ALTIN CORE	§
Appellant,	8
	§
	§
	§
vs.	§
	§
	§
LANDMARK COMMISSION,	§
Appellee.	§

In re 4523 Sycamore St.

Appeal to the City Plan Commission

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THE LANDMARK COMMISSION

A. Facts and Background

The structure in question is an existing single-family home located at 4523 Sycamore Street (the "Property"). (LC D2-1). The Property is in the Peak's Suburban Addition Neighborhood Historic District ("Peak's Suburban") and is contributing. (LC D2-2). Peak's Suburban was designated as a Dallas Landmark District and National Register of Historic Places in 1995. Peak's Suburban protects the front and side facades of contributing structures.

Appellant knew that the house was in a historic district when he purchased it. (Tr. 10^1). On October 15, 2018, the owner of the Property, Altin Kore ("Appellant"), sought retroactive approval for a certificate of appropriateness ("CA") for four items he had already added or changed to the Property. (CA). On December 3, 2018, the Landmark Commission held a hearing on Appellant's request for approval of the CA. (Minutes at 10-11). Staff noted several concerns with the Appellant's requests. (LC D2-2). Work on the four requested items had already occurred so the requests were retroactive. *Id.* In fact, Staff noted that requests #1-3 were already denied in 2017 by the Landmark Commission. *Id.* Another concern was that the Property had recently been put on the market and the listing had several misrepresentations. (LC D2-2). The listing claimed it was rebuilt and the year of build being 2018. (LC D2-15). It also asserted that the work was "all permitted", but permits for the exterior work were not pulled. *Id.* The house was listed as a Craftsman, but was originally built in the Victorian style. *Id.*

Staff recommended denial of all four requests. Item 1 seeks approval of Hardie Board on the siding of 100% of the main structure. Item 2 seeks approval of the replacement of 13 windows on the main structure with vinyl 12/12 simulated divided-lite windows. Item 3 seeks approval of columns that were installed on the front porch. Item 4 seeks approval of a newly installed front door.

At the December 3, 2018 Landmark Commission hearing on this matter, Appellant was represented by his realtor, Ms. Kelly Nyfeler. (Tr. at 4-5). At the hearing Staff recommended

¹ "Tr." refers to the transcription of excerpt of audio recording of the Landmark Commission public hearing from December 3, 2108 that is part of the record for review in this matter.

denial without prejudice of all four hearings. (Tr. at 2-4). Ms. Nyfeler spoke and answered questions of the Commissioners. (Tr. 4-18). Commissioner Sherman moved the Landmark Commission to deny items 1-4 and the motion carried unanimously. The Appellant appealed the Landmark Commission's decision to the City Plan Commission ("CPC") within the required 30-day deadline.

B, The Historic Preservation Program and Staff Recommendations

The purpose of the historic district preservation program is to protect, enhance, and perpetuate places that represent distinctive and important elements of the city of Dallas' historical and architectural history, and to preserve diverse architectural styles, patterns of development, and design preferences reflecting phases of the city of Dallas' history. Dallas Development Code 51A-4.501(a).

Due to the quasi-judicial nature of Landmark Commission proceedings, Landmark Commissioners are restricted from visiting properties that have pending CA applications, so the Landmark Commission finds the preservation criteria and staff recommendations helpful in determining what proposed work is compatible with the historic overlay district and what proposed work is not compatible.

C. The Legal Standard

The Landmark Commission must grant a CA for contributing structures if it determines that the proposed work:

a. is consistent with the regulations contained in this section and the preservation criteria contained in the historic overlay district ordinance;

b. will not have an adverse effect on the architectural features of the structure;

c. will not have an adverse effect on the historic overlay district; and

d. will not have an adverse effect on the future preservation, maintenance, and use of the structure or the historic overlay district.

51A-4.501(g)(6)(C)(i). At the December 3, 2018 Landmark Commission hearing, the Appellant had the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant a favorable action. § 51A-4.501(g)(6)(B).

Regarding appeals to the CPC, the City Council provided guidance and mandated that the CPC give deference to the Landmark Commission's decision. § 51A-3.103(a)(1). Their reasoning is based on their requirement that all Landmark Commissioners have expertise in historic preservation. § 51A-4.501(o)(requiring that the CPC give deference to the landmark commission decision and may not substitute its judgment for the landmark commission's judgment).

When the CPC hears an appeal from the Landmark Commission, it may not substitute its judgment for the judgment of the Landmark Commission, but, rather, shall determine if the Landmark Commission erred in its decision. \$51A-4.501(o)(1). The CPC is required to affirm the decision of the Landmark Commission unless it finds that the decision: "(A) violates a statutory or ordinance provision; (B) exceeds the [L]andmark [C]ommission's authority; or (C) was not reasonably supported by substantial evidence considering the evidence in the record." \$51A-4.501(o)(2).

