

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 18, 2015**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**  
**ABSENT: Valenzuela, Judson**

- Chairman’s Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements
- Election of Officers

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-064  | 1315 San Pedro Ave.  |
| 2. Case No. 2015-057  | 800 W. Ashby Place   |
| 3. Case No. 2015-034  | 516 S. Flores        |
| 4. Case No. 2015-072  | 618 Kampmann Blvd.   |
| 5. Case No. 2015-070  | 1203 E. Crockett St. |
| 6. Case No. 2015-066  | 418 Villita St.      |
| 7. Case No. 2015-036  | 3801 Broadway        |
| 8. Case No. 2015-052  | 513 E. Houston       |
| 9. Case No. 2015-060  | 1013 E. Crockett St. |
| 10. Case No. 2015-054 | 126 W. Agarita Ave.  |
| 11. Case No. 2014-394 | 111 W. Jones Ave.    |
| 12. Case No. 2015-061 | 126 Losoya St.       |
| 13. Case No. 2015-063 | 323 Callaghan Ave.   |
| 14. Case No. 2015-065 | 221 E. Guenther St.  |
| 15. Case No. 2015-071 | 317 Lamar St.        |
| 16. Case No. 2006-069 | 206 E. Arsenal       |

Item 3, 7 and 11 was pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to approve the remaining cases on the Consent Agenda based staff recommendations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. HDRC NO. 2015-034**

Applicant: Chris Crim/Bury, Inc.

Address: 516 S. Flores St.

The applicant is a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

Construct a new 12,000 sf grocery store and a four pump, covered fuel station. The store will be located on a parcel at the southeast corner of S Flores Street and E Cesar Chavez Blvd along the southern property line adjacent to the Commander’s House Park. Exterior finishes for the store include brick masonry, flat seam metal panels and “green” planter walls. The roof of the store consists of a long, barrel vault with monitor windows. A covered, outdoor dining patio will be located along S Flores with pedestrian access to the park. A simple, 4-foot wrought iron fence will be located along the recently-constructed bike path to provide separation between the path and the dining area. Surface parking with landscaping will be located to the north of the store with the fuel station immediately to the east of the parking area. The canopy for the fuel station features a barrel vault roof with standing seam metal. Visual impacts to the park will be

mitigated through the use of screening and vegetation along the southern wall of the store. Stone blocks salvaged from the partial removal of the historic perimeter wall along S Flores will be reused to define the park edge but is not intended replicate the original wall which features end pillars and capstones. Previously-approved curb cuts, perimeter landscaping and a VIA bus shelter have recently been completed at this location. Signage for the store has received conceptual approval and will be requested in a future application.

#### **FINDINGS:**

a. This request received conceptual approval from the HDRC on January 21, 2015, with the following stipulations:

1. That a site and building lighting study be provided; *the applicant has provided a lighting plan and photometric analysis of the site that illustrates that fixtures will be located away from the Commander's House Park and that spillover onto the park will not exceed what is allowed by UDC Section 35-673(j).*

2. That an entrance on S Flores or corner entrance be added; *the applicant has updated the design to include an additional entrance facing S Flores.*

3. That the applicant explore ways to engage the store with the park; *the applicant has updated the site plan to include an extended dining patio toward the park. Additional landscaping is also shown on the site plan along the property line.*

b. The proposed new construction will occur on an existing surface parking lot. A one-story addition to the adjacent office building will be demolished to allow for the proposed fuel station.

c. The proposed grocery store site is intended to be accessible by pedestrians and cyclists consistent with UDC Section 35-672(a). A pedestrian/bike path has recently been constructed along the perimeter of this property and incorporates specialty paving in areas to direct pedestrians to access points.

d. The S Flores corridor predominantly features commercial buildings along the street edge ranging in height between 1 and 4 stories. The proposed store is oriented towards S Flores with a primary entrance at the northwest corner of the building. This maintains the established pattern of the street edge consistent with UDC Section 35-673(b). The building's prominence on S Flores is further enhanced by the placement of an outdoor dining area, canopy and signage. The dining area is accessible to the park encouraging use of the public space.

e. The south façade of the store has been designed to incorporate a living "green" wall. This creates a compatible surface along the park edge. A service area adjacent to the property line will also be adequately screened consistent with UDC Section 35-673(m). No parking areas will be immediately visible from the Commander's House Park.

f. The proposed store features architectural elements and an overall character that are compatible within the RIO-4 district, consistent with UDC Section 35-674(a).

