

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Petition 410-07-37 Major Alteration/Minor
Construction for exterior alterations located at
approximately 23 North Virginia Street in the Avenues
Historic District
November 7, 2007



Planning and Zoning
Division
Department of Community
Development

Applicant: Jane Beatty

Staff: Nick Norris;
nick.norris@slcgov.com or
535-6173

Tax ID: 09-33-357-004

Current Zone: SR1-A Special
Development Pattern Residential
District

Master Plan Designation:
Low Density Residential

Council District: District 3;
Eric Jergensen

Acreage: 0.13 acres

Current Use: Single family
residential

Applicable City Ordinance:

- City Code Section
21A.34.020

Attachments:

- Narrative submitted by applicant
- Historic Photo of site
- Current Photos of site
- Site Plan and Building Elevations

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval of external modifications to a contributing structure located at 23 North Virginia Street in the Avenues Historic District. The proposed modifications include the following:

1. adding a new front porch
2. adding a new entrance feature over the front door
3. adding new window openings on the second floor of the front elevation of the home
4. adding new windows on the secondary elevation of the home
5. adding an addition on the rear of the home
6. replacing the existing garage with a new garage
7. replacing the second level balcony with a new arbor on the second level
8. new landscaping treatments

PUBLIC NOTICE

A public notice was mailed to all property owners within 85 feet of the property, to the interested parties on the Planning Division's email list serve and posted on the Planning Divisions website.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the proposed alterations to the east façade of the subject property for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would alter the defining characteristics of the primary façade of the home;
2. The proposed alterations would alter the original design of the primary façade of the home and create a false sense of history;
3. The proposed alterations of the primary façade are not based on historic, physical or pictorial evidence.

Staff does recommend approval of the proposed alterations to the rest of the property, specifically items four through 8 under the heading "Request" at the top of this page, because:

1. The alterations are located on secondary elevations of the property;
2. The proposed addition is replacing an earlier addition that has not achieved historical significance;
3. The proposed alteration and additions comply with ordinance 21A.34.020.G Standards for Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration of a Landmark site or Contributing Structure and applicable design guidelines.

VICINITY MAP



COMMENTS

Public Comments: To date, no public comments have been received.

BACKGROUND:

The structure was constructed in 1938 as a duplex. At some point in time it was converted to a single family home. The Avenues Historic Survey indicates that this building was not of the historic period when the survey was done in 1979. At the time of the 1938 survey, the property was not considered contributing. However, the structure is now over 50 years old and is a contributing structure in the Avenues Historic District. The City has hired a consultant to update the Avenues Survey. The first phase of that update is complete. The update indicates that the structure is contributing.

The structure is the only single family structure on the block that faces Virginia Street. The primary façade of the structure faces Virginia Street. The other two properties are corner properties. The property to the south is a multi family residential building that fronts on South Temple Street. The property to the north is a single family dwelling that fronts on First Avenue.

Due to the original use of the property, the primary façade is unusual in design. There are two small, irregular shaped windows on the sides of the primary entrance. A second entrance is located on the south side of the structure. The primary building material on the east façade is brick. The windows are wood windows. The upper windows and the windows on the south side of the primary façade are flanked by wood shutters. The existing doors are wood. The front porch and entry are designed in a neo-classical style with a small pediment surrounding the door. The porch is a simple concrete landing with stairs that face the street.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Base Zoning Analysis

The subject property is located in the SR1-A Special Development Pattern Zoning District. The SR1-A Zoning district was established after the subject property was constructed. In terms of the SR1-A regulations, the proposed alterations to the subject property impact the front building setback and building height.

The minimum required setback in the SR1-A Zoning District is the average of the front yards of existing building within the block face. For buildings legally existing on April 12, 2005 the required front yard setback is equal to the established setback line of the existing building. Therefore, the existing front wall of the building establishes the setback line. Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.36.020 allows for certain obstructions in required yards. Section 21A.36.020 lists decks, porches and steps and required landings as permitted obstructions in front yards. The Zoning Ordinance does not define decks, porches, or required landings but does provide language that helps describe what each item is. Table 21A.36.020B reads as follows for decks, porches and stairs and required landings:

- “Decks (open) 2 feet high or less” and allows them to encroach into the front yard setback.
- Porches (attached, covered and unenclosed) projecting 5 feet or less and are allowed to encroach into the front yard setback.
- Steps and required landings 4 feet or less above or below grade which are necessary for access to a permitted building and located not less than 4 feet from a lot line. Steps and landings are allowed to encroach into the front yard setback.

