

**SALT LAKE CITY  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**

**REQUEST BY SUSAN MICKELSEN FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE  
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION'S DENIAL OF A REQUEST TO  
LEGALIZE A NEW FRONT PORCH ELEMENT. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED  
AT 1253 EAST 100 SOUTH, IN THE UNIVERSITY HISTORIC DISTRICT  
CASE NO. 001-04  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2006**

**OVERVIEW**

Susan Mickelsen of Lupin Enterprises, Inc. is requesting a reconsideration of the Historic Landmark Commission's November 2, 2005 decision to deny a legalization request of the front porch element constructed without appropriate city review on the building located at 1253 East 100 South Street. The applicant views the new front porch element is in keeping with the architectural style of the home and the Historic Landmark Commission has approved similar improvements in the past. The applicant has gathered new information that she would like to present to the Commission regarding the appropriateness of the railing. Planning Division Management agreed to allow this because new information cannot be submitted to the Land Use Appeals Board in an appeal situation.

**BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL**

**November 2, 2005 HLC Action** - The Historic Landmark Commission reviewed the legalization request for this property on November 2, 2005 (Exhibit 3). The Historic Landmark Commission passed a motion regarding the request, subject to the following:

1. That the Historic Landmark Commission denies the request to legalize the front porch element specifically the balustrade and follow the Staff recommendation to remove the balustrade and work with Staff to find a design that is compatible with the building.
2. That window placement and shutters are to be approved pending plans to put in appropriate trim for the historic character of the house and subject to Staff approval.
3. That final site plans for grading and all site features be submitted and approved by the Planning Director or designee.
4. Legalization of the existing fiber cement siding material as it has been used for new construction on secondary elevations in the past.

Ms. Mickelsen is now requesting that the HLC reconsider their decision to **deny legalization** of the front porch element. In order for the HLC to reconsider the request, the applicant was required to provide new information showing where either the Commission approved similar replacement railings on similar buildings in the past or where similar architecture (simple Second Empire style or a saltbox type structure) originally had a similar type of railing. The submittal includes a number of examples of high-style buildings outside of Salt Lake City as well as residential properties where metal porch elements exist in Salt Lake City. Staff considers an evaluation of the material located outside of Salt Lake City's jurisdiction not germane to this discussion since this information does not include similar building types or relate to the historic context to which the subject property is associated. The following is an analysis of those properties located within a locally designated historic district (Avenues Historic District – listed in 1978). Documentation is available to evaluate the status of these installations.

## **ANALYSIS**

**DISCUSSION:** As mentioned above, the following is an analysis of the residential examples in Salt Lake City submitted by the applicant with metal porch elements. These properties are all located within the Avenues Historic District. The subject property is located in the University Historic District. The table below summarizes pertinent information included in the Historic Site Survey forms for each property and attached to this staff report as Exhibit 4. Available tax photographs are also included as part of Exhibit 4. A survey form is a record of the property at the time: giving its location, identifying its historic characteristics, stating its historical significance and describing its current condition. Assertions for historic significance are supported in the survey form by facts about the property. Sources of information are referenced on the form and include historic photographs, Sanborn Maps, Title Abstracts, City Directories and Building Permits. Photographs taken as part of the preparation of a survey form provide valuable evidence of the stylistic character and architectural form of a property. The survey forms for the properties included in this analysis indicate that photographs were taken in 1977, before local designation of the Avenues Historic District. Tax photographs of properties with metal porch elements included in Exhibit 4 are typically more recent pictures.

<b>Address</b>	<b>Site Form Evaluation</b>	<b>Condition of Existing Porch as Indicated on Site Form</b>	<b>Date of Porch Improvements (1977 photo)</b>
<b>824-826 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian duplex Contributing with minor alterations	Not original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>830 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian cottage Contributing with major alterations	Not original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>854 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian Eclectic Contributing with minor alterations	Not original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>918 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian cottage Contributing with minor alterations	No reference on site form, but does not appear original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>964 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian Eclectic Contributing with minor alterations	Not original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>1022 E. First Ave.</b>	Box type Contributing with minor alterations	Old iron railing	Prior to historic district designation
<b>1026 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian Eclectic Contributing and unaltered	No reference on site form, but does not appear original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>1040 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian Eclectic Contributing and unaltered	No reference on site form, but does not appear original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>1067 E. First Ave.</b>	Queen Anne Contributing with minor alterations	Not original	Prior to historic district designation
<b>1185 E. First Ave.</b>	Box type Contributing with minor alterations	Not original	Post designation – no record of permits
<b>1211 E. First Ave.</b>	Victorian Eclectic Contributing with minor alterations	Not original	Prior to historic district designation

A review of Salt Lake City Building Permit records for these properties does not specifically identify porch improvements for any of the buildings identified above (Exhibit 5).

Please refer to Exhibit 6 for a brief overview of the Second Empire style that is included in the Design Guidelines. Although the submittal does not include examples of architecture similar to the subject property, it does reflect a past trend identified in Section 5.0 of the Design Guidelines *Standards for Porches* that many porches were altered or removed (Exhibit 7). According to the Design Guidelines:

*Wood columns and posts were commonly replaced with thin "wrought iron" railings and posts. This compromised the proportions and architectural integrity of the house.*

Thus, staff maintains that the metal balustrade that was installed on the front porch detracts from the home's identity as a simple Second Empire style building. The UBC does not require a porch railing. However, if one is provided it should be appropriate for the architectural style of the building. In a previous decision on the issue, the HLC approved a wood railing if the owner decided to install a railing.

**FINDING:** The applicant has not uncovered additional information that warrants a reversal of the Historic Landmark Commission's decision. The new information fails to show where either the Commission approved similar replacement railings on similar buildings in the past or where similar architecture (simple Second Empire style or a saltbox type structure) originally had a similar type of railing. Removing elements on a primary elevation that contribute to the overall historic character of the building and replacing them with new details that do not convey the same visual appearance or match the architectural style of the house is inconsistent with Section 21A.34.020(G) of the Zoning Ordinance and the Design Guidelines. Furthermore, the new architectural details are historically, incorrect for the specific style of the building and do not match or resemble the original in form or material.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the analysis above, Planning Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission uphold its November 2, 2005 decision to deny the request to legalize the front porch element specifically the balustrade, remove the balustrade and work with Staff to find a design that is compatible with the building.

Janice Lew  
Planning Division  
January 25, 2005

- Attachments:** Exhibit 1: Submittal  
Exhibit 2: November 2, 2005 Staff Report  
Exhibit 3: November 2, 2005 Minutes  
Exhibit 4: Historic Site Survey Forms  
Exhibit 5: Building Permits Before 1970  
Exhibit 6: Second Empire Style  
Exhibit 7: Design Guidelines: 5.0 Porches

# **Exhibit 1 Submittal**

**Exhibit 2**  
**November 2, 2005 Staff Report**

**Exhibit 3**  
**November 2, 2005 Minutes**



**Exhibit 4**  
**Historic Site Survey Forms**

**Exhibit 5**  
**Building Permits Before 1970**

**Exhibit 6**  
**Second Empire Style**

**Exhibit 7**  
**Design Guidelines: 5.0 Porches**

