

HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
PERMITS IN NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICTS
FEBRUARY 1, 2022
HR-2023-002675
TRAVIS HEIGHTS-FAIRVIEW PARK
1702 ALAMEDA DRIVE

PROPOSAL

Construct an addition, repoint brick, replace windows, and add front porch to a ca. 1935 house.

PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS

- 1) Clean and repoint existing brick.
- 2) Replace windows to match existing.
- 3) Remove existing addition at west (rear) elevation. Replace with new single-story addition. The proposed addition is connected to the rear wall of the existing structure via a hyphen clad in vertical siding. The addition features an asymmetrical gable, horizontal siding, 1:1 sash and fixed windows, and a shed-roofed balcony.
- 4) Construct front porch. The proposed porch is steel with concrete footings.

ARCHITECTURE

1702 Alameda Drive is a 1.5-story, cross-gabled Tudor Revival house with masonry cladding, 1:1 windows, an arched entryway, and shallow eaves.

RESEARCH

The house at 1702 Alameda Drive was constructed around 1935. Its first residents were Gustaf Raymond and Lois Peterson. Gustaf Peterson worked as a concrete engineer and laboratory technician at the State Highway Department. In the early 1950s, they sold the property to the Ranney family. Roger Ranney began his career as a teacher and lawyer in Iowa before moving to Texas, where he sold insurance and pianos. After working as a salesman for several years, he changed careers and became one of the first professional parole officers in Texas.

DESIGN STANDARDS

The City of Austin's [Historic Design Standards](#) (March 2021) are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and are used to evaluate projects in National Register districts. The following standards apply:

Residential repair and alterations

1. General Standards

1.1 Do not remove intact historic material from the exterior of a building.

The proposed project removes some intact material from the building's secondary elevations, but removes mainly non-historic additions.

1.2 Always attempt repair first. Replacement should only be undertaken when absolutely necessary, and for the smallest area possible.

The proposed project replaces existing replacement windows in-kind, but does not appear to change the existing window openings at portions of the house visible from the street. It repairs existing masonry.

1.3 When historic material must be replaced due to damage or deterioration, replacement materials should look the same, perform reliably within the existing construction, and, in most cases, be made of the same material.

See 1.2.

1.4 Do not attempt to re-create an architectural detail or element without proof that it existed on the building historically. Documentation can be physical (traces on the building), written (such as building plans), or photographic.

The proposed project does not attempt to recreate architectural details without precedent.

1.5 When demolishing additions or features that were built after the building's period of significance, minimize damage to the building. a. Stabilize and repair building walls that are exposed when non-historic additions or features are removed. b. Avoid demolition that removes historic structural systems or compromises the structural integrity of a historic building.

The proposed demolition of additions appears to minimize damage to the historic portion of the building.

2. Foundations

2.1 Maintain the building's historic relationship with the site. Do not raise, lower, or rotate the historic building when rehabilitating the foundation. Any elevation changes to minimize flood risk will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

The proposed project does not alter the building's historic relationship with the site.

2.2 Retain portions of the foundation system visible from the exterior. a. Retain and repair masonry building skirts. b. Retain and repair historic wood or metal building skirts, where possible. Like roofs, these protective elements may require replacement over time. Replicate historic building skirts when necessary to replace them.

The proposed project retains the existing foundation and matches new skirting to the existing.

4. Exterior Walls and Trim

4.1 Repair, rather than replace, historic material, unless it is deteriorated beyond the point of stabilization or restoration. Replace only those portions of an exterior wall or trim that are deteriorated beyond repair, leaving the rest of the wall or trim intact.

The proposed project repairs existing masonry.

4.3 When repointing a masonry wall, use replacement mortar that matches the historic mortar in composition, joint profile, and color.

The proposed project uses matching replacement mortar.

4.4 When cleaning masonry, use gentle techniques that do not damage the wall.

The application does not specify cleaning methods to be used.