Decks would be allowed to encroach to the front property line provided they are 2 feet high or less. The qualifying statement on porches (attached, covered, and unenclosed) does not fit this proposal because the proposed landing is not covered. Steps and required landings and decks more accurately apply to this proposal than a porch. The proposed landing would be nine feet deep and ten feet wide. The existing landing is approximately five feet deep and 8 feet wide. The landing of the front entry is 2 feet above grade and is approximately ten feet from the front property line. Based on Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.36.020, the proposed enlargement of the landing is allowed to encroach into the front yard setback because it is under four feet in height and more than four feet from the front property line. In addition, the changes to the front of the property require review by the Historic Landmark Commission.

The proposal also includes an addition to the rear of the property. The proposed addition is approximately twenty five feet six inches in height. The existing building is approximately twenty nine feet in height. The maximum height in the SR1-A Zoning District is twenty three feet or the average of other principal buildings on the block face. Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.24.080.D.6 allows the Historic Landmark Commission to review requests for additional building height for properties located within an H Historic Preservation Overlay District subject to the provisions of 21A.34.020 to determine what the appropriate height is. This property is located within the Historic Preservation Overlay District. A review of the provisions in Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.34.020 is found later in this report.

H Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Analysis

Zoning Ordinance section 21A.34.020 (G) lists the standards for alterations of a Landmark Site or contributing structure. The Historic Landmark Commission is charged with determining if the project substantially complies the following standards and is in the best interest of the city:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be used for a purpose that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment;

Analysis: In 1938 the structure was built as a two family dwelling. At some point after that, it was converted to a single family dwelling and as been occupied as such since that time. A review of the historic property evaluations do not make it clear when the property was converted to a single family dwelling.

Due to the historic use of the property, the structure has two entrances. The primary entrance faces the street. The second entry is located on a south facing wall between the two planes of the front façade. It is not readily visible and the home reads as a single family dwelling. The structure would continue to be used as a single family dwelling. The proposed addition on the rear of the home will expand and alter the structure for the purpose of increasing the living area of the home and to provide modern conveniences within the structure. In addition, a new garage will be constructed in the rear yard of the property.

Finding: The historic use of the property has been converted from a two family dwelling to a single family dwelling. The proposal would maintain the use of the property as a single family dwelling.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided;

Analysis: The front façade provides the defining characteristics of the property. The proposed changes to the front façade include a new porch and landing with railing, new entry door and pediment, new windows and converting a second entry and landing to a balcony by removing the existing stair and installing new concrete decking and railing. A new garage will be built in the rear yard of the property.

The proposal would increase the size of the front landing. The landing is currently five feet deep and 8 feet wide. The stairs face the street. The proposed landing is nine feet deep and ten feet wide. The stairs would face the driveway to the north. There is no front walkway proposed that leads to the street and the west side of the street does not have sidewalks. Landings and decks that are two (2) feet or less in height can encroach into required front yard setbacks as stated in Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.36.020. The landing would be faced with brick to match the brick on the house. The railing would be a black iron railing.

The proposal includes removing the existing door and pediment and replacing it with a new door and pediment. The existing door and pediment fit into a classical architectural design. The proposed door and pediment retain the classical style, but include a more substantial entablature above the door. The proposed door would be a solid wood panel door. The entablature would be constructed of fiber cement composite materials with a smooth finish.

Two new window openings are proposed to be added to the second level of the primary façade. The new windows are “six over six” double hung windows. The existing window is a wood window with the glass divided into a six over six pattern. The applicants are proposing to use an aluminum clad wood window with a similar profile as the existing windows. They would match the existing color. The existing windows are flanked by wood shutters. The proposal would replace the wood shutters with a composite based shutter in a similar design. The shutters are similar in dimension to the existing shutters. If a composite material is used, it should have a smooth pattern and a fake wood pattern should be avoided.

The stairs and landing to the second entrance on the primary façade would be altered and converted from a second entrance into an outdoor seating area. The existing stairs leading to the established grade would be removed. The patio would be faced with brick to match the house and a black iron railing.

