the garage. Changes are proposed on the interior, but nothing that that will affect the exterior. The structure will be maintained as much as possible.

Chair Stephens asked if the current pitch was the original roof pitch. Planner Jackson thought it was based on the 528 Park Avenue photo.

Planner Jackson added a clarification to Findings of Fact #20. It would not affect the HPB review. Planner Jackson stated that the Staff and applicant had discussed the entire garage structure from top to bottom and historic vs. non-historic. Anything that needed to be replaced would be wood, including the windows. Planner Jackson remarked that technically the applicant did not need to make everything wood unless it is a historic portion. She changed the wording for Finding #20. The current language reads, "Any windows replaced on the existing historic structure, including the non-historic additions to the main and lower levels, will be wood windows, will abide by the Historic District Design Guidelines, and will be consistent with the style of the historic garage". Planner Jackson proposed to revise Finding #20 to read, That the applicant proposes to replace any non-historic windows on the historic portion of the garage with wood windows. Any windows replaced on the existing structure will abide by the Historic District Design Guidelines and will be consistent with the style of the historic garage".

Chair Stephens understood that a number of non-historic windows would be reviewed. Planner Jackson answered yes. She noted that a standard condition of approval requires the windows to be reviewed by a window specialist to

determine what is or is not historic. Planner Jackson stated that during site visits with the Preservation Team and the Design Review Team it was determined that many of these windows are not historic. If the windows need to be replaced, and per the window specialist's report, replacement would need to be in accordance with the Design Guidelines. The window could be wood or wood aluminum clad, but no vinyl.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know what material would replace the shingles. Mr. Horn replied that it would be historic vertical wood siding. Whatever siding is not under the shingles will be matched in. Chair Stephens understood that siding would be part of the HDDR process. Planner Jackson replied that he was correct.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Stephens closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 526 Park Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as amended to modify Finding #20. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### Findings of Fact – 526 Park Avenue

1. The Site is located at 526 Park Avenue.
2. The Structure is designated as Significant on the Historic Structures Inventory.
3. The Site is located within the Historic Residential (HR-2A) Zoning District.
4. On March 27, 2019, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 526 Park Avenue; it was deemed complete July 10, 2019. The HDDR application has not yet been approved as it is dependent on the HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval.
5. The Structure was constructed c.1897, per Summit County's records. The 1941 Sanborn Map for this Site shows the existing Structure. A different Structure is shown on the 1889 Sanborn Map. The 1907 and 1929 Sanborn Maps show no Structure on the Site.
6. The Historic Structure Form has identified this Site's era of historical significance as the Mature Mining Era, 1894 to 1930.
7. The Structure first appears on the 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a simple one-story, metal clad automobile Structure, facing west toward Park Avenue.

8. The first photograph of the Structure was taken as part of the c.1940 tax assessment, but shown on the 1940 tax photo of the Site to the north of 526 Park Avenue – also known as 528 Park Avenue. The one-story garage is shown with vertical wood siding and a metal standing-seam roof.

9. Prior to 1982, a lower level addition below the existing Structure was added to create a bedroom, living room, and storage area.

10. The Structure was listed as ineligible to be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.

11. The Applicant proposes to remove the existing concrete landing pad, stone and railroad tie retaining walls, and Rear Yard stairs. The non-historic porch Structures on the north and west facades will also be removed. The non-historic shed Structures have already been removed, per Building Permit BD-19-26718. Any material deconstruction involved in the Site improvements does not impact the historical importance of the Structure located on the property or adjacent parcels. These later additions to the Site do not contribute to its historical integrity or historical significance.

12. Based on physical evidence, staff believes the lower level addition was added between 1941 and 1982. This addition will remain as the same footprint as it is currently. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the historical significance and architectural integrity Historic Structure.

13. The Applicant proposes to stabilize the Historic Structure from the interior by adding new framed walls on the interior, where necessary. The proposed interior changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the Historic Structure and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

14. The Applicant proposes to restructure the roof from the interior, replace the non-historic metal roof, and is subject to approval or denial by the Planning Director and the CBO in accordance with applicable guidelines within LMC 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Structures and the International Residential Code. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact that will occur to the historical significance and architectural integrity Historic Structure.

15. There is no chimney on the Existing Structure.

16. The Side (north and south) and Rear (east) exterior walls are to remain, but the non-historic shingles will be removed. The Front (west) façade will be replaced to restore the original garage door layout, as seen in the 1940 tax photo for 528 Park Avenue. The Applicant only proposes to repair and replace rotted siding where necessary. This siding will be vertical wood siding to match the Historic siding. 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.

