

607 E. Main Street Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007

Request: This Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) review involves recently completed alterations to the property including:

- Replacing windows with door openings and new doors of a different style, and extending the eave as a shallow canopy,
- Replacing four double hung windows with a single, fixed window of a different style
- Enclosing part of a patio as new building area
- Addition of a new balcony on the south side

Date of Review: July 21, 2026

Historic Designations and Zoning:

Subject property has local historic designation and MU-L (Mixed-Use Limited) base zoning.

Review Considerations:

1. [The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties](#)
 - a. Pg. 2-3: Introduction: Choosing an Appropriate Treatment for the Historic Building
 - b. Pg. 75-79: Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
 - c. Pg. 102-109: Windows
 - d. Pg. 110-112: Entrances and Porches
 - e. Pg 156-162: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction
2. [City of Round Rock Design Guidelines for Round Rock Historic Residential Properties](#) (Historic Design Guidelines)
 - a. Pg. 6: Building Additions
 - b. Pg. 11-12: Building Fabric: Preservation/Rehabilitation
 - c. Pg. 16: Doors and Entry Designs
 - d. Pg. 17: Windows
3. [Sec. 2-73: MU-L \(Mixed-Use Limited\) zoning district](#)
 Note: In 2013, the HPC recommended the creation of a new residential historic district encompassing the 400-800 blocks of E. Main Street and E. Liberty Ave., which would have been called the East End Historic District. Because the Council wanted to preserve the historic character of the area but did not want to require a CofA of non-historic and vacant properties, instead MU-L zoning requires conformance with the Historic Design Guidelines.
4. *McAlester A Field Guide to American Houses.*
 - a. Pgs. 397-405: Folk Victorian
 - b. Pgs. 580-585: Modernistic
5. Additional description and examples of Art Deco style
 - a. [Art Deco Architecture Explained: A Complete Guide for Design Lovers | ArchitectureCourses.org](#)
 - b. [Art Deco Characteristics: A Visual Guide | ArchitectureCourses.org](#)
 - c. [1920s Art Deco Style: The Key Details That Make It Deco | ArchitectureCourses.org](#)

607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007

- d. [What Art Deco Homes Really Look Like | ArchitectureCourses.org](https://www.architecturecourses.org/what-art-deco-homes-really-look-like)
- e. [Art Deco History: Key Moments from Its Birth to Now | ArchitectureCourses.org](https://www.architecturecourses.org/art-deco-history-key-moments-from-its-birth-to-now)

About the Property:

This house was built between 1896-1900 and is associated with the Black, Engstrand and Nelson families. Historic resource surveys describe the style as Queen Anne (2010 survey) and Folk Victorian (1992 survey). In the 2000s, the house began to fall into disrepair and was restored with a large rear addition between 2016-2019. The current owner purchased the house in 2022 to house her med spa business.



May 2026 photo.



607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007

About the Project:

At the completion of the previous owner's addition project, the HPC made a concession allowing the 2/2 muntin-between-the glass windows on the addition to remain in place if they were concealed with new wooden screens. The new owner's 2024 tax exemption inspection noted that the required screens had been removed from the windows. The owner is aware of the CofA process as she was informed of the CofA requirement and applied for a CofA for new, lighter wooden screens that were also appropriate. The screens were approved administratively and installed in 2024.

After receiving a reminder about the 2026 tax exemption applications in February, the owner emailed that she no longer wished to participate in the tax exemption program and offered to return the city historic marker. She was informed that designation is done through the zoning process and is a separate process than the tax exemption program. Ultimately the owner applied for the 2026 exemption.

During the 2026 tax exemption inspection, staff noted significant alterations to the 2019 addition that had been made without a CofA, including:

- The paired doors and windows on the west side had been removed and replaced with three paired doors with elaborate Art Deco style grilles. A shallow canopy had also been added under the eaves.
- An east-facing wall with four double-hung windows was removed when part of the patio was enclosed. The east-facing wall of this new addition had a new door and a wide new fixed window with an Art Deco style grille.
- A pair of double-hung windows on the second floor of the south (back) side had been replaced with a pair of doors with similar Art Deco grilles. A metal balcony had been added with similar Art Deco railing. On later investigation, it was discovered that the windows had been replaced with doors between the 2023 and 2024 inspections, and because the inspector was focused on the window screens the doors were overlooked.
- A single door on the south side was replaced with a door with an Art Deco grille.