4.5 Minimize changes to side walls that are visible from streets (not including alleys).

The proposed project removes some masonry at side walls, but retains most.

5. Windows, Doors, and Screens

5.1 Repair, rather than replace, historic windows, doors, and screens; and their trim, surrounds, sidelights, transoms, and shutters, unless they are deteriorated beyond the point of stabilization or restoration. Retain windows if 50% or more of the wood or metal sash members are intact. a. Using modern material in repairs and patches is a possibility if the material has proven appropriate and stable in similar uses.

The house's existing windows appear to be replacements. The application proposes in-kind replacement at the historic portion of the house, but does not specify material.

5.5 Do not enlarge, move, or enclose historic window or door openings that are highly visible from a front or side street. It may be appropriate to restore historic door or window openings that have been enclosed.

See 1.2.

9. Light Fixtures

9.1 Retain and repair historic light fixtures. 9.2 If historic light fixtures must be replaced, use a fixture that matches the historic fixture as closely as possible or a modern light fixture that does not distract from the streetscape or building's historic character.

The proposed project replaces existing non-historic light fixtures. Details not provided.

Residential additions

1. Location

1.1 Locate additions to the rear and sides of historic buildings to minimize visual impact.

The proposed addition is located to the rear side of the historic building.

1.2 Step back side additions from the front wall a distance that preserves the shape of the historic building from the primary street.

The proposed addition is a single story, connected via hyphen and set back beyond the rear wall of the house.

1.5 Minimize the loss of historic fabric by connecting additions to the existing building through the least possible invasive location and means.

See 1.2.

2. Scale, Massing, and Height

2.1 Design an addition to complement the scale and massing of the historic building, including height. The addition must appear subordinate to the historic building.

The proposed addition appears mostly subordinate to the historic building.

2.2 Minimize the appearance of the addition from the street faced by the historic building's front wall. a. If the addition connects to the historic building's rear wall, step in the addition's side walls at least one foot (1') from the side walls of the historic building. b. The historic building's overall shape as viewed from the street must appear relatively unaltered. See 1.2.

3. Design and Style

3.1 Design additions to be compatible with and differentiated from the historic building, if they are visible from the street. a. Design proportions and patterns such as window-to-wall area ratios, floor-to-floor heights, fenestration patterns, and bay divisions to increase compatibility. b. Do not replicate the design or details of the existing building to a degree that the addition might be mistaken as historic.

The proposed addition is differentiated from the historic building, though it appears to be minimally visible from the street. Proportions are mostly compatible and the design of the historic building is not replicated.

3.2 No particular style is required for addition design. Designs in both traditional and contemporary styles can successfully achieve compatibility and differentiation with historic buildings.

The proposed addition is somewhat compatible in design and style, mixing contemporary and traditional design elements.

4. Roofs

4.1 If an addition will be visible from a street on the front or side, design its roof form and slope to complement the roof on the historic building.

The proposed addition's asymmetrical roofline and compound form only somewhat complements the simple roof on the historic building.

4.2 Use roof materials that match or have similar color, texture, and other visual qualities as the roof on the historic building.

The proposed roof material appears to be replaced in-kind with shingles.

5. Exterior Walls

5.1 If an addition will be visible from a street on the front or side, use exterior wall materials that are compatible with those on the historic building, as well as with the character of the district, in scale, type, material, size, finish, and texture.

The proposed addition's vertical and horizontal siding are compatible with the historic building and the surrounding district.

5.2 Differentiate the exterior wall materials of the addition from those of the historic building. This could be accomplished by using different materials, using the same materials with different dimensions, or changing trim type or dimensions.

The proposed addition uses vertical siding at the hyphen to differentiate the addition.

5.3 Avoid windowless walls facing a street, unless such walls are a character-defining feature of the historic building.

The proposed addition does not have street-facing windowless walls.