The existing garage is a simple building with horizontal wood siding with a raised panel aluminum garage door. The existing garage is four hundred and eleven (411) square feet. It is located on the property line. The replacement structure will be four hundred and eighty (480) square feet. The placement, square footage and height of the garage comply with the maximum requirements in the SR1-A Zoning District. It will be covered with a fiber cement composite siding installed horizontally. The garage door will be similar to the existing garage door.

Available photographs are from the mid to late 1960’s and were obtained from the Salt Lake County Assessors Office (attachment B). They show the front of the house as it is today, with the exception of the front porch and entry door. The porch is covered with an aluminum awning. It appears as though the pediment around the door is open at the top. The proposed changes to the front of the property would alter the original façade.

Design Guidelines that do not support the proposal

3.2 Preserve the position, number, and arrangement of historic windows in a building wall.

Enclosing a historic window opening in a key character-defining facade is inappropriate, as is adding a new window opening. This is especially important on primary facades where the historic ratio of solid-to-void is a character-defining feature. Greater flexibility in installing new windows may be considered on rear walls.

3.3 Preserve the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall on a primary facade.

Significantly increasing the amount of glass on a character-defining façade will negatively affect the integrity of the structure.

4.1 Preserve the functional, proportional and decorative features of a primary entrance.

Maintain features important to the character of a historic doorway. These may include: the door, door frame, screen door, threshold, glass panes, paneling, hardware, detailing, transoms and flanking sidelights. Avoid changing the position and function of original front doors and primary entrances. If necessary, use replacement doors with designs and finishes similar to historic doors.

5.1 Preserve an original porch when feasible. Replace missing posts and railings when necessary. Match the original proportions and spacing of balusters when replacing missing ones. Unless used historically, wrought iron, especially the "licorice stick" style that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, is not allowed.

5.2 Avoid removing or covering historic materials and details on a porch. Removing an original balustrade, for example, is inappropriate.

6.2 If replacement is necessary, design the new element using accurate information about original features. The design should be substantiated by physical or pictorial evidence. One of the best sources for historic photographs is Salt Lake County Records Management, which maintains early tax photographs for thousands of buildings. In historic districts, intact structures of similar age may offer clues about the appearance of specific architectural details or features. Speculative reconstruction is not appropriate for individual landmarks, as these structures have achieved significance because of their historical and architectural integrity. This integrity may be jeopardized by speculative reconstruction. Replacement details should match the original in scale, proportion, finish and appearance

Design Guidelines that do support the proposal

3.5 Match a replacement window to the original in its design. If the original is double-hung, then the replacement window should also be double-hung, or at a minimum appear to be so. Match the replacement also in the number and position of glass panes. Matching the original design is particularly important on key character-defining facades.

4.2 When a historic door is damaged, repair it and maintain its general historic appearance.

4.3 When replacing a door, use materials that appear similar to that of the original. A metal door, if seen from the street, is inappropriate where the original was wood.

4.4 When replacing a door, use a design that has an appearance similar to the original door or a door associated with the style of the house.

5.3 If porch replacement is necessary, reconstruct it to match the original in form and detail when feasible. Use materials similar to the original whenever feasible. On contributing buildings, where no evidence of the historic porch exists, a new porch may be considered that is similar in character to those found on comparable buildings. Speculative construction of a porch on a contributing building is discouraged. Avoid applying decorative elements that are not known to have been used on your house or others like it. While matching original materials is preferred, when detailed correctly and painted appropriately, fiberglass columns may be

acceptable. The height of the railing and the spacing of balusters should appear similar to those used historically.

8.1 Design an addition to a historic structure such that it will not destroy or obscure historically important architectural features. For example, loss or alteration of architectural details, cornices and eave lines should be avoided.

8.2 Design an addition to be compatible in size and scale with the main building. Set back an addition from historically important primary facades in order to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent. Keep the addition visually subordinate to the historic building. If it is necessary to design an addition that is taller than the historic building, set it back substantially from significant facades and use a “connector” to link it.

8.3 Place an addition at the rear of a building or set it back from the front to minimize the visual impact on the historic structure and to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent. Locating an addition at the front of a structure is inappropriate.

8.4 Design a new addition to be recognized as a product of its own time. An addition shall be made distinguishable from the historic building, while also remaining visually compatible with these earlier features. A change in setbacks of the addition from the historic building, a subtle change in material, or a differentiation between historic and more current styles are all techniques that may be considered to help define a change from old to new construction.

