



AGENDA

SITE VISIT – 4:30 PM – *No discussion or action will be taken on site.*

823 Norfolk Avenue – Site Visit will be at 4:30 PM

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM

ROLL CALL

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF April 6, 2016

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

CONTINUATIONS

1259 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance
Public hearing and continuation to June 1, 2016

PL-15-02645 39
*Planner
 Turpen*

REGULAR AGENDA – *Discussion and possible action as outlined below*

823 Norfolk – Reconstruction and Material Deconstruction—Landmark Site. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the historic shed. In addition, the applicant will be removing non-historic shed, removing non-historic retaining walls, removing the roof for structural upgrades, removing non-historic windows and doors, removing two historic chimneys, removing non-historic foundation, and removing non-historic porch elements and historic porch roof.

PL-15-02909 41
*Planner
 Grahn*

Public hearing and possible action

Design Guideline Revisions- Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for Park City’s Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings. Specific Guidelines B. Primary Structures will be reviewed for: Roofs, Exterior Walls, Foundation, Doors, Windows, Gutters and Downspouts, Chimneys and Stovepipes, Porches, Architectural Features, Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems, and Service Equipment, Paint and Color; Additions to Primary Structures will be reviewed for: Protection for Historic Structures and Sites, Transitional Elements, General Compatibility, Scenario 1: Basement Addition Without a Garage, Scenario 2: Basement Addition with a Garage, Decks, Balconies and Roof Decks; H. Accessory Structures; Sidebars will be reviewed for: Fencing in Old Town, How to Case a Window, Why Preserving Historic Siding is Recommended, Why Preserving Original Siding is Recommended, Why Preserving Original Windows is Recommended. The Board will provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a

GI-13-00222 167
*Planner
 Grahn &
 Planner
 Turpen*

recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB)

Public hearing and possible action

WORK SESSION – *Discussion item only, no action taken*

Discussion as requested by the Historic Preservation Board of Historic Preservation Terms used in the application of the Historic District Guidelines for projects: *Compatibility, Subordinate, Complementary*, as defined in the General Plan, Land Management Code and/or the Historic District Guidelines.

Discussion item only, no action taken

*Planner 205
Grahm &
Planner Tech
Scarff*

ADJOURN

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Lola Beatlebrox, Cheryl Hewett, Jack Hodgkins, Puggy Holmgren, Doug Stephens

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Louis Rodriguez, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels Mclean, Louis Rodriguez

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Hope Melville, who was excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 2, 2016

MOTION: Board Member Stephens moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 2, 2016 as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Planning Director Erickson reported that the determination of significance for 569 Park Avenue was appealed to the Board of Adjustment. That meeting would be held either late April or early May within the 45 day time limit. He recommended that the HPB arrange to have one representative at that meeting to sit in the audience and report back to the Board Members on the action taken by the Board of Adjustment.

Louis Rodriguez noted that the appeal meeting was scheduled but the applicant was not able to attend on that date. A new meeting date will be rescheduled for early May.

Board Member Holmgren was willing to attend the Board of Adjustment meeting as the HPB representative if the meeting is scheduled on a Tuesday or Wednesday. She would not be available other days. The Staff would keep that in mind when trying to schedule another date.

Chari White announced that prior to this meeting the HPB had a field trip to 1406 Park Avenue and 1055 Norfolk.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 1406 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-15-02883)

Planner Grahn noted that the HPB discussed this item at the last meeting and visited the house this afternoon during the field trip.

The Staff had taken a neutral position and requested that the HPB determine whether or not it meets the criteria to be designated as significant. The criteria was outlined on pages 58 and 59 of the Staff report.

Planner Grahn noted that the first criteria is whether or not the structure is 50 years old. She noted that the house was constructed in 1912. The second criteria is whether or not the structure retained its integrity and historic form because, but limited to, (i) if it received a grant; (ii) it was previously listed on the HSI or; (iii) it was previously listed on a Recon Survey. Planner Grahn stated that those are indicators that it might retain its historic form, but it does not necessarily indicate that it does. The third criteria is whether or not the structure retains its historic context and reflects the historical or architectural character of the site. Criteria four is whether it is deemed important or local or regional history.

Planner Grahn noted that the Staff previously outlined their reasoning based on each criteria.

Board Member Stephens stated that when he visited the home he looked at it from the viewpoint of restoring the home if the additions were removed whether the home could be restored to more closely resemble what was consistently there at a specific time in the historic period. He noted that most times when additions are added the original historic material is left underneath. However, in this particular case, a few of the historic walls were completely removed and replaced with beams. If they removed the additions near the front porch and the where the kitchen was there would be no historic material left.

Board Member Stephens remarked that after the site visit the narrative and the photographs in the Staff report made more sense.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the size and basic mass was compatible with historic but most of the lines and the shape had been altered. In her opinion, the original form had been lost. Board Member Hewett concurred.

Board Member Holmgren it looked like a different structure and nothing close to the original historic house.

Board Member Hodgkins had not attended the site visit and he had nothing further to add.

Chair White stated that from the exterior he could find a semblance of what the original ridge lines were, but a couple of feet down from each ridge the historic is gone. Inside the home it is possible that some of the flooring is original, but it is hard to tell. Chair White concurred with the other Board Members that the majority of the house does not resemble what was there historically.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Planner Grahn noted that the Staff had prepared Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval for action to support the request for placing 1406 Park Avenue on the HSI as a Significant site, as well as a second set of Findings and Conclusions if the Board finds that it is not Significant. If the HPB makes a motion in opposition they should including the Findings, Conclusions and Conditions beginning on page 62 of the Staff report.

Planner Grahn stated that based on their comments the motion should be that the house at 1406 Park Avenue did not meet the criteria to be designated as a Significant Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory in accordance with the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law found in the Staff report.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren made a motion in accordance with the recommended motion as stated by Planner Anya Grahn. Board Member Hewett seconded the motion.

VOTE: the motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1406 Park Avenue

1. The Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI), adopted February 4, 2009, includes 414 sites of which 192 sites meet the criteria for designation as Landmark Sites and 222 sites meet the criteria for designation as Significant Sites.
2. The house at 1406 Park Avenue is within the Historic Residential-Medium (HRM)

zoning district.

3. The residential structure at 1406 Park Avenue was included in the 2009 HSI; however, it was removed in March 2010 due to the modifications made to the original roof form outside of the historic period based upon the older criteria.

4. In December 2015, City Council amended the Land Management Code to expand the criteria for what structures qualify to be significant sites.

5. There is wood-frame cross-wing cottage at 1406 Park Avenue.

6. The house was built c. 1912 during the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930). The structure appears in the 1929 and 1941 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. A c. 1938 tax photo of Park City also demonstrates that the overall form of the structure has not been altered.

7. In 1943, an addition was constructed to the northeast corner of the original crosswing according to the 1949 tax card. The roof of the east-west stem wing was modified to create a low-pitched side-facing saltbox form, seen today, in order to extend the roof form from the original ridge over the c.1943 in-line addition.

8. By 1958, the house had been clad in aluminum siding. The form of the house was modified further to create a new porch on the northwest side of the house, consuming the original cross-wing form. It is unknown if the historic wood siding has been retained beneath the aluminum siding.

9. By 1968, the front porch was relocated from the northwest side of the house to the southwest side, which is consistent with what exists today.

10. An enclosed sunporch was constructed on the front of the house, replacing the c.1968 porch. The roof form was further modified and built over the sunporch in the 1980s, according to the current owner.

11. The house is currently clad in aluminum and vinyl siding. There are casement windows of various sizes and shapes used throughout the house.

12. The original cross-wing structure is not discernable from the exterior and the original cross-wing, which was typical of the types of residential structures built during the Mature Mining Era, has been lost.

13. Built c.1912, the structure is over fifty (50) years old and has achieved Significance in the past fifty (50) years.

14. The post-1943 additions to the north side and front of the house have diminished its Historical Form, and the original cross-wing has been lost. Its scale and context has not been maintained.

15. The house is important in local or regional history because it is associated with an era of historic importance to the community, the Mature Mining Era.

16. The structure at 1406 Park Avenue does not meet the standards for local "significant" designation, it does not meet the criteria for "landmark" designation. In order for the site to be designated as "landmark," the structure would have to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and retain a high level of integrity.

Conclusions of Law – 1406 Park Avenue

1. The existing structure located at 1406 Park Avenue meets 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:

(i) It previously received a historic grant from the City; or

(ii) It was previously listed on the Historic Sites Inventory; or

(iii) It was listed as Significant or on any reconnaissance or intensive level survey of historic resources; or

Does not comply.

(c) It has one (1) or more of the following:

(i) 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; and

(ii) 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; or

Does not comply.

2. The existing structure located at 1406 Park Avenue does not meet all of the criteria for designating sites to the Park City Historic Sites Inventory as a Landmark Site including:

a. It is at least fifty (50) years old or has achieved Significance or if the Site is

of exceptional importance to the community; and Complies.

b. It retains its Historic Integrity in terms of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association as defined by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places; and Does Not Comply.

c. It is significant in local, regional or national history, architecture, engineering or culture associated with at least one (1) of the following:

i. An era that has made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

ii. The lives of Persons significant in the history of the community, state, region, or nation; or

iii. The distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction or the work of a notable architect or master craftsman. Complies.

2. 1259 Norfolk Avenue – Determination of Significance
(Application PL-15-02645)

Planner Turpen noted that this item was continued from the last meeting for clarification and additional information. She reviewed the additional information provided.

Planner Turpen stated that the first item in question was the 1940s tax photo and whether or not it was actually from the 1940s. He presented a slide showing the 1940s tax photo. She remarked that the Park City Museum are the keepers of the tax card collection for historic structures in Old Town. The Museum has tax cards from all the years that the property was assessed, as well as tax photos from other years. She explained that the tax photo did not match the date of the tax card because it is a collection of all the assessments of the property.

Planner Turpen stated that she was also able to find photographic evidence from 1947 taken from the park where they used to play football when it was a high school. She pointed out that the original windows are in their original location. Another photograph from 1950 showed that the windows had been altered and other windows were added. That indicates that an alteration occurred sometime after 1947 but before 1950.

Planner Turpen reported that at the last meeting there was some confusion as to whether or not this structure was deconstructed in 2002 as part of the renovation. The Staff was unable to find any evidence; and given the detail in the 2002 Historic District Design Review action letter it would have been mentioned. The Staff could find nothing to prove that it had occurred and concluded that it was not deconstructed.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

Malia Binderly was representing her mother who is the property owner. Ms. Binderly stated that at the last meeting they talked about the nature of the building and where it sits; and whether or not it is in its property context. They talked about one building being out of proper context in the historic district. She believed that applied to this house. Ms. Binderly stated that one issue that kept coming up during the last meeting was the Contributory Site in the LMC. She thought that needed to be considered. Ms. Binderly remarked that currently they were looking at whether this home is a Significant site, but she felt it was not a Significant site in so many ways. However, she believes it is a Contributory site. Ms. Binderly outlined why she thought the home did not meet the criteria for a Significant Site. Ms. Binderly requested that the HPB reconsider the request for determining significance and to look at the criteria for a Contributory site outlined in the LMC.

Board Member Holmgren did not believe the HPB had the purview to make a change. They were in the position of determining significance as requested.

Ms. Binderly clarified that she was asking the HPB not to find in favor of Significance because it does not meet the criteria. She requested that they deny the Significant Site request, and take it back to the HSI as a Contributory site in the future.

Board Member Stephens stated that in order for the HPB to deny, they would have to deny it within the framework of the current LMC. He agreed with Board Member Holmgren that the Board did not have the option to make a change. Planner Turpen noted that if the Board chose to deny, she would have to craft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for denial.

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that the Board was correct about their position being an analysis of the criteria for Significant Determination and whether the house meets that criteria.

Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that the Board review the criteria for Significant as requested by the applicant, specifically considering the new photos presented and verification that it is the 1943 tax card.

Director Erickson noted that the Staff had not had the opportunity to run the analysis of the structure as a Contributory site. He recommended that the HPB focus on the significance of the structure at 1259 Norfolk Avenue in the context presented by the applicant.

Board Member Beatlebrox concurred. Planner Turpen presented the criteria for determining a Significant site.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hewett recalled that the unresolved issue at the last meeting was whether the house has lost its historic significance because of its site location. She believed it was a challenge because the area has become fairly commercial

The Board agreed that the structure met the first criteria because it is over 50 years old.

Ms. Binderly pointed out that the structure that was built 116 years ago was moved and flattened and a new foundation was put in. Only one piece of the front wall was retained. In her opinion the structure was completely altered and did not resemble the original building. The roof line is different and the footprint doubled in size. The structure was newly built in 2002.

Board Member Stephen stated that if the structure was newly built in 2002 they would be correct in saying that the historic fabric of the house has been removed. Under bullet (b) it would not qualify as being significant. However, without any evidence other than Ms. Binderly's statement, the Board did not have sufficient information to make that determination. If that evidence would be provided, Mr. Stephens suggested that they wait to make a determination and continue this item until the information can be provided. Otherwise, the HPB would have to move forward with the information that has been presented to make a determination of significance.

Ms. Binderly stated that she could only ask the developer to confirm in writing what he said was done. Mr. Stephens stated that if they had visited this site they would probably have been able to tell what alterations were made in 2002. The structure itself could be its own evidence. Ms. Binderly remarked that if the Board was asking for a site visit she was willing to let them inside to see the interior. Mr. Stephens clarified that the discussion was not about the interior of the structure. The discussion relates to the exterior. However, he believed there would be exterior evidence to show both new and historic material.

Planner Turpen offered to schedule a site visit at the Board's request.

