Notice of Meeting for the
Historic and Architectural Review Commission
of the City of Georgetown
September 24, 2020 at 6:00 PM
at Teleconference

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 regular meeting will convene at 6:00pm on September 24, 2020 via teleconference. To participate, please copy and paste the weblink into your browser:

Webinar ID: 986-0859-0841
Password: 357876

To participate by phone:
Call in numbers:  +1(346)248-7799,  +1(669)900-6833,  +1(253)215-8782,
+1(929)205-6099
Password: 357876

Citizen comments are accepted in three different formats:
1. Submit written comments to planning@georgetown.org by 5:00p.m. on the date of the meeting and the Recording Secretary will read your comments into the recording during the item that is being discussed.
2. Log onto the meeting at the link above and "raise your hand" during the item
3. Use your home/mobile phone to call the toll-free number

To join a Zoom meeting, click on the link provided and join as an attendee. You will be asked to enter your name and email address (this is so we can identify you when you are called upon). To speak on an item, click on the "Raise your Hand" option at the bottom of the Zoom meeting webpage once that item has opened. When you are called upon by the Recording Secretary, your device will be remotely un-muted by the Administrator and you may speak for three minutes. Please state your name clearly, and when your time is over, your device will be muted again.
Use of profanity, threatening language, slanderous remarks or threats of harm are not allowed and will result in you being immediately removed from the meeting.

Regular Session

(This Regular Session may, at any time, be recessed to convene an Executive Session for any purpose authorized by the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code 551.)

A Discussion on how the Historic and Architectural Review Commission virtual conference will be conducted, to include options for public comments and how the public may address the Commission -- Sofia Nelson, CNU-A, Planning Director

B 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

* Once staff and the applicant have addressed questions from the Commissioners, the Chair of the Commission will open the public hearing. The chair will ask if anyone would like to speak. To speak, click on the "Raise Your Hand" option at the bottom of the Zoom meeting webpage. Your device will be remotely un-muted and you may speak for three minutes. Please state your name and address clearly. A speaker may allot their time to another speaker for a maximum of 6 minutes. If a member of the public wishes to allot their time to another speaker, they may do so when their name is called by the Chair. Please remember that all comments and questions must be addressed to the Commission, and please be patient while we organize the speakers during the public hearing portion. When your time is over, your device will be muted again.

• After everyone who has asked to speak has spoken, the Chair will close the public hearing and provide a few minutes of rebuttal time to the applicant if they so choose.

Public Wishing to Address the Board

On a subject that is posted on this agenda: Please fill out a speaker registration form which can be found at the Board meeting. Clearly print your name, the letter of the item on which you wish to speak, and present it to the Staff Liaison, preferably prior to the start of the meeting. You will be called forward to speak when the Board considers that item.

On a subject not posted on the agenda: Persons may add an item to a future Board agenda by filing a written
request with the Staff Liaison no later than one week prior to the Board meeting. The request must include the speaker's name and the specific topic to be addressed with sufficient information to inform the board and the public. For Board Liaison contact information, please logon to http://government.georgetown.org/category/boards-commissions/.

C At the time of posting, no persons had signed up to address the Board.

Legislative Regular Agenda

D Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the September 10, 2020 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

E Conceptual review of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new building construction (infill development) at the property located at 405 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description 0.7434 acres, being Lot 9, Replat of Block 24, City of Georgetown.

F 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 ________________, 2020, at __________, and remained so posted for at least 72 continuous hours preceding the scheduled time of said meeting.

__________________________________
Robyn Densmore, City Secretary
City of Georgetown, Texas
Historic and Architectural Review
September 24, 2020

SUBJECT:
Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the September 10, 2020 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

ITEM SUMMARY:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
.

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>
The regular meeting convened at 6:00PM on September 10, 2020 via teleconference at: https://bit.ly/3aCYA8p

To participate by phone: Call in number: 888-475-4499 Webinar ID#: 978-1599-5564 Password: 453689

Public Comment was allowed via the conference call number or the “ask a question” function on the video conference option; no in-person input was allowed.

Members present: Amanda Parr, Chair; Catherine Morales; Pam Mitchell; Terri Asendorf-Hyde; Steve Johnston; Art Browner; Karalei Nunn, Robert McCabe

Members absent: Faustine Curry

Alternate Commissioner McCabe was on the dais.

Staff present: Britin Bostick, Historic Planner; Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst; Nat Waggoner, Long Range Planning Manager; Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

Call to order by Commissioner Parr at 6:00 pm.

Regular Session

(This Regular Session may, at any time, be recessed to convene an Executive Session for any purpose authorized by the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code 551.)