8.5 Design a new addition to preserve the established massing and orientation of the historic building. For example, if the building historically had a horizontal emphasis, this orientation shall be continued in the addition.

9.2 Construct accessory buildings that are compatible with the primary structure. In general, garages should be unobtrusive and not compete visually with the house. While the roofline does not have to match the house, it is best if it does not vary significantly. Allowable materials include horizontal siding, brick, and in some cases stucco. Vinyl and aluminum siding are not allowed for the walls but are acceptable for the soffits. In the case of a two car garage two single doors are preferable and present a less blank look to the street; however, double doors are allowed.

9.3 Do not attach garages and carports to the primary structure. Traditionally, garages were sited as a separate structure at the rear of the lot; this pattern should be maintained. The allowance of attached accessory structures is reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Finding: The following alterations do change the primary façade of the structure:

1. adding a new front porch
2. adding a new entrance feature over the front door
3. adding new window openings on the second floor of the front elevation of the home

The historic character of the property would not be retained or preserved if the above alterations were made to the front façade of the home. The following changes to the rest of the property are on secondary elevations or in the rear yard and would not alter the defining historic character of the property:

1. adding new windows on the secondary elevation of the home
2. adding an addition on the rear of the home

3. replacing the existing garage with a new garage
4. replacing the second level balcony with a new arbor on the second level
5. new landscaping treatments

3. All sites, structures and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create a false sense of history or architecture are not allowed;

Analysis: The primary façade of the structure is a unique design with odd shaped windows at the ground level and a single window above the front entrance. The historical photographs of the home (Attachment B) include an ornate covered front porch with a metal railing. The window directly above the front door is the only window that has shutters.

The proposed window openings would alter the primary façade. Adding second story window openings changes the solid to void ratio of the façade. The solid to void ratio of a primary wall adds to the historical character of a structure. The existing windows are currently flanked by shutters. The proposal would replace the shutters with a composite shutter in a similar design. The replacement shutters would be a composite material. The applicable design standards discuss state that when replacing an original material with a new material, the new material should match the original. The existing shutters are made of wood. If the replacement shutters do not attempt to recreate a wood grain texture, then they would be appropriate. The applicants will have a product sample available for the meeting on November 7, 2007.

The rear addition is approximately one hundred and fifty six (156) square feet. It is taller than the maximum allowed height in the SR1-A Zoning District. The addition would be covered with a fiber cement product applied in a horizontal pattern. The addition is on the rear of the property and is not readily visible from the street. The addition would replace an earlier addition. The addition is distinguished from the rest of the home by the use of a different material.

The garage is located in the rear yard and is not highly visible. The exterior building materials (discussed under standard 2 on pages 4-5) are appropriate for the garage due to the nature of the materials and the location of the garage.

Design Guidelines that do not support the proposal

3.2 Preserve the position, number, and arrangement of historic windows in a building wall.

Enclosing a historic window opening in a key character-defining facade is inappropriate, as is adding a new window opening. This is especially important on primary facades where the historic ratio of solid-to-void is a character-defining feature. Greater flexibility in installing new windows may be considered on rear walls.

3.3 Preserve the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall on a primary facade.

Significantly increasing the amount of glass on a character-defining façade will negatively affect the integrity of the structure.

4.1 Preserve the functional, proportional and decorative features of a primary entrance.

Maintain features important to the character of a historic doorway. These may include: the door, door frame, screen door, threshold, glass panes, paneling, hardware, detailing, transoms and flanking sidelights. Avoid changing the position and function of original front doors and primary entrances. If necessary, use replacement doors with designs and finishes similar to historic doors.

5.1 Preserve an original porch when feasible. Replace missing posts and railings when necessary. Match the original proportions and spacing of balusters when replacing missing ones. Unless used historically, wrought iron, especially the "licorice stick" style that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, is not allowed.

5.2 Avoid removing or covering historic materials and details on a porch. Removing an original balustrade, for example, is inappropriate.

6.1 Protect and maintain significant stylistic elements. Distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship should be treated with sensitivity. The best preservation procedure is to maintain historic features from the outset so that intervention is not required. Protection includes maintenance through rust removal, caulking, limited paint removal and reapplication of paint.

6.3 Develop a new design for the replacement feature that is a simplified interpretation when the original element is missing and cannot be documented. The new element should relate to comparable features in general size, shape, scale and finish. Such a replacement should be identifiable as being new. Use materials similar to those that were used historically, if feasible.