Chair White noted that Ms. Binderly had stated that the size of the existing building was larger than the original historic size. Planner Turpen assumed that was due to an addition. She found nothing in the action letter to indicate that the size of the historic portion was larger. Ms. Binderly stated that it was in the Staff report written by the Planner. The house was originally 883 square feet and the current size is more than 1200 square feet, excluding the lower garage which is obviously an addition.

Chair White noted that the size would show on the Sanborn map as opposed to the current size. He clarified that he was looking for the footprint. Planner Turpen stated that the footprint of the original house was expanded in the rear to accommodate an addition, which totals the 1200 square feet. The original house in the very front is approximately 800 square feet. She noted that this is typically seen throughout old town because the footprint always increases when doing an addition. Chair White explained that he was talking about the size of the historic portion and whether it was different from the original house size. Planner Turpen had no evidence of the front wall widening or any other change to that affect. She only had evidence of the rear addition.

Board Member Hewett thought the discussion should focus on whether or not the structure is in a context that is no longer historical, and whether that matters. If they were to say that the house is surrounded by non-historic homes and no longer has the right context, it would eliminate the need for additional information.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the Board did not make a determination that two other houses were not historic because everything around them was modern. The issue was the fact that they were not historic buildings. Since this particular building has not changed its historic form and looks very similar to the photos that have been presented as evidence, she was inclined to look at it as a historic building. In addition, it received a historic grant from the City.

Ms. Binderly remarked that the historic grant from the City never prevented demolition. She did not want to argue with the point of law, but the City now prohibits demolition of sites that are placed on the HSI as Significant. Ms. Binderly stated that if the property owner was made aware in 2001 that receiving a grant for \$16,000 would have changed the demolition requirements, they would have had a different reasoning for what they did, and they might not have accepted or even applied for the grant. She believed this was double jeopardy on this house. Simply because it had a historic grant it is suddenly prevented from being demolished.

Ms. Binderly stated that she appreciated what the HPB was trying to accomplish and what Park City is trying to do to maintain its historic character; but in her opinion it makes no sense to restrict from demolition that particular house in that particular location because it is surrounded by commercial and multi-family. She understood the Contributory designation which is why she presented the Contributory alternative. The owners were happy to be Contributory, but the demolition aspect of Significant is a major issue.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that in and of itself, having received a grant does put a structure on the HSI. As the language reads, "It retains its historic form as may be demonstrated..." Ms. McLean explained that the grant can be taken into consideration, but in and of itself having a grant does not

automatically meet that criteria. The idea is that when the owner applies for a grant the structure is evaluated and considered important enough to be maintained as historic. Ms. McLean pointed out that the real issue for the Board is whether or not the structure retains its historic form, and the grant may be considered as one indicator. Ms. McLean stated that it is not double-jeopardy for the property owner that they received a grant and suddenly their rights are taken away. It only means that the City values its historic materials and historic structures and for that reason they have implemented Code requirements. One requirement is if the structure retains its historic form and meets the criteria of the HSI, it is prohibited from demolition.

Ms. Binderly stated that this house has never been designated on the HSI and she believes that speaks to the intent of what the HPB is about. She could not imagine that for 15 years the Board had not done their job or it was left off the HSI as a mistake. The house has been in existence and the fact that it has never been considered showed the intentions of the Board because the house is out of context and should not be considered a significant site.

Board Member Stephen reiterated that the role of the Board was to evaluate the proposal before them this evening based on the information they were given. Mr. Stephens understood from his reading of criteria (b), "retains its historical form" does not mean in context with the surrounding properties. It refers to the specific site itself. He acknowledged that it may be a shortfall in the LMC because it is difficult to evaluate properties on the outskirts of the historic district without taking into consideration the context of surrounding development and what was allowed to be built around the historic homes in the 1980s and 1990s.

Board Member Stephens believed the information that was still missing was whether or not the historic fabric of this house has been removed. If it has been removed that would lead them down a different path. Without that evidence, he would have a difficult time making a decision. He would like to treat the owner fairly and suggested that Ms. Binderly provide additional information on what she was proposing this evening.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the criteria hinges less on the material and more about the form. He noted that criteria c) talks about scale, context and materials. However, when he reads the findings of facts, it appears to be more intent on historical form than on material materials.

Board Member Holmgren referred to the pictures on page 97 and page 94. The photo on page 97 was after the renovation and she thought they made the yellow house look very much like the house in 1940.

Board Member Stephens disagreed with Mr. Hodgkins because materials alone are important. If he sees a structure in the Historic District that appears to be

historic, he likes to know that it is historic. Mr. Stephens did not believe the LMC intended to keep homes that were replicated as being Significant. Mr. Stephens noted that their decision would have a financial impact on the property owner. If this house truly is a newly constructed home in 2002, it would lead him to a different decision than if it were still a historic home that was remodeled or restored. Mr. Stephens thought the applicant should be given the opportunity to provide additional information either through a site visit or valid documentation.

Planner Turpen noted for the record that notice was provided on Friday. The owners were out-of-town and did not receive their notification on Friday, but they were legally noticed.

Chair White understood that the Board would continue this item pending a site visit.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE this item to May 4, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. 1055 Norfolk Avenue – Material Deconstruction – Significant designation. The applicant is proposing a remodel restoration: Raise the house, restore existing historic home, add basement and garage and rear addition. (Application PL-15-02827)

Planner Francisco Astorga introduced the owner, David Baglino, and Kevin Horn, the project architect. The HPB had visited the site prior to this meeting.

Planner Astorga stated that this item was before the HPB due to recent changes to the LMC that requires any material deconstruction to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board. He referred to Exhibit C in the Staff report, which was prepared by the property owner, showing photographs justifying the removal of the non-historic material. Planner Astorga thought the Staff report was helpful in adding context to Exhibit C. In conjunction with the submittals in Exhibit C, the applicant had also prepared the required Historic Preservation Plan and the Physical Conditions Report. Planner Astorga explained that the Physical Conditions Report identifies what is there and the condition it is in. The HPB considers that specific component and further indicates whether it can be repaired or if it needs to be replaced, and whether or not it is historic.

Planner Astorga stated that the entire Historic District Design Review was also included in the Staff report. Before the Staff can move forward with the HDDR, the Board needs to determine whether the non-historic material can be removed. Planner Astorga pointed out that the Board should not focus on the addition and what could occur in the future. They should only focus on the existing guidelines

and criteria for materials deconstruction that would allow moving forward to the next steps.

Planner Astorga presented photographs, as well as the 1900 and 1907 Sanborn maps. He noted that the 1907 Sanborn map shows the rear addition. The Planning Department found that the applicant submitted enough evidence to show that the addition shown in 1907 is not the same addition that exists today. The Staff found no historic evidence in the existing addition. Planner Astorga suggested that the owners agree to some minor exploratory demolition to find out what materials are there. An exploratory demolition would help piece together exactly what occurred.

Planner Astorga presented an Exhibit based on the investigation of what the Staff could piece together from the actual evidence and the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The next Exhibit as a photo showing three levels of cladding, starting with the drop-novelty siding which was the predominant material that was used in Park City. The second level of material was plaster and stucco, and finally the metal siding. Planner Astorga presented a photo of the basement/crawl space and noted that no historic materials were found in the rear wing of the house. Planner Astorga reviewed the 1900 Sanborn map showing where the structure stopped before the addition was done. He did not have a specific record of when the newer portion to the right was built; however, it does not have the drop-novelty siding and the Staff was able to conclude that it was not historic. Planner Astorga pointed out that there was also no evidence of the stucco material. It was newer construction material with aluminum siding. Planner Astorga presented the south elevation and noted that there was no evidence of historic material on the south side. Photos of the attic showed what used to be the roof form under the existing roof form. There was also evidence of a flat porch roof form underneath the existing roof.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for further explanation of the flat porch roof. The applicant and the HPB reviewed photos to try and determine the original porch. Mr. Horn referred to page 241 of the Staff report which showed a half octagon shape. Mr. Hodgkins indicated the fascia off the octagon. Mr. Horn stated that it was the fascia above the flat roof. It was the fascia of the octagon. Mr. Hodgkins was unclear as to how that supports the fact that there was a flat roof at one time. Mr. Horn pointed out that the photo would have been taken by someone standing on the flat structure. He noted that the Sanborn maps also show a wrap-around porch. Mr. Hodgkins thought the question was whether or not it was a flat porch roof. Mr. Horn replied that if the roof had any slope it would have run into the freeze board. Mr. Hodgkins was satisfied with the explanation.

Planner Astorga referred to the drawings of the existing structure on page 214 of the Staff report. The bottom drawing showed the restoration to the original

existing house. Based on that evidence the Staff finds that this request meets the guidelines that were recently adopted by the City Council regarding material deconstruction. Planner Astorga noted that the view from the south shows the wraparound porch. He noted that the wraparound porch is not typical of Park City; however, the Staff was comfortable making this finding based on the evidence provided by the property owner. It would also suggest why there was no historic material on the south elevation. He noted that through the exploratory demolition there was evidence of historic material on the front and the front half of the north elevation.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the 1940s tax photo was the oldest photograph available. Planner Astorga replied that it was the oldest record they could find. He noted that the stucco was evident in the 1940s. Mr. Hodgkins stated that in looking at the photo it appeared that at some point something was attached to the fascia. He indicated where there was paint and then it stops. Mr. Horn pointed out where the paint resumes below that line. Mr. Hodgkins thought that area looked unpainted.

Mr. Hodgkins asked if it was typical to have flat porch roofs during that historic period. Planner Astorga replied that there were not many throughout Park City.

Planner Astorga remarked that he found a 1949 tax card that indicated stucco on the structure, which would be consistent with the 1940s photograph. The 1958 tax card still showed stucco and the aluminum siding was present in the 1962 tax card.

Board Member Holmgren thought the area Mr. Hodgkins believed was unpainted was actually paint because you could see where the paint was gouged.

Mr. Baglino stated that if the roof was not flat and they had buried the octagon look, the freeze board would have been damaged by the slope. He noted that the freeze board had slight damage like it was nicked up from something more recent in time. They found no nail holes or anything else to indicate that something was attached. He understood what Mr. Hodgkins was saying about the two paint differences, and he was unsure what had caused it. Mr. Baglino reiterated that there was no evidence that something had been attached. He clarified that he was not opposed to building a porch that meets the historic guidelines. They were proposing a flat roof based on evidence.

Planner Astorga clarified that flat roofs are not typical to Park City, but neither is the half octagon shape. Mr. Baglino stated that an octagon with a flat roof around it and the textured deep freeze board was very typical in the Victorian era.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he was only questioning the roof form because it did not seem practical given the climate in Park City.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic materials at 1055 Norfolk Avenue based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1055 Norfolk Avenue

1. The property is located at 1055 Norfolk Avenue.
2. The current HDDR application is for the rehabilitation/restoration of the existing single-family dwelling.
3. The site is listed on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) noted as Significant as it was built during the Mature Mining Historic Era (1894-1930).
4. The current physical evidence from the period that defines the typical Park City mining era home has been altered.
5. The current physical elements of the site, in combination, do not effectively convey a sense of life in western mining town of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
6. The current extent of the alterations to the main building diminishes its association with the past.
7. The current degree and cumulative effect of alterations to the site render it ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
8. The applicant requests to utilize the historic Building Footprint of year 1900 consisting of 488 square feet.
9. The applicant proposes a basement addition with garage, a main floor remodel and rear addition an upper floor remodel and rear addition, and an attic level

addition above the rear addition.

10. According to Summit County records the house was built in 1906, however, the house is clearly shown on the year 1900 and 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (Sanborn Maps).

11. The applicant proposes to restore and rehabilitate the structure based on what has been found with the exploratory evidence via small removal of materials and evidence shown in the existing attic, while at the same time piecing the evidence together with the Sanborn Maps.

12. The structure will be reduced to its original cross tee shape with the octagonal hip roof and flat wrap-around porch roof restored.

13. The original roof, shingles, trim and frieze are still present in the attic over the porch enclosure.

14. The historic roof will be uncovered from the additions and restored to its original shape with trim and frieze restoration as well.

15. The form will be brought back to its original cross tee with octagonal hip and flat wrap-around porch roof.

16. The front/east facade walls were originally drop-novelty wood siding and have since been covered with plaster stucco and then aluminum siding.

17. The walls that enclose the original porch and the new porch changed the shape from its original form to the curved roof.

18. The existing east exterior walls will be uncovered down to the original drop novelty siding, the siding will be restored where it has been damage by 2 new layers of finish.

19. The north and south walls west of the original structure have been constructed with newer wood and galvanized nails. Finishes are aluminum siding. Non-historic aluminum siding, historic porch enclosure and covered up details.

20. The existing north and south walls will be uncovered down to the original drop novelty siding, the siding will be restored where it has been damage by 2 new layers of finish.

21. The existing west exterior walls where not abutting the addition will be uncovered down to the original drop novelty siding, the siding will be restored where it has been damage by 2 new layers of finish.

22. The original foundation and some addition foundations are rubble stone with a crawl space.

23. One addition was done with unreinforced CMU.

24. The varied foundations are structurally unsound and need to be replaced with continuous concrete foundation walls and raise the historic structure as allowed in this zone.

25. Existing rubble and unreinforced CMU foundations will be replaced with continuous concrete foundations that accommodate a lower level and garage and raise the house 24" as allowed in the zone per the Land Management Code and the Design Guidelines.

26. The historic front porch is visible from the new attic.

27. The porch had a flat roof and wrapped around an octagonal shape main room and hip roof.

28. The frieze and fascia boards are still visible from the attic.

29. The porch was subsequently enclosed to enlarge the living room and a new porch constructed on the front of the home with a sweeping curved roof that is out of place.

