Notice of Meeting for the
Historic and Architectural Review Commission
of the City of Georgetown
October 8, 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 October 8, 2020 via teleconference. To participate, please copy and paste the weblink into your browser:

Weblink: https://bit.ly/3c2CQUg
Webinar ID: 985-7521-8377
Password: 131373

To participate by phone:
Call in numbers: +1(301)715-8592 or (Toll Free) 888-475-4499
Password: 131373

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 24, 2020 regular meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Commission. - Mirna Garcia, Management Analyst

E **Public Hearing and Possible Action** on 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. – Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

F **Public Hearing and Possible Action** on a request for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** (COA) for a 4'-0" setback modification to the required 6' side setback to allow a carport structure 2'-0" from the side (south) property line and an addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade at the property located at 1505 Olive Street, bearing the legal description 0.345 acres, being part of Block 40 of the Snyder Addition. - Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

G 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
SUBJECT:
Consideration and possible action to approve the minutes from the September 24, 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 24, 2020 via teleconference at: https://bit.ly/2FBeXXT

To participate by phone: Call in number: (346)248-7799, (669)900-6833, (253)215-8782, (929)205-6099 Webinar ID#: 986-0859-0841 Password: 357876

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; Art Browner, Steve Johnston, Terry Asendorf-Hyde, Catherine Morales; Pam Mitchell

**Members absent:** Faustine Curry, Robert McCabe, Karalei Nunn

**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 6:01 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.** 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/.

Public Wishing to Address the Board

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

Motion to approve Item C by Commissioner Morales. Second by Commissioner Johnston. Approved (5-0).

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.

Staff report presented by Bostick. 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
Historic and Architectural Review Commission
Meeting: September 24, 2020

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.

There were questions regarding the drive-thru and vehicle access by the Commission. Bostick provided an explanation of how customers would access the drive-thru from Austin Avenue.

There was also discussion about impact to the courthouse view, and further clarification was sought regarding the exemption process. Bostick explained that this is one of additional applications submitted, one which includes a Site Development Plan. The Site Development Plan will help address other issues such as drainage and impervious cover. The courthouse zone protection is a special overlay that is implemented to consider the impact the project will have on the view of the courthouse from Austin Avenue and IH-35. The evaluation process is done through the Administrative Exception process where staff determine whether the proposed height of the project will block the courthouse view.

The Commission also discussed the size of the windows for the proposed project and asked if the applicant will reconsider windows that are more similar to others in the area for a more historic feel, with a proportion of taller than wide. The Commission asked if the Austin Ave. street façade could have more variation or consideration toward pedestrians.

Bostick also requested feedback from the Commission, and asked if there is anything else they would like to see for the next time this item is presented. Commissioner Morales asked that for items that partially comply, staff continue to provide enough explanation and data to support why the criteria partially comply.

Chair Parr also requested to see what materials will be used and how, for the next presentation of this project.

Whitney Koch, the project’s architect, provided an explanation and reviewed the materials that will be used and provided examples for the Commission.

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

Staff provided updates on the Design Guidelines update project.

Adjournment

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:47 pm

Approved, Amanda Parr, Chair

Attest, Terri Asendorf-Hyde, Secretary
SUBJECT:
Public Hearing and Possible Action on 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. – Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

ITEM SUMMARY:
Overview of Applicant's Request
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’ roof height 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’-6” 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.

Staff Recommendation
Based on the findings listed above, staff recommends APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of the request. Staff recommends that the conditions of the approval are:

· That all three street-facing facades have a consistent window design on the first or ground floor of the building, and that the windows on the first or ground floor have proportions consistent with traditional storefront windows, or as proposed for the windows in the center portion of the Austin Avenue façade and the 5th Street and north facades.

· That the windows on the second and third floors be consistent on all four facades, and that the windows have a greater height than width, with proportions more consistent with traditional upper floor windows.

· That HARC be provided with additional examples of the proposed materials installed as requested during the conceptual review.

Public Comment
As of the date of this report, staff has received 1 written comment, which was provided to the applicant and the Commission during the Conceptual Review on 9/24/2020.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
None. The applicant has paid the required application fees.
**ATTACHMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Exhibit 4 - Applicant Response to HARC Conceptual Review</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Report</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
THE BUILDING WILL COMPLY WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.060

ARCHITECTURAL PLAN NOTES

ARCHITECTURAL COMPATIBILITY

REFER TO THE ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.050

ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES

AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40'

VERTICAL ARTICULATION FOR ELEVATION

AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT = 40'

CALCULATIONS BELOW

BUILDING ARTICULATION AND ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES. REFERENC

BUILDING ARTICULATION

REFER TO ELEVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC SECTION 7.03.040

BUILDING ELEMENTS

COLUMN LOCATIONS. ALL FOUNDATION COMPONENTS WILL BE CONVENTIONALLY REINFORCED.

FOUNDATION SHALL BE A BEAM STIFFENED SLAB ON GRADE FOUNDATION. INTEGRAL SPREAD FOOTERS WILL BE PROVIDED UNDER

FOUNDATION TYPE

SITE DEVELOPMENT NOTES

THIS SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN SHALL MEET ALL DESIGN STANDARDS FOR ARTICULATION, BUILDING DESIGN, BUILDING

ACCORDANCE WITH UDC CHAPTER 8

ALL ROOF, WALL AND GROUND MOUNTED MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT MUST BE SCREENED IN

MATERIALS AND ELEMENTS AND ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES OF SECTION 7.03 OF THE UDC.

SIGNAGE

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

SIGNAGE IS APPROVED WITH THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN OR HARDCOPY PLANS.

EAST ELEVATION

AUSTIN AVENUE / WEST ELEVATION

R BANK

CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS

SCALE: As indicated 10.01.2020

mustard

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

ELEVATION TAG: 01

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

ELEVATION TAG: 02

RETAINING WALL
PRECAST RETAINING WALL BLOCK WITH CAP
COLOR SIMILAR TO CUTCAST STONE VENEER

ELEVATION TAG: 16

METAL CLAD DOOR/WINDOW EXAMPLE
COLOR: DARK BRONZE ANODIZED OR BLACK

ELEVATION TAG: 07, 08, 09

R BANK
CONCEPTUAL ELEVATIONS & COLORS/MATERIALS

SCALE: As indicated 10.01.2020
Ms. Britin Bostick  
Downtown & Historic Planner  
City of Georgetown  
britin.bostick@georgetown.org

RE: 2020-45-COA: Site Plan for R Bank Pre-meeting HARC review comments

Dear Britin and members of HARC,

Thank you for the preliminary review of our project designs for the HARC proceedings, we have listed a written response to each of the partially compliant listings in the City staff comments, and the comments received during the pre-review meeting for the above-mentioned project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Staff Comment</th>
<th>Partially Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.3 A new building shall reflect the traditional lot width as expressed by the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Variation in height at internal lot lines.</td>
<td></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>
<tr>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject property is platted as a single lot and there are no 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

As noted the site is platted as a single lot and no interior lot lines were or are present in which to respond to.

