Notice of Meeting for the
Historic and Architectural Review Commission
of the City of Georgetown
December 12, 2019 at 6:00 PM
at 510 W. 9th Street Georgetown, Texas 78626 Council and Courts Building

The City of Georgetown is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you require assistance in participating at a public meeting due to a disability, as defined under the ADA, reasonable assistance, adaptations, or accommodations will be provided upon request. Please contact the City Secretary's Office, at least three (3) days prior to the scheduled meeting date, at (512) 930-3652 or City Hall at 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626 for additional information; TTY users route through Relay Texas at 711.

The Historic and Architectural Review Commission, appointed by the Mayor and the City Council, is responsible for hearing and taking final action on applications, by issuing Certificates of Appropriateness based upon the City Council adopted Downtown Design Guidelines and Unified Development Code.

Welcome and Meeting Procedures:
· Staff Presentation
· Applicant Presentation (Limited to ten minutes unless stated otherwise by the Commission.)
· Questions from Commission to Staff and Applicant
· Comments from Citizens *
· Applicant Response
· Commission Deliberative Process
· Commission Action

* Those who speak must turn in a speaker form, located at the back of the room, to the recording secretary before the item they wish to address begins. Each speaker will be permitted to address the Commission one time only for a maximum of three minutes.

Legislative Regular Agenda

A Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the October 10, 2019 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

B Public Hearing and possible action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for an alteration to a commercial property located at 712 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description of Georgetown City Of, BLOCK 41, Lot 5(PT), ACRES 0.06. (2019-66-COA) – Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

C Updates, Commissioner questions, and comments. - Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Adjournment
Certificate of Posting

I, Robyn Densmore, City Secretary for the City of Georgetown, Texas, do hereby certify that this Notice of Meeting was posted at City Hall, 808 Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Georgetown, TX 78626, a place readily accessible to the general public as required by law, on the _____ day of ________________, 2019, at ____________, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

__________________________________
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary
SUBJECT: Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the October 10, 2019 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ITEM SUMMARY: Attached.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: None

SUBMITTED BY: Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the September 26, 2019 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. – Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

Motion to approve Item A by Commissioner Johnston. Second by Commissioner Parr. Approved (7-0).

B. Public Hearing and possible action for the demolition of a low priority structure located in the Old Town Overlay District, located at 1304 E. 15th Street. – Nathaniel Waggoner, Long Range Planning Manager

Nelson informed the Commission that the applicant had made a change and would like present to the Commission first before the staff report.

The applicants, Paul Morris and Shawn Boyd, addressed the Commission. The applicants presented pictures of the home and described the issues with the home’s structure and stability. The house was identified as a low priority structure, which is why the applicants applied for a demolition. However, after speaking with department staff, the applicants decided to instead only request for demolition of the newest additions to the structure. The applicants commented on roofing issues, lack of structural support, plumbing and electrical issues, and foundation issues. There will be a significantly lower cost to update the issues to the core structure of the house rather than the entire house including additions.

Waggoner provided an overview of the relocation, removal, or demolition criteria from the UDC. The staff report was then presented by Waggoner. The one-story residential structure located at 1304 E 15th Street is identified as a low priority structure in the 2016, medium priority structure in the 2007 and was not included in the 1984 Historic Resources Surveys Reports (HRSR) completed by the City of Georgetown. The estimated date of construction is 1949. The 2016 HRSR indicates a “Ranch” stylistic influence with an irregular plan. Additions to the original structure include an enclosed garage and a carport. To date, staff has received one (1) written comment in favor of the demolition. This low priority structure is compatible with other ranch style homes in the area and remains habitable and repairable.
Waggoner also commented that on August 22, the demolition subcommittee toured the property. The original structure is still recognizable and can be preserved. There are original materials that can be of salvage value. The subcommittee recommends denial of the request for demolition of the structure.

Waggoner explained the approval options to the Commission: approval, approval with conditions, disapproval, and delay where final action must be taken within 35 days.

Commissioner Mitchell asked the applicants how long they have lived in the house for, and what changes were discussed with the applicant. Waggoner explained that there was discussion about the additions to the original structure that are creating issues. Although the application was initially for a full demolition, the applicant has reconsidered salvaging the original structure.