Additionally, a building permit is required for the structural alterations, and no building permit application for this project has been received to date.



2026 aerial photo indicating locations of different parts of the project.

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

West (side) doors and windows:



2023 photo showing the first set of screens



June 2026, showing new doors and canopy.

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

East-facing addition and window (opposite the new west doors):

The wall opposite the three new doors was removed as part of a small addition into a patio area between the historic house and the 2019 addition. The four double-hung windows on the wall that was removed were replaced with one large horizontal fixed window on the east wall of the new addition.



June 2026, during installation the east-facing window on the addition opposite the west doors. The east door is out of frame to the left. A wall with four double-hung windows was removed for this addition.



Although the addition is tucked behind the historic part of the building, it is visible from the sidewalk.

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

South (back) balcony:



2023 inspection photo. The older set of screens is in place.



June 2026 photo of new balcony. The balcony doors have grilles similar to the west doors. Photo also shows the new, lighter-weight screens, and unscreened mechanical equipment.

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

South (back) door:



June 2026

Staff Review and Analysis:

The HPC should determine which aspects of the project are historically appropriate, and if inappropriate should be removed. Once a CofA is issued, the applicant may begin the building permitting process. Additional historic reviews may be necessary to accommodate requirements of the building permit or for new product and design selections. The owner believed that her contractor had secured the necessary building permit, which would have triggered a historic review for the permit at that time.

The HPC's task is to determine whether the features of this project are appropriate according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the City's historic guidelines, or whether they should be removed and the building restored to its prior condition. Certain components of the project may be appropriate while others may not be appropriate. The HPC should provide a breakdown of how to proceed with each structural alteration and product selection. For consideration of this CofA, the owner has provided the specifications used to order the doors but has not provided building plans.

Applicable guidelines

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 9 and 10 apply to this case:

#2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007

#3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

#9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

#10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The Guidelines section of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards offers additional guidance as to what types of alterations are appropriate:

Pg. 78: Alterations

Some exterior and interior alterations to a historic building are generally needed as part of a Rehabilitation project to ensure its continued use, but it is most important that such alterations do not radically change, obscure, or destroy character-defining spaces, materials, features, or finishes. Alterations may include changes to the site or setting, such as the selective removal of buildings or other features of the building site or setting that are intrusive, not character defining, or outside the building's period of significance.

Pg. 79: New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction

Rehabilitation is the only treatment that allows expanding a historic building by enlarging it with an addition. However, the Rehabilitation guidelines emphasize that new additions should be considered only after it is determined that meeting specific new needs cannot be achieved by altering non-character-defining interior spaces. If the use cannot be accommodated in this way, then an attached exterior addition may be considered. New additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building, its site, and setting are not negatively impacted. Generally, a new addition should be subordinate to the historic building. A new addition should be compatible, but differentiated enough so that it is not confused as historic or original to the building. The same guidance applies to new construction so that it does not negatively impact the historic character of the building or its site.

Pg. 112: Entrances and Porches: Alterations and Additions for a New Use: *Not Recommended*:

Constructing secondary or service entrances and porches that are incompatible in size and scale or detailing with the historic building, or that obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Pg. 162: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:

Recommended: Ensuring that new construction is secondary to the historic building and does not detract from its significance. *Not Recommended*: Adding new construction that results in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the building, including its design, materials, location, or setting.

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

Relevant sections of the city's Historic Design Guidelines include:

Pg. 6: Additions should be compatible in size, texture, color, design, proportion and detail to adjacent residential buildings and streetscapes, and should be appropriate to the architectural styles of the existing building and/or adjacent buildings, or those on the streetscape or within the district.