The design the Austin Avenue (west) façade has been adjusted to more closely align with the 30 foot module referenced. The parapet heights have been adjusted to provide more of a height variation at the modules, and the parapet returns on the central sections of the North, South, and West facades have been increased to visually imply the continuation of the center module from the street-perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Staff Comment</th>
<th>Partially Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.4 Building heights of larger projects should provide variety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A larger development should step down in height towards the street or smaller, surrounding structures.</td>
<td></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>
<tr>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

The building height as presented is allowed by the standard zoning ordinance, and is in process of Staff review for compliance with the Courthouse View corridor requirements. However, in an effort to respond to the adjacent townhomes, the original design provides a lower covered parking area to reflect the garage entries opposite the access easement. The design team has also adjusted the parapet over the drive through area down to provide a step-down to the adjacent site while not minimizing the building’s available square footage.

The design the Austin Avenue (west) façade has been adjusted to more closely align with the 30 foot module referenced. The parapet heights have been adjusted to provide more of a height variation at the modules, and the parapet returns on the central sections of the North, South, and West facades have been increased to visually imply the continuation of the center module from the street-perspective.
### City Staff Comment:
13.5 Large project sites should be developed with several buildings, rather than a single structure.

- This will help reduce the perceived size of the project.
- The façade height shall be varied to reflect traditional lot width.

#### Partially Complies
The half block subject property is not being developed entirely with buildings, as on-site parking requirements apply. However, the three-story height and 22,702 sq. ft. size of the building make it a large project, and the façade height does not have variation that reflects traditional lot width.

#### Response:
While the site is large, the project design is driven by a single banking tenant set to occupy the first floor of the building, and thus is not conducive to a design where multiple buildings are present. A single building is required to meet the client needs.

The design the Austin Avenue (west) façade has been adjusted to more closely align with the 30 foot module referenced. The parapet heights have been adjusted to provide more of a height variation at the modules, and the parapet returns on the central sections of the North, South, and West facades have been increased to visually imply the continuation of the center module from the street-perspective.

### City Staff Comment:
13.6 Where a large building is needed, divide the building into modules that reflect the traditional size of buildings.

- A typical building module should not exceed 30 feet in width. The building module should be expressed with at least one of the following:
  - A setback in wall planes of a minimum of 3 feet
  - A change in primary facade material for the extent of the building module
  - A vertical architectural element or trim piece

- Variations in facade treatment should be continued through the structure, including its roofline and front and rear facades.

- 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.

#### Partially Complies
The proposed building is approximately 100’ wide and 96’ deep, and the proposed design of the modules, which highlight the center portion or module of the building facades with materials, cornice details and height difference, exceed 30‘ in width for the two side modules. The variation in materials for the center module is carried through to the roof line and part of the facades except for the east façade, which is designed to accommodate the bank drive-thru. The variation in height is not great enough for the building scale to be reduced, and the modules are more two dimensional than three dimensional.

#### Response:
The design the Austin Avenue (west) façade has been adjusted to more closely align with the 30 foot module referenced. A material change has been provided at the central module, and vertical and horizontal trim has been provided to articulate the façade change.

The parapet heights have been adjusted to provide more of a height variation at the modules, and the parapet returns on the central sections of the North, South, and West facades have been increased to visually imply the continuation of the center module from the street-perspective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Staff Comment:</th>
<th>Partially Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.8 Masonry materials that convey a sense of scale are preferred.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The project proposes to use a cut stone or cast stone (manufactured stone) material for the first floor of the building and at the center modules, as well as stucco or EIFS for the primary façade materials, including the siding, window sills and cornices. The stone and stucco are meant to reference materials on other commercial structures in the Downtown.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brick and stone are preferred for new construction.</td>
<td><strong>Partially Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff Comment:</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.10 Traditional building materials such as wood, brick, and stone are encouraged.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partially Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Horizontal lap siding of traditional dimensions is appropriate in most applications.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Maintenance of traditional siding dimensions are encouraged.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Brick or stone, similar to that used tradition-ally, is also appropriate.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Highly reflective materials are inappropriate.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ 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.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Limestone has been provided as the primary material at the pedestrian level and as a method for articulating the vertical central module. The stone proposed is used to represent cut stone traditionally found on governmental buildings and building of higher importance such as banks and post offices. Buildings such as the Williamson County Courthouse and the original post office, now the Georgetown Finance Department, the Public Library, and the Tamiu Building have cut stone in their facades. We have reduced the block size to be more in scale with the larger block found on such buildings as 701 S Main St. (Gumbo’s restaurant), 803 S Main St. (P.H. Dimmitt&amp;Co.) building, and the building at 816 S Main St. (Georgetown Art Center), and the new Georgetown City Hall and Municipal Court buildings. Our stucco finish materials are representative of traditional plaster overlays which can be found on 700 S Austin Ave #100 (Quenan’s Jewlers) where the stucco is present only at the upper levels of the north façade and all the way to street level on the east façade facing Austin Ave, other buildings fronting the courthouse square, and the new Municipal Court building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Staff Comment:
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
  - 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.

Response:
The building design provides pedestrian access along the 4th and 5th street elevations. Due to the natural topography of the site, the building finish floor elevation in relationship to Austin Avenue, and the building program for access to the bank lobbies, pedestrian access cannot be provided directly from the west elevation (Austin Ave.)

Pedestrian access is accommodated through direct connections along 5th Avenue and through the parking lot entry facing 4th Street. The primary entries provide a recessed entryway complete with traditional style doors with traditional-style kick plates and transom elements.

A landscape buffer has been provided in the original design documents to soften the pedestrian sidewalk running parallel to the west, Austin Ave. elevation. Soft, lush landscape and flowering multi-trunk trees will be provided to soften the tall façade that faces Austin Ave.

To provide a more pedestrian feeling elevation the Austin Street façade windows have been adjusted at the first floor level. The window spacing and layout have been adjusted to more reflect the traditional “storefront” window type, while allowing for privacy and security to the bank tenants within the building.

Commissioner Comment:
Window Orientation is suggested to be more vertical than wide

Response:
The window orientation and layout have been reviewed, and updated to reflect a more vertical window. The positioning and paring of the windows has also been updated to reflect the revised building elevations.

