

1. Purpose and Authority

- 1.1 The Memphis and Shelby County Unified Development Code (Sec. 8.6.1) says
1. The Historic Overlay District (-H) is intended to protect and conserve the heritage and character of the community by providing for the preservation of designated areas, including individual properties that embody important elements of social, economic, political, or architectural history, and by promoting the stabilization and enhancement of property values throughout such areas.
 2. It is intended that this development code ensure that buildings or structures in a Historic Overlay District are in harmony with other buildings or structures located within the District. However, it is not the intention of this development code to require the reconstruction or restoration of individual or original buildings, or to prohibit the demolition or removal of such buildings, or to impose architectural styles.
- 1.2 The Memphis City Code (Sec. 14-24-1) says
The local historic district provisions are established in order that appropriate measures may be taken to ensure preservation of structures of historic value to Memphis and Shelby County pursuant to the authority contained in T.C.A. § 13-7-401. The general intent includes the following specific purposes:
- A. To promote the educational and cultural welfare of the people of Memphis;
 - B. To preserve and protect the historic and architectural value of significant resources;
 - C. To ensure compatibility and to create an aesthetic atmosphere with local historic districts;
 - D. To foster civic beauty and community pride;
 - E. To stabilize and improve property values and to strengthen the local economy;
 - F. To enhance the city's attractions to tourists and visitors and the support and stimulus to business and industry thereby provided.

2. Cooper-Young Historic District

- 2.1 The Cooper-Young Historic District includes the area bounded by Central Avenue on the North, East Parkway on the East, Southern Avenue on the South, and McLean Boulevard on the West, except as follows:
1. The Northwest portion previously designated as part of the Central Gardens Historic Landmark District; and
 2. Non-residential properties, along Cooper Street and Young Avenue, that lie within the district's borders.

3. Historic Overview and Character-Defining Features

This historic overview is excerpted from the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for the Cooper-Young Historic District (1989). Numbered references (e.g. #0001) refer to the inventory included in this document. Much of this description is based on the following report:

Jemison, Peggy Boyce, et al. (1977). *A History of the Cooper-Young Neighborhood*. (Memphis: Metropolitan Inter-Faith Association.)

3.1 From Section 8: Significance:

The Cooper Young Historic District in Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee...[was listed on the National Register of Historic Preservation] for its significance as an important, cohesive and largely intact collection of late 19th and early 20th century middle-class architectural styles and types, constructed over the period of ca. 1880 to 1940. The district contains numerous examples of architectural types and styles in pure form and in various combinations that demonstrate both the tendency of builders to mix and match elements from various styles and trade catalogs during the period of the district's development, as well as the experimentation with mixed plans, forms and substyles also prevalent during the period. In addition, the district is being nominated for its principal association with the Christie's Cut Stone Company, a masterful architectural stoneworks company associated with the creation of many of Memphis landmarks, as well as architectural elements of many buildings within the Cooper-Young district itself.

In many ways, the Cooper-Young district acts as a mirror for the development of Memphis and Shelby County from the mid-1870s to the present. The area grew and changed greatly beginning in the early 1880s and reached its zenith as a neighborhood by the late 1920s. The Great Depression slowed the development of the little undeveloped area remaining, but it did not stop it entirely. For all intents, the area was continuously developed during this period until stopped by the onset of World War II. Construction that occurred following the War is readily apparent in contrast to the character of the district in its pre-War years.

Settlement of the general area around Cooper-Young can be traced to as early as 1819, when Soloman Rozelle was awarded a land grant of several thousand acres by the State of Tennessee in the area that now comprises most of Midtown Memphis. Though Rozelle actively farmed much of this tract, there is little physical indication of development activity in the district itself until many years following the Civil War. None-the-less, there were several important occurrences in the intervening years that have greatly shaped the development of the Cooper-Young area.

Of major importance to the area [sic] was the establishment of the LaGrange and Memphis Railroad (later the Memphis and Charleston, Southern and now, the Norfolk-Southern) along the district's southern boundary at Southern Avenue. The LaGrange and Memphis line was an ill-fated venture that was successful in laying trackage past the district in ca. 1841-42, before folding due to poor financing. However, with the re-establishment of service under the Memphis and Charleston Railroad in 1845, the value and desirability of this area was greatly enhanced. Speculation in rail-side property abounded, as reflected in the purchase of 577 acres of land by William Cooper in 1848--land that comprises much of the district today.