A. (Instructions for joining meeting attached). Discussion on how the Historic and Architectural Review Commission virtual conference will be conducted, to include options for public comments and how the public may address the Commission. – Sofia Nelson, CNU-A, Planning Director

B. 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

*Once staff and the applicant have addressed questions from the Commissioners, the Chair of the Commission will open the public hearing. If a member of the public would like to provide comments on the agenda item under discussion, the chair will ask if anyone would like to speak. To speak, please identify yourself by either entering your name, address and item number on the Q/A chat on your screen. When your name is called you will have up to 3 minutes. A speaker may allot their time to another speaker for a maximum of 6 minutes. If a member of the public wished to allot their time to another speaker, they may do so when their name is called by the Chair. Please remember that all comments and questions must be addressed to the Commission, and please be patient while we organize the speakers during the public hearing portion. After everyone who has asked to speak has spoken, the Chair will close the public hearing and provide a few minutes of rebuttal time to the applicant if they so choose.

On a subject not posted on the agenda: Persons may add an item to a future Board agenda by filing a written request with the Staff Liaison no later than one week prior to the Board meeting. The request must include the speaker’s name and the specific topic to be addressed with sufficient information to inform the board and the public. For Board Liaison contact information, please logon to [http://government.georgetown.org/category/boards-commissions/](http://government.georgetown.org/category/boards-commissions/).

### Legislative Regular Agenda

C. Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the August 27, 2020 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

**Motion to approve Item C by Commissioner Morales. Second by Commissioner Johnston. Approved (6-0), with Commissioner Nunn abstained because she was absent at the last meeting.**

D. **Public Hearing** and Possible Action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for an addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street facing façade at the property located at 1257 S. Church Street, bearing the legal description of Lot 18, Block I of the Cody Addition. – Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

Staff report by Bostick. The applicant is requesting HARC approval of a request to enclose the front porch with screening material to protect against mosquitoes in warmer months. The screening material is proposed to be installed with minimal disturbance to the historic material, and the screens would be installed within thin frames attached to the porch to minimize the visual impacts from the street. As the front porch is asymmetrical with the front door to the left of the porch as viewed from S. Church Street, the screened area would be limited to the portion with porch railing, and not include screening across the area in front of the front door so that
the front door remains fully visible from the street. The 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows that the subject property did not have any structure in that year, but the 1925 shows the house with a detached garage to the rear along Myrtle Street. The 1940 Sanborn Map, 1964 aerial photo and 1974 aerial photo show no changes to the structures on Lot 18. The medium priority historic structure has a large, west-facing front porch that is original to the design of the house, which is Craftsman in style with low roof slopes, stone columns at the front porch, exposed rafters under the roof eaves and an asymmetrical front façade. The low height of the beam across the stone porch columns and the presence of landscaping provide for a less obtrusive condition for the installation of screening as seen from the street.

There were questions from the Commission to the applicant related to any additional changes that will need to be made to complete the request. The applicant commented that there will no be additional changes.

Chair Parr opened and closed the Public Hearing as no one signed up to speak.

**Motion to approve Item D (2020-43-COA) as presented by the applicant by Commissioner Nunn. Second by Commissioner Morales. Approved (7-0).**

E. Presentation and discussion of Commission training on Infill Development.

The purpose of this item is to train the Commission on Infill Development. Bostick reviewed the training goals, which included learning vocabulary for commercial infill development, learning about the distinction between mass and scale, how the UDC defines “Building Height” and the relationship to roof style, and key concepts guiding development in Area 1 and Area 2 of the Downtown Overlay District. Bostick also explained setback for commercial property and provided commercial infill setback examples. Bostick also reviewed building height exceptions, courthouse view protection, floor to area ratio, and impervious cover.

F. Updates, Commission questions, and comments. – Sofia Nelson, Planning Director

No updates

**Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Morales. Second by Commissioner Nunn.

Meeting adjourned at 7:21 pm

______________________________  ______________________________
Approved, Amanda Parr, Chair Attest, Terri Asendorf-Hyde, Secretary
SUBJECT:
Conceptual review of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new building construction (infill development) at the property located at 405 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description 0.7434 acres, being Lot 9, Replat of Block 24, City of Georgetown.

ITEM SUMMARY:
The applicant is requesting HARC approval of a new, three story bank and office with a drive-thru located on the east side of the building. The new building is proposed to be a total of 22,702 sq. ft., with a 40’ building height as defined by the Unified Development Code (UDC) and a 47’ parapet height. The proposed exterior materials are cast stone or cut limestone and stucco, with dark aluminum frame windows and non-reflective glazing. The proposed design includes decorative stucco details at the first and top floors, as well as stone and stucco details to highlight the building entrances on the north and south elevations and the center section of the Austin Avenue (west) façade. Signage is not proposed as part of this application, but the submitted plans show building signage areas on each of the three street facades. The highest point of the roof parapet at 49’ is proposed for the cornice details in the center of the street-facing facades, while the parapet surrounding the roof ("mid parapet") is 47’ in height. This parapet acts to screen rooftop mechanical equipment from view, while the “low parapet” is a decorative element.