Commissioner Romero opened and closed the Public Hearing as no one signed up to speak.

Commissioner Parr commented on her observations during the tour. She is opposed to the full demolition of the structure and would like to walk through again to look at the additions that have been made.

Commissioner Romero described his observations during the tour and commented that this does not meet the criteria for a demolition. He also would like to go back and tour the house again.

Waggoner clarified the voting options for the Commission. The applicant commented that the current condition of the house is not the best, but there are safety concerns.

**Motion to approve Item B by Commissioner Johnston.**

**Motion to approve Item B with conditions, where the demolition is restricted to any addition that is not core to the primary structure of the house, by Commissioner Mitchell. Second by Commissioner Asendorf-Hyde. Motion passes (4-3) with Commissioners Romero, Parr, and Johnston opposed.**

C. Updates, Commissioner Questions and comments. Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Nelson informed the Commission that notifications regarding attendance will be sent out from the Mayor. There will not be a meeting on October 24th as there are no items on the agenda.

**Adjournment**

**Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Parr. Second by Commissioner Morales. Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.**

__________________________    ____________________________
Approved, Josh Schroeder, Chair          Attest, Amanda Parr, Secretary
SUBJECT:
Public Hearing and possible action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for an alteration to a commercial property located at 712 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description of Georgetown City Of, BLOCK 41, Lot 5(PT), ACRES 0.06. (2019-66-COA) – Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

ITEM SUMMARY:
The Applicant is requesting HARC approval for the modification of the existing ground floor storefront, which is not original to the building, to return the façade to an appearance more consistent with two story buildings of the turn of the 20th century time period. The new façade would have an inset double door for the first floor, a left side door for the interior stair leading to the second floor, and a deep metal awning reminiscent of the deep awning visible in historic photos of the building. Additionally, the building would have a new paint scheme, new upper floor windows to replace the existing wood windows and new brick on the ground floor façade to replace the painted brick that was modified for the non-original storefront installation.

Based on the findings listed above, staff recommends APPROVAL of the request for alterations to the façade of this high-priority structure, with the exception that the wood windows on the upper floor be repaired and repainted rather than replaced. The proposed façade design is consistent with the Design Guidelines as well as with buildings of that era and with the Downtown Historic District, and the proposed design enhances the District by returning ground level features that are characteristic of buildings from the Victorian era and by removing features that were not character-enhancing.

Public Comment
None at the time of this posting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
N/A

SUBMITTED BY:
Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 1 – Letter of Intent</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 2 – Plans and Specifications</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To HARC:

Our family is very excited to rejuvenate the Doering Building on the west side of the square. Once we were able to acquire the building, we met with both the owner and discussed historic attributes with prior tenants of the building. Unfortunately, we were not able to find out a whole lot of information. In order to be the best stewards possible of the building, we have re-pointed the limestone façade at the rear of the building. Now we are seeking your support to renovate the façade and restore the integrity of this historic building.

The first structure appears to have been built on this site in 1885, and then through a couple of phased builds was replaced by the current structure in 1895(ish). As previously mentioned, the western side is not as photographed as the rest of the square. There are only a few direct photos of the Doering Building, but you can see a few different façade and awning styles over the life the building. We began our research process with Kim McAuliffe and the Main Street Program of the Texas Historic Commission. We’ve also looked through the Williamson County museum, Georgetown Library, and publications by Donna Scarbrough Josey related to the square (Georgetown: Then and Now / Georgetown: Images of America). Recently, we met with Ms. Britin Bostick to consult on our ideas to date to ensure we were fulfilling the City’s intent. The items we are focusing on restoring, pursuant to Chapters 6, 9 and 11 of the Design Guidelines are as follows:

**Facade**

A. **Paint** – Christian Prado (THC) helped to provide us with a sample of appropriate color schemes for this building. Given the coloration of the original brick facade, we prefer the dark green and cream color scheme with black accents. To address Sections 11.1-11.3, our family conducted the research described above to try to achieve a likeness from the historic photos. Granted the photos are in black and white, but the intent seems consistent. Additionally, we will do our best to match the original brick. We are adding a separate entry to the second floor, consistent with secondary access of other buildings on square. This is a similar color scheme consistent with the neighboring buildings. Pursuant to Section 11.6, we would like to highlight some of the beautiful detail in the second story tin features. We have attached indicative color samples. We have included pictures of the proposed color samples: Jasper (Dark Green), Sand Dollar (Cream) and Caviar (Black).