30. The original porch and roof was covered up.

31. The current porch is out of character for Park City.

32. The original wrap-around front porch that is evident from the attic and foundation will be restored.

33. The flat roof, frieze treatment and roof above are still intact in the attic and will be restored.

34. The structure has three non-historic doors.

35. The structure has ten (10) non-historic metal windows in fair condition.

36. All windows in the addition may be aluminum clad window.

37. The front picture window does not reflect the original or the period of the home.

38. The front picture window will be replaced with a period window and transom.

39. The post-1930 alterations to the site are non-contributory.

40. The multitude of additions made to the rear of the structure and the front porch detracted from the original octagonal roof-wrap-around porch.

41. These non-historic additions largely obscure the original historic form and make the developmental history of the site nearly indiscernible.

42. The removal of these non-historic additions to accommodate an addition is appropriate.

43. The proposed exterior changes do not destroy the exterior architectural features but bring back items that have been lost and that are hidden.

44. The removal of these non-contributory additions and material will not impact the historical significance of the structures nor impact their architectural integrity.

45. The applicant plans to remove material in order to rehabilitation and restore the original structure based on historic evidence gathered.

46. The proposed exterior brings back the historic material found on site based on the gathered evidence.

47. The original drop-novelty siding will be returned to the site as the metal siding and stucco will be removed.

48. The proposed remodel returns the original roof form and wrap-around porch which will significantly add to the character of the historic site.

Conclusions of Law – 1055 Norfolk Avenue

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

Conditions of Approval – 1055 Norfolk Avenue

1. Final Historic District Design Review plans shall reflect substantial compliance

with the HPB Review of the Material Deconstruction. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved HPB Review of the Material Deconstruction that have not been approved by the HPB may result in a stop work order. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Department that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

4. 3000 N. Highway 224 McPolin Barn – Material Deconstruction – Removal of portions of the historic roof to accommodate structural upgrades and removal of boarded windows to accommodate historically compatible windows. (Application PL-16-03117)

Planner Turpen handed out public comment she had received that day from Sandra Morrison, the Executive Director of the Park City Museum.

The applicant is Park City Municipal, represented by Matt Twombly, Sustainability Project Manager, Steve Cornell, the project manager with CRSA, John Ewanowski with CRSA, and Scott Bryner with Hogan Construction.

Planner Turpen explained that the Commissioners were looking at two separate items this evening. The first was a material deconstruction. The discussion should focus on the removal of the material; but not what would replace it. The second item will be input from the HPB on the design. Planner Turpen noted that the Board would take action on the material deconstruction. The design would be input only.

Planner Turpen reported that the first item was material deconstruction for the McPolin Farm. Structural upgrades are required due to issues with snow and wind loads on the structure.

Planner Turpen commented on the removal of the gambrel roof on the McPolin Farm. She clarified that they were talking about the actual white barn portion and not any of the additions. She noted that the shingles would be removed in an effort to incorporate some of the structural members of the interior. Planner Turpen referred to the drawings and noted that the cross-hatch areas would actually be removing the sheathing and other interior materials. The Staff recommended that all the interior boards be removed in whole and not sawed in half because it is part of the aesthetic from the interior.

Board Member Stephens asked if the sub-roofing was the material being removed to allow for the stud structure to go in. Steve Cornell stated that it would depend on the area. On the edges of the roof they would only be removing the shingles and the under alignment. In the three sections for the

center of the structure they would actually be removing the shingles, the under alignment and the structural sheathing and the skip sheathing in its entirety.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the strips in the center were 4' wide all the way down in those five areas, and then another three feet. She asked Mr. Cornell for the dimensions. Mr. Cornell stated that it will depend on how wide the boards are and they would not know until they get in and look at the skip sheathing. As Planner Turpen had stated, the intent is to remove a board in its entirety as opposed to cutting the board and only removing a portion. Mr. Cornell noted that the spacing on the roof rafter is 24" and it would at least be that size. If the skiff sheathing is only one rafter, then it would just be that one 24" section of skip sheathing. However, if the skip sheathing spans two rafters it would be 4' of skip sheet.

Ms. Beatlebrox pointed out that besides skip sheathing there was also asbestos. Mr. Cornell stated that there was only asbestos in the asphalt shingles. Ms. Beatlebrox wanted to know how long it would take to complete. Mr. Cornell replied that it should be a relatively quick process because of the type of procedure being done. Mr. Bryner anticipated four weeks for weeks from the time they tear the roof apart to when they put the roof back together. Ms. Beatlebrox understood that the barn would be exposed to the elements for four weeks. Mr. Bryner replied that four weeks should be the maximum. The plan is to do it in less time. Mr. Cornell stated that measures would be taken to put tarps over the exposures if necessary.

Ms. Beatlebrox asked if they had looked at any alternative solutions for doing it all from the inside. Mr. Cornell stated that doing it from the inside would require them to bring in each of the steel members individually and weld everything on the inside. There is no way to bring a big braced frame into the barn from the inside, stand it up, and erect it in place. With the proposed method they could bring in the braced frame in sections. They would be pre-welded off-site and then installed and bolted once all the pieces are in place.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted from the correspondence they received that Sandra Morrison was very concerned about welding. Ms. Beatlebrox shared her concern. She understood from Mr. Cornell that the frame would be bolted and there would not be any on-site welding. Mr. Cornell replied that there would be very minimal on-site welding if any. If on-site welding is necessary there would be a fire watch in place. They have asked the engineer to work on bolt connections wherever possible.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that the steel framing would be attached to new shear walls, and she asked for an explanation of new shear walls. Mr. Cornell stated that shear walls are essentially sections of wall on one side of the structure. He presented the plan of the milking parlor level, which is the main

level. He indicated the sections where the shear walls would be located and noted that it was basically a wall built on the inside of the barn. There will be three shear walls on each side. Mr. Cornell explained that it will brace the barn against any lateral movement. The shear walls are wood frame and they will be constructed in place inside the barn. It will be plywood on the inside face that will be covered with a sheathing that looks like the vertical sheathing on the outside. When inside it will appear to look like the outside wall. Board Member Hodgkins asked if the outside wall would remain. Mr. Cornell answered yes. The inside wall would abut up against it.

Mr. Cornell indicated the areas where the three steel brace frames would be installed. Chair White asked if it would alleviate the need for the cable that currently exist. Mr. Cornell answered yes. Mr. Cornell presented a slide showing what the shear walls would look like from inside the barn. He reviewed a diagram showing how the shear wall would be put together inside the barn. Another slide was a picture of the barn as it currently stands. He noted that the guide wires were installed in the 1990s to stabilize the building. He showed what the structure looked like historically, and what they were proposing to do structurally on the inside. Mr. Cornell pointed out that nothing in the barn meets current Code. They intent is to stabilize it with as minimal disturbance as possible. Mr. Cornell indicated new trusses on the roof level. They will be different than the historical look, but they will not be as low as the non-original that exist now.

Mr. Hodgkins asked how the sizes of the new members compare to the current structure. Mr. Cornell stated that other than being steel, the brace frames will mimic the shape of the hayloft rafter. The steel frames will be slightly smaller than the wood timbers and a dark color so they will recede into the background.

Mr. Cornell provided slides showing the methods for doing the work from start to finish. He also explained the below grade work space that would be done to support the foundation system. It would occur in the crawl space behind the foundation walls.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if workers would be walking on the roof. Mr. Cornell replied that they would be on the roof for the material deconstruction and to re-roof.

Mr. Cornell presented a slide showing the plan for the windows. Currently, there is plywood in the window openings. The plywood will be pulled out and new windows will be installed. He noted that the wood casing, trim and everything else around the windows is historic. They would only be making the sash and putting it into place.

Chair White stated that since this was a very sensitive City project, he asked if it was reasonable to have a construction consultant on-site every day while the work is occurring. Mr. Twombly stated that the City has selected Hogan Construction based on their experience with historic remodel work on barns and other commercial historic structures. He asked if Mr. White was suggesting that a City Staff person be on-site. Mr. White stated that he thought someone should be there every day to make sure everything was being constructed according to plan. He clarified that he was not suggesting that Hogan Construction were not qualified contractors, but he thought it was important to have someone on-site watching what occurs. Mr. Twombly assured Chair White that there would be several sets of eyes on the ground throughout the process.

Director Erickson stated that given the physical nature of this project there will be several people who can take a stop work action if they are not comfortable with the progress. Mr. Twombly explained that a superintendent will be on site every day that work is being done, and the superintendent will be in touch with the project managers and the City inspectors. Mr. Twombly believed someone from the Building Department would visit the site nearly every day. He was comfortable that there would be sufficient oversight.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if any of the proposed work would jeopardize the National Register listing and whether they had consulted the State Preservation Office. Planner Grahn stated that they had not spoken with the State Historic Preservation Office; however, CRSA has done a number of National Register projects. She and Planner Turpen have reviewed it closely, and Ann Oliver, the preservation consultant, has also been involved. Planner Grahn noted that they were following the Secretary of the Interior Standards completely. She did not believe they were doing anything that would jeopardize the National Register listing.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if any of the removed historic material would be put back. Mr. Cornell stated that the only material they anticipate removing is the skip sheeting on the roof. It will be taken off, numbered, and put back. Mr. Cornell emphasized that any removed material will be put back in place.

Board Member Stephens understood that at a minimum they were looking at taking out four foot sections in between a couple of rafters that are not 24". Mr. Cornell replied that he was correct. Mr. Stephens stated that from his personal experience in working on single family residential homes between Park City and Kamas, the planks seem to be typically old growth fir probably from the Uinta's, and they were 10 to 14 feet long. If they were planning to take those out in one piece he believed it dramatically change the scope of work. Mr. Cornell stated that based on his experience he believed there may be shorter pieces between the rafters. They will not know for sure until the sheeting is removed. He thought one approach might be to look at the lengths of the skip sheeting and if they

need to cut, they would cut at the rafter line so it would never been seen when it is put back in place. Mr. Stephens suggested that it may be less damaging to consider a cut rather than trying to take them out in full pieces. If they are numbered and put back in place he thought that might be a more efficient method.

Board Member Stephens assumed the original barn would have had wood shingles on the roof. He understood that they were putting new sheeting over the skip sheeting to provide structural support. He stated that at some point in the future the asphalt roof would have to be redone and that might be a good opportunity to put on cedar shingles.

Planner Turpen believed they had covered most of the points Sandra Morrison raised in the discussion. She asked if the Board has other questions or concerns. Ms. Beatlebrox thought it should be on the record that Ms. Morrison had the opinion that the entire roof may need to be removed. Mr. Cornell stated that they were not going to take off the entire roof. He noted that Ms. Morrison had also hinted at removing rafters but there would be no rafter removal. All of the structure of the barn would be retained. Very minimal sections would be removed.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if they only do one section at a time. Mr. Bryner stated that there will be a sequence. The work will be removing a portion, inserting and patching it back while they move to the next portion.

Board Member Holmgren believed Mr. Morrison was concerned that they would have to take off the entire roof like they did with the Marsac Building. Mr. Bryner remarked that Ms. Morrison had suggested sistering the new material to the existing rafters, and that is actually what they would be doing it.

Planner Turpen reported that a Historic Preservation Plan for this site was completed in January 2016. The Staff worked with the engineer to determine the best method to structurally upgrade with the most minimal impact on the structure. In working with this team they were able to find a good solution that is not visible from the interior and was less damaging to the exterior.

Board Member Holmgren was excited about this project.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of the McPolin Barn at 3000 North Highway 224 in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – McPolin Barn

1. The property is located at 3000 N. Highway 224. The site is commonly known as the McPolin Farm.
2. The McPolin Farm is listed as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The McPolin Barn was originally constructed ca. 1920-1922. Following its initial construction, the Milk House Addition was constructed ca. 1930. In 1954, the Milking Parlor Addition was constructed.
4. On March 14, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the McPolin Barn located at 3000 N. Highway 224.
5. The application was deemed complete on March 16, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
6. The applicant proposes to remove and reinstall sections of the McPolin Barn gambrel roof to allow for brace frames to be constructed as a part of the structural upgrades.
7. The removal of the specific sections of the McPolin Barn gambrel roof is appropriate, as all other alternatives have been exhausted. Due to the scope of the structural upgrade, the steel structural members are too large to install any other way and smaller steel structural members would be inadequate.
8. The applicant proposes to remove and reinstall sections of the ca. 1930s Milk House Addition gable roof will be removed to allow for brace frames to be constructed as a part of the structural upgrades.
9. The removal of the specific sections of the ca. 1930s Milk House Addition gable roof is appropriate, as all other alternatives have been exhausted. Due to the scope of the structural upgrade, the roof must be attached to the top wall plate, which can only be achieved by removing portions of the gable roof.

10. The applicant proposes to remove and reinstall sections of the 1954 Milking Parlor Addition gambrel roof will be removed to allow for brace frames to be constructed as a part of the structural upgrades.

11. The removal of the specific sections of the 1954 Milking Parlor Addition gambrel roof is appropriate, as all other alternatives have been exhausted. Due to the scope of the structural upgrade, the roof must be attached to the top wall plate, which can only be achieved by removing portions of the gable roof.

12. All historic roof materials will be numbered during removal and reinstalled in its historic location and orientation.

13. The 62 existing non-historic plywood boards of the boarded windows will be removed and replaced with replica historic three-over-three windows on the McPolin Barn and steel windows on the ca. 1930s Milk House Addition and 1954 Milking Parlor Addition.

14. Pieces of wood that are damaged or rotted beyond repair will be replaced in-kind.

15. The removal and replacement of wood boards that have been damaged or rotted beyond repair is appropriate as replacement of such is consistent with the recommendations of the McPolin Barn Historic Preservation Plan.

