

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT



Planning and Zoning
Division
Department of Community
Development

Brandon House
Major Alterations to a Structure Petition 470-07-33
located at approximately 113 West Clinton Avenue in
the Capitol Hill Historic District
October 3, 2007

Applicant: Jason Guinn

Staff: Janice Lew
(801) 535-7625
janice.lew@slcgov.com

Tax ID: 08-36-229-002

Current Zone: SR-1A (Special
Development Pattern Residential
District)

Council District: Three,
Council Member Jergensen

Acreage: .29 acres

Current Use: Single-family

**Applicable City Code Land
Use Regulations:**

- Section 21A.34.020

Attachments:

- A. Application
- B. Documentation
- C. Photographs

REQUEST

The applicant, Jason Guinn, representing Minta and Bob Brandon, requests approval to install vinyl siding to replace existing aluminum siding, replace the existing horizontal slider windows with similar vinyl windows, and replace the front door on the home located at 113 W. Clinton Avenue. The Planning Staff elected to refer the administrative approval request to the Historic Landmark Commission because of the extent of the proposed work and the care that the Commission has used when considering the use of vinyl siding and windows.

PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice of the proposed major alteration was mailed on September 19, 2007 to all property owners within eighty-five feet (85') of the subject property. Community Council review is not required by the City Code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the proposed alterations to the existing building located at 113 W. Clinton Avenue do not comply with the City's historic preservation standards as stated below and are inconsistent with the architectural character of the building. Therefore, Staff recommends the following:

1. That the Historic Landmark Commission denies the request to replace the existing doors, because the proposed design is not consistent with the character of the bungalow type house. Should the applicant present a door type that is more consistent with those found on a bungalow type house, staff requests that the Commission direct staff to administratively approve the alterations.
2. That the Historic Landmark Commission denies the request to replace the existing sliding windows with a vinyl sliding window, as this configuration is not consistent with the historic character of the building. Should the applicant present window types that are more consistent with those found on a bungalow type house, staff requests that the Commission direct staff to administratively approve the alterations.
3. That the Historic Landmark Commission denies the request to replace the aluminum siding including the soffit and fascia with vinyl siding because it is not consistent with the pattern of the original siding or the character of the building. Should the applicant present a building material that matches the original material in detailing or is a compatible substitute material, such as Hardiboard, staff requests that the Commission direct staff to administratively approve the alterations. These building materials would be consistent with that historically found on a bungalow type house.

VICINITY MAP



Public Comment

Staff received one comment by phone from an interested party who stated that they were opposed to the request.

BACKGROUND, ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS:

BACKGROUND

According to the historic site form prepared in 1980, this one-story gabled roof bungalow was built in 1922 for Frank J. and Ada Arnold Kirby. Kirby was a craftsman for the Galligher Machinery Co. The house is characterized by wide window openings; a gabled porch supported by tapered posts, and exposed purlins. At the time of the 1980 survey, the frame building with shingle siding had undergone major alterations over the years. However, the house was considered contributing in the Capitol Hill Historic District. The eaves are covered with aluminum, the building is now clad with aluminum siding and the front porch has been enclosed. In addition, the windows are not original, but aluminum horizontal sliders. This contributing status was reaffirmed in the Capitol Hill Historic District Reconnaissance Level Survey (RSL) completed in 2006.

The following is a summary of the proposed work to be undertaken (see Exhibit A for the full list):

- Replace the existing aluminum siding with Alcoa premium vinyl siding.
- Install Alcoa scallops on front gable.
- Wrap the porch columns in PVC coated aluminum.

- Replace all existing aluminum windows with fourteen two-panel sliding windows, four double-hung windows and two glass units. All trim will be wrapped in white PVC-coated aluminum.
- Replace existing doors with Champion doors.

Artificial Material Policy

In 1980, the Historic Landmark Commission adopted the following policy regarding the use of artificial materials:

The use of artificial material in a building which is listed on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources (either as a landmark site or as part of an historic district) shall not be approved unless it is proven necessary for the preservation of the building.

The policy lists the artificial materials addressed by the Commission and includes; vinyl siding, aluminum siding and asbestos siding. In August of 1994, the Commission discussed creating a new policy regarding the use of synthetic siding, but elected to address the issue through the citywide zoning ordinance rewrite. At that time, the Commission Members identified potential problems of synthetic siding and cited the following reasons for their resistance to the use of the material in the districts:

- It obscures original materials or material that defines the character of a building. As a substitute material for wood, it does not lend itself to the precise shaping that wood does, nor does it have a similar texture.
- Contrary to the claims made by synthetic siding companies, aluminum and vinyl siding are not maintenance and problem-free.