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>Staff Report</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 1 - Location Map</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 2 - Letter of Intent</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3 - Plans &amp; Specifications</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
Conceptual review of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new building construction (infill development) at the property located at 405 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description 0.7434 acres, being Lot 9, Replat of Block 24, City of Georgetown.

AGENDA ITEM DETAILS
Project Name: R Bank - Georgetown
Applicant: Whitney Koch (Mustard Design)
Property Owner: Carr Ryan Re 4, LLC
Property Address: 405 S. Austin Avenue
Legal Description: 0.7434 acres, being Lot 9, Replat of Block 24, City of Georgetown
Historic Overlay: Downtown Overlay District
Case History: N/A

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

APPLICANT'S REQUEST
HARC:
✓ New building construction (infill development)
Feedback staff is seeking:
• Building Form and Massing (Design Guidelines 13.3 – 13.6)
• Building Materials (Design Guidelines 13.8 – 13.12)
• Building Proportions (Design Guideline 13.18)

STAFF ANALYSIS
The applicant is requesting HARC approval of a new, three story bank and office with a drive-thru located on the east side of the building. The new building is proposed to be a total of 22,702 sq. ft., with a 40’ building height as defined by the Unified Development Code (UDC) and a 47’ parapet height. The proposed exterior materials are cast stone or cut limestone and stucco, with dark aluminum frame windows and non-reflective glazing. The proposed design includes decorative stucco details at the first and top floors, as well as stone and stucco details to highlight the building entrances on the north and
south elevations and the center section of the Austin Avenue (west) façade. Signage is not proposed as part of this application, but the submitted plans show building signage areas on each of the three street facades. The highest point of the roof parapet at 49’ is proposed for the cornice details in the center of the street-facing facades, while the parapet surrounding the roof (“mid parapet”) is 47’ in height. This parapet acts to screen rooftop mechanical equipment from view, while the “low parapet” is a decorative element.

- **Building Form and Massing (Design Guidelines 13.3 – 13.6)**

  Staff is requesting feedback on the proposed building form and massing. Massing is a term in architecture which refers to the perception of the general shape and form as well as the size of a building. Building form is the shape or configuration of a building. The proposed building is three stories in height, with a parapet height of 47’ and architectural elements with a maximum height of 49’. The building is a full three floors at the west and south property lines, or the Austin Ave. and W. 5th St. facades. The building is also three stories in height at the north façade facing the parking lot, and on the east façade, or the façade facing onto the access way, the drive-thru lanes are on the first floor, reducing the building mass at the first floor, with full second and third floors above.

  The Design Guidelines provide direction for larger infill buildings to reflect traditional building widths of about 30’, which is a reference to the buildings surrounding the Square. Those buildings range from approximately 20’-50’ in width, with buildings on the sides of the Square often having similar or wider street façades. Some historic structures in the Downtown, such as the County Courthouse and Post Office building, were designed not with storefronts but with wider, more prominent and classical façades. Other buildings in Area 2 of the Downtown Overlay District were designed not to mimic continuous storefronts, but to be standalone buildings with parking areas. The design of this building does not reflect the Design Guidelines' preference for variation in the building according to a “traditional” or 30’ building module, but rather is understood as one single structure that has less height and articulation variation along the street facades.

- **Building Materials (Design Guidelines 13.8 – 13.12)**

  Staff is requesting feedback on the proposed materials. The proposed exterior materials are cut limestone or cast stone (manufactured stone), as well as stucco, with dark bronze or black aluminum frame windows and doors and non-reflective glazing. The stone is proposed to wrap the first floor and the center portions of the south, west and north facades on the second and third floors, with the stucco wrapping the second and third floors and parapet, and used for the cornices, window sills and the roof over the drive-thru lanes.

  Stone and stucco are commonly seen on historic buildings in the Downtown Overlay District, as well as on newer buildings. Many of the historic buildings have a combination of stone, brick, painted wood and painted metal, with variations in the paint colors, as well as in the exposed
brick or stone. One of the differences between the materials proposed for this building and traditional materials in the Downtown is in the texture and color variation. The proposed cut stone or cast stone has a relatively smooth and consistent surface, as does stucco, which is different from the stone and stucco materials used traditionally. Traditional limestone building facades and sides have rough textures and color variations increased by weathering, water and time. The proposed stucco has a consistent texture, and when newly installed and painted, will have a consistent color and appearance on the building. Stucco was not used traditionally in the Downtown, but was rather added to building facades later in time to cover brick, stone or wood facades that may have aged and needed repair, or the stucco may have been installed in the mid-20th century to change the building from a Victorian period style to a more modern appearance. In some cases, these stucco finishes have been removed, but in many instances, they are still applied to the building, both on primary, street-facing facades and on side street facades. The proposed building, by contrast, has consistent textures and color throughout, with the dark window frames providing a color contrast to the light stone and stucco.

