# HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION 

June 17, 2020
HDRC CASE NO:
2020-249
ADDRESS:
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ZONING:
CITY COUNCIL DIST.:
DISTRICT:
APPLICANT:
OWNER:
TYPE OF WORK:
1102 S ALAMO ST
NCB 934 BLK LOT $1 \&$ N TRI 41 FT OF 2
C-3,H
1
King William Historic District
Carlos Platero jr
Jesse Sturgeon/STURGEON JESSE J
Front and side yard fencing
May 28, 2020
Not applicable due to City Council Emergency Orders
Stephanie Phillips
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { APPLICATION RECEIVED: } & \text { May 28, } 2020 \\ \text { 60-DAY REVIEW: } & \text { Not applicable due to City Council Emergency Orders }\end{array}$
CASE MANAGER: Stephanie Phillips

## REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install front and side yard fencing at the property addressed 1102 S Alamo. The fencing will measure three feet in height and have several gates, including pedestrian and car gates.

## APPLICABLE CITATIONS:

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

2. Fences and Walls
A. HISTORIC FENCES AND WALLS
i. Preserve-Retain historic fences and walls.
ii. Repair and replacement-Replace only deteriorated sections that are beyond repair. Match replacement materials (including mortar) to the color, texture, size, profile, and finish of the original.
iii. Application of paint and cementitious coatings-Do not paint historic masonry walls or cover them with stone facing or stucco or other cementitious coatings.
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.
C. PRIVACY FENCES AND WALLS
i. Relationship to front facade - Set privacy fences back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence.
ii. Location - Do not use privacy fences in front yards.

## FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 1102 S Alamo is a 1-story structure constructed circa 1890 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features a limestone façade, full-width front porch with square columns and decorative gingerbreading, and wood doors and windows with transoms. The structure includes a 2 -story rear addition and is contributing to the King William Historic District.
b. FENCING - The applicant is requesting to install a $36^{\prime}$ inch tall black iron fence along the north and east perimeter of the property, fronting S Alamo St and Mission St. Along the front side of the building along S. Alamo St., the applicant is requesting a 98 foot run of fencing with two openings: one opening at 12 feet wide and another at 6 feet wide as indicated on the site plan. Along the Mission St side of the property, the applicant is requesting to install a 92 foot run of black iron fencing with a pair of 30 foot wide sliding gates at the side parking area. This portion will front the right-of-way. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. The design of the fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Along S Alamo St, several properties have fences with a similar height and transparency. Staff generally finds the request appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings $a$ and $b$ with the following stipulations:
i. That the applicant verifies that the sliding gates along Mission St will not interfere with existing trees and will not extend into the right-of-way at any point, and that the fencing will be located within the property lines. The applicant should provide an updated site plan that shows existing trees in relation to the fencing and the fence line with gates open to staff for review and approval. If the gate cannot be installed in a manner that retains the existing trees, staff finds that the site plan should be modified along Mission St to be set back behind the parking area and run along the existing paver walkway before turning to meet the existing fence lines.
ii. 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. Front yard fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height at any point. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35514.
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Current Item


TuffBilt Brilliance
Heavy-Duty 4-1/2 ft. H $\times 8$ ft. W Black
(3)
s184 ${ }^{00}$

Add To Cart


TuffBilt Brunswick 3 ft . $\mathrm{H} \times 6 \mathrm{ft}$. W
Black Standard-
(1)


US Door \& Fence Pro Series 3.6 ft. X 7.75 ft. Black
(21)


ALEKO Dublin
Style 5 ft . x 8 ft . Black Iron Fence
(0)


ALEKO Madrid 5 ft . 8 ft . Black Iron Fence Panel
(0)
\$499 ${ }^{\circ 0}$

Add To Cart
Add To Cart
s $499^{\circ 0}$

Add To Cart
Add To Cart

## Product Overview

TuffBilt Pre-Assembled Aluminum fence panels are an economical solution to the classic look of wrought iron fence. Our patented ProLock technology secures panels from the inside, creating a clean look, seamless finish and superior strength. Additionally, TuffBilt aluminum fence products resist rust and corrosion and are backed by a transferable limited lifetime warranty.

- Coordinating posts sold separately: line post - model \# 73009102, corner post - model \# 73009103, end post - model \# 73009104, gate post - model \# 73009105, blank post - model \# 73002392
- Coordinating gates sold separately: arched top - model \# 73009456 or straight top - model \# 73009459
- Picket size is $5 / 8 \mathrm{in} . \times 5 / 8$ in, with 3.85 in. space between pickets
- Panel will adjust to the slope of your yard at a rate of 38 in. over 6 ft . panel
- Panel can be cut down to your desired size
- Made from powder coated aluminum that resists rust. corrosion and discoloration
- Transferable limited lifetime warranty
- 