Revised drawings have been provided as an attachment to this document. Thank you for the preliminary review, should you have any questions please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Whitney Koch, AIA, NCARB
Mustard Design Architects
Registered Architect Texas 24419
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
Public Hearing and Possible Action on 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

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)

STAFF ANALYSIS
Site information
Public records show that what is now Block 24 of the City of Georgetown was originally designated as Block 11. On October 5th, 1868, John J. Stubblefield purchased a block that had been Block 11 on the original and was now Block 24 on the revised map from Stephen and Eda Strickland for $1,000. The Stricklands noted that they had been living on that block at the time of the transaction. On March 15, 1884 the Stubblefields’ children sold the west half of Block 24 to Elizabeth Talbot for $1,200. Elizabeth Jane Talbott (also written Talbot) was the daughter of Georgetown founder George Washington Glasscock. Elizabeth’s first marriage was to Lon Logan, and their children and grandchildren inherited the west half of Block 24 when Elizabeth died in 1917. The heirs sold the property to Elizabeth’s oldest son J. D. Logan in 1918. J. D. sold the west half of the block to his son, Robert Lee Logan, in 1922 when
Robert was 25 years old. Robert and his wife Mildred had a son, Jackson Davis Logan, in July 1923, who later inherited the house, selling it in the early 1980s.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and photos from Special Collections at Southwestern University show a large house with several later additions was on the west half of Block 24 as early as 1916, when the house was still owned and possibly inhabited by Elizabeth Talbott. The original portion of the house may have been built by the Stricklands, as Stephen Strickland had successfully petitioned Williamson County to acknowledge his ownership of the block in 1855. Thirteen years later the Stubblefields purchased the block and lived there for sixteen years. From 1884 to 1980 the house was owned and mostly occupied by Elizabeth Talbott, her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. A photo from “before 1991” shows the house still standing, but by the mid-1990’s it was removed and replaced with a vehicle lot for Draeger Motor Company. The property has been vacant for several years.

The subject property was platted in 2004 with a large, single lot on the west portion of the block along Austin Avenue and eight smaller lots facing Main Street. The entire block is zoned Mixed Use Downtown (MU-DT), and is surrounded by MU-DT zoning to the south and west, MU-DT, Residential Single Family (RS) and Two-Family (TF) to the north and east and Office (OF) to the southeast. The surrounding properties are a mix of historic and non-historic structures, residential and non-residential, with building heights that range from a single story to four stories, and with a variety of building styles and materials. The smaller lots on the same block as the subject property have been developed as townhomes (attached dwellings on separate lots) as well as single family homes (separate dwellings on separate lots). The proposed building is sited at the southwest corner of the project site, along the Austin Avenue and E. 5th Street property lines. Directly to the south is the Tamiro Building, which is slightly taller than this proposed building and has four stories, the fourth being stepped back from the lower three floors. The Tamiro Building has a narrower façade along Austin Avenue but a wider façade along E. 5th Street than does this proposed building. To the southwest is the Monument Café, and to the west across Austin Avenue is a city parking lot. To the northwest is a single story, medium priority office building and to the north is the historic Williamson County Jail, a two-story, high priority structure. To the northwest are one-story residential structures that have converted to commercial use. Directly to the east are 8 residences, four detached single-family homes and four attached townhomes. The density of the townhomes to the east of the property is 13.6 units/gross acre. Further east on the next block is a historic, two-story, high-priority residential structure known as the Taylor-Cooper House. To the southeast is a two-story residence that has converted to office use.

Height
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’ roof height 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. The highest point of the roof parapet at 49’-6” 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.

Signage
Signage is not proposed as part of this application, but the submitted plans show building signage areas on each of the three street facades.

Building Design
A building entrance is proposed for the E. 5th Street façade, as well as for the north façade facing the parking area. As the sidewalk required by the new development is designed to follow the slope of the street curb along Austin Avenue and will require short retaining walls to manage the site grading, the building is not proposed to have an entrance on the Austin Avenue façade. Although signage is included in the project renderings and drawings for reference, approval of signage is not requested as part of this Certificate of Appropriateness and will be submitted in a separate application. The building massing and form were designed to reflect larger scale civic and business buildings rather than a set of narrower, traditional building widths as one would see around the Square and adjacent blocks.

Materials
The applicant is requesting HARC approval of cut limestone and cast stone on the building exterior for both the first floor façade and decorative architectural elements so that there can be some flexibility for the applicant in the final choice of materials. Either material would have a smooth face. In the Downtown Overlay District, the traditional stone used is limestone, which has a rough face or texture on many of the historic buildings and some of the newer infill buildings. There are some historic buildings, including the historic Williamson County Courthouse (1910) and the historic Farmer’s State Bank Building (1910), now the Williamson Museum, which have cut or cast stone details and a cut stone façade. The applicant is also requesting approval of stucco for the second and third floor exterior of the building. Although there are not many examples of stucco as an original siding material in the Downtown Overlay District, many buildings have had stucco applied to the façade, including the Stromberg-Hoffman & Co. Building and the Harry Gold Building. The windows are proposed to be aluminum storefront windows with either a dark bronze or black finish and non-reflective glazing. The ground floor windows are proposed to have an upper glazed section reminiscent of a traditional transom window, and the upper floor windows are proposed to have either two equal sections and appear as a single window or have four equal sections and appear as a double window.

In the Conceptual Review of the project on September 24, 2020, the HARC Commissioners provided feedback to the applicant on the design presented based on the applicable Guidelines, which included:

- Adding more variation to the façades, emphasizing the Austin Avenue street facade
- Reducing the mass of the building
- Adjusting the proportions of the upper floor windows to a greater height than width
- Giving more consideration to the pedestrian experience on the Austin Avenue façade
Stepping down the building height toward the adjacent residential properties
More examples of the proposed materials installed

In response to HARC’s feedback, the applicant has provided revised drawings and a letter noting the adjustments made in response to the Commission’s comments. The adjustments include:

- Reducing the height of the roof parapet on the portion of the building over the drive thru
- Adding headers over the windows and entrance openings on the first floor and over the windows within the stone-clad portions of the façade to reflect traditional building details
- Adjusting the Austin Avenue façade to a wider center module
- Adjusting the windows on the Austin Avenue façade to a different configuration on the two side modules
- Increasing the depth of the cornice returns on the parapets to create a greater perception of depth for that architectural feature
- Adjusting the proportions and number of the second and third floor windows on the Austin Avenue façade and on a portion of the east façade

The staff findings and recommendation are based on the latest version of the building design received after the HARC conceptual review.

**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</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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 along the three street frontages 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.2 Where a portion of a building must be set back,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>define the edge of the property with landscape elements.</strong></td>
<td>Landscaping and screening are to be provided in accordance with the UDC requirements and are reviewed as part of the Site Development Plan application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ For example, define the edges of a lot with landscaping, such as low-scale urban street trees or shrubs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Landscaping elements should be compatible with the character of the area in size, scale, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>Free-form, suburban type landscaping is inappropriate in this setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- 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. |

#### 13.3 A new building shall reflect the traditional lot width as expressed by the following:

- Variation in height at internal lot lines.  
- Variation in the plane of the front façade.  
- Variation in architectural detailing and materials to emphasize the building module.  
- Variation in the façade height to reflect traditional lot width.  

**Partially Complies**

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 façade plane has minimal variation with repeating architectural features, although the materials and details at the center portion of the street facades provide variation for the center module. The façade height is consistent except for cornice details in the center portions, and the lower parapet height over the drive thru.

#### 13.4 Building heights of larger projects should provide variety.

- A larger development should step down in height towards the street or smaller, surrounding structures.  
- Vary the building height in accordance with traditional lot width.  
- 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.  
- Vary the façade (or parapet) heights at the front.  

**Partially Complies**

The proposed project steps down in height toward the smaller structures to the east by reducing the height of the parapet. 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 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.