Design Guidelines that do support the proposal

3.7 In a replacement window use materials that appear similar to the original. Using the same material as the original is preferred, especially on key character-defining facades. However, a substitute material may be considered in secondary locations if the appearance of the window components will match those of the original in dimension, profile and finish.

4.3 When replacing a door, use materials that appear similar to that of the original. A metal door, if seen from the street, is inappropriate where the original was wood.

4.4 When replacing a door, use a design that has an appearance similar to the original door or a door associated with the style of the house.

8.1 Design an addition to a historic structure such that it will not destroy or obscure historically important architectural features. For example, loss or alteration of architectural details, cornices and eave lines should be avoided.

8.4 Design a new addition to be recognized as a product of its own time. An addition shall be made distinguishable from the historic building, while also remaining visually compatible with these earlier features. A change in setbacks of the addition from the historic building, a subtle change in material, or a differentiation between historic and more current styles are all techniques that may be considered to help define a change from old to new construction.

13.7 Construct and locate secondary structures in a manner similar to those seen historically in the district. Most secondary structures were built along the rear of the lot, accessed by the alley, if one existed. This should be continued. Garages, as well as driveways, should not dominate the streetscape; therefore, they should be detached from the main house and located to the rear of the house, if possible. Historically, garages and carriage houses in the

Avenues were simple wood structures covered with a gabled or hipped roof. A new secondary structure should follow historic precedent, in terms of materials and form.

Finding: The following proposed alterations change the defining characteristics of the primary façade of the home and are not based on historic documentation.

1. adding a new front porch
2. adding a new entrance feature over the front door
3. adding new window openings on the second floor of the front elevation of the home

Available historical documentation of the design of the front façade does not support the proposed alterations. The following alterations to the property are located on secondary elevations or in the rear of the property and do not create a false sense of history.

1. adding new windows on the secondary elevation of the home
2. adding an addition on the rear of the home
3. replacing the existing garage with a new garage
4. replacing the second level balcony with a new arbor on the second level
5. new landscaping treatments

The request for additional height on the addition is appropriate because the addition is lower than the existing roof line, is located on the rear of the structure and is not readily visible from a public street.

4. Alterations or additions that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved;

Analysis: The proposal would remove the addition on the rear of the home, the arbor on the back of the home and the arbor on the second level balcony on the south side of the home. The area under the balcony was enclosed at some time in the past. This area will be covered with the same material as the addition. A review of the building permit history for the subject property does not indicate when the existing addition was added.

Finding: The proposal would not remove an alteration or addition that has acquired historic significance.

5. Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved;

Analysis: The front entry pediment is one of the character defining features of the home. The tax ID photo was taken in the late 1960's. After reviewing the original photo at the Salt Lake County Archives, it is difficult to tell if the pediment in the tax ID photo is the same as what exists today. The metal awning in the tax ID photo includes an open lattice type of iron column. Either on top of the front portion of the metal railing or above the door attached to the house is an open pediment. While the metal awning and iron posts are probably not original to the home, it is unknown what the original pediment and entry looked like. The proposed pediment is larger than the existing and alters the existing façade of the home. Altering the front entry without historical documentation is not supported by the applicable design guidelines.

Adding the new window openings on the second level would remove some brick from the front façade. The pattern of solids to voids contributes to the defining characteristics of the home. Altering this pattern changes the distinctive features of the property.

Design Guidelines that do not support proposal

3.2 Preserve the position, number, and arrangement of historic windows in a building wall.

Enclosing a historic window opening in a key character-defining facade is inappropriate, as is adding a new window opening. This is especially important on primary facades where the historic ratio of solid-to-void is a character-defining feature. Greater flexibility in installing new windows may be considered on rear walls.

3.3 Preserve the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall on a primary facade.

Significantly increasing the amount of glass on a character-defining facade will negatively affect the integrity of the structure.

4.1 Preserve the functional, proportional and decorative features of a primary entrance.

Maintain features important to the character of a historic doorway. These may include: the door, door frame, screen door, threshold, glass panes, paneling, hardware, detailing, transoms and flanking sidelights. Avoid changing the position and function of original front doors and primary entrances. If necessary, use replacement doors with designs and finishes similar to historic doors.