g. The proposed store features a façade composition and architectural details that reinforce the human scale, consistent with UDC Section 35-674(b). The proposed dining area and shade canopy further enhance pedestrian comfort at the street level.

h. The proposed store is a single level with a clerestory. The proposed store is similar in height to nearby buildings, consistent with UDC Section 35-674(c).

i. The proposed store features traditional materials, finishes and colors consistent with UDC Section 35-674(d).

j. The façade of the proposed store is articulated by visual breaks in form and materials, consistent with UDC Section 35-674(e). The proposed storefront windows are divided by regularly-spaced mullions consistent with 35-674(e)(2) and the entrance is well-defined by architectural features consistent with 35-674(e)(3).

k. The applicant has expressed a commitment to fulfilling all requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Section 35-675.

Staff recommends approval as submitted. The applicant must fulfill all requirements for archaeology outlined in Unified Development Code

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with stipulation that the tree be preserved and protected during construction. The applicant must also fulfill all requirement for archaeology outlined in the UDC.

**AYES: Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Guarino**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**7. HDRC NO. 2015-036**

Applicant: Allison Chambers

Address: 3801 Broadway

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the Reptile Garden Structures located on the Witte Museum site in Brackenridge Park. The applicant has made a claim for loss of significance and has provided HABS documentation drawings and photos of the structures as mitigation for their removal. The applicant is also proposing to dismantle and relocate the 1939 Reptile Display podium to a nearby walkway. The original wrought iron gates have also been salvaged and stored by the Witte for future reuse.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. According to the National Register nomination submitted for Brackenridge Park, "The reptile garden is located north of Pioneer Hall near the location of the Alamo acequia dam. First constructed at another location closer to the museum, it was moved twice before being rebuilt on this site in 1937. The reptile garden closed many years ago. The deteriorated roof structure has been removed, but the perimeter limestone walls with "snake apartments" and metal gate are intact." Brackenridge Park is local historic landmark, National Register district and State Antiquities Landmark.
- b. According to newspaper articles, the existing central pool and steam-heated snake apartments were constructed by the National Youth Administration (NYA) in 1939 and was the fourth iteration of the gardens. The site was a popular attraction and was expanded in the mid 1940's by a private enterprise to include shallow concrete wading pools for the later "Alligator Garden". The attraction has been closed since 1975. A wood-framed enclosure once roofed the garden and has since been removed due to deterioration. Of the remaining structures are the 1939 central pool, stone entry, perimeter wall, reptile display podium, rattlesnake well, and later concrete wading pools. Some alterations to the original structures appear to have occurred throughout the use of the site.
- c. Members of the Designation and Demolition Committee met with the applicant and THC staff on January 13, 2015, to discuss the demolition request. Both members present noted the unique history of the reptile garden. In consideration of the Witte's plan to recognize the colonial history of the site through the proposed interpretive Acequia Garden, one committee member agreed that the proposal was appropriate and noted that there were other nearby examples of NYA construction that would be preserved. The other committee member expressed concern over full demolition of the garden, but understood the difficulty with retaining the feature in place.
- d. The Witte has developed a masterplan for expansion of the museum which anticipates removal of the reptile garden. Although no building or structure is proposed at the location of the garden, the Witte proposes an open green space for program activities. An interpretive landscape feature is proposed along the western edge of the green space to represent the path of the Acequia Madre and its associated diversion dam. A café and museum center are placed to the east of the site along Broadway in the masterplan.
- e. The applicant has made a claim for a loss of significance for the reptile garden. The roof structure has been removed due to deterioration and its supporting stone piers have been damaged. In many places, the stone masonry is in need of repair. The applicant has also cited potential safety issues being a hardship in retaining the structures, in particular with the central pool. According to UDC Section 35-614(c), a claim for loss of significance must be established by a preponderance of the evidence that the structure or property has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Additionally, the historic and design review commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner, and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect. Staff finds that, while some deterioration and damage to the structures has occurred, a majority of the 1939 construction remains intact and that a loss of significance has not occurred as described in this section.
- f. Demolition of contributing structures constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of the City of San Antonio. The reptile garden is one of many unique and varied structures that contribute to the rich and diverse history of Brackenridge Park. It is also an excellent example of the many New Deal projects constructed in San Antonio throughout the Depression Era, including similar features constructed at the Witte. Staff acknowledges that the reptile garden site has been modified over time and that full preservation of the reptile garden and greater alligator garden as the Witte masterplan is implemented presents a number of challenges due to necessary site grading. Staff finds that, when considering the application for demolition, a greater emphasis must be placed on the preservation of the 1939 NYA construction and that later additions to the site, such as the shallow concrete pools added for the alligator garden, may be considered for removal.
- g. The applicant has met the documentation and salvage strategy requirements outlined in UDC Section 35-614(d).
- h. The applicant has indicated that none of the heritage Bald Cypress trees located on the site will be removed as part of the proposed demolition.