Conclusions of Law – McPolin Barn

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

2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-12.5 Material Deconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – McPolin Barn

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on March 18, 2016. 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 will 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. Any deviation from approved Material Deconstruction will require review by the Historic Preservation Board.

5. 3000 N. Highway 224 McPolin Barn – Structural Upgrade and Restoration HPB to participate in the design review of the City owned project designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory
(Application PL-16-03117)

Planner Turpen reported that on March 24th the City Council requested that the Historic Preservation Board provide input on the proposed design of the interior spaces and how it will look visually from the inside from both the hayloft and the lower portion of the barn.

Steve Cornell felt they had gone through the presentation quite thoroughly during the materials deconstruction discussion in terms of the interior. He was willing to elaborate further and to answer questions.

Board Member Stephens asked if he were standing under the second level of the barn looking at the new roof structure whether he would be able to see what was new and distinguish it from the old. Mr. Cornell replied that the steel would stand out the most. The roof trusses at the peak would be wood, and they were working with the contractor to either use rough cut timber or stained lumber. Mr. Cornell noted that samples were provided at the City Council meeting. He stated that the roof rafters would definitely be seen, but they would not stand out as brand new.

With regard to the windows, Board Member Stephens asked for more details on the sashes that would be put in. Mr. Cornell replied that wood sashes would be custom made to fit. Mr. Stephens asked if historic float glass was a possibility. Mr. Cornell had not considered float glass and he assumed it had not been considered in the budget. Mr. Twombly noted that 65 windows would be replaced. Mr. Stephens commented on the number of windows and pointed out that new glass is very noticeably new glass. Mr. Cornell stated that there was one window with the original sash in the barn and they were planning to put that back in some location.

Planner Turpen noted that the lower wood windows on the front façade were previously replicated from the single window Mr. Cornell had mentioned. At that time the City worked with a prominent window restoration company in the State, and the Museum played a big part in determining what the windows should look

like. She stated that the goal is to use that same exact style for the rest of the windows.

Board Member Stephens thought the new windows on the plaza looked fine. His only suggestion was to use a glass that reflects the historic nature and age of the barn. He asked about the metal framework and whether they would be re-glazed. Mr. Cornell believed that all the metal frames were still in place and it would just be a glazing installation.

Board Member Stephens noted that the original barn has a sandstone foundation. He understood that sandstone should not be painted. He was surprised that the foundation was still in good shape. Mr. Stephens noticed that the sandstone foundation was not differentiated from the rest of the barn and he assumed it was not part of their scope of work. Mr. Cornell noted that the foundation is not sandstone. It is limestone. From inside the crawl space there is no paint. Therefore, the stone and the mortar are able to breathe on the inside. They have seen very little deterioration on the outside. Mr. Cornell stated that they were looking at options to remove the paint from the foundation, but that would also be another budget issue.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Chair White asked if this item required a motion. Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that the City Council can give the HPB the additional duty of providing input on design review on certain projects. It would not require a motion, but if the Board concurred with what was proposed they could do a motion to that affect.

Chair White stated that he would like the opportunity to give input as much as possible. The Board agreed.

6. Historic Preservation Updates – Review with HPB in preparation for 4.14.16 City Council quarterly update on Design Guidelines, Material Deconstruction applications, HPB’s authority to conduct design reviews and Historic Site Inventory (HIS) Updates

Planner Grahn noted that the HPB continued this item from the last meeting. On March 25th, they gave the City Council an update on some of the preservation activities. The next City Council update will be April 14th. Planner Grahn requested that the Board provide input on any items they would like the Staff to share with the City Council regarding progress on the design guidelines, the

materials deconstruction reviews, the Historic Site Inventory Updates, and whether or not the HPB should be doing design review. Planner Grahn suggested that they review each item.

Design Guideline Revisions.

Planner Grahn stated that they were currently working review of the Universal Design Guidelines and Site Design Guidelines. Next month they should begin to look at historic primary structures, accessory structures, and additions to historic buildings and sites. They would then move on to commercial buildings.

The Board had no comments.

Materials Deconstruction

Board Member Hodgkins found it difficult to review materials deconstruction without understanding the end result. He noted that the applicants propose the demolition because they have another plan in mind and it is difficult to separate the two.

Board Member Beatlebrox agreed. She stated that the presentation that was given for 1055 Norfolk earlier this evening made it far easier to make the decision than it would have been otherwise.

Board Member Holmgren believed that when people are looking for deconstruction they should be directed to provide a complete package. She appreciated the fact that occasionally it will be something like a dryer vent, but 1055 Norfolk and the McPolin Barn were complete and they were able to have a more intelligent conversation on what direction each project was going.

Board Member Hodgkins referred to the deconstruction they reviewed on lower Park Avenue where they could not talk about what was coming after the deconstruction. He thought it would have gone much better if the Board had a clear proposal of what the applicant was planning to do.

Planner Grahn stated that the Staff shared their concern. The more information they have the easier it is for the Staff to tell the HPB about the project.

Chair White remarked that the site visits help immensely.

Board Member Hewett raised the issue of cost to the applicant to create these presentations. She thought they needed to consider the difference between the McPolin Farm and the average citizen remodeling their house.

Board Member Stephens agreed that a complete package helps to see what is taking place. However, on the other hand, what if they had decided on the Norfolk project that the applicant was going down the wrong path and they would not allow the demolition. At that point the applicant would have spent significant architectural dollars putting together drawings and plans that they would not be able to use.

Director Erickson stated that the HPB saw two distinct types of material deconstruction presentations this evening. The one for 1055 Norfolk was practically below the full HDDR application, and the second was a fairly simple presentation of what is planned for the McPolin Barn. If the HPB wanted to give direction to Staff, he suggested that they consider something more like the McPolin presentation where the Board can see what is being proposed without going into the full depth of an HDDR. Director Erickson thought they might need that level only on Landmark buildings. The HPB could direct the Staff to pass that on to the City Council and if they have to adjust the Code to allow it and/or change the application, it could be done.

Board Member Hewett thought Director Erickson made a good point. However, for some of the historic homes she thought some people may need financial assistance to prepare a presentation.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the proposal for 1055 Norfolk had been reviewed to see if it complied with the Design Guidelines. Planner Grahn replied that the Staff has been involved with that application and guiding it through the process to achieve what they wanted to propose. When the Staff felt it was nearly ready to be approved through the HDDR process, they brought it to the HPB because there would not be any further substantial changes. Mr. Hodgkins stated that until what is presented actually meets the design guidelines, what they say in assessing the proposal would not matter. If the Board knows that the proposal actually meets the guidelines it would be easier to talk about the deconstruction piece and understand the full project.

Planner Turpen pointed out that sometimes material deconstruction determines the design of whatever will be in its place. In the event of a controversial deconstruction, she was concerned that the applicant would have to spend money on something that might be denied or have to be redesigned. Planner Turpen agreed with what the Board was suggesting, but her only concern was the potential of lengthening the process for the applicant by having them come back more than once.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that because the HPB only meets once a month having to come back to the Board could extend the process several months. However, she assumed only a small number of projects would need to have material deconstruction determined prior to the design. Ms.

McLean noted that the HPB could call a second meeting to review a project if necessary.

HPB Conducting Design Reviews

Board Member Beatlebrox requested that they discuss each of the pros and cons outlined on page 465 of the Staff report.

Planner Grahn reviewed the pros: 1) Greater transparency in the decision making process and provides an opportunity for the public to give input; 2) Expands the role of the HPB and provides greater interaction with the public; 3) In doing design review, the HPB would become more familiar with the Design Guidelines; 4) The HPB would also be more familiar with projects under construction as they would be the ultimate reviewer and decision maker.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that transparency is very important because people want to know what their next-door-neighbor is doing and possibly give input. She thought transparency would also give the community more confidence.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if an HPB review was the only way they could get transparency. Ms. Beatlebrox questioned how the neighbors get that transparency now. Board Member Holmgren stated that the property is posted and there is public notification and a public hearing. Chair White believed there was significant transparency. Ms. Holmgren thought there was more transparency now than ever before.

Planner Grahn explained the process. The HDDRs are noticed 14 days in advance to property owners within 100 feet. On the 15th day they hold a public hearing in the Planning Department conference room for neighbors who were noticed or anyone who saw the sign posted on the property to come in a review the plans. Following the public hearing the Staff begins their review of the project. Plans are available to the public throughout the review period. Once the Staff makes a decision there is a ten day appeal period. On the day of the decision the Planning Department also sends out a mailing and posts the property again saying whether the projects was approved or denied.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the projects are publicly noticed in the newspaper and the post office. Planner Grahn stated that HDDRs are not published in the newspaper or the post office, but they do it for all other public meetings.

Director Erickson thought transparency was more an issue of helping the public understand the implications of the sign and the notice and what they could do to get involved. Board Member Beatlebrox felt it was a different forum for one

person to look through plans without understanding what they are looking at, versus a forum where architects and homeowners are asked questions by the Board and there is the opportunity for the public to raise their concerns.

Director Erickson stated that the Planning Department processes three or four HDDR applications per week. In a one month period that would equate to 16 to 20 design reviews by the HPB or ten every two weeks if they meet more often. He suggested public education and other mechanisms to make the current process more user friendly.

Planner Grahn explained the HDDR process and the steps taken by the Design Review Team to reach a decision. She pointed out that the project is vetted very well.

Board Member Hodgkins understood that if the HPB reviewed these projects they would no longer be an appeal board. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. She explained that any decision made by the HPB such as material deconstruction or determination of significance would be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. In addition, an appeal of a Staff determination on compliance with design guidelines also goes to the Board of Adjustment because if the HPB reviewed the materials deconstruction they could not review the project twice.

Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that from a legal perspective there would be too much overlap. For example, if someone appealed the decision they made on 1055 Norfolk there would not be enough separation for the HPB to hear the appeal. Board Member Hodgkins assumed from the explanation that the HPB was no longer an appeal board. Ms. McLean clarified that the HPB was not an appeal board based on recent LMC changes. She stated that in addition to material deconstruction the Board also reviews moving historic structures and other applications that would create conflicts in an appeal.

Director Erickson explained that when the LMC was changed to remove the authority of the Planning Department and the Planning Director to approve these items and the authority was given to the HPB, all of the appeal processes of the HPB were moved to the Board of Adjustment.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that another "pro" was listed in a letter from John Plunkett. Mr. Plunkett asserted that the difficulties with a specific project would not have occurred if it had been reviewed by the HPB. He felt that the HPB should have design review capability.

Board Member Hewett asked if there was the possibility of doing commercial buildings with a separate rule than residential. For example, the Board could review commercial buildings but not residential. Planner Grahn thought it might create an unfair advantage or disadvantage. She personally felt the same body

should do the design review for all projects. However, the Staff would take that recommendation to the City Council if the Board shared Ms. Hewett's view.

Ms. Hewett asked for the current number of commercial applications. Director Erickson stated that they were seeing a complete shift in applications from residential to historic Main Street for this year. He believed that trend would be a 24 month cycle. Commissioner Erickson pointed out that the difficulty is trying to decide if a condominium that is used as nightly rental is considered a commercial structure or a residential structure. He suggested that it might be easier to make a distinction by zoning district. That could be a discussion for a future meeting.

Board Member Holmgren noted that on the Rio Grande Building the developer came before the HPB because he wanted to change the location. Ms. Beatlebrox pointed out that the developer would not have shown the design at the point. Ms. Holmgren stated that the developer did show extensive drawings but it turned out completely different. She recalled a lengthy discussion with the developer and the HPB decided to let him move the building forward because it created more of a corridor and the building would be seen coming from Park Avenue going into Main Street. Ms. Beatlebrox understood that the HPB decision related to moving the building and not the actual design. Ms. Holmgren stated that he showed the design of what he was proposing.

Commissioner Erickson stated that another issue is that the City does not regulate, even in restorations.

Board Member Stephens believed the HPB would be working with less information than the Planning Staff in reviewing these projects. He thought the Rio Grande project was being discovered as it moved along.

Planner Grahm reviewed the "cons": 1) The Design Review Team could lead the applicant in a direction that is not approved by the HPB causing the applicant to have to start over; 2) The process of going through DRT and then the HPB could seem onerous to the applicant and increase the time frame for the HDDR process; 3) In the past, there were allegations by the public that the Historic District Commission was not uniform in its decision making which led to a distrust among applicants; 4) The HPB cannot be the "taste police" and they would have to comply with the Design Guidelines; 5) The purpose of the HPB would shift to preservationist, which requires more specialized expertise in preservation by the HPB; 5) Design review is a much narrower and prevents the HPB from being the overseer of the entire district; 7) It will require a much higher time commitment from the HPB.

Planner Grahm asked if the Board had other items to add to the list.

Board Member Stephens stated that time is money on these projects. In the 1990s the architects and owners were looking at designs that they knew would get approved. The result was a number of repetitive designs that could not be denied but became boring. Mr. Stephens likes the idea of creative architecture to make the building fit within the framework of the neighborhood.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it would be tremendously time-consuming. She appreciated what the Staff does every day and their experience and attention to detail. Their dedication comes through every time. She was concerned that a bureaucratic board would not be able to do the same justice to all of the applications.

Chair White thought that he was probably more familiar with what the Planning Staff does because he works with them as an architect. He likes and respects how the Planning Department conducts the design reviews. Chair White stated that he was part of the Historic District Commission in the late 1980s and 1990s when it was a design review board. It was a time commitment and created one log jam after another getting projects through. Chair White liked the current process. However, on high profile projects like the McPolin Barn he would like the HPB to be invited to participate in the Design Review. He was against the HPB reviewing every project.

