# HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION 

## June 15, 2016

Agenda Item No: 6

## HDRC CASE NO: <br> ADDRESS: <br> LEGAL DESCRIPTION: <br> ZONING: <br> CITY COUNCIL DIST.: <br> DISTRICT: <br> APPLICANT: <br> OWNER: <br> TYPE OF WORK: <br> REQUEST:

2016-218
127 E MULBERRY AVE
NCB 1701 BLK 4 LOT 20
R4 H
1
Monte Vista Historic District
Thomas Bradley Heidi White/Thomas Bradley \& Associates
Mary Vexler
Fencing, pergola and storage structure

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a new gate and fence across the driveway on the east side of the primary historic structure.
2. Demolish the existing rear pergola and storage enclosures and construct a new pergola with storage enclosures.

## APPLICABLE CITATIONS:

Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, Guidelines for New Construction
5. Garages and Outbuildings

## A. DESIGN AND CHARACTER

i. Massing and form-Design new garages and outbuildings to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form.
ii. Building size - New outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40 percent of the principal historic structure footprint.
iii. Character-Relate new garages and outbuildings to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details.
iv. Windows and doors-Design window and door openings to be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principle historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions.
v. Garage doors-Incorporate garage doors with similar proportions and materials as those traditionally found in the district.

## B. SETBACKS AND ORIENTATION

i. Orientation-Match the predominant garage orientation found along the block. Do not introduce front-loaded garages or garages attached to the primary structure on blocks where rear or alley-loaded garages were historically used. ii. Setbacks-Follow historic setback pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the principal building. In some instances, historic setbacks are not consistent with UDC requirements and a variance may be required.

## Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 5, Guidelines for Site Elements

## B. NEW FENCES AND WALLS

i. Design-New fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. ii. Location-Avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them.
iii. Height—Limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. If a taller fence or wall existed historically, additional height may be considered. The height of a new retaining wall should not exceed the height of the slope it retains.
iv. Prohibited materials—Do not use exposed concrete masonry units (CMU), Keystone or similar interlocking retaining wall systems, concrete block, vinyl fencing, or chain link fencing.
v. Appropriate materials-Construct new fences or walls of materials similar to fence materials historically used in the district. Select materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district, and that are compatible with the main structure. Screening incompatible uses-Review alternative fence heights and materials for appropriateness where residential properties are adjacent to commercial or other potentially incompatible uses.

## FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing rear pergola located on the rear east side of the primary historic structure. This pergola is not an original element of this property nor is it contributing. Staff finds its removal appropriate.
b. MASSING \& BUILDING SIZE - The applicant has proposed to construct a new pergola that is to be approximately $20^{\prime}-0$ " in width and approximately $30^{\prime}-0$ " in length. The overall height of the proposed pergola is to be approximately $12^{\prime}-0 \prime$ ". The Guidelines for new construction state that accessory structures should feature a massing and overall building size that is subordinate to the primary historic structure. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.
c. CHARACTER - The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. state that new construction should feature materials that are complementary of those of the primary historic structure. The primary historic structure features Craftsman elements including cedar columns and various stone elements. Per the applicant's construction documents, the primary materials for the proposed pergola are stone and steel wide flange beams and posts. Staff finds the applicant's proposal of stone appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should substitute cedar posts for steel. The applicant has proposed a solid copper roof which staff finds appropriate for the proposed contemporary pergola.
d. CHARACTER - The applicant has proposed new storage enclosures for bicycles, an outdoor television and other items. The applicant has noted the proposed storage enclosures are to be steel for durability. The applicant has proposed screening elements consisting of stone walls on both the north and south side of the proposed enclosures. Additionally, an existing stone wall will screen the enclosures from the view from the east. Staff finds this appropriate.
e. FENCING - Toward the front of the primary historic structure, behind the front façade, the applicant has proposed to install a wood gate and fence to be 3' -6 " in height and a total of approximately $9^{\prime}-0$ " in length. The applicant has proposed for the fence to feature Craftsman elements. Staff finds the applicant’s proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
f. The applicant's site plan notes a proposed stone wall to be located at the location of the proposed pergola. The applicant has noted that this stone wall is not a current request.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items \#1 and \#2 based on findings a through e with the stipulation that the applicant use cedar posts and beams in place of the proposed steel posts and wide flange beams.

## CASE MANAGER:

Edward Hall

## CASE COMMENT:

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.
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