Staff does not recommend full demolition of the reptile garden and all of its features at this time. Staff finds that the reptile garden still retains historical and cultural significance which warrants its preservation and recommends retaining the following features:

1. Portions of the 1939 stone entry and perimeter wall immediately flanking the entry pillars. The perimeter wall in particular is an excellent example of NYA construction. Staff encourages the applicant to consider retaining this entry element as a portal into the planned acequia garden once site grading is completed.
2. The 1939 central pool is an inherently unique feature and its construction cannot be replicated. Staff recommends that the applicant explore ways to preserve this feature in place. If this is found to not be feasible, then staff recommends that the applicant consider developing an interpretive feature at this location.
3. The 1939 display podium is proposed by the applicant to be dismantled and relocated to a nearby walkway. Staff concurs that this is an appropriate solution for this feature.

If, by a preponderance of evidence presented by the applicant, the HDRC finds that retaining the reptile garden places an unreasonable economic hardship on the owner or that a loss of significance has occurred in accordance with UDC Section 35-614, a demolition permit will not be issued until the applicable fees are collected and replacement plans are approved and permitted. If full demolition is approved as submitted, then staff recommends the stipulation that at least one interpretive panel be installed at the location of the former entry to the reptile garden.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with the stipulations that portions of the 1939 stone entry and perimeter wall immediately flanking the entry pillars are retained as a portal into the planned Acequia garden once site grading is completed. The 1939 central may be fully removed.

**AYES: Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Guarino, Feldman**

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

##### **11. HDRC NO. 2014-394**

Applicant: Alamo Manhattan River Walk LLC

Address: 111 W. Jones

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for building elevations and facade arrangement of the proposed 6 story residential building at 111 W Jones.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant received conceptual approval of both the site plan and the landscaping plan for the proposed multifamily residence at 111 W Jones on December 3, 2014. This request for conceptual approval of the façade arrangement was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 27, 2015. At that meeting, Committee members suggested that the materials used on the façade relate more to those of the San Antonio Museum of Art, that the applicant address the cornice of the building, that the applicant provide a landscape screening at the base fronting the river, that the base appear heavier and that further consideration should be shown to the contrast of the different façade materials. The DRC also suggested that the applicant present the various metal samples that are proposed to the Historic and Design Review Commission.
- b. According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a “human scale” which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed multiple components that achieve this which include projecting and recessed balconies, the positioning of the street façade on the block face, the use of different materials between lower, middle and upper floors and the use of a ground level store front façade. This is consistent with the UDC.
- c. For river and street facing facades in RIO-2 that are longer than fifty (50) long, additional steps must be taken to divide the façade. The applicant has proposed to change materials with each building module to reduce its perceived mass and to alternate the arrangements of windows and roof height to further divide the façade. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The UDC Section 35-674 (c) addressed height issues in the River Improvement Overlay Districts. At a height of approximately sixty (60) feet tall in proximity to other multi story structures, the proposed multi-family development is consistent with the UDC.

e. The materials that have been proposed by the applicant include a brick veneer, cast stone trim and banding, stucco, cementitious panels, metal wall panels, metal railings, fascia and freeze boards and vinyl windows. Each of the previously listed materials as well as their chosen colors are consistent with the UDC Section 35-674 (d) except the vinyl windows. Staff finds that if the applicant uses vinyl windows, white should not be their color and that a more natural color should be selected.

f. According to the UDC Section 35-764 (e), building facades located in the River Improvement Overlay must be organized into three distinct segments; a base, mid-section, and a cap. Through a change in materials, colors and the use of moldings at the roof line, the applicant has clearly separated the façade into three distinct segments. However, staff has some concern over the Jones Street façade (northeast elevation), particularly the bays of the curtain wall system that do not include storefront glass and the lack of a visual reference of a column bay being shown at street level as it is on all other levels of the façade.