- Building Proportions (Design Guideline 13.18)

Staff is requesting feedback on the proposed proportions, particularly for the windows. On buildings in the Downtown Overlay District, upper floor windows primarily have a vertical orientation. That is, most upper floor windows, and the upper floor windows in historic buildings, are taller than they are wide. In large part this was for technical reasons. Upper floor windows were operable, and a taller, narrower window was easier to construct and open, and the taller windows helped with cooling the building prior to air conditioning, especially if the windows were double-hung, or if the top could be opened down as well as the bottom opened up. The windows proposed for this building are wider than they are tall, which is proportionally different from windows seen traditionally. These aluminum frame windows would be fixed, however, and the building function does not require them to be operable.

**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 13 – DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL CONSTRUCTION IN AREA 2 – DOWNTOWN OVERLAY DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.1 Locate a new building at the front property line.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Align the building front at the sidewalk edge.</td>
<td>Proposed building is set at the Austin Ave. and W. 5th St. property lines along the sidewalk edge. New sidewalk is to be constructed as part of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A minimum of 50% of the street frontage of a property shall have a building wall at the sidewalk edge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Where no sidewalk exists one should be installed that aligns with nearby sidewalks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guidelines

**CHAPTER 13 – DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL CONSTRUCTION IN AREA 2 – DOWNTOWN OVERLAY DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.2 Where a portion of a building must be set back, define the edge of the property with landscape elements.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ For example, define the edges of a lot with landscaping, such as low-scale urban street trees or shrubs.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Landscaping elements should be compatible with the character of the area in size, scale, and type. Free-form, suburban type landscaping is inappropriate in this setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Also consider using a fence, or other structural element, that reflects the position of typical storefront elements. These elements should align with nearby traditional commercial building types.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.3 A new building shall reflect the traditional lot width as expressed by the following:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Variation in height at internal lot lines.</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variation in the plane of the front façade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Variation in architectural detailing and materials to emphasize the building module.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variation in the façade height to reflect traditional lot width.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.4 Building heights of larger projects should provide variety.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Findings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A larger development should step down in height towards the street or smaller, surrounding structures.</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vary the building height in accordance with traditional lot width.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set back the upper floor to vary the building façade profile(s) and the roof forms across the width and the depth of the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Vary the façade (or parapet) heights at the front.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscaping and screening is to be provided in accordance with the UDC requirements, and is reviewed as part of the Site Development Plan application process.

The subject property is platted as a single lot and there are not interior lot lines to be expressed in the building façade. The front facade plane has minimal variation with repeating architectural features, although the detailing at the center portion of the street facades provides variation for the center module. The façade height is consistent except for cornice details in the center portions.

The proposed project does not step down in height toward the street or toward smaller structures to the east, and a structure of similar height is adjacent to the south. The building height is not varied in accordance with traditional lot width (typically 20’-40’ width around the Square and 50’-60’ for lot widths s in the surrounding blocks for comparison), although the parapet height at both the Austin Ave. and W. 5th St. facades has a variation in the center.
### GUIDELINES

#### CHAPTER 13 – DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL CONSTRUCTION IN AREA 2 – DOWNTOWN OVERLAY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.5 Large project sites should be developed with several buildings, rather than a single structure.</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ This will help reduce the perceived size of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ The façade height shall be varied to reflect traditional lot width.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6 Where a large building is needed, divide the building into modules that reflect the traditional size of buildings.</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ A typical building module should not exceed 30 feet in width. The building module should be expressed with at least one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ A setback in wall planes of a minimum of 3 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ A change in primary facade material for the extent of the building module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ A vertical architectural element or trim piece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ Variations in facade treatment should be continued through the structure, including its roofline and front and rear facades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ If a larger building is divided into “modules,” they should be expressed three-dimensionally throughout the entire building. Variation in height should occur where the site is larger than two traditional lot widths, in order to reduce overall scale of the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7 Maintain views to the courthouse.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ In certain circumstances views to the courthouse shall be taken into consideration when designing a new building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ A new building shall not be so tall as to block views of the courthouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8 Masonry materials that convey a sense of scale are preferred.</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ✔ Brick and stone are preferred for new construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guidelines  
#### Chapter 13 – Design Guidelines for Infill Construction in Area 2 – Downtown Overlay District

- New materials should appear similar in character to those used traditionally. For example, stucco, cast stone, and concrete should be detailed to provide a human scale.
- New materials should have a demonstrated durability for the Central Texas climate. For example, some facade materials used in new construction are more susceptible to weather and simply do not last as long as stone or brick.