Cooper's interest in the area likely did not pay off in the short or the long run due to the lack of housing and commercial development in the area at this time, but his mark was left in the name of Cooper Street and of the Cooper Subdivision, the basis on which the

division of property within the district has been based since the mid-1850s.

Following the Civil War, the City of Memphis and many other communities in Shelby County were devastated by a series of Yellow Fever Epidemics, beginning in 1868 and continuing until 1879. Though the death toll from this mosquito-borne disease was astounding in itself, the secondary effects of the loss of population by those fleeing the city were equally devastating to the local economy. Many of Memphis' prominent citizens, businessmen and industrialists fled the city never to return. Others took refuge in the countryside by purchasing tracts along railroad lines and highways. In spite of the devastating effects of the Yellow Fever Epidemics on the City of Memphis, it was from this chaos that emerged the establishment of early pockets of housing development like Cooper-Young, Buntyn, Ridgeway, Idlewild Heights, and many others.

By the early 1880s, much of the land included in the district had been developed for large estates and farms. The earliest known survivor of this era is the Cheatham-Barron House at 1064 Blythe Street (#0067), which was developed between 1883 and ca. 1885 for Major John A. Cheatham on Lot 99 of William Cooper's subdivision. Other property owners in the area included J. C. Neely, W. M. Sneed, Frank Trimble, John J. Williams and George B. Fleece. Many of these men were directly responsible for the development of the Cooper-Young area in the decades that followed as partners in subdivision development companies or as land developers themselves.

In spite of the location of Cooper-Young some three miles outside of the Memphis City limits (then at East Street), the area quickly became the scene of considerable development activity following the establishment of the New Memphis Jockey Club at Montgomery Park (now the Mid-South Fairgrounds) in 1884. The park, to the east across East Parkway South from the district, became a major attraction to the citizens of Memphis and all of Shelby County.

Following the success of Montgomery Park, many of the same investors, J. C. Fleece and W. M. Sneed among them, joined in 1887 to form a street trolley company called the Citizen's East End Railway. The line's major purpose was to take advantage of the small but growing suburban growth of areas between Montgomery Park and the city of Memphis and to connect them to the downtown business district. The "East End Dummy Line" was thus established with a route that ran out Madison to Cooper, south to Young, and then to Montgomery Park before beginning its return route south to Southern Avenue to the Wilson Station at Cooper before turning northward for the return to downtown. The route of this line encircled part of the Mount Arlington Subdivision, and thus enhanced its development. Though trolleys have long disappeared from the streets of Memphis, the spirit of this early trolley line has been preserved to this day by modern bus service, which still travels much of the same route from downtown Memphis.

The ease of daily travel afforded by the "dummy", as it was commonly called, created the desirability of the Cooper-Young area for suburban living. The Mount Arlington Subdivision became the first effort to take advantage of this new market. Led by Frank Trimble, Leslie Stratton, Charles Gilcrest and Frank Hill, Mount Arlington was laid out in March and April of 1890 and included all of the area south of Young between Cooper and Trezevant, along with an irregular portion extending to Nelson along Meda, Nellie Bly (now Cox), New York and Philadelphia Streets. The establishment of this subdivision in such a large area required the negotiation of a number of purchase/resale agreements with the current residents of the area. Most, like John Cheatham, sold their property to the developers for only a short time before repurchasing their land as a group of subdivided lots. And like Cheatham, many of the pre-existing home [sic] required the lifting of the building off its existing foundations and then turning the building to face the right-of-ways of the new streets created for the subdivision.

Mount Arlington was laid out in twenty-one blocks and was specifically-oriented to

provide residents with convenient pedestrian access to the "dummy", unlike future subdivisions in the area that were oriented toward the convenience of automotive traffic. Though the Mount Arlington area is often seen as the "break in the grid" of streets in the Cooper-Young area, it was Mount Arlington that established the pattern-- the rest of the area broke with its' precedence.

Lots within Mount Arlington were small, measuring only twenty feet wide and 100 feet deep. Though most were purchased as double lots, the smaller lot size when combined with the lack of built-in development control and the lack of zoning created the interesting mix of large and small houses that characterizes the Mount Arlington area today.

The success of Mount Arlington as a residential area is readily recognizable in its surviving architectural context. Most of the district's pre-1900 structures exist in this area in the form of Queen Anne cottages, L-plan cottages, shotguns and Colonial Revival cottages. Many of the best examples of these may be found along Cox, Meda and Blythe Streets today.