Adopted in April of 1995, Section 21A.34.020(G)(10) addresses the use of synthetic siding on contributing and Landmark Sites and is addressed below.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Historic Landmark Commission should make findings in this case based upon Section 21A.34.020(G): *Standards for Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration of a Landmark Site or Contributing Structure*, of the City Zoning Ordinance.

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: No changes are proposed in the use of the building for residential purposes.

Finding: The project is consistent with this standard.

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 distinct characteristics of original building materials, including the scale of the element, its texture and finish, are important in defining the overall historic character of a property. The design of surrounding window casings, the dimensions and profile of window sash elements and the materials of which they were constructed are also important elements. Thus these features should be retained and preserved. When the material is too deteriorated to repair, then limited replacement in kind may be permitted. Additionally, primary historic building materials should never be covered or subjected to harsh cleaning materials. The architectural integrity of this residential structure, however, was compromised when the original wood windows were replaced with aluminum windows that did not match the appearance of the originals, and the original siding was covered or removed.

Finding: The application meets this standard, as the applicant is not proposing to remove historic materials that characterize the property or alter historic features beyond those changed previously. The original building materials were removed at an earlier date.

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: Removal of the aluminum windows and siding and replacing them with a synthetic material (vinyl) does not create a false sense of history because vinyl is a modern construction material. Continuing to use sliding windows, another synthetic cladding material (vinyl) and a door that is not associated with the style of the house, however, is to continue the inappropriate alteration of features not characteristic of a historic bungalow. One-over-one single- and double-hung windows, as well as casement windows, are identified in the Design Guidelines as appropriate for this type of building. The applicant has indicated that no exploratory work has been done to determine if the original siding has been covered or replaced. Where an important architectural feature is missing such as the siding, its recovery is always recommended as the preferred treatment. A second acceptable course of action for the replacement feature is a new design that is compatible with the remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

Finding: The proposed building materials comply with this standard to the extent that their application would not create a false sense of history. The proposed recommendations by staff for different types of windows, cladding and doors that are consistent with a bungalow building type, is not conjectural, as this would reinforce the historic character of the home.

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

Analysis: Staff does not know exactly when the previous alterations were made, but does not consider the changes to this house to have acquired historic significance in their own right. Based upon the site form, the work was performed after 1980 and is a modification to the building that is less than the benchmark of 50 years old. As such, the previous alterations are not considered significant historically or architecturally.

Finding: The primary façade and character-defining elements of the historic building as seen from the street would not be negatively affected by the removal of the existing aluminum windows, door and metal cladding. These features are inappropriate alterations that detract from the historic character of the building and not of an age to have achieved historic significance in their own right.

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

Analysis: The metal siding, windows and existing doors are not character-defining features of the property; in fact, they detract from the home's identity as a bungalow.

Finding: The application complies with this standard in that the replacement of inappropriate materials would not remove finishes or construction techniques that characterize this historic property.

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 Historic Landmark Commission and staff have not made it a practice to require property owners to return a property to an earlier appearance if a material or feature was removed or obscured.

Thus, the Commission must determine to what extent the applicant should restore the incompatible alterations while making the house viable for the property owner as well as adhering to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Design Guidelines. Since the existing building materials are not original or in keeping with the character of a bungalow type house, staff is of the opinion that other cladding, window and door types could be used that would be more consistent with the visual qualities associated with this building type. The Historic Landmark Commission, however, has allowed the use of horizontal sliders on secondary locations when necessary for egress purposes or where they replaced original casement, awning or hopper windows, so the exterior appearance is similar to the original window. The windows must also be the same size and configuration as the historic windows.

Regarding the replacement of the aluminum siding, the qualities of the new material (vinyl) varies from those offered by wood, the original material, nor does the new material match the existing in composition, design and texture. If an original material is missing or too deteriorated to repair, then a compatible substitute material may be considered. The proposed vinyl siding differs from wood in its composition, design and its texture which will have an artificial wood grain rather than the smooth finish of wood. The Historic Landmark Commission has found substitute materials such as Hardiboard an acceptable substitute material for wood siding because it lends itself to the crisp detailing found in wood products. The Historic Landmark Commission's design guidelines discuss replacement materials extensively and recommend the following:

Treatment of original material

2.1 Preserve the historic appearance of original materials with new material. Preservation includes proper maintenance of the materials to prevent deterioration.

