

**HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness**  
**February 4, 2026**  
**HR-2025-158169**  
**Confederate Woman’s Home**  
**3710 Cedar Street**

**Proposal**

---

Construct two courtyard additions at a City of Austin landmark.

**Project Specifications**

---

- 1) At the interior courtyard, construct a two-story addition behind the main structure of the Confederate Women’s Home.
- 2) Construct a rear addition at the rear, Home Lane facing service structure.
- 3) Replace windows as required due to failure or deterioration.

**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 at historic landmarks. The following standards apply to the proposed project:

*Repair and alterations*

*1. General standards*

General repairs are proposed at the original buildings, with some exploration at areas where original material may have been lost or covered.

*5. Windows, doors, and screens*

Windows are not original and are proposed to be replaced with fixtures that are intended to perform better for the proposed apartment use.

*Residential additions*

*1. Location*

This application calls for three additions, two attached to the main residence structure facing Cedar Street and one attached to the former service building facing Home Lane. All of these are to be located at the rear of their respective buildings, toward the center courtyard area, though without entirely filling in that area. While the site is very narrow, and these additions will be visible from the street opposite from the side the original buildings front, the selected locations are as minimally invasive as can be achieved.

*2. Scale, massing, and height*

All additions are two stories in height (though the second floor is minimal at the addition attached to the former service structure) but are kept at or below the full height of the historic structures. Though they do add a large area to the building footprint, their scale and massing defers to the original building size well. The overall building shape is largely maintained due to this massing and the location at which they are proposed.

*3. Design and style*

The original structures at the site appear to have been made using decorative, though not high end, materials at the front porch, with utilitarian materials at the side and rear. The proposed fenestration patterns, cladding materials, and overall form of the additions complement this design well and will neither appear too ornamental nor too utilitarian. Where non-historic alterations have been made, there may be some alterations proposed depending on the condition of the non-historic material.

*4. Roofs*

At the main building, the overall roof height is to be raised due to the wider building footprint proposed. While this extra height is not ideal, it is as minimal of a height increase as possible, and allows the existing roof pitch to be

maintained. Applicant has also explored the option of constructing a flat roof to minimize the overall height, but concerns about proper drainage and accelerating deterioration of existing material was determined to be more of a threat to the building than a slight increase in roof height.

#### *5. Exterior walls*

Proposed exterior walls are to be a mixture of cementitious or insulated paneling, as well as some type of stone cladding. As mentioned above, it is likely that the materials used to construct the original structure were selected for their lower cost while still containing some decorative element, such as what appears to be pressed manufactured stone at the front porch. To this end, the materials selected for the addition are in keeping with that spirit, which will look complete, sturdy, and with some decoration while not overwhelming the historic.

Proposed additions will also cover large portions of the original rear exterior walls at both buildings. While not ideal, and the design standards recommend the exploration of a hyphen or other minimal interaction with the historic portions of the property, the narrow site and space requirements make this unfeasible given the scope of the housing project. The applicant has instead proposed that covered exterior walls will be retained in their current form and serve as hallway or apartment partitions within the building. This fulfills the spirit of reversibility that is generally recommended by the Standards.

#### *6. Windows, screens, and doors*

Windows and doors will have similar patterns and appearance to the original building. It is noted that the original windows have all been replaced at some point in the past, and there is no material left to match new windows to. Instead, new fenestration will be simple and nondecorative while maintaining the spacing found at historic elevations.

#### *7. Porches and decks*

Evaluation.

#### Summary

The project meets the applicable standards.

### **Department Comments**

---

Previous Historic Landmark Commission action: January 7, 2026: Application was postponed with a referral to the January 14th Architectural Review Committee meeting.

This application will time out on March 23, 2026.

### **Architectural Review Committee Feedback**

---

Applicant attended April 2025 and May 2025 Architectural Review Committee. Project proposals presented at these meetings addressed new construction at the southern, non-landmarked, half of the property, and are not included in this application.

Applicant attended January 2026 Architectural Review Committee, per recommendation by Commission on January 7. Investigate the history of the corner tower and former colonnade, consider a hyphen or other minimal connection between the historic section and the proposed addition, ensure addition cladding material is similar but deferential to the historic (though acknowledging that the original material may not have been highly ornamental at time of construction), if historic materials at the rear courtyard are to be covered, ensure that they remain in place as best as possible; locations of entrances and punched openings at windows or non-historic perforations are ideal.

### **Staff Recommendation**

---

Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness in concurrence with Architectural Review Committee feedback.



**Property Information**

---

*Photos*



*Exterior of landmarked section of property, Google Streetview, 2024*



*Interior courtyard of landmarked section of property, permit application, 2025*