There is no violation of a statutory or ordinance provision. Neither did the Landmark Commission exceed its authority as the Dallas Development Code specifically grants the Landmark Commission jurisdiction to approve, deny with prejudice, or deny without prejudice the certificate of appropriateness and may impose conditions on the certificate of appropriateness. § 51A-4.501(g)(6)(B). Therefore, this appeal considers whether there is substantial evidence in the record to support the decision of the Landmark Commission.

D. Argument

The record in this case is clear and there is substantial evidence to support the Landmark Commission's decision. The Landmark Commission's decisions were consistent with Staff's recommendations. (D2-2 through D2-3; Landmark Commission Minutes at 10). Both Staff and Landmark Commission's reasoning for their recommendations and vote to deny with prejudice is clear on the record.

For Appellant to have prevailed at the Landmark Commission, he had to have proved all four of the criteria in 51A-4.501(g)(6)(C)(i). However, Appellant failed to meet his burden with regard to the first criteria, whether the work already done is consistent with the regulations contained in this section and the preservation criteria contained in the historic overlay district ordinance. 51A-4.501(g)(6)(C)(i)(aa).

As to Item 1, Appellant's request to replace all the siding with Hardie Board, it did not meet the preservation criteria for Section 3.2 of the preservation criteria which requires that the "reconstruction, renovation or repair of opaque elements of the protected facades must employ materials similar to the original materials in texture, color, pattern, grain and module size . . ." (D2-2 through D2-3; D2-9 through D2-10). Appellant's representative admits there was wood siding originally on the house. (Tr. at 5). Hardie Board does not look the same as wood siding and is not typically approved by the Landmark Commission. (Tr. 13). The preservation criteria is the replacement materials matching the original materials, not what was on the house when it was purchased as Appellant's representative asserted at the hearing. (Tr. 5).

As to Items 2 and 4, Appellant's requests to replace thirteen wood windows with vinyl windows and the front door, they did not meet the preservation criteria for Section 3.10 of the preservation criteria which requires that the "where replacement of an original door or window is necessary, replacement doors and windows must express mullion size, light configuration, and material to match the original doors and windows." (D2-3; D2-11 and D2-14). Appellant's representative only offered to replace the front windows, not with compliant windows, but with

"glass windows." (Tr. 9). Appellant's representative fails to explain how this gets the Appellant into compliance or resolves the preservation issue.

As to Item 3, Appellant's request to replace wood columns on the front porch, it did not meet the preservation criteria for Section 3.20 of the preservation criteria which requires that "all original columns . . . that are part of the porch of balcony configuration must be preserved." (D2-3; D2-12 through D2-13). Appellant's representative claimed that "in the early 1900's the columns were contrasting . . ." and then offers to paint the columns so they are not contrasting. (Tr. 9). The column placement is "strange." (Tr. 13-15). However, Appellant's representative fails to explain how this gets the Appellant in compliance with the preservation criteria at issue or resolves the issue preservation issue.

Appellant's representative claimed that the Appellant's house looks historical, but does not provide a basis for the assertion. (Tr. at 9). The Staff's evidence provided in the record is the only substantial evidence and it supports the decision of the Landmark Commission. Appellant provided no evidence that the work already done to which he is seeking approval, is consistent with the regulations contained in this section and the preservation criteria contained in the historic overlay district ordinance. \$51A-4.501(g)(6)(C)(i)(aa). Nor does Appellant provide any evidence on the record of his burden to meet 51A-4.501(g)(6)(C)(i)(bb) through (dd). It is clear from the record that the Appellant did not meet his burden and there is substantial evidence on the record to support the decision of the Landmark Commission.

E. Conclusion

Because the Landmark Commission did not violate a statutory or ordinance provision, did not exceed its authority, and its decision is reasonably supported by substantial evidence in the record, the City Plan Commission must affirm the decision of the Landmark Commission. The City Plan Commission must give deference to the Landmark Commission, even if the City Plan Commission may have come to a different conclusion than the Landmark Commission. Because the City Plan Commission may not substitute its judgment for that of the Landmark Commission, the CA with imposed conditions must be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

CITY ATTRORNEY OF THE CITY OF DALLAS Christopher J. Caso Interim City AtTr.ney

/s/ Justin H. Roy

JUSTIN H. ROY Assistant City Attorney Texas Bar No. 24013428 justin.roy@dallascityhall.com 7DN Dallas City Hall 1500 Marilla Street Dallas, Texas 75201 Telephone: 214-670-3519 Facsimile: 214-670-0622

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF DALLAS AND BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE CITY OF DALLAS