17. The 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 Structure.

18. The Applicant is proposing to lift the Structure to install a new foundation. This is subject to approval or denial by the Planning Director and the CBO in accordance with applicable guidelines within LMC 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Structures and the International Residential Code. The proposed exterior changes will not damage or destroy exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the Historic Structure.

19. There are no Historic doors on the Structure, but the Applicant will match the c. 1940 tax assessment photo for 528 Park Avenue for the Front (west) garage doors. The Applicant proposes to replace the doors on the Side (north) and Rear (east) elevations with a window (north) and door (east) that abide by the Historic District Design Guidelines and will be consistent with the style of the Historic garage.

20. There is a total of one (1) Historic wood window on the Side (south) of the Historic Structure, and eighteen (18) non-historic windows. The Applicant's Physical Conditions Report notes they range from fair to poor condition, and proposes to replace the non-historic windows. One (1) non-historic window will be replaced with a door on the Rear (east) upper level. Any windows replaced on the existing Historic Structure (including the non-historic additions to the main and lower levels) will be wood windows, will abide by the Historic District Design Guidelines, and will be consistent with the style of the Historic garage. The Historic window will be salvaged and restored, if possible. The 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 Structure.

21. This Site has been determined to not require a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit, per a Planning Director Determination dated August 15, 2019.

22. The sheds shown on the survey were removed per Building Permit BD-19-26718. These sheds were determined to be non-historic per a staff Site visit on September 5, 2018.

#### Conclusions of Law – 526 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to 15-2.3 Historic Residential (HR-2A) District.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for material deconstruction pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction.
3. There is good cause for this HDDR application, as the proposed project will restore and rehabilitate a Historic Structure to its original Use as a garage.

#### Conditions of Approval – 526 Park Avenue

1. Final Building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal received by the Planning Department on October 30, 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 and Planning Departments if changes are made.
3. Replacement doors and windows shall exactly match any Historic doors in size, material, profile, and style. Doors and windows that are non-historic will abide by the requirements within LMC 15-13 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Structures and the International Residential Code.
4. An independent window evaluation specialist will assess and report on the existing window conditions and outline options for rehabilitation or replacement in satisfaction of the Planning Director.
5. Should the original Historic wood Side (south) window not be able to be restored, the replacement windows shall exactly match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material.
6. Should restructuring the roof from the interior not be possible due to the condition of the existing roof Structure, the Applicant shall schedule a Site visit with the Chief Building Official and Planning Director to evaluate the condition of the roof Structure. The Applicant shall also submit a structural engineer's report to the Planning Director outlining the defects in the roof that prevent the new Structure from being added alongside the existing roof members. The Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of these walls and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Planning Department. 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 prior to construction.
7. The Applicant shall maintain the original gable roof form. If reconstruction is needed, structural stabilization shall occur by adding new structural members to the interior of the roof.
8. 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.
9. Prior to filing an application/building permit to construct a new foundation beneath the Historic Structure, the Applicant shall schedule a Site visit with the Chief Building Official and Historic Preservation Planner to evaluate the current foundation. The lifting shall not raise the Structure more than two feet (2') from its original floor elevation above grade prior to construction. If not already reflected, the Physical Conditions Report and Preservation Plan shall be amended to document the condition of the Structure and provide an updated scope of work to the satisfaction of the Planning Department. 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 and Chief Building Official prior to lifting the Structure.

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

13. Historic Buildings which are lifted off the foundation must be returned to the completed foundation within 45 days of Building permit issuance.

14. 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, they determine 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.

15. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Building and Planning Departments 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. 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 financial guarantee for historic preservation or ACE could take place.

16. All excavation work to construct the foundation shall start on or after April 15th and be completed on or prior to October 15th. 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, determines that it is necessary 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.

17. A Plat Amendment shall be recorded prior to construction on this Site for this HDDR, to remove the Lot Line between Parcel PC-143 and PC-124-D. This shall abide by the Conditions of Approval found in Ordinance 2019-40, which was approved by City Council on July 18, 2019.

6.B. 1135 Norfolk Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Ratification of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as directed by the Historic Preservation Board on October 2, 2019.  
(Application PL-17-03702)

Chair Stephens noted that the Board discussed this item on October 2, 2019.