Pg. 7: Additions to historic or non-historic buildings should relate to and complement the style of the main building, or relate to the general style of the streetscape if possible. Such additions should relate to the existing buildings with simplified details if possible...Additions should be clearly secondary to the original building. This can be accomplished by providing a clear visual break between the historic building and the addition...or by constructing a recessed area at the point at which the addition and the historic building join together.

Pg. 11: When a building has been subjected to numerous alterations over time, it is important to determine the relative integrity and importance of [currently] existing materials and forms...Non-historic alterations should be removed.

Pg. 12: Some interior and exterior alterations and additions to historic buildings are often needed to assure their continued use, particularly when adapting a historic residential building for commercial use...While rehabilitation projects are frequently appropriate, it is important that alterations and additions do not radically change, obscure or destroy the features of the building that define its historic character.

Pg. 16: Doors and Entry Designs

The proportion, shape, location, pattern and size of doors contribute significantly to the historic character of a building and are particularly important in helping to identify its style and period...When original fabric no longer exists, recreate original design in appropriate materials whenever possible. The design of replacement doors should reflect the style and period of the building.

Analysis

This staff analysis will consider the appropriateness of the structural alterations (replacing windows with doors, adding a balcony), and of style (the appearance of the specific door, window and railing selections) separately:

Structural Alterations

Staff does not believe that the alterations to the building structure have appreciably diminished the historic integrity of the property. The alterations were made to the 2019 addition; the historic house was not altered.

Unfortunately, the applicant was not able to provide building plans for any of the alterations, and plans could not be retrieved from a building permit because no building permit application was filed. The applicant says she believed that her contractor had obtained the necessary building permits. To pass Building Inspection she will need to either produce plans or hire a structural engineer to inspect the work and take responsibility for certifying that the work is structurally sound.

607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007

The west doors and windows were removed and replaced with three pairs of larger doors. A canopy with downlights was constructed to shelter the entry. The applicant made this change because she uses it as the primary entrance for her business.

The architect designing the 2019 addition connected it to the historic house through a narrow segment that formed a courtyard/patio on the east side and was more densely glazed than the rest of the addition. It was intended to clearly distinguish where the historic house ended and the addition began. The three glazed doors on the west side appear to be a slightly more modern take on this type of connector that is something that connects the historic house and addition but isn't part of either.

A wall consisting of a row of French doors is also not unusual for a residence, though usually they would traditionally open to a landscaped patio or similar outdoor space rather than a parking area. It is, however, unusual for the side entrance to be the primary entrance to a home.

A small addition with a new horizontal window was constructed on the east side of the room that connects the historic house and the addition. The four 2/2 double-hung windows on this wall were replaced with a door and one large, fixed window.

The part of the patio that was enclosed is tucked behind the historic part of the house and does not affect its historic integrity. Although the horizontal window contrasts with the double-hung windows on the rest of the house, it isn't particularly noticeable from outside.

A balcony is common on Queen Anne style homes, though they are usually integrated with other details on the wall rather than placed on an otherwise flat wall, and they usually have wood railings. The new balcony also appears to project further out from the wall than would be common for a Queen Anne house, unless it were built over a first story bay window or other projection. Staff does not believe that this particular balcony is appropriate for this building, although a different design might be appropriate.

Building Fabric: Architectural Style of the Selected Doors, Window and Railing

The most significant alteration to the building's historic character is the introduction of Art Deco-style metal grilles to the doors, windows and railings on a Queen Anne style house. The owner has stated that she believes the alterations she has made to the house are appropriate, and that the style is appropriate because it dates to the 1920s-1930s. Staff, however, does not believe that these features are appropriate for a Queen Anne style house in the MU-L zoning district.

