

DESIGN REVIEW & PRESERVATION BOARD
1231 T Street - SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

APPLICANT	Bruce Booher, 1217 - 38th Street, Sacramento, California	95816
OWNER	Bruce Booher, 1217 - 38th Street, Sacramento, California	95816
PLANS BY	Bruce Booher, 1217 - 38th Street, Sacramento, California	95816
FILING DATE	8/24/87	REPORT BY: RL:vf
NEGATIVE DEC.	EIR	ASSESSOR'S PCL NO. 002-112-16

APPROVED ON CONSENT SEPTEMBER 16, 1987
LOCATION: 530-10th Street (northwest corner 10th and F Streets)

PROPOSAL: The applicant proposes door and window modifications and a rear porch enclosure on a Priority Structure in the Alkali Flat Preservation Area.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Existing Zoning of Site: R-3A
Existing Land Use of Site: Vacant two-family residence

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North: Two-family; R-3A
South: Offices; OB
East : Two-family; R-3A
West : Vacant, multiple-family; R-3A

Parking Required: 2 spaces
Parking Provided: 2 spaces
Property Dimensions: 46' x 80'
Property Area: 3,680 sq. ft.
Square Footage of Building: 4,200 sq. ft.
Height of Building: 3-1/2 stories
Significant Features of Site: Priority Structure in Alkali Flat Preservation Area
Exterior Building Colors: Not provided
Exterior Building Materials: Horizontal Wood Siding

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: In 1982 the Board approved plan for the rehabilitation of the subject structure and its additions to the Official Register (PB82-021).

The property has since changed ownership. The current owner intends to complete the work previously accomplish and include a few modifications of his own.

Current proposal relates only to exterior windows and doors and the enclosure of a covered rear porch area. The intent of the applicant is also to return to Board later with the design for a north side fire escape and the rear balcony that is shown on his submitted plans. The balcony is not being requested at this time due to the need for a Commission approval for encroachment into the required rear yard.

PROJECT EVALUATION: Staff has the following comments regarding the proposed project. In some instances number references are made to correspond with notations on the submitted plans.

1. The addition of a window (#1) to the dinette, the replacement of two bedroom windows with one (#3) are acceptable to staff.
2. Replacement of three kitchen windows with one window (#2) is acceptable to staff provided a double unit with a six over one arrangement is used.
3. The addition of the rear deck (#4) is deleted from the current application. The applicant intends to seek Board approval later pending application for a rear yard variance from the Commission.
4. Elimination of a covered rear porch (#5) will not adversely affect the appearance of the rear of the structure.
5. The use of "continuous siding" (#6) across the rear of the building is appropriate provided the siding matches existing siding.
6. The addition of a door (#7) to the rear deck should be considered later along with the deck when the applicant returns to the Board.
7. The replacement of six windows on the rear elevation with a single double-hung window (#8) and the addition of a bathroom window (#9) is acceptable to staff provided they are matching in design and size.
8. The rear deck has been deleted from the current application. Staff has indicated to the applicant the need for more detailed deck plans including a continuous header matching the height of the underside of the bay window and lattice screening of the area below on the street side and rear side.
9. The applicant would prefer that all replacement window units on the north elevation be metal. Although admittedly, the north side elevation would be relatively out of view and, therefore, the most appropriate location for use of metal units in lieu of wood units, staff finds that the overall quality of this listed structure justifies the consistent use of wood units through the project.
10. Previously, the garage door was conditioned to be "one piece wood". Although the use of matching horizontal wood siding is desirable and was accomplished as specified, staff has an addition suggestion with which the applicant has indicated concurrence. To reduce the modern appearance of the single piece double car garage door staff suggests a vertical wood element to split the door face. Simply attach to the door surface, the hint of two separate doors would be created without the expensive of modifying the existing improvement or inhibiting access into the garage as would a real post or wall section separated two individual doors.

11. The partially rehabilitated structure has a high concrete foundation wall. For the sake of aesthetics, a brick veneer is appropriate.
12. Colors for the project were not specified and will need subsequent review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the proposed modifications to the Listed Structure subject to the following conditions:

1. The kitchen window (#2) shall be a double or single hung unit with a six over one arrangement.
2. All new and replacement siding shall match existing siding.
3. The new door (#7) to the future deck proposal shall be excluded from the current approval.
4. Windows (#8 and #9) on the rear elevation shall be matching in design and size.
5. All windows shall be wood units.
6. The garage door shall be modified with an attached vertical center wood member to create the appearance of two separate doors. The final design shall be subject to staff review and approval.
7. The perimeter foundation wall shall be brick veneered.
8. The applicant shall submit color for review and approval by staff or may return for Board consideration when fire escape and rear balcony plans are ready for review.

Approval is based on the following findings of fact:

1. The project, as conditioned, will enhance the appearance of the Listed Structure.
2. The approval of the modifications currently proposed by the applicant can be made in advance of consideration of the rear deck and north side fire escape without ultimately creating a piecemeal appearance in the rehabilitation of the Listed Structure.
3. Approval of the project is in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

APPROVAL BY THE DESIGN REVIEW/PRESERVATION BOARD DOES NOT RELIEVE THE APPLICANT OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO MEET REQUIREMENTS OF ALL ZONING ORDINANCES AND BUILDING CODES.

FINAL PLANS SUBMITTED TO THE CITY FOR A BUILDING PERMIT WILL INCLUDE ALL CHANGES REQUIRED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL BY THE BOARD. THE CHANGES WILL BE SHOWN BY DRAWING REVISIONS AND/OR BY NOTATION, WHICHEVER IS MORE APPLICABLE. PLANS WHICH HAVE OMISSIONS WILL BE RETURNED TO THE APPLICANT FOR CORRECTION AND WILL NOT BE PROCESSED. THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY TIME LOST DUE TO INCOMPLETE LANDS. NO EXCEPTIONS WILL BE MADE.

THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DELAYS RESULTING FROM NONCOMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.



REAR WEST SIDE
PB 87-040

530 03 N H H N 2

SOUTH SIDE
PB 87-040