#### 13.5 Large project sites should be developed with several buildings, rather than a single structure.

- This will help reduce the perceived size of the project.  
- The façade height shall be varied to reflect traditional lot width.  

**Partially Complies**

The half block subject property is not being developed entirely with buildings, as on-site parking requirements apply. However, the three-story height and 22,702 sq. ft. size of the building make it a large project, and the façade height does not have variation that reflects traditional lot width.
### CHAPTER 13 – DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL CONSTRUCTION IN AREA 2 – DOWNTOWN OVERLAY DISTRICT

#### 13.6 Where a large building is needed, divide the building into modules that reflect the traditional size of buildings.

- **Partially Complies**

  The proposed building is approximately 100' wide and 96' deep, and the proposed design of the modules, which highlight the center portion or module of the building facades with materials, cornice details and height difference, are 36’ in width for the two side modules and 30’ for the center module. The variation in materials for the center module is carried through to the roof line and part of the facades except for the east façade, which is designed to accommodate the bank drive-thru. The variation in height is not great enough for the building scale to be reduced, and the modules are more two dimensional than three dimensional.

- **✓** A typical building module should not exceed 30 feet in width. The building module should be expressed with at least one of the following:
  - A setback in wall planes of a minimum of 3 feet
  - A change in primary facade material for the extent of the building module
  - A vertical architectural element or trim piece

- **✓** Variations in facade treatment should be continued through the structure, including its roofline and front and rear facades.

- **✓** 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.

#### 13.7 Maintain views to the courthouse.

- **Complies**

  The proposed building is located directly north of an existing building with a taller height and greater width within the Courthouse view corridor than is proposed for this project, and the subject building does not further block existing views of the courthouse.

- **✓** In certain circumstances views to the courthouse shall be taken into consideration when designing a new building.

- **✓** A new building shall not be so tall as to block views of the courthouse.

#### 13.8 Masonry materials that convey a sense of scale are preferred.

- **Complies**

  The project proposes to use a cut stone or cast stone (manufactured stone) material for the first floor of the building and at the center modules, which provides the detail at human scale, which the Design Guidelines recommend. The design also includes stucco for the primary façade materials, including the siding, windowsills and cornices. The stone and stucco are meant to

- **✓** Brick and stone are preferred for new construction.

- **✓** 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
## Findings

**Guidelines**

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

- Example, some facade materials used in new construction are more susceptible to weather and simply do not last as long as stone or brick.

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
  - Landscaping
  - A courtyard or plaza

**Complies**

- Proposed materials are matte finish and non-reflective.

- Proposed materials include stone and stucco, and the proposed cut limestone (natural stone) or cast stone (manufactured stone) would have a smooth face, which is similar to some of the cut stone facades and building details 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 façades including buildings on the Square. In some cases, the stucco material has been removed, but several building still retain their painted stucco facades.

- 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 and office building and does not have traditional storefront features, however the ground floor windows have been designed with an upper section that interprets a
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>✓ Include traditional elements such as display windows, kickplates, and</td>
<td>traditional transom, and there are no blank walls proposed for the building facades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transoms on commercial storefronts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Avoid a blank wall or vacant lot appearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Complies**
Proposed parking is reviewed as part of the Site Development Plan, and must meet the City’s UDC requirements.

**CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The application is</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete and the</td>
<td>Staff reviewed the application and deemed it complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information contained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is correct and sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough to allow adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review and final action;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance with any</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design standards of this</td>
<td>Proposed project requires approval of an Administrative Exception for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code;</td>
<td>proposed overall building height within the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject property is a vacant lot and has no historic structures.</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></td>
<td>Proposed project complies or partially complies with applicable Design Guidelines.</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></td>
<td>The subject site has been vacant for several years and was previously a residential block with commercial parking lot.</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></td>
<td>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 south of this property. The proposed height is compatible with the existing commercial building to the south, but taller than the residential structures to the east. 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 vary in width/height on all the building facades. The windows on the Austin Avenue façade have different sizes and proportions than the windows on the other three facades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which are proportioned with a greater width than height and which visually compete with the vertical elements of the building facade.</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></td>
<td>The proposed new building has elements that reflect the variation in character of the Downtown Overlay District, including materials and exterior details, however some characteristics of the building design, such as the windows, are not consistent with the overall character of the district.</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No signage is proposed as part of this application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the findings listed above, staff recommends *APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS* of the request. Staff recommends that the conditions of the approval are:

- That all three street-facing facades have a consistent window design on the first or ground floor of the building, and that the windows on the first or ground floor have proportions consistent with traditional storefront windows, or as proposed for the windows in the center portion of the Austin Avenue façade and the 5th Street and north facades.
- That the windows on the second and third floors be consistent on all four facades, and that the windows have a greater height than width, with proportions more consistent with traditional upper floor windows.
- That HARC be provided with additional examples of the proposed materials installed as requested during the conceptual review.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

As of the date of this report, staff has received 0 written comments.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Exhibit 1 – Location Map  
Exhibit 2 – Letter of Intent  
Exhibit 3 – Plans and Specifications  
Exhibit 4 – Applicant Response to HARC Conceptual Review
SUBMITTED BY

Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner
Historic & Architectural Review Commission
October 8, 2020
Item Under Consideration

2020-45-COA – R Bank Georgetown

Public Hearing and Possible Action on 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
1916 & 1925 Sanborn Maps
c. 1934 Aerial Photos From SU Special Collections
c. 1934 Aerial Photo from SU Special Collections
Replat of Block 24
R Bank – Proposed Site Plan
R Bank – Proposed Elevation

5TH STREET / SOUTH ELEVATION

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

NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

Page 51 of 116
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
R Bank – Proposed Materials

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
Downtown Materials

WILCO Courthouse – Brick & Cut Stone

Stromberg-Hoffman – Stucco, Williamson Museum – Cut Stone
R Bank – Proposed Design
R Bank – Proposed Design
R Bank – Proposed Design
Current Context

View from northwest

View from southwest
Current Context

Parking lot to west

Residential to east
Historic Courthouse
57.5' Top of Railing
Riverplace
48' Top of Parapet
Tamiro Building
51' Building Height
Hitch Hall
33'-8" Top of Dome
Masonic Lodge
44' Top of Parapet
Historic Courthouse
57.5' Top of Railing
Watkins Building
34' Top of Parapet
Performance Center
44' Top of Parapet
WILCO Justice Center
31'-63' Building Height
## 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</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application is correct and sufficient enough to allow adequate review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and final action;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance with any design standards of this Code;</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Historic Properties to the most extent practicable;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compliance with the adopted Downtown and Old Town Design Guidelines,</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as may be amended from time to time, specific to the applicable Historic</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The general historic, cultural, and architectural integrity of the</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building, structure or site is preserved;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New buildings or additions are designed to be compatible with</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected; and</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Master Sign Plan is in keeping with the adopted Downtown and Old</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Design Guidelines and character of the historic overlay district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Notification

• Three (3) signs posted
• No comments received
Recommendation

Staff recommends **APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS** of the request. Staff recommends that the conditions of the approval are:

- That all three street-facing facades have a consistent window design on the first or ground floor of the building, and that the windows on the first or ground floor have proportions consistent with traditional storefront windows, or as proposed for the windows in the center portion of the Austin Avenue façade and the 5th Street and north facades.
- That the windows on the second and third floors be consistent on all four facades, and that the windows have a greater height than width, with proportions more consistent with traditional upper floor windows.
- That HARC be provided with additional examples of the proposed materials installed as requested during the conceptual review.
HARC Motion – 2020-45-COA

• Approve (as presented by the applicant)
• Deny (as presented by the applicant)
• Approve with conditions
• Postpone
SUBJECT:
Public Hearing and Possible Action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a 4'-0" setback modification to the required 6' side setback to allow a carport structure 2'-0" from the side (south) property line and an addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade at the property located at 1505 Olive Street, bearing the legal description 0.345 acres, being part of Block 40 of the Snyder Addition. - Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner

ITEM SUMMARY:
The Applicant is requesting HARC approval for the construction of a new, detached carport. The carport is proposed to be 20' x 20' or 400 sq. ft. in size and located on top of the existing concrete driveway. The carport is proposed to be constructed of metal columns and roof, with exterior materials including columns, roofing and siding, to match the columns on the existing historic main structure and the roof and siding materials on the existing detached garage structure. Due to the location of the existing driveway in the setback, the applicant is also requesting approval of a 4'-0" setback modification, so that the carport structure can encroach 2'-0" into the side 6'-0" setback. The main structure has an approximately 2,737 sq. ft. footprint, and the existing detached garage is approximately 480 sq. ft. on both ground and second floors.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
None. The applicant has paid the required application fees.

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>Exhibit 4 - Historic Resource Surveys</td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 5 - Public Comments</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION
Public Hearing and Possible Action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a 4'-0"
setback modification to the required 6' side setback to allow a carport structure 2'-0" from the side (south)
property line and an addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade at the
property located at 1505 Olive Street, bearing the legal description 0.345 acres, being part of Block 40,
Snyder Addition.

AGENDA ITEM DETAILS
Project Name: Maxwell's Carport
Applicant: Jordan Silva (Zen Contracting)
Property Owner: Mary Sexton Maxwell
Property Address: 1505 Olive Street
Legal Description: 0.345 acres, being part of Block 40, Snyder Addition
Historic Overlay: Old Town Overlay District
Case History: N/A

HISTORIC CONTEXT
Date of construction: 1915 (Main House) and 1945 (Detached Garage) – HRS
Historic Resources Survey Level of Priority: Medium (Main House) and Low (Detached Garage)
National Register Designation: Within the Olive Street National Register Historic District
Texas Historical Commission Designation: N/A

APPLICANT'S REQUEST
HARC:
✓ An addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade
✓ Setback modification

STAFF ANALYSIS
The Applicant is requesting HARC approval for the construction of a new, detached carport. The carport
is proposed to be 20' x 20' or 400 sq. ft. in size and located on top of the existing concrete driveway. The
carport is proposed to be constructed of metal columns and roof, with exterior materials including
columns, roofing and siding, to match the columns on the existing historic main structure and the roof
and siding materials on the existing detached garage structure. Due to the location of the existing
driveway in the setback, the applicant is also requesting approval of a 4'-0" setback modification, so that
the carport structure can encroach 2'-0" into the side 6'-0" setback. The main structure has an
approximately 2,737 sq. ft. footprint, and the existing detached garage is approximately 480 sq. ft. on both ground and second floors.

The property is not visible on any of the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and the house does not appear in c. 1934 aerial photos from Southwestern University’s Special Collections that show Olive Street from two angles. In 1934, the property and surrounding blocks were farmland. Public records indicate that Sam and Clellia Harris purchased the property from A. A. and Bonnye Allen on January 28, 1946. The garage was likely to have been constructed that same year, but per information provided by the current owner, the house was moved from the J. M. Page property on the west side of what is now Interstate 35, which is why the house is estimated to have a 1915 construction date but the property was not developed until 1946. The Harrises owned the property until 1955. The house has had a mix of architectural styles, and the exposed rafter ends, tapered front porch columns and divided lite upper windowpanes visible today are Craftsman in style, which was popular at the time the house the is estimated to have been constructed. The 1984 Historic Resource Survey form notes that in 1984 the front porch had fluted Doric columns in pairs, which would have been more commonly found in buildings with a Classical Revival style. At the time the house also did not have a front porch railing.

The proposed new carport would have a style similar to the current style of the main structure, with the same style of columns, wood siding to match the siding profile of the detached garage (the main house has asbestos siding), asphalt shingles and a gable roof instead of the hipped roof of the main house and garage, which provides some differentiation between the new carport and the historic structures. The new carport is proposed to be painted blue and white to match the current paint color scheme of the historic structures.