A few other reminders of the 19th century era of development in the Cooper-Young area outside of Mount Arlington remain evident, most notably the large and exuberant Queen Anne house at 2106 Young (#1542), built in ca. 1890 for developer Frank Trimble, and known commonly today as the Captain Harris House (NR 12/19/79). Like the Cheatham-Barron House, this home was also lifted from its foundations and turned from Cooper Street to face Young in ca. 1910.

The success of the Mount Arlington subdivision was followed by the subdivision of other large estate tracts in the next few years, the J. Henkel subdivision being next in the area and bound by Southern, Cooper, Young and Green (now Tanglewood). Following the annexation of the portion of the district south of Cooper in 1899 under the administration of Mayor John J. Williams, the entire area literally exploded with development activity.

Beyond the annexation of 1899, which brought about the extension of sewer and water service to the Cooper-Young area, the Williams administration also brought about many sweeping changes in the Memphis urban environment that had a direct benefit to the development of the district. The fact that Williams was a major property owner in Cooper-Young was by no means an accident, though the entire city benefited greatly by the progressive leadership of the city under Williams. The establishment of the Memphis Park System including its system of parkways was one such inspired action, the benefits of which are still enjoyed today. The original route of East Parkway was proposed to run through Cooper-Young along what is now Barksdale before turning northeastwardly along the course of Lick Creek to Overton Park. The existing routes of the Parkways were chosen in 1904, with modifications in ca. 1921 and subsequent years.

The wave of development activity in the newly annexed area was spurred by the aggressive expansion of the Memphis economy from 1892 to the late 1920s. Many of the subdivisions developed during this time, such as Annesdale Park (NR 12/22/78), Belvedere (Central Gardens, NR 9/9/82) and Annesdale-Snowden (NR 10/25/79), contained larger lots and development restrictions that forced the construction of large and expensive homes. The various subdivisions of Cooper-Young were among the more middle-class alternatives for residential construction. Maps of Memphis from the period of 1900 to 1927 dramatically demonstrate the desirability of this alternative. Whereas the 1907 Sanborn Maps for the area only document the existence of about fifty homes in the entire district, the 1927 Sanborn Maps show that the area had been nearly developed in entirety. The pattern moved generally from east to west, unlike the pattern in most of Midtown. The existing pattern of streets and blocks appears to have been completed to McLean Boulevard by ca. 1911-13.

Population growth in the Cooper-Young area was reflected in the establishment of a

local school in 1906. Called Mount Arlington School, the structure originally was located on Cox Street near Walker, but was burned by an arsonist in 1908. A temporary school was established to serve the area until the completion of the Fleece Station School in 1910. The name of the school was changed to Peabody School (NR 9/17/82, -41537) later in the same year. The school has witnessed many generations of service to the Cooper-Young neighborhood, and continues this tradition to the present day. The recent rehabilitation of the school by the Memphis School Board has restored many of its original finishes and has affirmed its continuance as a neighborhood resource for years to come.

Subdivisions of the district following the turn of the century included the Malone and Nelson, Richland Place, the E. O. Bailey, Cooper and Central, Edmunson and Cummings, the Highlands, Lamar Heights and the Parkway Subdivisions, along with numerous fractional subdivisions of these larger areas. Leading by example following his defeat by Walter Malone in 1906, John J. Williams turned to the subdivision development of his own estate and constructed a new home within it for his family at 2006 Young (#1511).

The surprising speed with which the Cooper-Young area developed during the first two decades of the 20th century has given it its' remarkable character. Largely homogeneous in terms of the scale, mass and architectural styles, the area none-the-less displays a surprising diversity in the design of its individual properties. Most of these, both Southern cottage and bungalow forms alike, were not constructed from architects plans, but were drawn largely from the vast array of builder's guides, stylebooks and plans published in the popular magazines of the day. A number of the homes in the district resemble the prefabricated residences available for purchase from the Sears and Roebuck Company, though none have yet been conclusively identified as such.

The diversity of design traits in the individual residences of Cooper-Young was provided mostly by the availability of inexpensive pre-manufactured house parts made both locally and nationally. Columns, mantles, windows, doors, art glass windows and other decorative details were all available to speculative builders and individual home owners alike at reasonable cost. The use of pre-manufactured materials like these may be seen throughout the district; the popularity of cast stone as a "new" alternative to wood is particularly prevalent. The use of stone as a building material was more expensive than cast stone, but became a more common alternative for home builders following the establishment of Christie's Cut Stone Company at 2082 Elzey Street (#0333) in 1921. Even though the lion's share of Christie's business was involved in the production of fine stonework for churches, office buildings and some of Memphis' finest residences, the company was also responsible for much of the more modest treatments in the district. Aside from the many bungalows and Tudor cottages in the district that can be tied to the Christie Company, other structures like the earlier L-plan house at 2037 Elzey (#0324) were "up-dated" with a veneer of stone during the 1920s.