### Findings

#### 13.9 A simple material finish is encouraged for a large expanse of wall plane.
- A matte, or non-reflective, finish is preferred.
- Polished stone and mirrored glass, for example, are inappropriate and should be avoided as primary materials.

#### 13.10 Traditional building materials such as wood, brick, and stone are encouraged.
- Horizontal lap siding of traditional dimensions is appropriate in most applications.
- Maintenance of traditional siding dimensions are encouraged.
- Brick or stone, similar to that used traditionally, is also appropriate.
- Highly reflective materials are inappropriate.
- New materials that are similar in character to traditional ones may be considered. Alternative materials should have a proven durability in similar locations in this climate.

#### 13.11 Use roof materials that appear similar to those seen traditionally.
- Metal and shingle roofs are preferred.
- Clay tile is discouraged.

#### 13.12 Develop the ground floor level of a project to encourage pedestrian activity.
- Provide at least one of the following along primary pedestrian ways:
  - A storefront
  - Display cases

---

Proposed materials are matte finish and non-reflective.

Proposed materials include stone and stucco, but the proposed cut or cast stone would have a smooth face, which is different from the traditional limestone blocks used on buildings in the Downtown. Stucco was not usually an original exterior material in the Downtown but has been added later to several buildings to cover the building’s façade rather than make other repairs, and many of the stucco façade coverings have been removed over time or are being considered for removal.

Proposed roof is a flat roof with parapet, which is compatible with traditional structures.

Proposed project will provide landscaping in accordance with UDC requirements, which are reviewed as part of the Site Development Plan application. The proposed building is constructed as a bank.

---
## GUIDELINES

**CHAPTER 13 – DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL CONSTRUCTION IN AREA 2 – DOWNTOWN OVERLAY DISTRICT**

- Landscaping  
- A courtyard or plaza  
  - Include traditional elements such as display windows, kickplates, and transoms on commercial storefronts.  
  - Avoid a blank wall or vacant lot appearance.

### Findings

- and office building and does not have traditional storefront features.

#### 13.13 Orient the primary entrance of a building toward the street.

- A building should have a clearly-defined primary entrance.  
- The building entrance should be recessed.  
- A primary building entrance also should be at or near street level.

**Complies**

The proposed building has a defined primary entrance from W. 5th St. and from the parking lot on the north side of the building, both of which are recessed and at street level. However, the Austin Ave. façade does not have an entrance.

#### 13.14 Clearly identify the road edge and project entrances for both automobiles and pedestrians.

- Use landscaping and lighting accents to identify entrances.

**Complies**

The proposed project has defined entrances for both pedestrians and vehicles.

#### 13.15 Minimize the number of entrances along a street edge.

- Sharing ingress and egress points with neighboring projects is strongly encouraged with consideration to safety.

**Complies**

Proposed site access is from the rear of the project via a shared access easement.

#### 13.16 Place parking areas to the rear of a site when feasible or disburse throughout the site.

- See also the design guidelines for Parking found in Chapter 8.

**Partially Complies**

Proposed parking is located to the north side of the site but is not located to the front of the building.

---

### CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

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

#### SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The application is complete and the information contained within the application is correct and sufficient enough to allow adequate review and final action;

**Complies**

Staff reviewed the application and deemed it complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Compliance with any design standards of this Code; | Partially Complies  
Proposed project requires approval of an Administrative Exception for the proposed overall building height within the Courthouse View Protection Overlay District. |
| 3. Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to the most extent practicable; | Not Applicable  
Subject property is a vacant lot and has no historic structures. |
| 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; | Partially Complies  
Proposed project complies or partially complies with applicable Design Guidelines. |
| 5. The general historic, cultural, and architectural integrity of the building, structure or site is preserved; | Complies  
The subject site has been vacant for several years and was previously a residential block with commercial parking lot. |
| 6. New buildings or additions are designed to be compatible with surrounding properties in the applicable historic overlay district; | Partially Complies  
The proposed design does not mimic the traditional building widths as expressed in the Design Guidelines, however the architect has stated their perspective that the building is more in keeping with larger buildings in the Downtown rather than attempting to replicate the Main Street storefronts that are two blocks from this property. The proposed height is compatible with the existing commercial building to the south, but is tall in comparison to the residential structures to the east, and only a small portion of covered parking adjacent to the drive-thru is a single story in height while the second and third floors are situated above the drive-thru lanes. The proportions of the window openings are one of the most significant differences between this proposed building and the traditional buildings in the Downtown. Downtown windows tend to be taller than they are wide and emphasize a vertical orientation. The proposed windows |
**SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA** | **FINDINGS**
--- | ---
are proportioned with a greater width than height, which visually competes with the vertical elements of the building facade. | **Partially Complies**
The proposed new building has elements that reflect the character of the Downtown Overlay District, including materials and exterior details. However, the Austin Ave. façade does not have the pedestrian orientation that could be provided through breaking the building into smaller modules, stepping back the upper floors or providing canopies or awnings along the public right-of-way.