Board Member Stephens thought Chair White made a good point with regards to using the HPB on high profile projects. He asked whether the HPB could legally be another set of eyes on specific projects. Chair White noted that the HPB was invited to provide input on the McPolin barn, which they did this evening.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that currently there is a mechanism in the Code where the owner could request a review by the HPB. She recalled that the language reads, "All other projects within the Historic District or within a block thereof." She had concerns with consistency because otherwise they would be open to complaints. Ms. McLean thought it was possible to be more specific to justify their review, such as National Register buildings. However, she would be concerned about discretionary reviews such as times when the Staff needs more help.

In terms of reporting their comments to the City Council, Planner Grahn asked if there was agreement among the Board to look at National Register Commercial Buildings.

Board Member Hodgkins thought the question of the National Register was interesting because some buildings are on the National Register that the Design Guidelines would not protect. In those instances where the determination was made by the National Park Service, he thought it made more sense to review the

design guidelines with additional oversight to make sure they would not jeopardize the designation.

Board Member Stephens stated that if they want to make sure to keep the designations on Main Street, he asked if that would apply to something like the Riverhorse covering their patio, which affected Main Street. Mr. Stephens suggested that it should be the HCB District rather than just the National Register. Planner Grahn preferred not to limit it to the HCB because the Historic District that is Main Street extends beyond the HCB zone. She thought it was better to include anything on the Main Street National Register District.

Director Erickson stated that the global strategy in crafting the ordinances was to have the HPB be the keeper of the abstract notion of what historic preservation is and how to protect the neighborhoods. It allowed the Board to be more pure in their reactions and in applying the design guidelines. The Planning Commission makes the compromise decisions and the City Council makes the biggest compromises. The intent is to keep the HPB as pure as possible in interpreting what historic preservation really means.

Board Member Stephens stated that he personally preferred not do design review with regards to any historic buildings. He trusts what the Planning Department has been doing and their approach. It would be nice to take some of the responsibility off of the Staff, but in the end it would not be in the best interest of the HPB. Board Member Hewett agreed.

Chair White reiterated that he was happy and proud of what the Planning Department does and what they go through, and fully agreed with Board Member Stephens. Chair White also reiterated his request for the HPB to be involved in design review the design review of special projects.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed that design review was not the place of the HPB. He reiterated his concerns with the individual listings and the actual listings on the National Register. His reasoning related more to the protection of those pieces, especially since the HPB is no longer an appeal board. He was unsure whether the Board of Adjustment understood the need to protect the National Register pieces within the community.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought they should let the professional Staff do their jobs. The HPB is a group of citizens with common sense and some expertise. He shared Chair White's request to involve the HPB on certain projects so the community has confidence that a group of citizens are overseeing historic preservation.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with all the comments of her fellow Board Members.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board had comments regarding the Historic Sites Inventory that should be reported to the City Council.

Board Member Stephens was concerned that there were structures primarily in the upper zone outside of what is defined as the Historic District that may be historic or significant by themselves, but in context of the surrounding built environment they have lost all historic context. He hoped that as a Board, they would have that as part of their review process to consider when looking at determinations of significance.

Board Member Hewett agreed. She thought it was a place where the HPB could make decisions that would not have to be revisited continually.

Planner Grahn asked if there was Board agreement on that issue. The Board concurred.

7. Annual Historic Preservation Award Program

Planner Grahn stated the Board needed to decide whether they wanted to do a plaque and if so, their plaque preference. They also need to provide four plaque recipients and one recipient for the painting. She noted that the plaque styles and sizes were located on page 544 of the Staff report.

The Board discussed the plaque style and size and agreed on the 6" x 6" square plaque with minimal text.

The Board moved to choosing recipients. They agreed that the four nominated projects were 562 Main Street, 343 Park Avenue, 651 Park Avenue and 337 Daly Avenue. One would be chosen for the painting and four would have plaques.

Board Member Beatlebrox nominated 562 Main Street for the painting. Board Member Hodgkins agreed. Board Members Hewett and Holmgren favored 343 Park Avenue for the painting. David White favored 651 Park Avenue for the painting.

The Board discussed the nominees and after two rounds of voting and a final 3-2 vote the HPB chose the Fletchers building at 562 Main Street for the painting. Fletchers and the remaining nominees would receive plaques.

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



Subject: 1259 Norfolk Avenue
Author: Hannah Turpen, Planner
Project Number: PL-15-02645
Date: May 4, 2016
Type of Item: Administrative – Determination of Significance

Summary Recommendations

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and continue the item to June 1, 2016 to allow Staff to coordinate a site visit with the property owner.

Topic:

Project Name: 1259 Norfolk Avenue
Applicant: Park City Municipal Corporation
Owners: Maureen Barbara Moriarty (Trustee)
Proposal: Determination of Significance



Historic Preservation Board Staff Report

Planning Department

Author: Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation Planner
Subject: Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction Review
Address: 823 Norfolk Avenue
Project Number: PL-15-02909
Date: May 4, 2016
Type of Item: Administrative – Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction

Summary Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and approve the reconstruction of the historic barn and material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 823 Norfolk Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Topic:

Address: 823 Norfolk Avenue
Designation: Landmark
Applicant: Jeremy Sheppe (Architect Jon Degray)
Proposal:

1. Reconstruction of c.1907 Barn
2. The applicant is requesting to remove: failing stacked stone and concrete retaining walls; historic house roof; two (2) historic chimneys; historic walls on the west and south elevations of the historic house; portion of the Norfolk façade; c.1940s foundation beneath the house; c.1940s improvements to the house's front porch which include iron columns, iron rail, concrete steps, and historic porch roof; two (2) non-historic existing doors; non-historic wood and vinyl windows as well as a glass block window; removing historic windows, doors, and foundation of the historic c.1907 barn.

Background:

On February 2, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the property at 823 Norfolk Avenue. The application was deemed complete on February 22, 2016. The Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application has not yet been approved, as it is dependent on HPB's Review for Material Deconstruction approval and the request for reconstruction of the historic barn.

There have been very few applications for this property in the past. In 2011, a business license was issued for Lucid Cycles LLC, which operated from the historic barn. The house also received a re-roof in 1997.

The current HDDR application is for the renovation of the historic house and reconstruction of the historic barn at 823 Norfolk.

Analysis 1: Reconstruction of the Historic Barn

There are currently two sheds on site. There is a historic barn (sometimes referred to as a shed) in the northwest corner of the site that first appears in the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps as 823 ½ Norfolk Avenue; this barn was attached to the house sometime after 1927 and likely during the 1970s-1980s. The second barn is located in the southwest corner of the site. This barn is not historic and is new construction, evident by its construction methods and materials. The applicant proposes to demolish this non-historic barn, pictured below.



Does the HPB agree with demolishing the (second) non-historic barn?

The c.1907 wood-framed barn is constructed at the rear of the property, along Crescent Tram. It likely originally served as a stable for horses, but has had different uses over the years including, most recently, a bicycle repair shop. Sometime after 1927, a small addition was constructed, attaching the barn to the historic house. Historically, however, these were two separate buildings.

The c.1907 historic barn is in poor condition and the applicant proposes reconstruction. The reconstruction will be based on photographic and physical evidence, and the applicant proposes to reconstruct the barn in its existing location. Reconstruction, as outlined in LMC 15-11-15, requires Historic Preservation Board review and approval. Building and Planning Department staff have conducted a site visit and examined the condition of the building.

Michelle Downard, Deputy Building Official and Chief Building Official's designee has toured the site. Her comments are attached as Exhibit G.



Current photograph of c.1907 historic barn, Crescent Tram elevation

The [Design Guidelines for Historic Sites](#) provide guidance on the Reconstruction of Historic Buildings (pages 38-39). The Guidelines explain that reconstruction is allowed if the Chief Building Official determines the structure to be a hazardous or dangerous building, pursuant to Section 115.1 of the International Building Code AND the building cannot be made safe and serviceable through repair. Reconstruction must be guided by documentation and physical evidence in order to facilitate an accurate re-creation, as the reconstruction cannot be based on conjectural designs or adopted features of different historic buildings. The Guidelines also require that the reconstruction recreate the documented design of exterior features such as the roof shape, architectural detailing, windows, entrances and porches, steps and doors, and their historic spatial relationships. Reconstructions should also preserve and reuse any remaining historic materials found to be safe and/or serviceable. The reconstruction should accurately duplicate the appearance of the historic building in materials, design, color, and texture. Finally, the building may not be reconstructed on a location other than its original site.

Additionally, the reconstruction of a historic building or historic structure must comply with [LMC 15-11-15](#). This section of the LMC was recently amended and shifted the review authority from the Planning Director and Chief Building Official to the Historic Preservation Board (HPB). The HPB shall review staff's analysis and find that the project complies with the following criteria in order for the relocation to occur:

(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 PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CODE - TITLE 15 LMC, Chapter 11 - Historic Preservation 15-11-19 Section 116.1 of the International Building Code; and*

Deputy Chief Building Official Michelle Downard inspected the site on April 14th and her observations have been included as (Exhibit G). She found that the historic barn has a visible lean to the southwest of approximately 6 inches. This was likely caused by the structure's inability to retain the uphill slope of the property along Crescent Tram. The drainage and topography of the site have contributed to the deterioration of the foundation framing, exterior walls, and exterior doors. The foundation, which consists of small rocks and sand, has settled and does not consistently support the barn's wood framing. Some of these framing members have rotted and deteriorated to the extent that they are no longer in contact with the ground and foundation. There are also active leaks and gaps in the roof structure, which has exposed the structure's attic to the elements.

Michelle Downard concluded that the structure is in poor condition and should be considered for reconstruction based on the deficiencies. She found that the material

of the barn has deteriorated to a condition that it cannot be reasonably repaired, nor was it reasonable to attempt to move the structure or dismantle it for panelization.

(2) The Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair; and

The applicant's structural engineer has found:

"The back portion of the building appears to be a barn that has been attached to the main house. The walls of this structure have moved 5" to 7" horizontally. Existing framing is 2x4 at 24" o.c. The framing does not meet code and needs to be modified. Due to the racking of the building the existing material is in stress and its structural integrity compromised. We would not recommend using this material as its capacity is unknown, we recommend replacing it. This portion of the existing building shall be removed and replaced."

There is no foundation beneath the existing barn. Historically, the barn was constructed so that its main floor was at street level with Crescent Tram. The area below the first floor was filled with stone and debris to create a makeshift foundation. The limited posts that created footings for the floor framing have disconnected from the structure and no longer support the weight of the barn. This has caused the barn to rack, as noted by the structural engineer, as the walls are pulling and settling in different directions. A portion of the structure is supported by Crescent Tram, which has since been raised in street level.

The exterior walls consist of 2"x4" non-historic framing, covered with 1" thick wood plank. The existing siding is unfinished wood drop novelty siding; however, as it was never painted, it has severely deteriorated. Staff finds that if the applicant attempted to remove the individual siding to reuse on the reconstructed building, they would likely disintegrate as they were removed, causing greater damage to the historic material.

The applicant finds that the barn has settled and weathered to the extent that the structure and materials are not salvageable, thus the applicant has proposed to reconstruct the structure in its entirety.

(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.


The architect proposes to reconstruct the barn. As required by the Design Guidelines, the reconstruction will be guided by documentation and physical evidence in order to facilitate an accurate re-creation. Though the original materials are beyond repair, they can be used to create accurate reconstructions of the building and its details. The reconstruction will include recreated the documented design of the exterior features such as roof shape, architectural details, windows,

entrances, doors and their spatial relationships; any modifications to these materials is addressed as part of the Material Deconstruction review on the barn. The reconstructed building will accurately duplicate the appearance of the historic building, as it existed historically, in materials, design, and texture; new cedar siding will be milled to match the existing; however, it will appear new. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the building at its current site.

Per the Preservation Plan, any historic material that can be made safe and serviceable through repair will be salvaged and reused on reconstructed barn.


Analysis 2: Material Deconstruction

The house was originally constructed c.1901 as a cross-wing or “L-shape” cottage. The east-west stem wing featured a box bay on the Norfolk façade, and there was a wrap-around porch on the southeast corner of the house. It is evident that rear additions were constructed early on as the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a form that is not a true T-shaped cross wing:



1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map

Several alterations were made between 1900 and 1907, as evident by the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance map. The east-west cross has been extended to the west (1) and an addition has been constructed on the southwest corner of the house (2). Additionally, the historic barn first appears in the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as 823-1/2 Norfolk along the rear property line.



1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map

The house remains largely unchanged in the 1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map; the major change is that the one-story wood-frame barn seen on the southwest corner of the property has been demolished by 1927:



1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map


The house largely appeared as it did in the pre-1927 historic photograph:



This photograph, taken prior to 1927 shows the original porch, porch's architectural ornamentation, box bay, and original chimney.

Following the end of the period of significance—the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930)—and after the historic photo was taken, a number of modifications were made to create the form that exists today. The box bay window was removed on the east façade. A portion of the wrap-around front porch was enclosed to expand the interior living space, creating a partial-width front porch. A sunporch was also added to the south elevation. The applicant believes these modifications were made between 1930 and 1940 based on the use of materials and method of construction. In addition, the area between the

two east-west stem wings, which create a u-shape on the rear elevation, was filled in (indicated in red below). Sometime after 1940, the historic c.1907 barn was connected to the house.



The applicant is proposing to restore many of the c.1927 details to the house including the original porch ornamentation, vertical wood porch skirt, and box bay window. The applicant is not proposing to restore the original wraparound porch; however, there is a clear seam in the wood siding of the front elevation, showing where the porch had been enclosed.

