# HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION 

April 04, 2018

## HDRC CASE NO: <br> ADDRESS: <br> LEGAL DESCRIPTION: <br> ZONING: <br> CITY COUNCIL DIST.: <br> DISTRICT: <br> APPLICANT: <br> OWNER: <br> TYPE OF WORK: APPLICATION RECEIVED: 60-DAY REVIEW:

2018-136
525 MISSION ST
NCB 2879 BLK 4 LOT 13
RM-4, H
1
King William Historic District
Delia Bara
Delia Bara
Front Yard Fencing - Wood Pickets
March 16, 2018
May 15, 2018

## REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a wood picket front yard fence featuring three (3) feet in height.

## APPLICABLE CITATIONS:

## 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 structure at 525 Mission was constructed circa 1930 in an American Foursquare configuration and features Craftsman style elements including square columns with subtle woodworking details. The structure is a two-story, multi-family home with a shared central entry.
b. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a wood picket fence to span the width of the property and turn at the driveway to meet at the corner of the structure. The applicant has not requested a driveway gate at this time. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii, new front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that did not historically have them. While staff finds that a fence was not historically present on this property, fences are found along Mission Street and within the King William Historic District.
c. FENCE DESIGN - According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., the design of the fence should respond to the design and materials of the primary historic structure or structures of a similar style in the neighborhood in relation to scale, transparency, and character. Staff finds that the proposed wood picket fence is appropriate for a Craftsman house. At this time, the applicant has not a measured drawing or example of the proposed wood picket fence.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings $b$ and c with the stipulation that the applicant submit a measured drawing or example of the proposed wood picket fence and that no portion of the fence exceeds four feet in height. This request does not include a driveway gate at this time.

## CASE MANAGER:

Huy Pham

## 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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PLOT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMITS


I certify that the above plot plan shows all improvements on this property and that there will be no construction over easements. I also certify that I will build in compliance with the UDC and the 2015 IRC.

Date: $\qquad$ Signature of Applicant: $\qquad$