6. Windows, Screens, and Doors

6.1 If an addition will be visible from a street on the front or side, use windows that are compatible with those on the existing building in terms of material, fenestration pattern, size, proportion, configuration, and profile.

Proposed windows visible from the street appear to be compatible.

6.2 Do not use windows with false muntins inserted inside the glass.

The application does not appear to propose use of false muntins.

6.3 If metal screens are used over addition windows, minimize their visual presence with coated or other non-shiny frames.

The application does not specify use of screens.

7. Porches and Decks

7.1 Do not add porches or decks to the front of a historic building unless physical, photographic, or plan evidence exists that the feature was historically present.

The proposed project adds a covered pergola to the front of the building, which is not compatible.

7.2 If new back porches and decks will be visible from the street, design them to be compatible with the historic building in terms of size, style, materials, and proportions.

The proposed back porch does not appear visible from the street.

Summary

The project meets most of the applicable standards, with the exception of *Residential Additions: 4.1* and *Residential Additions: 7.1*.

PROPERTY EVALUATION

The property contributes to the Travis Heights-Fairview Park National Register district.


Designation Criteria—Historic Landmark


- 1) The building is more than 50 years old.
- 2) The building appears to retain high to moderate integrity. Windows have been replaced.
- 3) Properties must meet two criteria for landmark designation (LDC §25-2-352). Staff has evaluated the property and determined that it does not meet two criteria:
 - a. Architecture. The building is constructed in the Tudor Revival style.
 - b. Historical association. The property does not appear to have significant historical associations.
 - c. Archaeology. The property was not evaluated for its potential to yield significant data concerning the human history or prehistory of the region.
 - d. Community value. The property does not appear to possess a unique location, physical characteristic, or significant feature that contributes to the character, image, or cultural identity of the city, the neighborhood, or a particular demographic group.
 - e. Landscape feature. The property is not a significant natural or designed landscape with artistic, aesthetic, cultural, or historical value to the city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Comment on plans, strongly encouraging the applicant to omit the front porch/pergola addition.

LOCATION MAP






1: 2400

1/13/2023

HR 23-002675

1702 ALAMEDA DRIVE



This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey. This product has been produced by the City of Austin for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Photos




Historic review application, 2023

Occupancy History

City Directory Research, January 2023

1959	Roger F. and Lois E. Ranney, owners Salesman
1955	Roger L. and Lois Ranney, owners Salesman, Capital Piano Company
1952	Roger L. and Lois Ranney, owners Salesman, J. R. Reed Music
1947	G. Raymond and Lois Peterson, owners Cement concrete engineer, State Highway Department
1944	G. Raymond and Lois Peterson, owners Laboratory assistant, State Highway Department
1941	G. Raymond and Lois Peterson, owners Technical assistant, State Highway Department
1937	Gustaf Raymond and Lois Peterson, owners Laboratory assistant, State Highway Department
1935	Address not listed

Historical information



PIANO EXECUTIVE VISITS—George H. Stapley, fifth from left, president of the Everett Piano Company of South Haven, Mich., visited the J. R. Reed Music Company, Austin and Central Texas dealer for Everett and Cable-Nelson pianos, last week. He was accompanied by Edward Amrein, sixth from

left, sales manager of the Everett Piano Company. Shown with them are, left to right, Roger Ranney, Victor W. Pannell, Robert L. Oglesby of J. R. Reed piano and organ department, Jack Reed Jr., president of Reeds, and John H. Kavanaugh, general manager of Reed's (extreme right). — (Neal Douglass Photo)

PIANO EXECUTIVE VISITS. The Austin American (1914-1973); 15 Feb 1953: B8

What Sort Picks Out This Job?

By KEN TOWERY
Capitol Correspondent

(This is second of a series of stories on the Texas adult parole system. This article deals primarily with the parole officer.)

Just what kind of a man is he who chooses as his life vocation the task of guiding back into society the murderer, the thief, the rapist, the swindler?