**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 14 – DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL CONSTRUCTION AND ADDITIONS IN THE OLD TOWN OVERLAY DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10 Non-traditional siding materials are discouraged.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Typically, artificial stone and brick veneer are not appropriate.</td>
<td>The applicant is proposing a tongue-in-groove wood siding for the carport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Asphalt shingles are not appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Aluminum and vinyl are not appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.11 Avoid alterations that would damage historic features.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the carport is proposed to be a detached structure, no historic materials are proposed to be altered or removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 14 – Design Guidelines for Infill Construction and Additions in the Old Town Overlay District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Avoid alterations that would hinder the ability to interpret the design character of the original building or period of significance.</td>
<td>✓ Complies The proposed single-story addition is compatible in size, height, materials, and character with the main house, and proposes a roof pitch, siding and columns that reference the existing historic structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Alterations that seek to imply an earlier period than that of the building are inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.12 An addition shall be compatible in scale, materials, and character with the main building.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An addition shall relate to the building in mass, scale, and form. It should be designed to remain subordinate to the main structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An addition to the front of a building is usually inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.13 Design a new addition such that the original character can be clearly seen.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partially Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ In this way, a viewer can understand the history of changes that have occurred to the building.</td>
<td>The carport structure is proposed to be set back from and located behind and to the side of the historic main structure, and will not obstruct the view of it. However, the carport is proposed to be located in front of the garage structure as viewed from the street, which would partially block the view of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An addition should be distinguishable from the original building, even in subtle ways, such that the character of the original can be interpreted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Creating a jog in the foundation between the original and new structures may help to define an addition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Even applying new trim board at the connection point between the addition and the original structure can help define the addition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ See also <em>Preservation Briefs #14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings</em>, published by the National Park Service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.14 Place an addition at the rear of a building or set it back from the front to minimize the visual impacts.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partially Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ This will allow the original proportions and character to remain prominent.</td>
<td>The carport structure has minimal visual impact on the main structure but would partially obstruct the view of the detached garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Locating an addition at the front of a structure is usually inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDELINES</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14.15 Do not obscure, damage, destroy, or remove original architectural details and materials of the primary structure.  
  ✓ When preserving original details and materials, follow the guidelines presented in this document. | Complies  
  As the carport is proposed to be a detached structure, no historic materials are proposed to be altered or removed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 14.16 An addition shall be compatible in scale, materials, character, and architectural style with the main building.  
  ✓ An addition shall relate to the historic building in mass, scale, and form. It should be designed to remain subordinate to the main structure.  
  ✓ While a smaller addition is visually preferable, if a residential addition would be significantly larger than the original building, one option is to separate it from the primary building, when feasible, and then link it with a smaller connecting structure.  
  ✓ An addition should be simple in design to prevent it from competing with the primary façade.  
  ✓ Consider adding dormers to create second story spaces before changing the scale of the building by adding a full second floor. | Complies  
  The proposed single-story addition is compatible in size, height, materials, and character with the main house, and proposed to use elements that reflect the columns on the front porch of the main house, as well as the siding and pitch of the detached garage. The gable roof style of the carport differentiates the carport from the historic main structure and garage. |
| 14.17 An addition shall be set back from any primary, character-defining façade.  
  ✓ An addition should be to the rear of the building, when feasible. | Complies  
  The carport is proposed to be fully behind and to the side of the main structure.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 14.18 The roof of a new addition shall be in character with that of the primary building.  
  ✓ Typically, gable, hip, and shed roofs are appropriate for residential additions. Flat roofs may be more appropriate for commercial buildings.  
  ✓ Repeat existing roof slopes and materials.  
  ✓ If the roof of the primary building is symmetrically proportioned, the roof of the addition should be similar. | Complies  
  The historic main structure and garage have hip roof styles, and the carport is proposed to have a gable roof style. However, the gable roof has a pitch similar to the existing structures, and the gable style helps to differentiate the carport from the historic structures. |
CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</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>Staff reviewed the application and deemed it complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance with any design standards of this Code;</td>
<td>Partially Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed carport requires approval of a setback modification.</td>
<td></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>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOI Standard #9: “New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” The proposed carport is compatible with the historic structures and differentiated from them by the proportions, materials and roof style.</td>
<td></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>Proposed project complies or partially complies with applicable Design Guidelines.</td>
<td></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>The proposed carport is compatible with the existing historic structures on the site.</td>
<td></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>The proposed new carport is compatible with surrounding properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The overall character of the applicable historic overlay district is protected; and</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed project does not diminish the Old Town Overlay District, and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 3.13.030 Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>SECTION 3.13.030 CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proposed carport is consistent with the character of the Overlay District.</td>
<td><strong>8.</strong> The Master Sign Plan is in keeping with the adopted Downtown and Old Town Design Guidelines and character of the historic overlay district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>No signage is proposed as part of this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the approval criteria listed above, HARC must also consider the following criteria for a request for COA for a setback modification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
<th>SECTION 3.13.030.D.2 CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>a. Whether the proposed setback encroachment is solely a matter of convenience;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>b. Whether there is adequate room on the site to allow the proposed addition or new structure without encroaching into the setback;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>c. Whether the proposed setback is compatible and in context within the block in which the subject property is located;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>d. Whether the proposed addition or new structure will be set closer to the street than other units within the block;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>e. Whether the proposed structure is replacing a structure removed within the past year;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>f. Whether the proposed structure will replace a structure that previously existed with relatively the same footprint and encroachment as proposed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>g. If the proposed encroachment is for a structure that is replacing another structure, whether the proposed structure is significantly larger than the original;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>h. If the proposed encroachment is for an addition, the scale of the addition compared to the original house;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings listed above, staff recommends APPROVAL of the request for the carport addition and setback modification.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

### ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit 1 – Location Map  
Exhibit 2 – Letter of Intent  
Exhibit 3 – Plans and Specifications  
Exhibit 4 – Historic Resource Surveys

### SUBMITTED BY

Britin Bostick, Downtown & Historic Planner
To Whom It May Concern:

Please allow the following description of work to be done at 1505 Olive St Georgetown, Texas to serve as our “Letter of Intent.”

The plan is construct a carport in front of the existing garage to serve as additional covered parking. The structure will be street facing and constructed with four metal 4x4 posts that support metal trusses, and a metal roof. In order for the design of the structure to match the existing house, the metal columns will be capped in craftsman style plywood and trim to provide the look of the columns that are currently on the house. Furthermore, the street-facing gable will be covered in 105 siding that matches the existing structure, trimmed and painted to match.

The goal is to build a new metal structure out of new materials but to give it the same look as the existing structures on the property.

If any further information is required please email Zen Contracting (Jordan Silva) at zencontractingatx@gmail.com.

Thank you,

Jordan Silva
SURVEY OF 0.346 ACRES IN GEORGETOWN, WILLIAMSON COUNTY, TEXAS, BEING A PORTION OF BLOCK 40, "SNYDER'S ADDITION TO GEORGETOWN", A SUBDIVISION RECORDED IN VOL. 67, PG. 502, DEED RECORDS, WILLIAMSON COUNTY, TEXAS, ALSO BEING THE SAME TRACT RECORDED TO DAVID TOPE AND SARAH TOPE IN DOC. NO. 2007003569, OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS, WILLIAMSON COUNTY, TEXAS.

NOTE:
NO TITLE COMMITMENT FURNISHED.

ROBERT L. SOULEN
476.396

MYRON R. BOYD
642.619

To: David Tope and Sarah Tope

The undersigned does hereby certify that the plat shown represents the results of a survey on the ground under my supervision, and is true and correct and that there are no discrepancies, conflicts, shortages in area, boundary line conflicts, encroachments, overlapping of improvements, visible utility easements, except as shown and the property has access to a dedicated roadway.

The property shown hereon is located in Zone "X": areas outside the 500 year floodplain as shown on Community Panel Number 480688 0230 C of the FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP prepared for City of Georgetown by the Federal Insurance Administration Department, H.U.D. Effective Date: Sept 27, 1991
COLUMN BASE PLATE CONNECTION

DETAIL 1
COLUMN BASE PLATE CONNECTION

1-7/8" x 11 GAUGE STEEL COLUMN

5/8" x 10 STEEL PLATE WITH 1-3/8" x 10" WELD BOLT CAST IN PLACE WITH 1/2" COMMERCIAL installations.

NUTS SHALL BE PUNCHED OR DRILLED IN A STEEL FABRICATION SHOP AND NOT FIELD BURRNED.
10' 5" siding, painted blue to match current house

White upper column board

White hard board siding with 1"x4" hard trim, white to match existing house color and trim

5' high column base

18"
1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding Pattern 105

Prices are Listed Per Linear Foot (L).
1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding - Installed from Front

1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding Pattern 105

Prices are Listed Per Linear Foot (LF).
1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding (Pattern 105)

Strong, versatile, abundantly available, and reasonably priced, Southern Yellow Pine is always a popular choice with homeowners. With its beautiful golden color and distinctive grain, our 1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding will make the perfect addition to your home’s exterior.