Planner Barhorst reported that this item was ratification of the Findings the HPB directed the Staff to make at the last meeting on October 2, 2019. She noted that the Findings were based on their discussion in October. In addition, Conclusion of Law was added stating that if additional structural issues are found during construction that would not allow the house to be appropriately shored, the applicant could reapply for disassembly and reassembly.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know the reason for the additional Conclusion of Law. City Attorney Harrington stated that typically an applicant does not have the right to reapply once a request has been denied. The Conclusion of Law makes it clear that the HPB left the door open for reconsideration. If the applicant did reapply, it would come back to the HPB for a decision; and the request would need to be based upon information that was found and different than what the Board found lacking in the original application. It could be information that was discovered through further demolition. Mr. Harrington clarified that the determination would be made by the HPB and not the Staff.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that the applicant could reapply for panelization even if it was previously denied. The added Conclusion of Law leaves the door open to a different panelization proposal. Chair Stephens understood that it would also require new information that was not available when panelization was denied. Planner Barhorst noted that she had drafted language mirroring Condition #10 from the material deconstruction approval, which states that the applicant must submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer. City Attorney Harrington thought that language was sufficient. Chair Stephens noted that if no additional information is provided, the HPB would make the same decision based on the prior information.

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to RATIFY the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the denial of the proposed Disassembly and Reassembly of 1135 Norfolk Avenue as proposed by Staff pursuant to direction provided at the October 2, 2019 HPB meeting. Board Member Scott seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1135 Norfolk Avenue

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. On July 17, 2019 the Historic Preservation Board approved the Material Deconstruction for the site at 1135 Norfolk Avenue. The Reconstruction proposal was continued to August 7, 2019. July 17, 2019 HPB Staff Report (page 24). At the August 7, 2019 meeting the applicant withdrew the proposal for Reconstruction (Minutes, page 10).
6. After withdrawing the application for Reconstruction during the August 7, 2019 HPB meeting (Minutes, page 10), the applicant updated the proposal to Disassembly and Reassembly (Panelization).
7. The proposal for Disassembly and Reassembly was reviewed at the October 2, 2019 HPB meeting Staff Report (page 28).
8. 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) was set to expire June 21, 2019. The extension of the plat amendment was approved through Ordinance No. 2019-42 by City Council on August 1, 2019.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.

13. After the exploratory interior demolition completed by the applicant on August 21, 2019, the construction techniques can clearly be seen with an addition to the south end of the cross-gable structure having been added sometime post-circ. 1940s.

14. The applicant is proposing the Disassembly and Reassembly of the Significant Historic Site. The proposal is to re-use any interior siding, as well as the siding on the rear of the house that was approved in the Material Deconstruction Review on July 17, 2019, to restore the exterior.

15. The HPB has made the following findings with respect to LMC § 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure:

☐ Criteria A:

a. **Does not comply.** The provided structural engineering report is insufficient in determining that the Historic Structure cannot be reasonably shored and braced to support lifting as one unit.

b. At least one of the following:

A. The proposed disassembly and reassembly will abate demolition of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the site; or

☐ **Does not apply.** The proposed disassembly and reassembly does not abate demolition of the Historic Structure.

B. 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; or

☐ **Does not comply.** The Chief Building Official (Exhibit F) determined the Structure is not hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code.

C. The Historic Preservation Board determines, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly; unique conditions include but are not limited to:

☐ **Does not comply.** The Historic Preservation Board determined the existing conditions of the site and structure do not warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly. The Historic Preservation Board found, with input from the Chief Building Official and after review of the provided engineering report, that unique conditions do not exist and that the structure should be lifted rather than panelized (Disassembly and Reassembly). Specifically, the Chief Building Official provided input that the Structure could be stabilized from the interior with additional structural members which would enable the lifting of the structure in whole. The Material Deconstruction approval on July 17, 2019 (Staff Report page 45) includes Condition of Approval #10 requiring the applicant to "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 materials 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.”

☐ Criteria B:

☐ **Complies.** 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. The applicant is not proposing to relocate or reorient the Historic Structure.

Conclusions of Law – 1135 Norfolk

1. The proposal does not meet the criteria pursuant to LMC § 15-11-14 Disassembly and Reassembly of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.
2. If, during construction, there are additional structural issues found and reported by a structural engineer that do not allow the house to be appropriately shored and stabilized, the applicant may re-apply for Disassembly and Reassembly pursuant to LMC § 15-11-14.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas Stephens, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board