Covering materials

2.2 Covering original building materials with new materials is not allowed. Covering original materials with new materials is not allowed. Vinyl or aluminum siding is prohibited on historic buildings, as well as any other imitation siding material that may be designed to look like wood siding but that is fabricated from other materials.

2.3 Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance. Once the siding is removed, repair the original material. Removal of other materials, such as stucco, must be tested to assure that the original material will not be damaged. If masonry has a stucco finish, removing the covering may be difficult, since original brick finishes were sometimes chipped to provide a connection for the stucco application. If removing stucco is to be considered, first remove the material from a test patch to determine the condition of the underlying masonry.

Replacement materials

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.

2.9 Do not use synthetic materials, such as aluminum or vinyl siding or panelized brick, as a replacement for primary building materials. In some instances, substitute materials may be use for replacing architectural details but doing so is not encouraged. If it is necessary to use a new material, such as fiberglass for a replacement column, the style and detail should match that

of the historic model. Primary building material such as masonry, wood siding and asphalt shingles shall not be replaced with synthetic materials. Modular materials may not be used as replacement materials. Synthetic stucco, and panelized brick, for example, are inappropriate.

Design Standards for Windows

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

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

3.4 Preserve the size and proportion of a historic window opening. Reducing an original opening to accommodate a smaller window or increasing it to receive a large window are inappropriate measures.

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.

3.6 Match the profile and its components, as closely as possible to that of the original window. A historic wood window has a complex profile--within its casing, the sash steps back to the plane of the glazing (glass) in several increments. These increments, which individually only measure eighths or quarters of inches, are important details. They distinguish the actual window from the surrounding plane of the wall. The profiles of wood windows allow a double-hung window, for example, to bring a rich texture to the simplest structure. In general, it is best to replace wood windows with wood on contributing structures, especially on the primary façade. Non-wood material, such as vinyl or aluminum, will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and the following will be considered: will the original casing be preserved? Will the glazing be substantially diminished? What finish is proposed? Most importantly, what is the profile of the proposed replacement windows?

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.

Design Standards for Doors

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.

Finding: Since this is a request to alter previous inappropriate work, it may not be possible to repair the original building materials. The request does not meet this standard in that the replacement materials are not appropriate substitute materials for a building of this type.

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: No chemical or physical treatments are proposed as part of this request.

Finding: This standard is not an issue for the project.

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: Since the historic character of the building was diminished by the removal of important architectural materials and features, preservation practices dictate that replacement materials and features should match the appearance of the originals to the greatest extent possible.

Finding: The application for new siding, replacement windows and door does not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archaeological material. The use of vinyl siding as a replacement material is inconsistent with this standard because the replacement material has not been found to be an appropriate substitute material for wood in the districts. The configuration of the existing windows (sliders) is not consistent with the character of this home. The proposed door is also not compatible with the bungalow type of the house, due to the design of the glass. Thus, the design of the proposed sliding windows and doors does not meet this standard.

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 character-defining features of this building have undergone several changes over time. Although the most recent changes may be reversible, the alterations do not reinforce its historic character and diminish the integrity of the property. However, because the existing alterations are considered as later incompatible changes to the house, they are easily differentiated from the original form of the house.

Finding: The proposed alterations are inconsistent with meet this standard because they support a continuation of the inappropriate alteration of features not characteristic of a bungalow.

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: As discussed previously in this staff report, the Historic Landmark Commission has addressed the issue of synthetic materials and their opposition to the application of synthetic siding is reflected in the Zoning Ordinance. The ordinance states that synthetic siding is not allowed on original or historic materials. The metal siding is not an original material, and as far as the staff has been able to determine, a historic material. However, it was probably installed before the Capitol Hill Historic District was designated. Like the metal siding, vinyl siding does not lend itself to the precise shaping that wood does, nor does it have the texture of wood.

Finding: The proposed application of vinyl siding is inconsistent with this standard because it does not convey the same visual appearance including design and texture as wood siding.

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, Signs;

Analysis: Signage is not a component of this project.

Finding: This standard does not apply to the project.

12. Additional design standards adopted by the historic landmark commission and city council.

Analysis: The Historic Landmark Commission's *Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City* is applicable in this case.

Finding: The request is inconsistent with Standards 6, 8, 9, and 10 as noted above and not supported by the design guidelines mentioned in this staff report.

Exhibit A Application

Exhibit B Documentation

Exhibit C Photographs