The importance of Christie's Cut Stone Company to the significance of the district can not be understated. Aside from its role as an outlet for neighborhood employment..., the company has developed a significance by itself as a regionally important enterprise. Begun by Scottish immigrant Alexander Christie and his son Alexander, Jr. in 1921, a tradition of fine stonework has been continued to the present day by their descendants. From behind the unassuming facade of the company's shop on Elzey Street has come masterful stonework to ornament buildings of major significance throughout the Southern states. Local examples of the craftsmanship of the Christie Cut Stone Company include the Sterick Building (1928, NR 10/2/78), the entirety of the campus of Rhodes College (Formerly Southwestern at Memphis, 1924 to present, NR 7/20/78), various memorials and structures existing in Overton Park (1900 to present, NR 10/25/79), and what may be the Company's greatest known-work in the form of Idlewild Presbyterian Church (George Awsumb, architect, 1926-1930, with additions). Today, the tradition of master stone

masonry has flourished with the recent revival of stone as a modern building material.

One of the interesting characteristics of the Cooper-Young district that sets it apart from Memphis' many other historic neighborhoods is rooted in the development of its industrial and commercial resource base within the fabric of its residential environment. Most notable is the Keathley Pie Company building [formerly] on Young between New York and Philadelphia Streets, built in ca. 1940 (965 Philadelphia Street, #1201). Begun in 1930, the Keathley Company became nationally famous for its small pecan pies, originally sold for a nickel and hence the name "nickel pie". The company's business exploded from its modest beginnings in the kitchen of the Keathley family home at 997 Cox, turning into a mass-produced item following its first regional contract with the Tom Peanut Company in 1939. The Keathley trademark and formulas were bought by the Fairmont Foods Company in 1970 and...continued to be produced at the same location..., under the name of Auntie's Bakery. The Keathley family continues its baking tradition to the present under a different name, Progressive Foods, Inc., located just outside of the district at 2151 York. Ronco Foods, a major producer of macaroni products,...[was] also based in Cooper-Young at 800 Barksdale (#0001). Given the combined functions of these three enterprises, Cooper-Young is generally held as a center for commercial food-production in the Memphis area...

Unlike many areas of Memphis, Cooper-Young experienced a period of unabated, though modest, development during the Depression years that continued until the outbreak of World War Two. The structural survey included with this nomination indicates that at least thirty residential and commercial structures were built during the Depression era, including nearly a dozen structures in the half decade immediately prior to the War. Much of this construction became possible through the sale in 1938 of undeveloped property once owned by the Citizen's East End Railway, located generally at Evelyn, East Parkway South and Nelson. With the onset of the War in 1941, construction of residences ceased for the duration. Following the War, construction on the few remaining lots resumed. The type, style, materials and detailing of the post-War residences differed from those built in the historic period of Cooper-Young's development, forming a major break in the context of character for the neighborhood.

Cooper-Young, like many parts of Midtown Memphis (including Annesdale-Snowden, Central Gardens, Evergreen and Annesdale Park), experienced a slow decline with the rapid expansion in new housing areas in East Memphis beginning in the mid-1950s. Led by the determination of the members of the community, the neighborhood has witnessed a remarkable revival since the late 1970s which continues to the present. Fortunately, large portions of the district retain their character intact, with few vacant lots or intrusionary structures. As such, the district remains as a fine document of a vital and dynamic late-nineteenth and early 20th century urban middle class neighborhood.

As a document of such, the Cooper-Young district provides the opportunity for architectural historians, historians and cultural demographers to track the paths of dispersion of architectural styles and forms as they filtered from the "high-style" to common usage by the majority of Americans, rather than by the few. The blending of vernacular building forms with veneers of architectural styling, springing from the trade catalogs of sash, door and blind manufacturers and from the pages of the popular press, provides a genuine view of the cultural wants and needs of the middle class as represented in their built artifacts. Without the recognition of this value and its preservation for the future, our collective view of ourselves as Americans will be narrow at best.