7. The overall character of the applicable historic overlay district is protected; and | **Not Applicable**

8. The Master Sign Plan is in keeping with the adopted Downtown and Old Town Design Guidelines and character of the historic overlay district. | No signage is proposed as part of this application.

**ATTACHMENTS**
Exhibit 1 – Location Map  
Exhibit 2 – Letter of Intent  
Exhibit 3 – Plans and Specifications

**SUBMITTED BY**  
*Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner*
August 17, 2020

City of Georgetown, Planning and Development Services
Historic and Architectural Review Commission- (CoA)

Regarding: R Bank Georgetown - Certificate of Appropriateness
405 S. Austin Avenue, Georgetown, TX

Owner Information: Carr Ryan Re 4, LLC
5121 Bee Cave Road, Suite 207
Austin, TX 78746
Scott Carr
Email: scott@carrdevelopment.com

Project Summary:
We are proposing the design of a new three story office building on the town lot located at the 405 S. Austin Avenue. The lot is undeveloped, has some existing trees and is bordered by 4th Street on the north, Austin Avenue on the west, 5th Street on the south and a residential townhouse development to the east via a shared access easement.

The design vision for the new three-story building is that of a traditional bank office building that includes cut stone at street level, with decorative cornices and steel-look windows. The entries will be recessed into the building to provide covered entry for the patrons and tenants and located facing 4th and 5th streets. A bank drive through will be provided off of the shared access easement which also provided the primary entry and exit pathway on the site.

The first floor will be comprised primarily of a bank tenant and possible second small tenant while the 2nd and 3rd floors will be private office lease space.

The first floor and central entry elements are set to resemble traditional load-bearing masonry in a style reminiscent of historic bank/governmental buildings. These areas will be clad in a cut limestone veneer and be accented with decorative cornices. The second and third floor areas will still be reflective of traditional building styles utilizing a stucco veneer and decorative cornices. The upper parapets are stepped to signal a hierarchy of entry and accent the central entry elements.

The material selection of the building will coordinate well with existing traditional buildings throughout downtown and provides for a similar aesthetic with stone and stucco veneers and steel-look window and door appearances. The scale of the building meets with the development code guidelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our project for your review.

Whitney Koch, AIA, NCARB
Principal Architect
Texas Registered Architect #24419
August 28, 2020

Ms. Britin Bostick  
Downtown & Historic Planner  
City of Georgetown  
britin.bostick@georgetown.org

RE: 2020-45-COA: Site Plan for R Bank

Dear Britin,

Thank you for the preliminary CoA review for the HARc proceedings, we received your comments sent 08.26.2020 and have listed a written response to each for the above-mentioned project. Each item is in response to the red comments listed on the returned documents.

Comment:
Signage indicated is noted as “By Tenant”. Will signage be part of this CoA application or will it be submitted separately at a later date? Building will require approval of a Master Sign Plan for multi-tenant signage.

Response:
Signage approval is not being requested/submitted as part of application process, and the drawing notations have been updated accordingly.

Comment:
Are you requesting approval of both materials?

Response:
Yes, we are seeking approval of both materials as options, not to be used together, but to be used as a stand-alone finish type based on the overall cost of the building.

Cut stone is utilized throughout the downtown area, but also comes at a premium on cost. Through the use of a cast-stone product as an alternative, we can achieve an appropriate and cohesive building aesthetic while being cost-effective.

We seek to have both materials approved to allow the owner to have flexibility in his selections as the project progresses and overall costs are finalized. We will add an example of both types for review.

Comment:
Are you requesting approval of both materials? If so please provide an example photo of the stucco and/or EIFS finish installed or a manufacturer’s product cut sheet showing the proposed stucco and/or EIFS finish texture for HARC review.

Response:
EIFS is a type of a stucco system, and both stucco and EIFS have the same exterior finished representation. I have adjusted the wording to eliminate any confusion.

Current stucco/EIFS systems are indicative of traditional plaster building materials used in the downtown area. There are numerous buildings that have a plaster veneer, to which current stucco finishes are meant to mimic. We will add an example of the type of texture desired.

Comment:
What is the glazing type for the windows?

Response:
Glazing will be a low-E, non-reflective coating. The drawing notes have been updated.
Comment:
Design Guidelines 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, and 13.6 discuss building modules that express traditional (30’) lot widths, have variation in height, use setbacks in wall planes and give an appearance of multiple buildings. Were there options considered during the design process to address these Guidelines, or can you provide some commentary to HARC on the proposed building design?