g. In regards to window fenestration, the UDC Section 25-674 (2) states that windows help provide a human scale to a façade and therefore should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, they should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them, they shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and grouped to establish rhythms and that curtain wall systems should be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions. The applicant has provided information meeting each of these requirements.

h. While the primary use of this structure will be residential with entrances being within the building accessible from the parking garage, there is a commercial component. At street level on Jones, the applicant has proposed 1,490 square feet of restaurant space and 1,070 square feet of leasing space. Each entrance is prominent in itself, properly scaled, features a change in wall plane and is recognizable by a change in façade materials in its respective vertical façade bay. River side entrances are smaller in scale and are positioned in a manner to make them subordinate to the Jones Street entrances. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674 (3).

i. According to the UDC Section 35-674 (4) the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façade. The proposed southeast and southwest façades feature setbacks, a reduction in height and a variation in materials. This is consistent with the UDC.

j. The UDC Section 35-674 (f)(1) states that staircases to the river level shall be uniquely designed; they shall not replicate other stairs in a single project, they shall be constructed of handcrafted and traditional materials and they should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. The applicant has proposed a stone staircase that will provide access from the proposed development onto the Riverwalk. This is consistent with the UDC.

k. As shown in the application documents, the applicant has proposed the use of awnings in various locations throughout the project. The UDC Section 34-675 (g) (1),(2) and (3) give the design standards for awnings, canopies and arcades in the River Improvement Overlay. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

l. The UDC Section 35-675 states that an HDRC application for commercial development projects within a River Improvement Overlay district shall be reviewed by the city archaeologist to determine if there is potential of containing intact archaeological deposits. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through l with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant alter the proposed color of the vinyl windows to a more natural color similar to that of the metal wall panels or the brick veneer.
- ii. That the applicant explore alternative façade arrangements and/or materials at the northwest corner of the W Jones façade where brick has been proposed in the storefront bays.
- iii. That the applicant provide information to the City Archaeologist in regards to the archaeological requirements stated in the UDC Section 35-675.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff recommendations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2015-059**

Applicant: Julio Carpio

Address: 100 Soledad St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install electrically operated overhead over head roll down grilles to prevent intentional damage and vandalism to the Commerce Street glass of 100 Soledad.
2. Install peel away film on the glass of the Commerce Street façade of 100 Soledad to abate graffiti more efficiently.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to install two (2) over head roll down grilles to cover the windows on the Commerce Street façade of 100 Soledad. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 3, 6.B.viii and x, security bars are not to be mounted on the exterior of a historic structure. While the structure and design of the proposed roll down grilles is different than that of security bars, they serve the same intended purpose. The installation of security devices obscuring the windows or facades of historic structures is not consistent with the Guidelines.

b. According to the Guidelines for Additions, Chapter 3, 10.B.i., new façade elements that may alter or destroy the historic character of a structure should not be introduced. Staff finds that the housing structure of the grilles as well as the roll down grilles themselves detract from the rhythm of the commercial storefronts found along E Commerce as well as adds a feature that’s not historic in nature to this particular structure nor this block of E Commerce.

c. The applicant has provided information and the product specifications for a multi-layer protective film. Within the product specifications, it is noted that the particular window film that the applicant has proposed is hard coated, protects from intentional or unintentional scratching, acid etching, abrasions and permanent markers and does not leave an adhesive residue when removed.

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1 based on findings a and b.
2. Staff recommends approval of item 2 based on finding c.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff recommendations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2015-073**

Applicant: Jose Juan Garrigo

Address: 416 Dolorosa

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1.Install and 8’ x 12’ aluminum sign to advertise the “Shroud of Turin Expo”. The sign will be mounted to an existing sign frame on the Fawcett Furniture Building. The exhibit will be open through the end of March.

2.Display two window posters with similar imagery for the remainder of the exhibition, totaling approximately 30 sf. The applicant has received administrative approval to display a temporary A-frame sign for the remainder of the exhibition. The current request is in addition to that approval.