5.1 Preserve an original porch when feasible. Replace missing posts and railings when necessary. Match the original proportions and spacing of balusters when replacing missing ones. Unless used historically, wrought iron, especially the "licorice stick" style that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, is not allowed.

5.2 Avoid removing or covering historic materials and details on a porch. Removing an original balustrade, for example, is inappropriate.

6.1 Protect and maintain significant stylistic elements. Distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship should be treated with sensitivity. The best preservation procedure is to maintain historic features from the outset so that intervention is not required. Protection includes maintenance through rust removal, caulking, limited paint removal and reapplication of paint.

Design Guidelines that do support proposal

5.3 If porch replacement is necessary, reconstruct it to match the original in form and detail when feasible. Use materials similar to the original whenever feasible. On contributing buildings, where no evidence of the historic porch exists, a new porch may be considered that is similar in character to those found on comparable buildings. Speculative construction of a porch on a contributing building is discouraged. Avoid applying decorative elements that are not known to have been used on your house or others like it. While matching original materials is preferred, when detailed correctly and painted appropriately, fiberglass columns may be acceptable. The height of the railing and the spacing of balusters should appear similar to those used historically.

Finding: The following proposed alterations would alter the distinctive features, finishes or craftsmanship that characterizes the primary facade of the property:

1. adding a new front porch

2. adding a new entrance feature over the front door
3. adding new window openings on the second floor of the front elevation of the home

6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced wherever feasible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures or objects;

Analysis: The proposal would remove architectural features, including the front pediment. As discussed under standard five (page 10), the proposed pediment is different in design than the current pediment. Speculating on the design of the primary façade is not supported by the applicable design standards. Any changes to the primary entrance should be based on historic, physical or pictorial evidence.

The shutters will also be replaced or added where missing. Staff could not locate historical documentation of shutters ever being used for this structure. However, the structure does have some characteristics of a building designed in the neo-classical revival style where shutters were common. Adding shutters may be appropriate provided they are proportionate to the window openings so that they appear to be functional.

Design Guidelines that do not support proposal

2.8 Match the original material in composition, scale and finish when replacing materials on primary surfaces. If the original material was wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be wood. It should match the original in size, the amount of materials exposed, and in finish, traditionally a smooth finish, which was then painted. The amount of exposed lap should match. Replace only the amount required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, then only they should be replaced, not the entire wall.

3.2 Preserve the position, number, and arrangement of historic windows in a building wall. Enclosing a historic window opening in a key character-defining facade is inappropriate, as is adding a new window opening. This is especially important on primary facades where the historic ratio of solid-to-void is a character-defining feature. Greater flexibility in installing new windows may be considered on rear walls.

3.3 Preserve the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall on a primary facade. Significantly increasing the amount of glass on a character-defining façade will negatively affect the integrity of the structure.

4.1 Preserve the functional, proportional and decorative features of a primary entrance. Maintain features important to the character of a historic doorway. These may include: the door, door frame, screen door, threshold, glass panes, paneling, hardware, detailing, transoms and flanking sidelights. Avoid changing the position and function of original front doors and primary entrances. If necessary, use replacement doors with designs and finishes similar to historic doors.

5.1 Preserve an original porch when feasible. Replace missing posts and railings when necessary. Match the original proportions and spacing of balusters when replacing missing ones. Unless used historically, wrought iron, especially the "licorice stick" style that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, is not allowed.

5.2 Avoid removing or covering historic materials and details on a porch. Removing an original balustrade, for example, is inappropriate.

6.1 Protect and maintain significant stylistic elements. Distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship should be treated with sensitivity. The best preservation procedure is to maintain historic features from the outset so that intervention is not required. Protection includes maintenance through rust removal, caulking, limited paint removal and reapplication of paint.

Design Guidelines that do support proposal

4.3 When replacing a door, use materials that appear similar to that of the original. A metal door, if seen from the street, is inappropriate where the original was wood.

4.4 When replacing a door, use a design that has an appearance similar to the original door or a door associated with the style of the house.

5.3 If porch replacement is necessary, reconstruct it to match the original in form and detail when feasible. Use materials similar to the original whenever feasible. On contributing buildings, where no evidence of the historic porch exists, a new porch may be considered that is similar in character to those found on comparable buildings. Speculative construction of a porch on a contributing building is discouraged. Avoid applying decorative elements that are not known to have been used on your house or others like it. While matching original materials is preferred, when detailed correctly and painted appropriately, fiberglass columns may be acceptable. The height of the railing and the spacing of balusters should appear similar to those used historically.