Response:
The building design is meant to be representative of historic buildings of importance, such as the courthouse, post office, and traditional large bank buildings. Being that this project will house a banking institution on the first floor, and the building will be labeled for that banking institution (i.e. no other tenant signage on the building), the design was conceived to be representative of the traditional monumental buildings of the early 1900s that evoke timelessness, longevity and staying-power. The first floor is representative of this style through our use of cut or cast stone veneer which would be typically found in high-ranking buildings of this type historically. With the upper floor meant to be representative of traditional plaster.

We have addressed the variations in building height with our variations in the parapet elevations and have broken the building up visually with the use of the 3-story stone facade at the center of the building. Which is also indicative of traditional buildings historically entering on multiple sides. We also have varied the elevational plane with the use of the pilaster and cornice banding. This lot is very large and can support a building of this size appropriately, and I feel we have balanced the positioning of the building with the parking layout to maximize the site, and provided for pedestrian access off of 5th street, and vehicular-based access from 4th street.

This building is also bordered and within in view range of other large and somewhat grandiose buildings, such as the Tamu Building to its south, the current Jail to its west, and the Old Jail to its north. This building is not set into or surrounded by buildings fitting the “main street” frontage typology, or the 30’ module. In my professional opinion to ask that this building fit the main street style would actually set it apart even more and make it stand out as different from its surroundings.

Comment:
There is not an entrance proposed for the Austin Ave. façade. Is that due to the slope of the sidewalk in the ROW, or due to the interior layout?

Response:
There is not an entry from Austin Avenue; this is due to the security needs and plan layout of the bank tenant occupying the main floor of the building. However we did design the west facade to mimic traditional buildings of importance that would have been entered from multiple sides, and then modified at a later date.

I will provide revised drawings upon clarification of the articulation comments. Thank you for the plan review, should you have any questions please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Whitney Koch, AIA, NCARB
Mustard Design Architects
Registered Architect Texas 24419
R BANK
CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS

ELEVATION KEY NOTES
1. ABOVE BAY HEIGHT LIMIT, ALL BAY HEIGHTS WILL BE AS INDIcATED ON ELEVATIONS.
2. THRESHOLD HEIGHT LIMIT, ALL THRESHOLD HEIGHTS WILL BE AS INDIcATED ON ELEVATIONS.
3. ABOVE WINDOW HEIGHT LIMIT, ALL WINDOW HEIGHTS WILL BE AS INDIcATED ON ELEVATIONS.
4. ABOVE DOOR HEIGHT LIMIT, ALL DOOR HEIGHTS WILL BE AS INDIcATED ON ELEVATIONS.

SITE DEVELOPMENT NOTES
1. ALL FOUNDATION COMPONENTS WILL BE CONVENTIONALLY REINFORCED.
2. FOUNDATION TYPE:
   - BEAM STIFFENED SLAB ON GRADE FOUNDATION
   - INTEGRAL SPREAD FOOTERS WILL BE PROVIDED UNDER FOUNDATION COMPONENTS.

ARCHITECTURAL PLAN NOTES
1. AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40' - 0"
2. VERTICAL ARTICULATION FOR ELEVATION
3. HORIZONTAL ARTICULATION FOR FOOTPRINT
4. ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES
   - AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40'
   - REFER TO ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.050

ARCHITECTURAL COMPATIBILITY
1. REFERENCE THE ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.040

BUILDING ARTICULATION
1. REFER TO ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.040
2. BUILDING ELEMENTS
   - COLUMN LOCATIONS
   - ALL FOUNDATION COMPONENTS WILL BE CONVENTIONALLY REINFORCED.
   - FOUNDATION TYPE:
     - BEAM STIFFENED SLAB ON GRADE FOUNDATION
     - INTEGRAL SPREAD FOOTERS WILL BE PROVIDED UNDER FOUNDATION COMPONENTS.

SITE DEVELOPMENT NOTES
1. AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40' - 0" x 3 = 120' - 0", MAXIMUM LATERAL DISTANCE WITHOUT CHANGE IN VERTICAL ELEVATION
2. VERTICAL ARTICULATION FOR ELEVATION
3. HORIZONTAL ARTICULATION FOR FOOTPRINT
4. ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES
   - AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40'
   - REFER TO ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.050

CALCULATIONS BELOW
1. BUILDING ARTICULATION
2. REFER TO ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.040
3. BUILDING ELEMENTS
   - COLUMN LOCATIONS
   - ALL FOUNDATION COMPONENTS WILL BE CONVENTIONALLY REINFORCED.
   - FOUNDATION TYPE:
     - BEAM STIFFENED SLAB ON GRADE FOUNDATION
     - INTEGRAL SPREAD FOOTERS WILL BE PROVIDED UNDER FOUNDATION COMPONENTS.