1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding (Pattern 105) Product Specifications:

- **Stack Height**: 5”
- **Thickness**: 3/4”
- **Grade**: SPIB D & Better
- **Texture**: Milled Smooth
- **Drying Type**: Kiln-Dried
- **Joinery Type**: Shiplap
- **Available Lengths**: 16’ Lengths Only
- **Recommended Fasteners**: Stainless Steel Nail or Screw
1. County: Williamson  
   City/Rural: Georgetown

2. Name: Francis W. O'Brien
   Address: Same, 78626

3. Owner: Francis W. O'Brien
   Address: Same, 78626

4. Block/Lot: Snyder/Blk. 40/Lot 3

5. USGS Quad No: 3097-313
   Site No: 750
   UTM Sector: 627-3389

6. Date: Factual  
   Est: 1915


8. Style/Type: 
   Original Use: residential
   Present Use: residential

9. Description: One-story wood frame dwelling; exterior walls w/ asbestos shingle siding; hip roof w/ composition shingles; exposed rafter ends; front elev. faces W.; wood sash double-hung windows w/ 1/1, 4/1, and 3/1 lights; single-door entrance; one-bay porch w/ hip roof on W. elev.; fluted Doric columns in pairs. Other noteworthy features include crown molding on window facings; octagonal-plan front projecting ell. Outbuildings include wood frame double garage.

10. Primary area of significance: architecture. Similar to dwelling at 403 Elm (Site No. 608).

11. Present Condition: good

12. Significance: Primary area of significance: architecture. Similar to dwelling at 403 Elm (Site No. 608).

13. Relationship to Site: Moved  
   Date: _______ or Original Site 
   (describe)

14. Bibliography: Tax rolls

15. Informant: Rev Sansom

16. Recorder: A. Taylor/HHM
   Date: July 1984
## SECTION 1
### Basic Inventory Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type:</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>WCAD ID:</th>
<th>R047484</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Date:</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>2007 survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude:</td>
<td>30.630329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Longitude:</td>
<td>-97.666771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/Historic Name:</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic Influence(s)*</td>
<td>None Selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plan**
- L-plan
- T-plan
- Modified L-plan
- 2-room
- Open
- Center Passage
- Bungalow
- Shotgun

**Priority**
- 2016 Survey ID: 124608 A
- High
- Medium
- Low

**Explain:** Property retains a relatively high degree of integrity; property is significant and contributes to neighborhood character

**General Notes:** (Notes from 2007 Survey: None)

**Recorded by:** CMEC
**Date Recorded:** 4/21/2016

---

*Photographs and Preservation Priority have been updated in 2016, and the year built date has also been reviewed. However, the plan and style data are sourced directly from the 2007 survey.*

---

**Primary (west) elevation; Photo direction: East**

**Note:** See additional photo(s) on following page(s)
Properties Documented with the THC Form in 2007 and/or 1984 That Have Not Changed Preservation Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Williamson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1505 Olive St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Survey ID</td>
<td>124608 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Preservation Priority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local District</td>
<td>Old Town District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Photos

**Photo Direction**  Northeast

**Oblique of west and south elevations**
## SECTION 1
### Basic Inventory Information

**Owner/Address**  
PERKINS, DENNIS A & JANET G, 1505 OLIVE ST, , GEORGETOWN, TX 78626

**Current/Historic Name:**  
None/None

**Latitude:** 30.630203  
**Longitude:** -97.666537

**Legal Description (Lot/Block):** SNYDER ADDITION, BLOCK 40 PT OF, ACRES .345  
**WCAD ID:** R047484

**Addition/Subdivision:** S4615 - Snyder Addition

**Property Type:** ✅ Building  
**Current Designations:**  
- ✅ NR District  
- ![NR](https://example.com/nationalregister.png)  
- ![NHL](https://example.com/nationalhistoriclandmark.png)  
- ![NR](https://example.com/nationalregister.png)  
- ![RTHL](https://example.com/ruralthelandsite.png)  
- ![OTHM](https://example.com/otherthelandsite.png)  
- ![HTC](https://example.com/historytheculture.png)  
- ![SAL](https://example.com/site.png)  
- ![Local](https://example.com/local.png)  
- ![Old Town District](https://example.com/district.png)

**Architect:**  
**Builder:**

**Construction Date:** 1945  
**Source:** WCAD

**Recorded by:** CMEC  
**Date Recorded:** 4/21/2016

**Current Use:** ✅ Government  
**Historic Use:** ✅ Government

**Note:** See additional photo(s) on page 4

---

**Primary (west) elevation:**  
**Photo direction:** East

---

**Page 87 of 116**
## Architectural Description

**General Architectural Description:**
Two-story ancillary building with a lower level garage and upper level living space. It has a rectangular plan, hipped roof, and an exterior staircase leading to the upper level.

- **Additions, modifications:** Garage doors replaced, windows replaced
- **Relocated**

## Stylistic Influence(s)

- Log Traditional
- Greek Revival
- Italianate
- Second Empire
- Eastlake
- Queen Anne
- Shingle
- Spanish Colonial
- Neo-Classical
- Beaux Arts
- Mission
- Mediterranean
- Other:

## Structural Details

### Roof Form
- Gable
- Hipped
- Gambrel
- Shed
- Flat w/parapet
- Mansard
- Pyramid
- Other:

### Roof Materials
- Wood shingles
- Tile
- Composition shingles
- Metal
- Asphalt
- Other:

### Wall Materials
- Brick
- Stucco
- Wood siding
- Siding: Other
- Stone
- Wood shingles
- Glass
- Log
- Asbestos
- Terra Cotta
- Concrete
- Other:

### Windows
- Double hung
- Casement
- Metal sash
- Decorative Screenwork
- Other:

### Doors (Primary Entrance)
- Single door
- Double door
- With transom
- With sidelights
- Other:

### Plan
- L-plan
- T-plan
- Four Square
- Rectangular
- Modified L-plan
- 2-room
- Open
- Center Passage
- Bungalow
- Shotgun
- Other:

### Chimneys
- Specify #
- 0
- Interior
- Exterior
- None
- Brick
- Stone
- Stucco
- Corbelled Caps
- Other:

### PORCHES/CANOPIES
- Shed Roof
- Flat Roof
- Hipped Roof
- Gabled Roof
- Inset
- Support:
- Wood posts (plain)
- Wood posts (turned)
- Masonry pier
- Fabricated metal
- Box columns
- Classical columns
- Tapered box supports
- Jigsaw trim
- Suspension rods
- Spindlework
- Other:
- None
- Material:
- Metal
- Wood
- Fabric
- Other:
- Not visible
- # of stories: 2
- Basement:
- None
- Partial
- Full
- Unknown

### Ancillary Buildings
- Garage
- Barn
- Shed
- Other:

### Landscape/Site Features
- Sidewalks
- Terracing
- Drives
- Well/cistern
- Gardens
- Other:
- Stone
- Wood
- Concrete
- Brick
- Other materials:

### Landscape Notes:
### SECTION 3

**Historical Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Historical Context:</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Settlement</td>
<td>Law/Government</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Spirituality</td>
<td>Science/Technology</td>
<td>Social/Cultural</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Planning/Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicable National Register (NR) Criteria:**

- A Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of our history
- B Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past
- C Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic value, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinctions
- D Has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