B. **Windows.** The sizing, location and limestone lintels of the windows define this building as referenced in Sections 6.1-6.3. We would like to keep the exact look of the transoms and upper story windows, but put in a double paned product to help with efficiencies. Lower floor glass will need to be replaced to bring back the historic façade. As with other buildings on the east and west, throughout the day, the second floor heats substantially. Further, there is evidence of past leaks and wood rot on the second story. Given the cost of the interior renovation and of the façade, we want to preserve that as best as possible. We are looking at an Anderson A-series product similar to the replacement windows in the nearby David Love Building- double hung, double-paned and custom sized to fit the existing locations. The first floor windows will also need a custom cut, but we request they be double paned. This will comply with Sections 6.12, 6.13 and 6.16 of the Design Guidelines.

C. **Awning.** Working again with Christian, we were given some historically appropriate options for awnings. We preferred the metal awning for the clean line and classic look, as well as its durability. Besides restoring a historical feature, the awning has practical attributes, providing welcome shade for pedestrians, shielding the merchandise on the ground floor from direct sun, and providing shelter when those crazy Texas storms blow in. We have attached an example of a black standing seam metal roof.
We are happy to answer any questions that you might have, and are looking forward to starting this project!

Sincerely,

Kristofer Kasper
SW 6216 Jasper
SW 6099 Sand Dollar
SW 6990 Caviar
Original facade shows inset front door.....possible door on the front left??
Replaced floor seems to indicate location of original stairway
EXAMPLE OF AWNING – BLACK STANDING SEAM METAL
Casement Windows

Andersen® A-Series casement windows are our best performing casement windows. They’re available with all of our energy-efficient glass options, and their exteriors are virtually maintenance-free. With so many options to choose from, start designing yours today.

DURABLE
- Virtually maintenance-free
- Exterior finish never needs painting and won’t flake, rot, blister, peel or corrode
- Exteriors are protected by a Fibrex® material and fiberglass for long-lasting performance

ENERGY-EFFICIENT
- Weather-resistant construction for greater comfort and energy efficiency
- Variety of High-Performance Low-E4® glass options available to help control heating and cooling costs in any climate
- Many A-Series casement windows have options that make them ENERGY STAR® v. 6.0 certified throughout the U.S.

BEAUTIFUL
- Eleven exterior color options and a variety of interior options
- Extensive hardware selection, grilles, between-the-glass art glass and patterned glass options

*Visit andersenwindows.com/warranty for details.
*ENERGY STAR® is a registered trademark of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
Inventory sheet (Carol Kennedy Research 1982)

Address: 712 Austin Ave. Block: 41
Current Use: retail: Town Square Floors
Architect/Builder:

Dates: built between 1894 and 1900
Description:
2-story stone commercial building with brick facade of 3 bay width;
windows at 2nd story are 2/2 sash with stone sills and lintels; sheet metal
cornice; storefront has been altered

Historical Information:
Previously on site:
1885 1 1/2-story frame building @ north: drugs & books;
rear: 1-story tin building; paints & oils
shoemaker (small 1-story frame building @ south); *

1888 Ownership is unclear from 1888 City Tax records; possible owners:
A.P. Johnson or W.L. Mann

1889 barber & baths (1 story frame building @ north);
cobbler (small 1 story frame building @ south) *

1894 hardware; tin shop at rear *

Present building [See photo #2, #10]:
1900 hardware *
1905 dry goods, notions, clothing, boots & shoes *
1910 dry goods, notions, clothing, boots & shoes *
Ownership is unclear from 1910 City Tax Records; possibilities are:
W.L. Mann, J.H. Hodges, or J.T. Mileham

1916 grocery *

1983 UPDATE: Carl Doering, owner. Facade restoration pending.

WALKING TOUR BROCHURE:

56. Doering Building, ca. 1895
712 Austin Avenue
Though the first floor wooden storefront was replaced
with modern brick in the mid 20th century, this lime-
stone building exhibits typical turn of the century store-
front design. The buff colored brick facade is supported
with cast iron columns and accented with rusticated
limestone window details and a pressed metal cornice.
Date you purchased the property: 1965 (Carl Doering) 1992 (Doering Irrevocable Trust)

List below any exterior modifications you made to the property and date of renovations. Also, list any exterior modifications you are considering making in the near future.