3.3 From section 7: Description:

The physical characteristics of the basic street grid and lot orientation of the district were shaped by the evolution of the area through the period ca. 1880 to ca. 1925. The

characteristics of buildings within the overall framework of the district developed concurrently within this period and continued to ca. 1941. By the onset of World War II, the area was largely developed to the size and character known today; residences built since are of a dramatically different character than those developed during the district's historic period.

The district's street grid pattern and lot orientation are related to two separate periods of subdivision development common in the United States. The first set of characteristics is commonly associated with those of the "street car suburb" pattern-- embodied in the district in the form of a pedestrian-oriented regular grid of smaller blocks divided into small lots (20'-25' frontage, sold as single, double or triple lot groups), related internally to a nearby streetcar line serving the transportation needs of most residents, rather than to the larger street pattern of the city. The second set of characteristics is related to the "automobile suburb" pattern-- embodied in the district in the form of longer, more lineal blocks divided into larger lot sizes (50'-60' frontage, usually sold as single lots), related less to pedestrian use and more externally to the prevalent street pattern of Memphis as a whole.

Elements of the two patterns is evident in the street and lot pattern of the district. To the west of Cooper is the area that conforms to the pattern of the automobile suburb-- the primary street grid runs east/west, with properties facing north and south towards the street. However, north of Cooper, and especially in the area south of Nelson Street, the axis of principal streets runs north/south, with properties developed facing east and west. This particular area is the portion of the district conforming to the pattern of a street car suburb, and is known historically as the Mount Arlington subdivision.

Mount Arlington was developed within the earlier road pattern of Cooper Street, McLean Boulevard, Trezvant Street (now East Parkway South) and Southern Avenue. Its development beginning in 1890 lead the way in initiating the gradual subdivision and development of the rest of the Cooper-Young area. As one might expect, the Mount Arlington subdivision possesses physical characteristics and residential house types of a slightly different nature than the remainder of the historic district. The resulting overall development pattern in Cooper-Young ran contrary to that of Midtown Memphis as a whole-- development began in the eastern portion of the neighborhood and spread west, rather than the reverse pattern witnessed elsewhere.

In general, the Cooper-Young area contains many emblematic characteristics of a late-19th century and early 20th century middle-class neighborhood. House lots range in size from as little as 20' in frontage to 100', with the average frontage being between 50' and 55'. Lot depths range from 100' to 250' deep, with the common depth being about 150'. Building setbacks vary on the basis of location, from as little as 10' in some of the older, densely-developed areas of Mount Arlington, to more than 80' in rare instances. The norm ranges from 30' to 35'.

The right of way and railroad embankment of the Louisville and Nashville railroad provides a dramatic separation of the district from the other residential neighborhoods of Midtown Memphis, with the exception of the Rozelle-Annesdale neighborhood which lies to the west of the district boundary at McLean Boulevard. The railroad barrier is pierced at three points within the district, at McLean Boulevard, Barksdale Street and on Cooper Street. The existing "subways" connecting Cooper-Young with the rest of Midtown Memphis were built in ca. 1910-15 to replace earlier structures and remain as interesting cultural resources for the district at its edges. The McLean subway is of particular note, since the depth of its road cut under the railroad required the construction of cast concrete balustraded retaining walls on neighboring properties. One such wall retains the embankment and yard of 1822 Evelyn (#0386) at the district's western edge. Since this resource also is contained in part of the Rozelle-Annesdale neighborhood across the

street, it was not enumerated as a contributing resource for the district, but is noted as an important shared element of both areas.

The general topography of the district is gently rolling to nearly flat in character. Some streets, like Cox, Nelson and Oliver, among others, were cut into the rolling topography to lessen their grades; consequently, residences along these streets are raised on terraces above the street grade. Sidewalks are featured throughout the district at curbside. Pedestrian-scale replicated post-top streetlighting was reintroduced to the district in 1982 to replace the less compatible overhead lighting employed in the district for many years before.

Landscaping in the district is a private rather than public characteristic. Given the confinement of lot sizes in the district, yard trees rather than street trees were planted by subdivision developers throughout in regularly spaced intervals and patterns of species types. Many of these now mature plantings remain throughout the district and include water oak, sycamore, red maple, red gum, holly, magnolia, pecan and tulip poplar. Private plantings such as shrubbery and flowerbeds are generally removed from the street to the more private sphere of the residence.