8.1 Design an addition to a historic structure such that it will not destroy or obscure historically important architectural features. For example, loss or alteration of architectural details, cornices and eave lines should be avoided.

8.2 Design an addition to be compatible in size and scale with the main building. Set back an addition from historically important primary facades in order to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent. Keep the addition visually subordinate to the historic building. If it is necessary to design an addition that is taller than the historic building, set it back substantially from significant facades and use a “connector” to link it.

8.4 Design a new addition to be recognized as a product of its own time. An addition shall be made distinguishable from the historic building, while also remaining visually compatible with these earlier features. A change in setbacks of the addition from the historic building, a subtle change in material, or a differentiation between historic and more current styles are all techniques that may be considered to help define a change from old to new construction.

8.5 Design a new addition to preserve the established massing and orientation of the historic building. For example, if the building historically had a horizontal emphasis, this orientation shall be continued in the addition.

Finding: Historical documentation that would support altering the front façade has not been provided and research done by staff has not identified historical documentation that would support alterations to the front

of the property. Therefore, the proposed alterations to the front of the structure are not substantiated by any known historic, physical or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible;

Analysis: The proposal does not include any sort of chemical or physical treatments. If any surface needs to be cleaned, it shall be done using the gentlest means necessary. Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.34.020.D.3 a certificate of appropriateness is required for any masonry work, including sandblasting and chemical cleaning.

Design Guidelines that support the proposal

2.7 Use the gentlest means possible to clean the surface of a structure. Perform a test patch to determine that the cleaning method will cause no damage to the material surface. Many procedures can actually have an unanticipated negative effect upon building materials and result in accelerated deterioration or a loss of character. Harsh cleaning methods, such as sandblasting, damage the weather-protective glaze on brick and change its historic appearance. Such procedures are prohibited. If cleaning is appropriate, a low pressure water wash is preferred. Chemical cleaning may be considered if a test patch is first reviewed.

Finding: Cleaning of any exterior material or surface should be done utilizing the gentlest means necessary. Sandblasting or other power washing is prohibited. An Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness specifically for the cleaning or surface treatment of historic materials is required prior to any work being performed.

8. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment;

Analysis: The defining characteristics of the subject property are the front façade of the building and the general form of the house and its location. Making changes to the primary façade would alter the defining characteristics. The alterations and addition on the other elevations of the house are to areas of the house that have been altered in the past and are on a secondary elevation of the home.

Design Guidelines that support the proposal

8.1 Design an addition to a historic structure such that it will not destroy or obscure historically important architectural features. Appropriate: Set back an addition from historically important primary facades in order to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent, or set the addition apart from the historic building and connect it with a "link."

8.2 Design an addition to be compatible in size and scale with the main building. Set back an addition from historically important primary facades in order to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent. Keep the addition visually subordinate to the historic

building. If it is necessary to design an addition that is taller than the historic building, set it back substantially from significant facades and use a “connector” to link it.

8.3 Place an addition at the rear of a building or set it back from the front to minimize the visual impact on the historic structure and to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent. Locating an addition at the front of a structure is inappropriate.

8.6 Do not construct a new addition or alteration that will hinder one's ability to interpret the historic character of the building or structure. A new addition that creates an appearance inconsistent with the historic character of the building is inappropriate. An alteration that seeks to imply an earlier period than that of the building is inappropriate. In addition, an alteration that seeks to imply an inaccurate variation on the historic style is inappropriate. An alteration that covers historically significant features is inappropriate as well.

8.9 Minimize negative technical effects to original features when designing an addition. Avoid construction methods, for example that would cause vibration that may damage historic foundations. New alterations also should be designed in such a way that they can be removed without destroying original materials or features.

8.14 Keep a new addition physically and visually subordinate to the historic building. The addition shall be set back significantly from primary facades. A minimum setback of 10 feet is recommended. The addition should be consistent with the scale and character of the historic building or structure. Large additions should be separated from the historic building by using a smaller connecting element to link the two.

9.2 Construct accessory buildings that are compatible with the primary structure. In general, garages should be unobtrusive and not compete visually with the house. While the roofline does not have to match the house, it is best if it does not vary significantly. Allowable materials include horizontal siding, brick, and in some cases stucco. Vinyl and aluminum siding are not allowed for the walls but are acceptable for the soffits. In the case of a two car garage two single doors are preferable and present a less blank look to the street; however, double doors are allowed.