**Areas of Significance:**

**Periods of Significance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance:</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Integrity:**

- Location
- Design
- Materials
- Workmanship
- Setting
- Feeling
- Association

**Integrity notes:** See Section 2

**Individually Eligible:**

- Yes
- No
- Undetermined

**Within Potential NR District?**

- Yes
- No
- Undetermined

**Is Property Contributing?**

- Yes
- No
- Undetermined

**Priority:**

- High
- Medium
- Low

Explain: Property lacks significance

**Other Info:**

- Is prior documentation available for this resource? Yes No Not known

**Type:**

- HABS
- Survey
- Other

**Documentation details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 ID:</th>
<th>1142b</th>
<th>1984 ID:</th>
<th>Not Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**General Notes:** (Notes from 2007 Survey: doors clad in corrugated metal)

### Questions?

Contact Survey Coordinator
History Programs Division, Texas Historical Commission
512/463-5863
history@thc.state.tx.us
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>1505 Olive St</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Survey ID: 124608 B
2016 Preservation Priority: Low
Local District: Old Town District

### Additional Photos

- **Photo Direction**: South
- **Primary (west) elevation**
CITY OF GEORGETOWN
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Comments from Neighboring Property Owners

You are being notified as a requirement of the City of Georgetown Code of Ordinances. You are invited to express your views or concerns regarding the - described petition by returning this comment form and/or by attending the scheduled public hearings on the matter.

Project Name/Address: 1505 Olive Street

Project Case Number: 2020-49-COA  HARC Date: October 8, 2020  Case Manager: Britin Bostick

Name of Respondent: D. B. Sumner

(Please print name)

Signature of Respondent: [Signature]

(Signature required for protest)

Address of Respondent: 1604 Olive

(Address required for protest)

I am in FAVOR: YES I OBJECT: 

Additional Comments:

It is fine with us. That garage has been there a long time and it is far back from street.

Written comments may be sent to City of Georgetown Planning Department, P. O. Box 1458 Georgetown, Texas 78627. Emailed comments may be sent to planning@georgetown.org. Any such comments may be presented to the Commission.
Comments from Neighboring Property Owners

You are being notified as a requirement of the City of Georgetown Code of Ordinances. You are invited to express your views or concerns regarding the - described petition by returning this comment form and/or by attending the scheduled public hearings on the matter.

Project Name/Address: 1505 Olive Street

Project Case Number: 2020-49-COA  HARC Date: October 8, 2020  Case Manager: Britin Bostick

Name of Respondent: Robert L. Seulen

(Please print name)

Signature of Respondent: Robert L. Seulen

(Signature required for protest)

Address of Respondent: 1501 Olive St, Georgetown, TX 78626

(Address required for protest)

I am in FAVOR:  Yes  I OBJECT: 

Additional Comments:

Bruce & Mary Maxwell are making the house a lot of 1505 Olive St a very attractive home

Written comments may be sent to City of Georgetown Planning Department, P. O. Box 1458 Georgetown, Texas 78627. Emailed comments may be sent to planning@georgetown.org. Any such comments may be presented to the Commission.
Maxwell’s Carport
2020-49-COA

Historic & Architectural Review Commission
October 8, 2020
Item Under Consideration

2020-49-COA – Maxwell’s Garage

Public Hearing and Possible Action on a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a 4'-0" setback modification to the required 6' side setback to allow a carport structure 2'-0" from the side (south) property line and an addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade at the property located at 1505 Olive Street, bearing the legal description 0.345 acres, being part of Block 40, Snyder Addition.
Item Under Consideration

HARC:

- An addition that creates a new, or adds to an existing street-facing façade
- Setback modification
Item Under Consideration
Current Context
c. 1934 Aerial Photo – SU Special Collections
c. 1934 Aerial Photo – SU Special Collections
1974 Aerial Photo
Maxwell’s Carport – Proposed Location
Maxwell’s Carport – Proposed Location
Maxwell’s Carport – Proposed Design

4"x4"x 11 GAGE STEEL COLUMN

7/8" x 8"x8" STEEL PLATE WITH 1 - 3/8" x 1/2" WELD BOLT CAST IN PLACE WITH 12" MINIMUM EMBEDMENT.

3/4"x6"x6" STEEL PLATE WITH 1 - 3/8" x 1/2" WELD BOLT CAST IN PLACE WITH 12" MINIMUM EMBEDMENT.

1/4"x4"x10 GAGE PURIN AT 24" O.C.

28 GAGE METAL ROOFING MATERIAL

24" 13/16" BASE PLATE (TYP)

SLAB ON GRADE FOUNDATION PER ENGINEERS PLANS
Maxwell’s Carport – Proposed Design
Maxwell’s Carport – Proposed Materials
Maxwell’s Carport – Proposed Siding

1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding
Pattern 105

Prices are Listed Per Linear Foot (lf).

SKU 1X6SYPDC-105

1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding
Pattern 105

Prices are Listed Per Linear Foot (lf).

SKU 1X6SYPDC-105

Details

1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding (Pattern 105)

Strong, versatile, abundantly available, and reasonably priced, Southern Yellow Pine is always a popular choice with homeowners. With its beautiful golden color and distinctive grain, our 1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding will make the perfect addition to your home’s exterior.

1x6 Southern Yellow Pine Drop Siding (Pattern 105) Product Specifications:
- Stack Height: 5’
- Thickness: 3/4”
- Grade: SPID D & Better
- Texture: Milled Smooth
- Drying Type: Kiln-Dried
- Joinery Type: Shiplap
- Available Lengths: 16’ Lengths Only
- Recommended Fasteners: Stainless Steel Nail or Screw
## 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>Complies</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>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>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Setback Approval Criteria – UDC Section 3.13.030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Staff’s Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Whether the proposed setback encroachment is solely a matter of convenience;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Whether there is adequate room on the site to allow the proposed addition or new structure without encroaching into the setback;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Whether the proposed setback is compatible and in context within the block in which the subject property is located;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Whether the proposed addition or new structure will be set closer to the street than other units within the block;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Whether the proposed structure is replacing a structure removed within the past year;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Whether the proposed structure will replace a structure that previously existed with relatively the same footprint and encroachment as proposed;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Setback Approval Criteria – UDC Section 3.13.030.D.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Staff’s Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. If the proposed encroachment is for a structure that is replacing another structure, whether the proposed structure is significantly larger than the original;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. If the proposed encroachment is for an addition, the scale of the addition compared to the original house;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The size of the proposed structure compared to similar structures within the same block;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Whether the proposed addition or new structure will negatively impact adjoining properties, including limiting their ability to maintain existing buildings;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Whether there is adequate space for maintenance of the proposed addition or new structure and/or any adjacent structures; and/or</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Whether the encroachment would enable existing large trees or significant features of the lot to be preserved.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Notification

• One (1) sign posted
• 34 letters mailed
• No comments received
Recommendation

Staff recommends **Approval** of the request for the carport addition and setback modification.
HARC Motion – 2020-49-COA

- Approve (as presented by the applicant)
- Deny (as presented by the applicant)
- Approve with conditions
- Postpone