Outbuildings within the district were largely constructed as free-standing garages, though numerous other historic outbuilding types were inventoried with the building survey of the neighborhood. Included among these were several servant quarters and surviving carriage barns, now converted to garage and/or apartment use. Storage buildings, workshops and guest quarters are also represented in smaller numbers. Non-historic outbuildings encountered included carports, newer garages and prefabricated metal storage buildings. It is interesting to note that the part of the neighborhood lying west of Cooper contains the greatest number of garages and outbuildings, reflecting a characteristic of the automobile-oriented suburb. Private-use and shared drives connect these outbuildings to the street; many early dual-track concrete drives survive throughout the neighborhood as an indication of early automotive use and development.

Residential historic resources within the Cooper-Young district range in date from as early as ca. 1880 to ca. 1941, and display characteristics of a diverse range of architectural forms and styles during this period. Historic architectural forms represented include the L-plan vernacular cottage, shotgun. Southern cottage, Tudor cottage, bungalow, four-square, modified shotgun, and early suburban "Cape" and saltbox house, as well as the "raised (two-story) shotgun", a type not known to exist in other areas of Memphis. Of these forms, the Southern cottage and bungalow represent the majority of form types within the district. Architectural styles are equally as diverse and include the Queen Anne, the Tudor Revival, Colonial Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, Craftsman (Arts and Crafts), Art Moderne and Minimal/Traditional styles. Sub-types and styles are freely mixed throughout the district, thus providing a nearly endless variety of individual expressions. Of these styles, the Craftsman, Colonial Revival and Queen Anne are best represented.

Representative examples of the Queen Anne style within the district include 1064 Blythe (#0067), 1069 Blythe (#0068), 968 Philadelphia (#1202), 2085 Elzey (#0334) and 926 New York (#1014). Examples of the Colonial Revival include 937 Philadelphia (#1200), 1054 Philadelphia (#1235), 1831 Oliver (#1064), 1961 Nelson (#0883) and 1938 Evelyn (#0430). The Craftsman style is most widely represented in the district and includes 823 Cooper (#0121), 1053 East Parkway South (#0319), 1972 Evelyn (#0444), 2174 Elzey (#0361), 1043 Fleece (#0672) and 1915 Manila (#0714).

In addition to its housing stock, the district is unusual for its indigenous industrial and food processing base, some of which predates many of the residential resources within the area, and have actually contributed greatly to the character and vitality of the neighborhood. Christie's Cut Stone at 2082 Elzey (#0333)...[and] Ronco Foods at 800

Barksdale (#0001) have...provided a unique character to the district rarely seen in other Memphis residential neighborhoods. This is true of other neighborhood districts previously listed, including Annesdale Park (NR 12/22/78), Annesdale-Snowden (NR 10/25/79), Central Gardens (NR 9/9/82), Evergreen (NR 1/11/85), Hein Park (NR 11/16/88) and South Parkway-Heiskell Farm (NR 2/16/83), none of which contain indigenous industrial resources. The contribution made by Christie's Cut Stone is especially notable, since the firm has provided most of the stonework in evidence today for the district's residential, commercial and church buildings.

3. Definitions

For the purpose of the Cooper-Young Historic District, terms and words used herein shall be used, interpreted, and defined as in the Memphis and Shelby County Unified Development Code and as set forth below.

- 4.1. PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE: 1880 – 1941
- 4.2. DEMOLITION: the complete or partial tearing down of a building or structure, or the removal of a building or structure from the district. The Landmarks Commission must deem such proposed demolition appropriate.
- 4.3. HABITABLE ADDITIONS: the addition of heated/air conditioned space to the existing structure. These may include but are not limited to the following: front or side porch enclosures, rear porch enclosures if visible from street, or a new addition.
- 4.4. NON-HABITABLE ADDITIONS: additions that do not include heated/air conditioned space but that are still attached to the primary structure. These may include but are not limited to the following: non-enclosed front or side porches, garages, porte cocheres, and carports.
- 4.5. RELOCATION: moving a building or structure into or out of the district, or from one site to another within the district. Such relocation of a building or structure shall be considered and reviewed as a demolition of the building or structure.
- 4.6. RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURE: a principal structure that was originally designed for residential use, including single family, duplex, and triplexes, although the current use may be non-residential.
- 4.7. STREET-BLOCK: properties on both sides of a street between the closest intersecting public streets

4. General Principles

- 5.1. These guidelines shall apply only to the exteriors of residential structures and to areas of lots that are visible from the public right-of-way (excluding alleys). The public facades – both front and street-visible elevations – of proposed new residential buildings shall be more carefully reviewed than other facades.
- 5.2. New residential buildings shall be compatible with the existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block in terms of style, height, scale, setback, rhythm, massing, materials and other design characteristics. The dominance of that pattern and rhythm of design characteristics shall be respected and not disrupted.