Exterior painted - May '99
New roof - Sept. '01

List below any interior modifications you made and the date of renovations. Also, list any interior modifications you are considering making in the near future.

July '99 - Interior stairway redone.
July '99 - Second floor opened for use; steel bracing installed on first floor to support upstairs use.

Current Use: Retail (Upstairs/Downstairs)
Option 7. Color Scheme

- Brick base color, cream, green accents & black awning.
- Addition of sloped awning to protect storefront and clerestory windows from eastern and south-eastern sun.
- Awning material requested most likely metal.
- Awning structurally supported by brackets underneath, properly secured to masonry construction.
Planning Department Staff Report

Historic and Architectural Review Commission

Meeting Date: Thursday, December 12, 2019
File Number: 2019-66-COA

AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
Public Hearing and possible action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for an alteration to a commercial property located at 712 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description of Georgetown City Of, BLOCK 41, Lot 5(PT), ACRES 0.06.

AGENDA ITEM DETAILS
Project Name: Doering Building
Applicant: Kristofer Kasper
Property Owner: Opossum Creek LLC
Property Address: 712 S. Austin Avenue
Legal Description: Georgetown City Of, BLOCK 41, Lot 5(PT), ACRES 0.06
Historic Overlay: Downtown Historic Overlay District
Case History: COA-2017-001 – Business Signage

HISTORIC CONTEXT
Date of construction: 1895 (HRS)
Historic Resources Survey Level of Priority: High
National Register Designation: N/A
Texas Historical Commission Designation: N/A

APPLICANT’S REQUEST
HARC:
✓ Addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade (Contributing High Priority Historic Structure)
✓ Awning or Canopy (Contributing High Priority Historic Structure)
✓ Replacing a historic architectural feature with a non-historic architectural feature (Contributing High Priority Historic Structure)

HPO:
✓ Changes to paint color on previously painted surfaces (Contributing Historic Structure)

STAFF ANALYSIS
The current ground floor storefront configuration is not original to the building. Returning the ground floor façade to a design consistent with the time period in which the building was constructed, returning the structural columns and foundation to the interior of the building and installing a metal awning that is consistent with the awning visible in historic photos of the building are all appropriate for this high-priority structure. The addition of the door on the left to provide access to the interior stair is consistent
Planning Department Staff Report

Historic and Architectural Review Commission

both with designs of that era and with indications of a stair once in place in that location. First floor construction materials of brick, Douglas Fir and new storefront are consistent with rehabilitating the façade while also not creating a false narrative that this is the original storefront.

The replacement of the upper windows with non-historic materials is not consistent with the Design Guidelines and is not appropriate. Repairing the wood windows as needed and repainting is the recommendation of Chapter 6 of the Guidelines.

**APPLICABLE DESIGN GUIDELINES**
The following guidelines are applicable to the proposed scope of work in accordance with the adopted Downtown and Old Town Design Guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 If a storefront is altered, restoring it to the original design is preferred.</td>
<td><strong>Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ If evidence of the original design is missing, use a simplified interpretation of similar storefronts. The storefront still should be designed to provide interest to pedestrians.</td>
<td>Storefront from a recent modification is being removed and replaced with a design more consistent with the building’s time period as identified in Exhibit 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Note that, in some cases, an original storefront may have been altered early in the history of the building, and may itself have taken on significance. Such alterations should be preserved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ See also Preservation Briefs #11: Rehabilitating Historic Storefronts, published by the National Park Service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15 Repair wood features by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the wood.</td>
<td><strong>Does Not Comply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid the removal of damaged wood that can be repaired.</td>
<td>Applicant proposes to replace wood windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rebuild or repair portions of existing window frames, sashes, sills, or portions thereof, rather than replacing complete windows unless it is technically infeasible to do so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See also Preservation Briefs #9: The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows, published by the National Park Service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.20 When window or door replacement is necessary, match the replacement to the original as closely as possible.</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Preserve the original casing, when feasible.</td>
<td>New windows are proposed to be consistent with design of original, but of a different exterior material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Very ornate windows or doors that are not appropriate to the building’s architectural style are inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Using the same material (wood) is preferred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHAPTER 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Avoid alterations that would damage historic features.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Avoid alterations that would hinder the ability to interpret the design character of the original building.</td>
<td>Design character of building is clear and proposed alterations are consistent with original time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Alterations that seek to imply an earlier period than that of the building are inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GUIDELINES                                                                 | FINDINGS                      |
| 7.2 Properties designated by the City as a High or Medium Priority Historic Structure should be preserved and their historic character retained. | Complies                      |
| ✓ Due to special circumstances, a structure’s historic priority may change over time (because a reduced number of similar style structures in stable condition still exist within the district or city, or if unknown historic information becomes available that adds significance). | Proposed alterations do not diminish historic character. |