What kind of a man is he who will take a cut in pay that he might assume the responsibility of rehabilitating one whom society has ostracized and punished? One who will get out of bed on a cold, rainy night while

(See SORT, Page A-6)



Roger Ranney is one of Texas' 40 parole officers who are dedicated to their work with men released from Texas prison. Ranney has charge of

about 70 parolees in Travis and eight other Central Texas counties. He says the work is rewarding as well as a tremendous challenge.

Austin American UPI

SORT

(Continued from Page One)

others sleep to counsel with a man who was a number only yesterday?

"Today's parole officer in Texas is not necessarily a 'special breed.' But he most certainly is a 'new breed'; far different from the stereotyped, hard-boiled character who gives ex-cons a rough time in grade 'B' movies.

An effort to find the "typical" parole officer in Texas by the customary cross-hatch method proved the utter futility of trying to categorize individuals, but it did produce a wealth of information on the background of Texas' first professional parole officers.

We can say that the average parole officer in Texas is between 35 and 39 years of age. He has a bachelor's degree and is about one-third of the way through work on a master's. He is a former school teacher with a penchant for welfare work of one type or another.

Roger L. Ranney, parole officer of District 311 with headquarters in Austin, is neither an average of all other parole officers in Texas, nor is he completely typical of the group in educational background and experience.

At 49 he is older than the average. While his background includes teaching, it is heavily weighted in favor of law, insurance and selling. But on the subject of parole, his philosophy is about typical of all the officers with whom we talked.

He is one of 40 professional parole officers in the state. As such, Ranney is one of more than 400 who tried for a place in the parole system when it first became operative in January 1958.

As a parole officer he receives a maximum monthly salary of \$115.

"This is the most satisfying work I've ever done," he says.

Ranney is a native of Iowa. He received a bachelor's degree from the University of Iowa, taught school, and then took up the study of law at the same university.

He practiced law for three years in Iowa and came to Texas 20 years ago as claims adjuster for several insurance companies. Eventually his territory included Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, Arkansas and Louisiana.

Unhappy with the prospect of staying on the road almost constantly, Ranney became associated with an Austin music house as salesman. But even this fairly lucrative field was not entirely of his liking.

"I just wasn't too happy in the work," he said. "I even thought of doing prison work; but the prospect of leaving Austin for Huntsville was not encouraging. Then the parole system came along."

More than 400 men who met the legal requirements laid down by the 56th Legislature in 1957 appeared for the first written examination. These requirements proved that to be employed as a parole officer, the applicant must be between the ages of 26 and 55 years, must have had four years in an accredited college, and must have had two years of experience in correctional work, education, personnel or social work.

An oral examination followed. From those who passed both examinations, 40 were selected to be Texas' first professional staff of parole officers. Seventeen were appointed in December, 1957, 13 in April, 1958, and 10 during August of that year. Ranney was in the first group.

have compassion for them. That doesn't mean that we condone what they have done, or that we have to put up with their transgressions. But unless a parole officer does have a sense of compassion he will never consent to visit the hovels some of these parolees live in. And if he doesn't do that, he's never going to fully understand them or be able to help them."

Ranney has charge of about 70 parolees. These include all Latin-American parolees in Austin and one-half the Negroes. He has all parolees of all races in Bastrop, Lee, Burleson, Fayette, Caldwell, Gonzales, Hays and Lavaca Counties.

Ranney's partner in Austin, parole officer T. J. Gizalbach, shares in the Travis County case load and services a nine-county area to the north and northwest of Austin.

The parole officer must be all things to the parolee. This is primarily because the intellectual and cultural background of the parolees differ greatly. Some are men who once stood high in their community. Others are men who subsisted in society's darker nooks and crannies until they finally took the big fall.

To one parolee the parole officer is a combination of guiding hand and confessor. To another he may offer little more than an opportunity for the prisoner to serve a good portion of his sentence outside a state prison. But in both instances it is the parole officer's duty to see that when the sentence is completed and the supervision period is ended, the parolee is adjusted to life in the community.