- 5.3. If there are no existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block, new residential buildings shall be compatible with the existing residential structures on that street-block.
- 5.4. These guidelines shall not apply to ordinary repairs and maintenance.
- 5.5. These guidelines shall not apply to construction that has been approved prior to their adoption.
- 5.6. Where the word “should” appears it is to be interpreted as “highly encouraged”. Mandatory guidelines will be indicated by “shall” or “shall not”.
- 5.7. These guidelines shall apply to residential structures even in non-residential use.

5. **New Construction - Residential**

New construction shall be consistent with the architecture and styling of the existing residential structures along the same street-block in terms of the following design characteristics:

6.1. Height

1. New residential buildings shall be constructed with the same number of stories as any existing residential structure constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.
2. The height of new construction shall be consistent with the height of any residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.

6.2. Building Mass, Scale, and Form

1. A new residential building shall appear similar in mass and scale to those residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block in terms of the height of the foundation wall, porch roof, and main roofs.
2. The front elevation shall appear similar in scale and width to the residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.
3. New roofs, dormers, and eave depths shall be similar to those of the residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.
4. Story heights in new construction shall be consistent with residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.

6.3. Setbacks and Rhythm of Spacing

1. The setback from front and side property lines established by residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block shall be maintained.
2. When a definite rhythm along a street-block is established by uniform lot and residential building width, new construction shall maintain that rhythm.

6.4. Orientation

1. The site orientation of new residential buildings shall be consistent with that of existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.
2. The front of the new residential building shall face the street-block, and the front door should shall be visible and obvious.

6.5. Building Materials

1. The common materials used during the district's period of significance were brick, stucco, clapboard or lap wood siding, stone, split-faced concrete block, and raised metal or asphalt shingled roofing.
2. Masonry materials such as stone and brick that appear similar to that seen traditionally may be used.
3. Horizontal lap siding may be used as a primary building material or as an accent but shall be constructed of wood, fiber cement board, or a material of similar appearance and comparable durability.
4. Roof materials may be either metal or asphalt composite shingles and shall convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.
5. Alternate materials are acceptable if they appear similar to those traditionally used and have comparable durability.
6. New construction materials shall be reviewed by the Commission for their compatibility with materials used during the period of significance prior to approval for use in new construction.

6.7 Relationship of Materials, Textures, and Details

The relationship and use of materials, texture, and details of a new residential building's principal facades shall be visually compatible with, and similar to, those of residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.

6.8 Proportion and Rhythm of Openings

The relationship of width to height of windows and doors, and the rhythm of solids to voids in new residential buildings shall be visually compatible with residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.

6.9 Roof Shape

The roof shape, slope and orientation of new residential buildings shall be consistent with the roofs of existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance along the same street-block

6.10 Foundations

1. New residential buildings shall be constructed on a raised foundation that is consistent with the foundation height of existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance along the same street-block.

2. Contrasting materials or a belt course may be used to assist in creating the difference between the raised foundation and the body of the structure.

6.11 Architectural Character

1. New residential buildings shall use architectural features and styles common to residential structures throughout the neighborhood during the period of significance; contemporary interpretations of these styles are strongly encouraged.
2. Decks shall not be constructed on the front of a new residential building.
3. The amount of hard surface paving for patios, terraces, and/or drives in front yard shall be minimized.

6.12. Porches

1. Any new residential building shall be constructed with a front porch.
2. Front porches shall be consistent in scale, form, and dimensions of any residential structure constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.

6.13 Parking

1. Parking areas other than a driveway shall be located to the rear or to the rear side of a new residential building.
2. A front yard parking pad is not compatible with the period of significance and shall not be permitted.
3. Ribbon paving is an approved design form, and concrete is an appropriate material for driveways.
4. Driveways shall maintain a similar width consistent with driveways of any existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.

6.14 Attached Parking Structures

1. A porte cochere may be located in front of the habitable space of the primary structure as an extension of the front porch if consistent with any existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block.
2. Carports shall be placed to the side or rear of the primary structure. The front plane of the carport shall either line up with the front plane of the front façade of the primary structure or be setback from that plane.
3. Attached garages are prohibited on the front of the habitable space for the primary structure. Garages shall be secondary in scale and setback at least 25 feet from the front of the habitable space for the primary structure.