### CHAPTER 10

| GUIDELINES                                                                 | FINDINGS                      |
| 10.2 A fixed metal canopy may be considered.                             | Complies                      |
| ✓ Appropriate supporting mechanisms are wall-mounted brackets, chains, and posts. | The proposed metal canopy is a contemporary interpretation of the fabric awning seen in the historic photos. |
| ✓ Consider using a contemporary interpretation of those canopies seen historically. |                               |

### CHAPTER 11

| GUIDELINES                                                                 | FINDINGS                      |
| 11.1 Develop a color scheme for the entire building that coordinates all the façade elements. | Complies                      |
| • Using the historic color scheme is encouraged.                        |                               |
### GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Choose a base color that will link elements of the entire building face together. It can tie signs, ornamentation, awnings, and entrances together. It can also help the building better relate to others on the block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A single color scheme should be used for the entire exterior so upper and lower floors and subordinate wings of buildings are seen as components of a single structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 11.2 Paint colors should enhance individual building elements while creating a unified, coordinated appearance for the entire structure.

- ✓ Paint colors and placement should create a cohesive look for the structure. There should be one main color on the body of the building to unify the façade.
- ✓ Choose colors for trim, accents, and architectural details that complement the main color on the body of the structure.
- ✓ Consider the palette of surrounding structures to create a harmonized appearance along the block face.

#### 11.6 Paint colors should highlight architectural details.

- ✓ Plan painting to use more than one color. It is inappropriate to allow architectural details to be camouflaged by painting them the same color as the background of the structure.
- ✓ Strong or bold colors can be appropriate for trim, accents, and architectural details.

### CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

In accordance with Section 3.13.030 of the Unified Development Code, the HARC must consider the following criteria:

#### 3.13.030 CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The application is complete and the information contained within the application is correct and sufficient enough to allow adequate review and final action;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance with any design standards of this Code;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to the most extent practicable;</td>
<td>Partially Complies – Does Not Comply with Standard 6. Deteriorated Historic Features Shall Be Repaired Rather Than Replaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compliance with the adopted Downtown and Old Town Design Guidelines, as may be amended from time to time, specific to the applicable Historic Overlay District;</td>
<td>Partially Complies – Complies with the Applicable Design Guidelines Excepting 6.15 and 6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The general historic, cultural, and architectural integrity of the building, structure or site is preserved;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New buildings or additions are designed to be compatible with surrounding properties in the applicable historic overlay district;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The overall character of the applicable historic overlay district is protected; and</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Master Sign Plan is in keeping with the adopted Downtown and Old Town Design Guidelines and character of the historic overlay district.</td>
<td>Not Applicable – No Signage Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the findings listed above, staff recommends APPROVAL of the request for alterations to the façade of this high-priority structure, with the exception that the wood windows on the upper floor be repaired and repainted rather than replaced. The proposed façade design is consistent with the Design Guidelines as well as with buildings of that era and with the Downtown Historic District, and the proposed design enhances the District by returning ground level features that are characteristic of buildings from the Victorian era and by removing features that were not character-enhancing.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

As of the date of this report, staff has received no written comments on the request.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Exhibit 1 – Letter of Intent  
Exhibit 2 – Plans and Specifications

**SUBMITTED BY**

Britin Bostick, Downtown Historic Planner