The following work is proposed as part of this renovation and requires HPB review:
The following Material Deconstruction work is proposed at 1450 Park Avenue:

1. Removing along the west and south property lines of the rear yard.
2. Restructure the existing historic house roof, which was largely constructed between 1900-1930.
3. Remove and restore c.1900 brick chimney on the north-south ridge of the historic house, and remove the modified brick chimney on the west (rear) elevation.
4. Remove and reconstruct historic walls on the west and south elevation of the historic house which were constructed between 1907 and 1930.
5. Remove a portion of the historic house's Norfolk façade on the projecting cross-wing in order to reconstruct the historic bay window.
6. Remove the c.1940s foundation of the historic house, which consists of unreinforced masonry, stacked stone, and timbers.
7. Remove the non-historic 1940s concrete deck, unreinforced masonry block foundation, ornamental iron columns, iron rail, concrete steps, and roof of the house's front porch.
8. Remove two (2) non-historic existing doors—one on the façade of the historic house, the other on the c.1940 sunporch addition.
9. Remove non-historic wood and vinyl windows as well as a glass block window on the historic house.
10. Remove historic window openings on the historic c.1907 barn, which is proposed to be reconstructed.

11. Remove historic doors on the historic c.1907 barn, which is proposed to be reconstructed.
12. Remove the original rubble stone foundation on the c.1907 barn, which is proposed to be reconstructed.

1. SITE DESIGN

Per the site plan, there are existing stone retaining walls that frame the north, east, and south edges of the front yard. There are concrete retaining walls along the west and south property lines of the rear yard as well. The structural engineer has found that these retaining walls are significantly shifting, sometimes as much as 5 to 12 inches horizontally. The applicant proposes to remove these walls and reconstruct them to meet code. New concrete retaining walls will be constructed on the front (Norfolk), south side, and rear yards to retain grade.

Staff finds that the proposed material deconstruction is required for the renovation of the site and to correct dangerous, failing retaining walls that pose health and safety hazards. These 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 site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

2. ROOF

The prominent roof form on the historic house is the cross-wing gable form. The stem wings of this form have a 12:12 pitch running east-west and north-south. On the west side of the east-west stem wing, the roof has been altered several times to accommodate the number or rear additions. There is also a low-pitch barn roof above the entry porch that wraps the southeast corner of the house; a portion of the front porch was enclosed between 1930 and 1940 to expand interior living space. These are original roof forms, with the exception of the post-1927 gable roof in the center of the west elevation.

The existing roof joists used on the roof structure are 2x4s at 24" on center. These roof joists span approximately 8 feet to 12 feet and are covered by a 1x wood plank wood decking installed perpendicular to the existing joists. Per the Engineer's Report, the 12-foot roof joists are at 12% capacity per code and need to be upgraded or replaced. Further, new 5/8 inch plywood or OSB board will need to be installed as new roof sheathing as there currently is no capacity of shear diaphragm value.

The applicant is proposing to re-evaluate the roof structure with the structural engineer following further interior demolition. The applicant proposes at that time to determine whether the existing roof structure can be sistered¹ with new joists or if the roof will need to be entirely reconstructed. Any reconstruction will maintain the historic roof form, line, pitch, and overhang, as well as any functional and decorative elements.

1. The reinforcement of a structural member by nailing or attaching a stronger piece to a weaker one.

Staff recommends adding Condition of Approval 3 to address this:

Should the applicant's structural engineer find that the existing roof structure of the house cannot be sistered with new structural members following additional interior demolition, the applicant shall provide a structural engineering report to the Planning and Building Departments for review prior to completing any demolition and reconstruction of the historic roof.

Staff finds that restructuring the roof is generally part of its routine maintenance and is required for the renovation of the structure to ensure the house's longevity; however, staff finds that the roof should not be entirely reconstructed unless the structural engineer finds that inserting additional roof structure is infeasible.




Photo of existing roof structure above the house.

Two of the three rear additions along the west (rear) elevation of the house, facing Crescent Tram, were constructed prior to 1927 (outlined in red below) with the central addition being constructed post-1930 (shaded on the drawing below).



Interior living spaces in these areas have very low ceiling heights because of the slope of the roof. The applicant proposes to raise the height of walls along the west elevation in order to create a higher ceiling height in these living areas.



Though the roof forms in these additions may have been constructed during the Mature Mining Era or more than 50 years ago, staff finds that modifications to rear roof forms are necessary to making these spaces livable. The Land Management Code says that a portion of an existing building may be considered contributory to the historical significance of a Building or Site if it reflects the Historical or architectural character of the site or district as designated by the Historic Preservation Board. Staff finds that while these later additions contribute to our understanding of the development of the house, these additions do not significantly contribute to the overall historic integrity of the house. As a contributing structure to the district's National Register listing, the important features of the house are largely those seen from the Norfolk Avenue right-of-way.

Staff finds that the proposed scope of work mitigates any impact to the visual character of the neighborhood as this modification to the west elevation is not visible

from the primary right-of-way, Norfolk Avenue. The modifications to the roofline will not impact the historical significance or historic designation of the building. Further, the proposed restructuring of the roof will not impact the architectural integrity of the building as viewed from Norfolk Avenue.

HPB Discussion Requested.

3. CHIMNEY

There are two historic chimneys on this house—(1) brick chimney located on the ridge of the north-south stem wing and (2) a brick chimney constructed on an early rear addition. The applicant proposes to disassemble and reconstruct Chimney #1 using the existing historic bricks and compatible mortar in order to preserve this character-defining feature. Chimney #2 rises 6 feet above the roof surface and is capped with a non-historic metal flue; the applicant proposes to remove this chimney.



Staff finds that the scope of work to restore Chimney #1 is necessary as part of the rehabilitation of the building. Further, the proposed scope of work for this chimney's restoration will mitigate any impacts that will occur to the architectural integrity of the object. Rather than compromise the structural stability of the chimney, the scope of work will improve its structural stability and reduce its threat of collapse.



Further, staff finds that the demolition of Chimneys #2 is acceptable as 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 may be removed. This chimney is on the rear elevation and is not visible from the primary right-of-way, Norfolk Avenue.

4. EXTERIOR WALLS

The exterior walls consist of single-wall construction. Over time, a framed wall system of 2x4s at 24 inches on center has been installed; however, even with this structural upgrade, the structural engineer has found the walls cannot withstand wind, seismic, or gravity loads. The applicant proposes to sister new framing to the existing framing as well as install new shear wall sheathing and hold-downs to

create a lateral system. This work will be completed from the interior and will have no visual impact on the exterior of the building. Staff finds that the structural upgrades to the exterior walls will bring the structure into compliance with the International Building Code (IBC) and is required as part of the renovation of the structure.

As previously noted in #2 Roof, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the walls on the west and south elevation in order to increase the height of the roof. The dormer will create sufficient head room in the area of the space that is to function as part of the new kitchen. The applicant intends to salvage and reuse any historic material in this area and reapply it to the new walls.



Staff finds the proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the building; any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the building; and any impact that will compromise the structural stability of the historic building.


5. HISTORIC BAY

The Sanborn Map analysis and historic photograph indicate that there was a box bay window historically located on the east façade, facing Norfolk Avenue, of the east-west stem wing. This bay was likely removed as part of the renovations that occurred between 1940 and 1950; however, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the box bay based on physical and photographic evidence. Universal Design Guideline #4 encourages owners to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have removed. Staff finds that the partial demolition of the existing wall, necessary to construct the box bay, is required as part of the restoration of this key feature.



6. FOUNDATION

Much like the house, the foundation has developed over several periods of time. The house sits on a tall crawlspace foundation, a portion of which has been excavated further to create a mechanical room; stacked stone and timbers form the walls in some areas of this crawlspace. The basement area beneath the porch and façade are constructed of unreinforced masonry, and likely date to the 1940s remodel.



Per the structural engineer's report, the existing building has no footings. The crawl space floor joists consist of 2x6s at 24 inches on center, spanning 8 to 12 feet. The 8-foot floor joists are at 57% capacity and the 12 foot joists are at 22% capacity of code requirements; these both will be need to be upgraded. The applicant proposes to install new plywood or OSB to provide a lateral diaphragm for the floor. At the same time, the applicant proposes to temporarily lift the house, demolish the existing foundation, and pour new reinforced concrete footings and foundation walls to support the existing building. In addition to living space, the basement will also house a new single-car garage.

Staff finds that the proposed foundation work will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property. On the Norfolk façade, where a significant portion of the foundation is exposed, the applicant proposes to clad the concrete with vertical wood siding, similar to the porch decking shown in the historic photograph. Similarly, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the historic stairs, relocating them from the side of the porch to the front yard.

7. PORCH

The existing historic porch on the Norfolk Façade consists of an elevated concrete deck and unreinforced masonry block foundation, ornamental iron columns, and iron railing. These improvements to the historic porch were likely added in the 1940s are part of the larger renovation of the house.

The applicant proposes to rebuild the porch to meet the International Building Code (IBC). The existing elevated concrete deck will be removed, and replaced with a

waterproof deck with a wood walking surface. The entry steps will be relocated from the south elevation to their original placement on the Norfolk façade. The applicant proposes to reconstruct a simple wood railing, porch posts, and the architectural ornamentation as based on photographic evidence from the historic period. Staff finds that this demolition is necessary in order to restore the appearance of the historic porch.

The applicant also proposes to reframe the existing porch roof. The applicant proposes to remove the existing porch ceiling in order to determine the roof structure of the porch. Currently, the applicant predicts that it is framed with 2x4s at 24 inches on center. The applicant proposes to either sister these existing framing members or completely rebuild the porch, depending on the results of further exploratory demolition. Staff recommends adding Condition of Approval 4 in order to address this:

Should the applicant's structural engineer find that the existing roof structure of the porch cannot be sistered with new structural members following additional interior demolition, the applicant shall provide a structural engineering report to the Planning and Building Departments for review prior to completing any demolition and reconstruction of the historic roof.




The partial demolition of the porch is required for the restoration of the porch. Further, the existing porch with its 1940s additions has been found to be non-contributory to the historical significance of the structure.

A second porch was constructed on the south elevation of the home after the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) and was enclosed at a later date. In looking at the construction methods and materials used on this addition, staff finds that it was likely enclosed in the 1950s or later.

The applicant is proposing to replace the existing windows, remove the exterior doors, and demolish the two-riser step on the exterior of this sunporch to create interior living space. Staff finds that the proposed changes will not damage or

destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site; the sunporch is located beyond the midpoint of the historic structure, is not an original feature of the historic house, and will not detract from the historic structure or its historical significance.



8. DOORS

The existing doors on the house are not historic. The wood front door is not historic and is not original to the house; the historic photograph shows a two-panel arched light door. There is an existing interior door that matches this profile and will be used to reconstruct the front door. On the sunporch, there is an east-facing door which will be removed and replaced with windows.

Staff finds that the proposed demolition of the front door is necessary in order to restore the original entry door (1). The door on the sunporch addition (2) is necessary as part of the structure's rehabilitation and does not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.




9. WINDOWS


There are no historic windows remaining on the house. These windows have been replaced over time with vinyl and wood windows as well as glass block. The applicant proposes to replace these existing windows with new wood windows that match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material. The front bay window will be removed as part of the reconstruction of the lost box bay and the three (3) existing window openings on the north façade will be removed, with new siding weaved in to match the existing.

As previously noted, a portion of the original wrap-around porch was enclosed after 1930 in order to expand the interior living space. This addition features a set of four square ribbon windows, reminiscent of the Craftsman period. The applicant proposes to remove these windows in order to accommodate a new fireplace and install two one-over-one double-hung windows in its place. This style of the new window is in keeping with the Victorian era of the original house construction (1). Staff finds that this proposal does not destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

The applicant also proposes to remove the wood windows of the sunporch and replacing them with larger, one-over-one double-hung windows consistent with the window style and patterning of the rest of the house. The sunporch is located beyond the midpoint of the structure, and replacing these windows will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property.



LEFT (SOUTH) ELEVATION



The applicant anticipates that additional historic window and door openings may be uncovered as part of the interior demolition. Staff has added Condition of Approval #5 to address the restoration of these windows:

Should the applicant uncover historic window and door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the window or door opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and door openings shall be documented to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner, regardless of plans for restoration.


Staff finds that the removal of the existing non-historic windows are necessary in order to restore the original wood windows on the house. The new windows on the c.1950 sunporch will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

10. Reconstructed Barn—Modifications for Reconstruction

As discussed in Analysis 1, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the historic barn along the rear property line and Crescent Tram. As part of the historic reconstruction, the applicant proposes to add several features:

a. Windows

On the barn’s façade, facing Crescent Tram, the applicant has indicated in his Preservation Plan that the existing openings will remain. On the lower level, the applicant will maintain the boarded appearance of the window opening to the north of the barn doors. On the upper level, the applicant proposes to replace the existing second story door with a new window opening (1); as seen in the updated plans (Exhibit C); the door will be reapplied to the exterior to appear as if it is open. On the south elevation, the existing window will be replaced with a new window (2). A new window openings will be constructed on the south elevation of the reconstruction barn at the foundation level (3).



Staff finds that the window proposed changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site; the new windows on the south elevation are located beneath the street level, and will not detract from the historic structure or its historical significance.

Staff finds the partial demolition is required for the renovation and reconstruction of the c.1907 barn.

b. Doors

The applicant proposes to salvage the existing door on the lower level of the Crescent Tram façade of the barn. This door, as noted in the Physical Conditions Report, is severely rotted at its base. Should the applicant find that the severity of the deterioration or material defects require replacement, the door shall be reconstructed as a veneer and match the existing in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish, as noted by Condition of Approval 6.

As noted previously, the applicant proposes to replace the existing second level door on the Crescent Tram façade with a new window.

Finally, the four (4)-panel door on the south elevation has deteriorated so significantly that it is beyond repair. The applicant will install a new door on this elevation as a veneer; the new door will match the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish.

On the new basement level, the applicant will install a French door. This door is located below the street level of Crescent Tram and will not be visible from the right-of-way.