607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007

The two styles emerged and were popular in different eras – Queen Anne in the later decades of the 19th century and Art Deco in the 1920-1930s. They were also used in different types of buildings. A comparison of the styles follows:

Queen Anne

- Architectural style for detached houses
- Popular in the 1870s-1910s
- Asymmetrical composition and massing
- Ornamentation utilizing an abundance of delicate features (e.g. spindlework, patterned shingles)
- Ornamental themes rooted in nature (florals, leaves, etc.)
- Ornamental motifs such as florals, graceful C- and S-curves, sunbursts, scallops,
- Associated with luxury, domesticity, femininity, abundance, propriety, gracefulness

Art Deco

- Decorative/graphic style also used in architecture, rare in houses
- Popular in the 1920s-1930s
- Symmetrical composition and massing
- Ornamentation utilizing a few bold features and colors
- Ornamental themes rooted in the machine age
- Geometric ornamental motifs such as zig-zags, waves, sunbursts, stepped or ziggurat shapes
- Associated with luxury, cities, energy, power, dynamism

The Secretary of the Interiors Standards and the city’s Historic Design Guidelines specify that new features should be differentiated from the historic structure. However, they also emphasize that any alteration or new part must be compatible with the historic material, scale, massing, proportion, and detailing. Both also state that new features should be secondary to the historic building and should not detract attention from it. When a feature compatible with the historic property is not available, we are directed to employ something with a contemporary but minimal appearance.

Here the design of the doors, window, and railing is much bolder than the historic house and is intended to contrast with it. The use of metal and geometric decorative motifs like sunbursts and jagged lines is oppositional to the delicate wooden “gingerbread” ornament on a Queen Anne. These would be more appropriate for an apartment or commercial building. Staff does not believe that these features are compatible with the historic character of the house or the MU-L zoned area.

It was noted during this project review that the site includes unscreened mechanical equipment and trash receptacles. These should be screened in accordance with zoning district standards. A CofA is required to approve the material and design of required screening.

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

Staff Recommendation:

Because all parts of the project are alterations to the 2019 addition and may be reversed without adversely affecting the historic structure, the structural alterations in the project satisfy Standard for Rehabilitation #10.

However, staff believes that the specific products selected for installation are not compatible with this structure, based on Standards for Rehabilitation #2, 3, and 9. The HPC's motion should specifically address the appropriateness of structural alterations and product selection for each component of the project:

- Replacing one paired door and two pairs of windows on the west side with three pairs of doors is appropriate as a feature of the connector between the historic house and the 2019 addition.
- The canopy with downlights is not appropriate because it was constructed under the eave and is not integrated with the roof structure of the 2019 addition.
- The new doors on the west side are not appropriate for this structure. More compatible doors should have a much simpler design, without the graphic decoration of the grilles. They should either have features usually associated with traditional doors such as panels, muntins, and moldings, or should have a minimal design with one large pane of glazing. Appropriate doors should be painted or stained wood.
- The east-facing addition is appropriate because it is attached to the 2019 addition and is tucked behind the historic structure.
- The window on the east-facing addition is not appropriate for this building because it has an Art Deco-style grille and a horizontal orientation, while the house is a Queen Anne/Folk Victorian and all the windows have a strong vertical orientation. A more compatible window would not have a grille. Appropriate replacements would be either a set of windows with vertical proportions, or a single window divided into lites with vertical proportions. Please note that windows with simulated muntins must have a grille on the exterior of the window; grilles-between-the-glass are not appropriate.
- The addition of a balcony to the south wall and conversion of the windows behind it to doors are appropriate for an addition to a historic Queen Anne-style house.
- The design of the balcony and doors are not appropriate on this structure. A more compatible balcony should have a much simpler wooden railing and would not be as deep. It should be embellished with elements such as wooden brackets, a roof, or moldings that relate to details on the addition.
- Staff recommends including a condition that replacements for the inappropriate products must be approved with an amendment to this CofA prior to ordering. The HPC should specify which components of the project should be approved by the HPC and which may be approved by staff. Because of the complicated nature of this project, HPC review of specified replacement components may be most appropriate.
- Please include a condition stating that a CofA does not replace a building permit or any other

**607 E. Main Street
Certificate of Appropriateness HP26-007**

city permit otherwise required.