7. Habitable Additions to Existing Structures - Residential

Habitable additions are defined as the addition of heated/air conditioned space to the existing structure. These may include but are not limited to the following: front or side porch enclosures, rear porch enclosures if visible from street, or a new addition.

- 7.1. Habitable additions shall be located to the rear or side of existing residential structures so that they do not disturb the principal facade. New additions to the front of existing

residential structures are not compatible with the structures built during the period of significance and shall not be allowed.

- 7.2 Additions not seen from the public right of way will not be reviewed by the Landmarks Commission.
- 7.3 Additions shall be compatible with the existing residential structure in scale, material and texture, and shall not contrast with the existing facade.
- 7.4 Additions shall be subservient in scale and massing to the main structure.
- 7.5 Enclosing front porches to create habitable space is prohibited.

8. Non-Habitable Additions to Existing Structures - Residential

Non-habitable additions are defined as additions that do not include heated/air conditioned space but that are still attached to the primary structure. These may include but are not limited to the following: non-enclosed front or side porches, garages, porte cocheres, and carports.

8.1. Porches

1. Enclosing front porches is prohibited. Screening is permitted.
2. Front porches shall be consistent in dimensions with adjacent residential structures built during the period of significance.
3. A front porch shall be required if front porches are part of the dominant character of residential structures from the period of significance on the same street-block.
4. Any project that requires a front porch shall have a front porch with a minimum depth of six feet. (commentary - these are basically taken from the UDC 3.9.2.I regarding Contextual Infill Standards; technically all development, even now, should be following these guidelines, but the city continues to ignore these standards; it is very important we support the integrity of our historic porches)

8.2. Attached Parking Structures

1. A porte cochere may be located in front of the habitable space of the primary structure as an extension of the front porch if consistent with any existing residential structures constructed during the period of significance on the same street-block. The driveway under the porte cochere shall extend to the rear of the residential structure.
2. Attached garages are prohibited on the front of the habitable space for the primary structure. Garages shall be secondary in scale and setback at least 25 feet from the front of the habitable space for the primary structure.
3. Carports shall be placed to the side or rear of the primary structure. The front plane of the carport shall either line up with the front plane of the front facade of the primary structure or be setback from that plane.
4. Detached garages located to the rear of the lot are encouraged and are compatible with construction during the period of significance.
5. Street-facing garages and carports shall not be allowed unless they are part of the dominant character of all properties from the period of significance on the same street-

block. (commentary - once again, this wording is taken more or less directly from the UDC, 3.9.2.H, in terms of contextual infill standards.)

9. Outbuildings and Fencing - Residential

- 9.1. Front yard fencing shall not completely obscure the view of the house from the public right of way. Materials used during the period of significance such as wood or iron—or materials with a similar appearance—are encouraged.
- 9.2. Backyard and side yard privacy fencing shall be allowed.
- 9.3. Carports, garages, sheds, or other similar structures shall be compatible with the character and design of the main structure and nearby outbuildings.
- 9.4. Freestanding, detached outbuildings are prohibited on the front of the primary structure. Such outbuildings are permitted to the side of the primary structure so long as they are set back at least 25 feet from the front of the habitable space for the primary structure.

10. Demolition

The term 'demolition' is defined as the complete or partial tearing down of a building or structure, or the removal of a building or structure from the district. The Landmarks Commission must deem such proposed demolition appropriate.

- 10.1. Since the purpose of historic zoning is to protect historic properties, the demolition of a building or structure is inappropriate if that structure contributes historically or architecturally to the character and significance of the district.
- 10.2. Demolition is not appropriate if the proposed reuse and new construction would diminish or detract from the predominantly single-family character of the district.
- 10.3. Demolition is appropriate when the structure is shown to be unsound. A professional, written report stating the reasons the property is structurally unsound must be presented for review.

11. Relocation

The term 'relocation' is defined as moving a building or structure into or out of the district, or from one site to another within the district. Such relocation of a building or structure shall be considered and reviewed as a demolition of the building or structure.

- 11.1. A building or structure may be moved into the district if it shows architectural unity with existing structures constructed during the period of significance along the street-block and otherwise complies with the guidelines set forth in this document.
- 11.2. A building or structure may be moved from one location to another within the district if it complies with all the requirements set forth above and receives the approval of the Commission.