The State Board for Pardons and Paroles asked the recent 56th Legislature for an additional 30 parole officers to carry forward the original design for a system that can handle an annual prison release rate of 2,000. The Legislature, hamstrung by a \$65 million deficit in the general fund and the necessity of raising new tax revenue to take care of state services, turned down the board's request.

As it operates today the parole system still has 40 officers supervising the parole of 3,700 prisoners trying to regain their place in society.

"What Sort Picks Out This Job?" Ken Towery. *The Austin American* (1914-1973);]. 31 Jan 1960: A1.

Probation Department Gains Member

Roger Ranney, who has extensive experience in parole work, has joined the Travis County Adult Probation Department.

Ranney served as district parole officer in Austin with the Board of Pardons and Paroles since 1957 before joining the county unit. With the state, he supervised paroles in Travis, Milam, Burleson, Fayette and Lee Counties.

Ranney came to Austin in 1941 from Des Moines, Iowa, where he practiced law. He came here as an insurance representative for several New England companies and later went with Reed Music Company before joining the Board of Pardons and Paroles.

Ranney, who lives at 1702 Alameda Drive, is vice president of the Texas Probation and Parole Association, a member of the Downtown Lions Club, Methodist Church and Masonic Order.

"Probation Department Gains Member." *The Austin Statesman* (1921-1973); 13 Mar 1964: 19.

Permits

SANITARY SEWER SERVICE PERMIT				No. 12033	
Austin, Texas					
Received of	J. O. Andrewar'n			Date	7-27-35
Address	1702 Alameda Drive				
Amount	\$				
Builder or Owner	G. Raymond Peterson		Plumber		
Lot	2	Block	10	Subdivision	Travis Heights
				Plat No.	131
Date of Connection	8-2-35				

Sewer service permit, 1935

PERMIT FOR WATER SERVICE AUSTIN, TEXAS No E 2832
INDEXED
 M. N. A. Peterson Address 1702 Alameda St.
 Plumber J. O. Anderson Size of Tap 1/2 Date 5-29-35
 Date of Connection 5/30/35 Foreman's Report X

Water service permit, 1935

WATER SERVICE PERMIT E No 2832
 Austin, Texas
 Received of C. C. DANIELS Date 2-1-55
 Address 1415 RIDGEMONT Drive
 Amount TWENTY + 00/100 20
 Plumber L. L. MYERS Size of Tap 3/4
 Date of Connection 2-7-55

Water service permit, 1955

OWNER Bob Kuhn **ADDRESS** 1702 Alameda Street
PLAT 124 **LOT** 2 **BLK** 10
SUBDIVISION Travis Hts.
OCCUPANCY Carport
BLD PERMIT # 102174 **DATE** 1-26-67 **OWNERS ESTIMATE** 80.00
CONTRACTOR G. Johnson **NO. OF FIXTURES**
WATER TAP REC # **SEWER TAP REC #**
Frame Addition to An Acc. Bldg.
240 sq. ft.
9-24-79# 185900- Margare. Solon Ansley- Acc bldg.
Russ Ansley- 100.00

Building permit, 1967

Roger Ranney 1702 Alameda Dr.
 124 2 10

Travis Heights

Frame Addition rear of Residence

82018 11-22-61 50.00
 Owner 0

DEN Enclose screen porch for den.

Building permit, 1961

Roger L. Ranney 1702 Alameda Drive
 124 2 10

Fairview Heights

Frame Addition to rear of residence

75285 2/10/60 300.00
 owner 3

W.

BEDROOM & BATH

Building permit, 1960

Roger L. Ranney 1702 Alameda Drive
~~124~~ 2 10

124

Travis Heights

Remodel residence.

48907 8-17-51 \$1500.00

O. A. Heuppelheuser

Building permit, 1951