Staff finds the partial demolition is required for the renovation and reconstruction of the c.1907 barn. The new French doors will not impact the historical significance of the building or its architectural integrity.

c. Foundation

As previously indicated, the barn was constructed with a main floor level equal to Crescent Tram. The area beneath the main floor was filled with small rocks and sand that were used to support the posts and beams that supported the floor above. Over time, the building has settled at different rates and the foundation has shifted. The posts have deteriorated to a point that the rubble foundation no longer holds supports them upright, and many have rotted to the extent that they are no longer in contact with the ground or foundation.

The applicant proposes to replace this foundation with a new concrete foundation as part of the reconstruction.

Staff finds the partial demolition is required for the renovation and reconstruction of the c.1907 barn.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss the application, conduct a public hearing, and approve the reconstruction of the historic barn and material deconstruction of non-historic materials at 823 Norfolk Avenue pursuant to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval.

Finding of Fact:

1. The property is located at 823 Norfolk Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Landmark on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Based on Sanborn Fire Map analysis, the house was constructed c.1900. Following its initial construction, several additions were constructed on the rear elevation of the original cross-wing form. The existing historic barn, located at the northwest corner of the property and adjacent to Crescent Tram, was constructed c.1907.
4. On February 16, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and reconstruction of the historic barn at 823 Norfolk Avenue; the application was deemed complete on February 22, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department.
5. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the historic c.1907 wood barn located on the northwest corner of the site.
6. The proposal to relocate complies with LMC 15-11-15 Reconstruction of a Historic Building or Historic Structure. Deputy Chief Building Official Michelle Downard inspected the site on April 14, 2016, and found the structure to be hazardous or dangerous based on its visible leaning, failing foundation, and overall poor condition. The applicant's structural engineer has also found that the building cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair due to the significant racking of the building and the stress on existing materials. Finally, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the barn based on documentation and physical evidence to facilitate an accurate re-creation.
7. The applicant intends to remove existing stacked stone retaining walls that frame the north, east, and south edges of the front yard as well as the concrete retaining walls along the west and south property lines of the rear yard. The structural engineer has found that these walls are shifting significantly, sometimes as much as 5 to 12 inches horizontally. The proposed material deconstruction is required for the renovation of the site and 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 site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.
8. The applicant proposes to maintain the original roof form on the historic house, but re-evaluate the roof structure with the structural engineer following further interior demolition. The applicant also proposes to raise the roof on the c.1907 and post-1927 rear additions of the house. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impact to the visual character of the neighborhood as this modification to the west elevation is not visible from the primary right-of-way, Norfolk Avenue. Further, the proposed restructuring of the roof will not impact the architectural integrity or historical significance of the building as viewed from Norfolk Avenue.
9. The applicant is proposing to remove and reconstruct the historic brick chimney on the north-south stem wing and remove a brick chimney constructed on an early rear addition. The proposed scope of work for restoring the historic chimney will mitigate any impacts that will occur to the structural integrity of the object. The demolition of the second chimney is acceptable as this chimney is non-contributory to the historic integrity and historic significance of the structure or site to be removed.
10. The applicant will remove and reconstruct the walls on the west and south elevation in order to increase the height of the roof on the c.1907 and post-1927 rear

additions. The proposed scope of work mitigates any impacts that will occur to the historical significance of the building,; any impact that will occur to the architectural integrity of the building; and any impact that will compromise the structural stability of the historic building.

11. The applicant will remove a portion of the front Norfolk façade of the historic house's original east-west cross wing in order to reconstruct the box bay window that was removed after 1930. The partial demolition of this existing wall is necessary to construct the box bay and is required as part of the restoration of this key feature.
12. The existing c.1940 foundation of the historic houses is comprised of stacked stone and timbers and unreinforced masonry. The applicant will remove this foundation and replace it with a new poured concrete foundation. The proposed foundation work will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property.
13. The existing porch on the Norfolk façade consists of an elevated concrete deck and unreinforced masonry block foundation, ornamental iron columns, iron railing, and concrete steps that were constructed c.1940. The historic roof dates from c.1900. The applicant will restructure the roof and remove the c.1940 improvements. The partial demolition of the c.1940s improvements is necessary in order to restore the original porch. The existing porch is non-contributory.
14. The applicant is proposing to remove and replace the wood windows on the sunporch. Staff finds that this porch was building c.1930, but enclosed in the 1950s. The proposed changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.
15. The applicant will remove two (2) existing non-historic doors on the house—the wood front door and a wood door on the sunporch. The proposed demolition of the front door is necessary to restore the original door and the removal of the door on the sunporch will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site. There are no historic windows remaining on the house. The applicant proposes to remove the existing non-historic vinyl, wood, and glassblock windows as well as the wood windows on the c.1950 sunporch. Staff finds that the removal of the existing non-historic windows are necessary in order to restore the original wood windows on the c.1900 house. The new windows on the c.1950 sunporch will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.
16. The applicant will maintain the boarded appearance of the window openings on the Crescent Tram façade of the barn. On the upper level, the applicant will replace the existing second story door with a new window opening. New window openings will be constructed on the south elevation of the reconstruction barn, beyond the midpoint and below the street level of Crescent Tram. Staff finds that the proposed changes will not damage or destroy the exterior features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the site, nor will they detract from the historic structure or its historical significance.
17. The applicant will remove the historic barn door on the Crescent Tram façade of the barn and the historic four-panel wood service door on the south elevation; these will be restored as a veneer on the reconstructed barn. On the lower level of the south elevation, the applicant will be installing a new French door, located beneath the

street level of Crescent Tram. The partial demolition of the two historic doors is necessary for the renovation and reconstruction of the c.1907 barn. The new French doors will not impact the historical significance of the barn or its architectural integrity.

18. The applicant will replace the existing rubble stone foundation of the c.1907 barn with a new concrete foundation. The partial demolition is required for the renovation and reconstruction of the c.1907 barn.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.
2. The proposal meets the criteria for relocation pursuant to LMC 15-11-15.
Reconstruction of the Historic Building and/or Structure on a Landmark Site.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on April 12, 2016. 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 will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
3. Should the applicant's structural engineer find that the existing roof structure of the house cannot be sistered with new structural members following additional interior demolition, the applicant shall provide a structural engineering report to the Planning and Building Departments for review prior to completing any demolition and reconstruction of the historic roof.
4. Should the applicant's structural engineer find that the existing roof structure of the porch cannot be sistered with new structural members following additional interior demolition, the applicant shall provide a structural engineering report to the Planning and Building Departments for review prior to completing any demolition and reconstruction of the historic roof.
5. Should the applicant uncover historic window and door openings that were not documented at the time of the Historic Preservation Board's review, the applicant shall schedule a site visit with the Planning Department and determine if the window or door opening should be restored. Any physical evidence of lost historic window and door openings shall be documented to the satisfaction of the Preservation Planner, regardless of plans for restoration.
6. Should the applicant find that the severity of the deterioration or material defects require replacement of the barn door, the door shall be reconstructed as a veneer and match the existing in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish.

Exhibits:

- Exhibit A – HPB Checklist for Material Deconstruction
- Exhibit B – Historic Sites Inventory Form

- Exhibit C – Updated Plans, dated 4.27.16
- Exhibit D – Structural Engineer’s Letter, 4.4.16
- Exhibit E – Historic Preservation Plan
- Exhibit F – Physical Conditions Report
- Exhibit G – Deputy Chief Building Official Input, 4.15.16

Exhibit A

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.

HISTORIC SITE FORM - HISTORIC SITES INVENTORY

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (10-08)

1 IDENTIFICATION

Name of Property:

Address: 823 NORFOLK AVE

AKA:

City, County: Park City, Summit County, Utah

Tax Number: SA-139

Current Owner Name: MATSUMOTO KATHERINE

Parent Parcel(s):

Current Owner Address: PO BOX 951, PARK CITY, UT 84060-0951

Legal Description (include acreage): LOTS 5 & 6 BLK 14 SNYDERS ADDITION TO PARK CITY; ALSO BEG AT THE NE COR OF LOT 2 BLK 14 SNYDERS ADDITION TO PARK CITY & RUN TH S 54*01' W 77.98 FT TO THE NW COR OF SD LOT 6; TH N 35*59' W 3.00 FT; TH N 54*01' E 77.91 FT; TH S 37*21' E 3.00 FT TO THE PT OF BEG CONT 0.01 AC (LESS & EXCEPTING A PARCEL MORE PARTICULARLY DESC AS FOLLOWS: BEG AT THE NE COR OF LOT 4, BLK 14 SNYDERS ADDITION TO PARK CITY & RUN TH S 54*01' W 79.17 FT TO THE NW COR OF SD LOT 4; TH N 35*59' W 3.00 FT; TH N 54*01' E 79.10 FT; TH S 37*21' E 3.00 FT TO THE PT OF BEG BAL 0.09 AC

2 STATUS/USE

Property Category

- building(s), main
 building(s), attached
 building(s), detached
 building(s), public
 building(s), accessory
 structure(s)

Evaluation*

- Landmark Site
 Significant Site
 Not Historic

Reconstruction

- Date:
 Permit #:
 Full Partial

Use

Original Use: Residential
 Current Use: Residential

*National Register of Historic Places: ineligible eligible
 listed (date:)

3 DOCUMENTATION

Photos: Dates

- tax photo:
 prints: c. 1960, 1995 & 2006
 historic: c.

Drawings and Plans

- measured floor plans
 site sketch map
 Historic American Bldg. Survey
 original plans:
 other:

Research Sources (check all sources consulted, whether useful or not)

- abstract of title
 tax card
 original building permit
 sewer permit
 Sanborn Maps
 obituary index
 city directories/gazetteers
 census records
 biographical encyclopedias
 newspapers
 city/county histories
 personal interviews
 Utah Hist. Research Center
 USHS Preservation Files
 USHS Architects File
 LDS Family History Library
 Park City Hist. Soc/Museum
 university library(ies):
 other:

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

Blaes, Dina & Beatrice Lufkin. "Final Report." Park City Historic Building Inventory. Salt Lake City: 2007.
 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.
 McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.
 Roberts, Allen. "Final Report." Park City Reconnaissance Level Survey. Salt Lake City: 1995.
 Roper, Roger & Deborah Randall. "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination." National Register of Historic Places Inventory, Nomination Form. 1984.

Researcher/Organization: Preservation Solutions/Park City Municipal Corporation Date: 12-2008

4 ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION & INTEGRITY

Building Type and/or Style: Cross-wing type / Vernacular style

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), # 1; structure(s), # _____.

General Condition of Exterior Materials:

 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.):

Foundation: No foundations were noted on the 1949 and 1958 tax cards. The 1968 tax card mentioned a concrete block foundation. The foundation is not visible in the available photographs and therefore its material or existence cannot be verified.

Walls: The exterior walls are clad in painted drop or novelty wooden siding.

Roof: The roof is a cross-gable form clad in composition shingles. A brick ridge-line chimney with a corbelled shaft is visible in the 2006 photographs.

Windows/Doors: The windows are two-over-two with a horizontal divider, double-hung with wooden sash. A central larger window is flanked by two narrow ones on the front gable-end elevation. A pair of one-over-one double-hung windows shares a decorative window header on the porch. Windows are covered with what appear to be external aluminum storm windows. The views of the entry door in the available photographs are obscured by reflections on the storm door.

Improvements: A 16' x 25' drop-sided unpainted barn, built in 1911, is noted on the 1949 tax card (but not on the 1968 tax card). It is set next to the road and has 1 ½ stories. It is visible in the 2006 photographs.

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): This frame house is a cross-wing with a shed-roofed front porch in its L that has decorative openwork metal roof supports. The side shed-roofed porch is enclosed. A 1 ½ story frame barn has unpainted drop-siding and is sited next to the street.

Setting (The physical environment--natural or manmade--of a historic site. Describe the setting and how it has changed over time.): The house sits above the finished road grade with a poured concrete retaining wall and concrete steps leading to the front porch. The yard is filled with native plants and grasses. Like most of the historic neighborhoods in Park City, the overall setting is a compact streetscape with narrow side yards and other homes of similar scale within close proximity.

Workmanship (The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during a given period in history. Describe the distinctive elements.): The distinctive elements that define this as a typical Park City mining era house are the simple methods of construction, the use of non-beveled (drop-novelty) wood siding, the plan type (crosswing), the simple roof form, the informal landscaping, the restrained ornamentation, and the plain finishes.

Feeling (Describe the property's historic character.): 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.

5 SIGNIFICANCE

Architect: Not Known Known: (source:)

Date of Construction: c. 1901¹

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. 1: East elevation (primary façade). Camera facing west, 2006.

Photo No. 2: South elevation of accessory building. Camera facing north on Crescent Tram, 2006.

Photo No. 3: South elevation of accessory building. Camera facing north on Crescent Tram, 2006.

Photo No. 4: East elevation (primary façade). Camera facing west, 1995

Photo No. 5: Southwest oblique of accessory building. Camera facing northeast from Crescent Tram, 1995.

Photo No. 6: Southeast oblique Camera facing northwest, c. 1960.

¹ Summit County Recorder

² From "Residences of Mining Boom Era, Park City - Thematic Nomination" written by Roger Roper, 1984.