SITE DEVELOPMENT NOTES
1. AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40' - 0" x 3 = 120' - 0", MAXIMUM LATERAL DISTANCE WITHOUT PERPENDICULAR OFFSET
2. VERTICAL ARTICULATION FOR ELEVATION
3. HORIZONTAL ARTICULATION FOR FOOTPRINT
4. ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES
   - AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40'
   - REFER TO ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.050

CALCULATION IF IT IS FOUND TO REFLECT COLOR THAT IS CONSIDERED SIGNAGE ACCORDING TO THE DEFINITION OF COLOR SELECTION IS NOT APPROVED WITH THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND MAY BE COUNTED TOWARD THE SIGNAGE REQUIREMENT PERMITTED WITH THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OR HARC PLAN.

SIGNAGE IN THE UDC
1. SIGNAGE IS APPROVED WITH THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OR HARC PLAN.
2. ALL ROOF, WALL AND GROUND MOUNTED MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT MUST BE SCREENED IN ACCORDANCE WITH UDC CHAPTER 8. SIGNAGE REQUIRES A SEPARATE APPLICATION AND APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT, NO SIGNAGE IS APPROVED WITH THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OR HARC PLAN.
ELEVATION TAG: 01

CUT OR CAST STONE VENEER
IMAGE ABOVE REPRESENTS THE TYPICAL COLOR FOR EITHER CAST OR CUT STONE VENEER

ELEVATION TAG: 02

STUCCO COLOR
SHERWIN WILLIAMS: INCREDIBLE WHITE 7028 OR SIMILAR
TYPICAL COLOR FOR STUCCO

ELEVATION TAG: 16

RETAINING WALL
PRECAST RETAINING WALL BLOCK WITH CAP
COLOR SIMILAR TO CUT/CAT STONE VENEER

ELEVATION TAG: 07, 08, 09

METAL CLAD DOOR/WINDOW EXAMPLE
COLOR: DARK BRONZE ANODIZED OR BLACK
R Bank 405 S. Austin Ave.
2020-45-COA

Historic & Architectural Review Commission
September 24, 2020
Item Under Consideration

2020-45-COA – R Bank Georgetown

• Conceptual review of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new building construction (infill development) at the property located at 405 S. Austin Avenue, bearing the legal description 0.7434 acres, being Lot 9, Replat of Block 24, City of Georgetown.
Item Under Consideration

HARC:
  • New building construction (infill development)
Item Under Consideration
Current Context
Staff Feedback Request

- Building Form and Massing (Design Guidelines 13.3 – 13.6)
- Building Materials (Design Guidelines 13.8 – 13.12)
- Building Proportions (Design Guideline 13.18)
R Bank – Proposed Site Plan
R Bank – Proposed Elevation
R Bank – Proposed Elevation

SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
R Bank – Proposed Elevation

EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
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R Bank – Proposed Elevation
R Bank – Proposed Materials

ELEVATION TAG: 01

CUT OR CAST STONE VENEER
IMAGE ABOVE REPRESENTS THE TYPICAL COLOR FOR EITHER CAST OR CUT STONE VENEER

CUT STONE VENEER EXAMPLE
PARKS CANADA FEDERAL BUILDING

CAST STONE VENEER EXAMPLE
AMERICAN STONECAST, LLC
ELEVATION TAG: 02

STUCCO COLOR
SHERWIN WILLIAMS: INCREDIBLE WHITE 7028 OR SIMILAR
TYPICAL COLOR FOR STUCCO

STUCCO FINISH EXAMPLE WITH CORNICE BANDING
TEXTURE: WALL: SMOOTH TO FINE
BANDS: SMOOTH TO FINE
R Bank – Proposed Materials

ELEVATION TAG: 16

RETAINING WALL
PRECAST RETAINING WALL BLOCK WITH CAP COLOR SIMILAR TO CUT/CAST STONE VENEER

ELEVATION TAG: 07, 08, 09

METAL CLAD DOOR/WINDOW EXAMPLE COLOR: DARK BRONZE ANODIZED OR BLACK
R Bank – Proposed Proportions
R Bank – Proposed Proportions
R Bank – Proposed Proportions
## Approval Criteria – UDC Section 3.13.030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Staff’s Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The application is complete and the information contained within the application is correct and sufficient enough to allow adequate review and final action;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance with any design standards of this Code;</td>
<td>Partially 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>N/A</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</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>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The overall character of the applicable historic overlay district is protected; and</td>
<td>Partially 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>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Feedback Request

- Building Form and Massing (Design Guidelines 13.3 – 13.6)
- Building Materials (Design Guidelines 13.8 – 13.12)
- Building Proportions (Design Guideline 13.18)