9.3 Do not attach garages and carports to the primary structure. Traditionally, garages were sited as a separate structure at the rear of the lot; this pattern should be maintained. The allowance of attached accessory structures is reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

13.7 Construct and locate secondary structures in a manner similar to those seen historically in the district. Most secondary structures were built along the rear of the lot, accessed by the alley, if one existed. This should be continued. Garages, as well as driveways, should not dominate the streetscape; therefore, they should be detached from the main house and located to the rear of the house, if possible. Historically, garages and carriage houses in the Avenues were simple wood structures covered with a gabled or hipped roof. A new secondary structure should follow historic precedent, in terms of materials and form.

Finding: The alterations to the front façade of the home alter the historic character of the property and are not consistent with this standard. The addition to the subject property is consistent with applicable design standards and does not destroy cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material.

9. Additions or alterations to structures and objects shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible in massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment;

Analysis: The addition on the rear of the home would be located in an area where a previous addition is currently located. This area would be altered in a manner that would make it difficult to remove in the future. However, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. The addition would be covered with a fiber cement composite siding that differentiates it from the rest of the structure.

The alterations to the front of the structure would be difficult to remove and restore to the original design. If the proposed window openings were to be filled in, matching the brick may be difficult and would be visible from the public street. The alterations to the front porch make the front entry a more predominant element of the home because of the increased width and larger pediment. It appears as though the front entry has been modified in the past, so it may be possible to restore the front entry. It would be difficult to remove the enlarged concrete landing without damaging the original foundation of the structure.

Design Guidelines that support the proposal

8.1 Design an addition to a historic structure such that it will not destroy or obscure historically important architectural features. Appropriate: Set back an addition from historically important primary facades in order to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent, or set the addition apart from the historic building and connect it with a "link."

8.2 Design an addition to be compatible in size and scale with the main building. Set back an addition from historically important primary facades in order to allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent. Keep the addition visually subordinate to the historic building. If it is necessary to design an addition that is taller than the historic building, set it back substantially from significant facades and use a "connector" to link it.

13.6 Because side yard spaces are relatively small between residences in this area, plan additions and alterations so that they have minimal visual impacts on adjacent properties. Avoid locating a massive addition where it may directly overlook inhabited rooms on adjacent properties or obstruct views from them.

Finding: The following proposed additions and alterations to the front of the structure do alter the essential form and historic integrity of the structure:

1. adding a new front porch
2. adding a new entrance feature over the front door
3. adding new window openings on the second floor of the front elevation of the home

The addition to the rear of the home is on a secondary elevation and does not alter essential form or function of the structure. The rear addition would be differentiated from the original structure by the use of different materials.

10. Certain building materials are prohibited including the following:

a. Vinyl or aluminum cladding when applied directly to an original or historic material, and

b. Any other imitation siding material designed to look like wood siding but fabricated from an imitation material or materials;

Analysis: The proposal does include aluminum clad windows and fiber cement composite materials. The aluminum clad windows are new and do not cover historic material. The pediment would be constructed of a synthetic material with a smooth finish. It does not have a grain pattern. The materials on the secondary elevations and additions are similar.

Finding: The proposed building materials are compatible with the existing materials on the home and do not cover historic or original material.

11. Any new sign and any change in the appearance of any existing sign located on a landmark site or within the H historic preservation overlay district, which is visible from any public way or open space shall be consistent with the historic character of the landmark site or H historic preservation overlay district and shall comply with the standards outlined in part IV, [chapter 21A.46](#) of this title;

Analysis: There are no signs associated with this property.

Finding: This standard is not applicable because there are no signs associated with the property.

12. Additional design standards adopted by the Historic Landmark Commission and City Council.

Analysis: This report references the publication “*Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City*”, including the design guidelines that are specific to the Avenues Historic District. There are not additional design standards adopted by the Historic Landmark Commission or City Council that are applicable to this property.

Finding: The proposal shall comply with any additional design standard adopted by the HLC and City Council.

Attachment A
Narrative Submitted by Applicant

Attachment B
Historic Photo of Site

Attachment C
Current Photos of Site

Attachment D
Site plan and elevations