SERIAL NO.
RE-APPRAISAL CARD (1940 APPR. BASE)

Owner's Name _____
 Owner's Address _____
 Location _____
 Kind of Building RES Street No. _____
 Schedule 1 Class 4 Type 1-2-3-4 Cost \$ _____ %
 X _____ %

Stories	Dimensions	Cu. Ft.	Sq. Ft.	Actual Factor	Totals
1	x x		1267	\$	\$ 3227
	x x			\$	\$
	x x			\$	\$

No. of Rooms 5 Condition Good

Description of Building	Add	Deduct
<u>6x2x1.15</u> Foundation—Stone Conc. None <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		175
Ext. Walls <u>SIDING</u>		
Insulated—Floors Walls Clgs.		
Roof—Type <u>GAB</u> Mat. <u>SHG</u>		
Dormers—Small Med. Lg. —		
Bays—Small Med. Lg. —		
Porches—Front <u>100 @ 1.20 120.</u>		
Rear <u>72 @ 1.00 72</u>		
Cellar—Basmt— $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{3}{4}$ full-floor <u>No</u>		45
Basement Apts.—Rooms Fin.		
Attic Rooms Fin. Unfin. —		
Plumbing— { Class <u>1</u> Tub <u>1</u> Trays <u>1</u> Basin <u>1</u> Sink <u>1</u> Toilet <u>1</u> Urns. Ftns. Shr. <u>1</u> Dishwasher. Garbage Disp. <u>1</u>		
Heat—Stove <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> H. A. Steam S. Blr. <u>1</u> Oil Gas Coal		
Air Conditioned Incinerators		
Radiant—Pipeless		
Finish— { Hd. Wd. <u>1</u> Floors— { Hd. Wd. <u>1</u> Fir. <u>1</u> Fir. <u>1</u> Conc. <u>1</u>		125
Cabinets <u>1</u> Mantels		
Tile— { Walls <u>1</u> Wainscot. <u>1</u> Floors <u>1</u>		
Lighting—Lamp Drops <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fix.		
<u>WOOD LINED</u>		100 Val.
Total Additions and Deductions	192	445
Net Additions or Deductions	192	3227

REPRODUCTION VALUE \$ 2974
 Depr. 1-2-3-4-5-6 61/39 % \$ 1160
 Reproduction Val. Minus Depr. \$ 1160

Remodeled Est. Cost _____ Remodeling Inc. _____ %
 Garage—S 8 C _____ Depr. 2% 3% _____
 Cars _____ Walls _____ Out Bldgs. \$ 125
 Roof _____ Size x Age _____
 Floor _____ Cost _____ Depreciated Value Garage _____
 Remarks AV. AGE RECORDED Total Building Value \$ 1285
ON OLD CARD 40 YRS (1941)

Serial No. SA 189

Location Block 14 SA Lots 546
 Kind of Bldg. RES St. No. 823 Norfolk Ave
 Class 1 Type 1 2 3 4 Cost \$ 2733 X — %

Stories	Dimensions	Cu. Ft.	Sq. Ft.	Factor	Totals
1	x x		1267		\$ 2733
	x x				
	x x				

Gar.—Carport — x — Flr. — Walls — Cl. —

Description of Buildings	Additions	
Foundation—Stone <u>—</u> Conc. <u>—</u> None <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Ext. Walls <u>Siding</u>	17	
Insulation—Floors <u>—</u> Walls <u>—</u> Clgs. <u>—</u>	41	
Roof Type <u>Gable</u> Mtl. <u>Shingle</u>	59	
Dormers—Small <u>—</u> Med. <u>—</u> Large <u>—</u>		
Bays—Small <u>—</u> Med. <u>—</u> Large <u>—</u>		
Porches—Front <u>100</u> @ <u>125</u>	125	
Rear <u>72</u> @ <u>130</u>	94	
Porch <u>—</u> @ <u>—</u>		
Metal Awnings <u>—</u> Mtl. Rail <u>—</u>	18	
Basement Entr. <u>—</u> @ <u>—</u>		
Planters <u>—</u> @ <u>—</u>		
Cellar-Bsmt. — 1/4 1/2 3/4 Full <u>—</u> Floor <u>—</u>		
Bsmt. Apt. <u>—</u> Rooms Fin. <u>—</u> Unfin. <u>—</u>		
Attic Rooms Fin. <u>—</u> Unfin. <u>—</u>		
Plumbing {	350	
		Class <u>1</u> Tub <u>1</u> Trays <u>—</u>
		Basin <u>1</u> Sink <u>1</u> Toilet <u>1</u>
		Wtr. Sftr. <u>—</u> Shr. St. <u>—</u> O.T. <u>—</u>
Dishwasher <u>—</u> Garbage Disp. <u>—</u>		
Built-in-Appliances <u>—</u>		
Heat—Stove <u>—</u> H.A. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steam <u>—</u> Stkr. <u>—</u> Blr. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	281	
Oil <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gas <u>—</u> Coal <u>—</u> Pipeless <u>—</u> Radiant <u>—</u>		
Air Cond. <u>—</u>		
Finish—Fir <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hd. Wd. <u>—</u>		
Floor—Fir <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hd. Wd. <u>—</u> Other <u>—</u>		
Cabinets <u>1</u> Mantels <u>—</u>		
Tile—Walls <u>—</u> Wainseot <u>—</u> Floors <u>—</u>		
Storm Sash—Wood D. <u>—</u> S. <u>—</u> ; Metal D. <u>1</u> S. <u>4</u>		
	850	

Total Additions		850
Year Built <u>1921</u>	Avg. Age <u>59</u>	Current Value \$ <u>3583</u>
Owner - Tenant -	Neighbor - Record - Est.	Commission Adj. %
Remodel Year	Est. Cost	Bldg. Value
Garage—Class <u>—</u> Depr. 2% 3% Carport <u>—</u> Factor <u>—</u>		Depr. Col. (1) 2 3 4 5 6 <u>30</u> %
Cars <u>—</u> Floor <u>X</u> Walls <u>—</u> Roof <u>—</u> Doors <u>—</u>		Current Value Minus Depr. \$ <u>1075</u>
Size— <u>x</u> Age <u>—</u> Cost <u>—</u> x <u>—</u> %		
Other <u>—</u>		

Appraised 4-25-1958 By 1302

Owners Name _____
 Location BIK 141 SA 6T 5+6
 Kind of Bldg. Res St. No. 823 NORFOLK Ave
 Class. 3 Type 1 2 3 4. Cost \$ _____ X 100 %


Stories	Dimensions	Sq. Ft.	Factor	Totals	Totals
1	x x	1090		\$ 4305	\$
	x x				
	x x				

Att. Gar.—C.P. x Flr. _____ Walls _____ Cl. _____

Description of Buildings	Additions	Additions
Foundation—Stone _____ Conc. <u>BIK</u> Sills <u>x</u>		
Ext. Walls <u>Sid (A)</u>		
Roof Type <u>Gab</u> Mtl. <u>Pat</u>		
Dormers—Small _____ Med. _____ Large _____		
Bays—Small _____ Med _____ Large _____		
Porches—Front <u>100 @ 150</u>	<u>150</u>	
Rear <u>72 @ 125</u>	<u>90</u>	
Porch _____ @ _____		
Planters _____ @ _____		
Ext. Base. Entry _____ @ _____		
Cellar-Bsmt. — 1/4 1/8 1/2 2/3 3/4 Full _____ Floor <u>None</u>		
Bsmt. Gar. _____		
Basement-Apt. _____ Rms. _____ Fin. Rms. _____		
Attic Rooms Fin. _____ Unfin. _____		
Plumbing {	Class <u>1</u> Tub. <u>1</u> Trays _____	
	Basin <u>1</u> Sink <u>1</u> Toilet <u>1</u>	
	Wtr. Sfr. _____ Shr. St. _____ O.T. _____	
	Dishwasher _____ Garbage Disp. _____	<u>550</u>
Heat—Stove _____ H.A. _____ FA <u>1</u> HW _____ Stkr _____ Elec. _____		
Oil _____ Gas <u>x</u> Coal _____ Pipeless _____ Radiant _____	<u>404</u>	
Air Cond. — Full _____ Zone _____		
Finish—Fir. <u>✓</u> Hd. Wd. _____ Panel _____		
Floor—Fir. _____ Hd. Wd _____ Other _____		
Cabinets <u>1</u> Mantels _____		
Tile—Walls _____ Wainscot _____ Floors _____		
Storm Sash—Wood D. _____ S. _____; Metal D. <u>1 S. 4</u>	<u>130</u>	
Awnings — Metal _____ Fiberglass _____		

Reg 12-4-79
 12/1/98
 12/1/98

Total Additions		<u>1324</u>
Year Built <u>1901</u>	Avg. <u>1.1902</u>	Replacement Cost <u>5629</u>
<u>1965</u>	Age <u>2</u>	Obsolescence
Inf. by <u>Owner</u> - Tenant -		Adj. Bld. Value
<u>Neighbor</u> - Record - Est.		Conv. Factor <u>x.47</u>
Replacement Cost—1940 Base		
Depreciation Column <u>1</u> 2 3 4 5 6		
1940 Base Cost, Less Depreciation		
Total Value from reverse side		
Total Building Value \$		



RESIDENTIAL OUT BUILDINGS	Age	Size	Area	Factor	Cost	Conv. Fac.	Adj. Cost	Depr. Value
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		
		x				.47		

Garage — Class _____ Depr. 2% 3% _____
 Cars _____ Floor _____ Walls _____ Roof _____ Doors _____
 Size _____ x _____ Age _____ Cost _____ x 47% _____
 _____ 1940 Base Cost _____ x _____ % Depr. _____

Average Year of Construction Computation:
 RE MARKS 1901 \$ 5499 = 98 % X 65 Year = 6370
 Year 1965 \$ 130 = 2 % X Year = 02
Average Year of Construction 1902 6372
 2
 66













SHEPPE RESIDENCE 823 NORFOLK AVENUE PARK CITY, UT 84060 HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGN REVIEW SET

CONSULTANTS

ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANTS, INC. 614 MAIN STREET SUITE 302 PARK CITY, UTAH 84060

CODE ANALYSIS

Table with columns: APPLICABLE CODES, OCCUPANCY, CONSTRUCTION TYPE, AREA SQUARE FOOT CALCULATIONS, DEFERRED SUBMITTALS, and GENERAL NOTES.

LEGEND

Legend table mapping symbols to material and construction terms like BRICK & STONE, CONCRETE, INSULATION, etc.

ABBREVIATIONS

Table of abbreviations for architectural elements such as AC (AIR CONDITIONING), AD (ACUSTICAL), etc.


GENERAL NOTES

- 1. THIS DESIGN IS AN ORIGINAL UNPUBLISHED WORK... 2. THESE SHEETS - LISTED BY DRAWING INDEX... 3. ALL WORK IS TO BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PERMITS AND ORDINANCES...


INDEX TO DRAWINGS

Index to Drawings table listing sheet numbers (Aa, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20) and their descriptions.

WINDOW AND DOOR CALLOUTS ARE FOR USE IN PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT.




1 AS BUILT - CRAWL SPACE FLOORPLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"




2 AS BUILT - MAIN LEVEL FLOORPLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"






2 AS BUILT - ATTIC LEVEL FLOORPLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"




1 AS BUILT - UPPER LEVEL
 1/4" = 1'-0"




3 AS BUILT - ROOF LEVEL PLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"

WINDOW AND DOOR CALLOUTS ARE FOR
 USE IN PHYSICAL CONDITIONS REPORT.






2 AS BUILT - SOUTH ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



1 AS BUILT - EAST ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"

Jonathan DeGray
 Architect
 P.O. Box 1574, 614 Main Street, Suite 202, Park City, Utah 84060
 Tel: 435-437-2721, Email: jdegray@jondegray.com



Jonathan DeGray
Architect

SHEPPE RESIDENCE
823 NORFOLK AVENUE
PARK CITY, UT 84060

AS BUILT
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS



AB2.0


DATE: 04/27/16
PROJECT NUMBER:

P.O. Box 1524 824 Main Street, Suite 202 Park City, Utah 84060
Tel: 435-644-7121 Email: jgray@jonathandegray.com


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

EXISTING HOME






FF AS BUILT BUILDING SECTION
1/4" = 1'-0"






EE AS BUILT BUILDING SECTION
1/4" = 1'-0"

- KEYED NOTES**
- 1 ARCHITECTURAL GRADE COMPOSITION PER DETAIL (A2.2) - BUILD FRAMED WALL AND MASONRY IN PLACE PER DETAIL (A2.2) - BUILD FRAMED WALL AND MASONRY IN PLACE PER DETAIL (A2.2) - BUILD FRAMED WALL AND MASONRY IN PLACE PER DETAIL (A2.2)
 - 2 STAINLESS STEEL METAL ROOF WITH 1/2" AND 1/4" METAL FLASHING OVER EXISTING ROOF SURFACE UP TO 24" DOWN FROM ROOF TYP.
 - 3 1/2" CEDAR SOFFIT - STAINED.
 - 4 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 5 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 6 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 7 2" CONT. METAL FLASHING ABOVE ALL METAL FLASHING AND ABOVE TRIM.
 - 8 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 9 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 10 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 11 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 12 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 13 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 14 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 15 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 16 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 17 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 18 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 19 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 20 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 21 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 22 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 23 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 24 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 25 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 26 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 27 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 28 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 29 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 30 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 31 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 32 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 33 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 34 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 35 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 36 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 37 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 38 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 39 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 40 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 41 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 42 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 43 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 44 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 45 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 46 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 47 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 48 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 49 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 50 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 51 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 52 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 53 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 54 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 55 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 56 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 57 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 58 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 59 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 60 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 61 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 62 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 63 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 64 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 65 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 66 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 67 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 68 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 69 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 70 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 71 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 72 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 73 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 74 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 75 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 76 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 77 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 78 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 79 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 80 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 81 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 82 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 83 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 84 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 85 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 86 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 87 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 88 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 89 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 90 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 91 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 92 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 93 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 94 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 95 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 96 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 97 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 98 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 99 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.
 - 100 1/2" X 5/12 CEDAR TRIM - STAINED.



A FAUX BARN DOOR DETAIL
1/4" = 1'-0"



2 NORTH ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"