**FINDINGS:**

a. UDC Section 35-612 allows for temporary signage as part of special exhibition signage for museums and art galleries or as part of a change of business. Standards for change of business signage most directly apply to this request since the exhibitioners are leasing the space as the sole tenant for the duration of the exhibit. The applicant has been encouraged to work within the constraints of the existing building signage consistent with UDC Section 35-612(i).

b. Consistent with the UDC, this type of signage request should be limited to one or two signs advertising the exhibition. Excessive signage can result in visual clutter which detracts from quality and character of the historic property. Staff finds that only one sign in addition to the approved A-frame sign is sufficient to advertise the exhibition and meets the intent of UDC Section 35-612(i).

c. The proposed aluminum sign (item 1) mounted to the historic sign frame is larger than the signage allotted to the previous tenant and exceeds the provisions for change of business signage. The proposed sign is also out of scale with the building façade.

February 18, 2015

7

d. A window sign, as requested in item 2, is an appropriate application of temporary signage and can be easily removed. The window sign will also help to direct patrons to the exhibit's entrance. Only one window sign would be consistent with UDC Section 35-612(i).

1. Staff does not recommend approval of the large aluminum blade sign based on finding c.

2. Staff recommends approval of only one window sign in addition to the existing A-frame sign based on finding d with the stipulation that all signage be removed within 24 hours of the last day of the exhibition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with stipulations: 1. That banner not exceed area of existing sign frame on building and be a fabric material instead of aluminum and 2. That only one window sign be displayed. The previously-approved A-frame sign may also be displayed.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**19. HDRC NO. 2015-067**

Applicant: Vince Cantu

Address: 516 E. Houston

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify a previously-approved dining enclosure to include arched, metal braces to stabilize an existing fence. The braces will be attached to both the fence and the side of the building.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The existing patio fence was approved by the HDRC in 2014. Since its installation, the fence has been difficult to maintain due to instability in the footings. As a solution, the applicant installed the arched braces without approval.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 4.B.iii., new metal elements should only be added based on accurate evidence and should be designed based on the style of the building. The requested braces add a new element that is attached to the building for which there is no historical precedent. A more appropriate solution would be one that does not require an alteration to the building itself.

Staff does not recommend approval. Staff recommends that the applicant explore a footing that doesn't require attachment to the building.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny the applicant's request based on finding b.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2015-048**

Applicant: Nathan Manfred

Address: 127 Crofton

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a two-story addition at the rear of the existing single family two-story house built in 1900 to replace a one-story addition that was built in the late 1980's that is to be demolished. The applicant has submitted an application to receive administrative approval to demolish the rear addition as well as the existing one story side addition located on the north side of the original house, both of which were constructed in the late 1980's.

2. Construct a two story accessory structure to the south west of the primary structure. This accessory structure will consist of a garage with vehicular access for two vehicles (parked behind one another) with an art studio above.
3. Construct a two story accessory structure to the north west of the primary structure. This accessory structure will be used as a guest house.
4. Restore the front façade, including the two-story front porch of the primary house.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has been coordinating with staff in regards to the proposed restoration, additions and new construction at 127 Crofton. The applicant also met with the King William Association on February 4, 2015.
- b. This project was viewed by the Design Review Committee on February 10, 2015. At that meeting, the Committee expressed many of the same concerns that staff has expressed in the following findings.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Additions, all additions should be located at the side or rear of the primary structure to limit views from the public right of way, additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, additions should have a similar roof form and should feature a setback or other distinct feature to distinguish it from the primary existing structure. The applicant's request to locate the proposed addition at the rear of the primary structure is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- d. In regards to scale, massing and form of residential additions, the Guidelines for Additions 1.B. states that additions should be subordinate to the principle façade, their footprint should respond to the size of the lot and the height of additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. The applicant's proposal of a rear two-story addition is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A. and B., materials that match in type, color and texture should be used and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure. Metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion to the primary structure's historic metal roof. Inappropriate or synthetic materials such as vinyl siding, brick or simulated stone veneer or plastic should not be used.
- f. Additions should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the primary structure and district. Architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be used as well as contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for additions. The applicant has proposed to include windows that contain fenestration elements that are not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii. Staff recommends that the applicant resolve these fenestration issues as well as the incorporate windows into the currently, blank walls of the addition.
- g. The applicant has proposed two accessory buildings to be located to the rear (west) of the primary structure. One accessory structure is to be a garage with access for two vehicles with an upstairs art studio and the other is to be a guesthouse. In regards to massing and form, new accessory structures should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the height of each accessory structure to relate more to the primary structure's floor height as well as to become consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i.
- h. Individually, the two accessory structures feature footprints of approximately 800 square feet for the garage and approximately 1,000 square feet for the guesthouse. The existing structure feature approximately 2,500 square feet of livable space. The footprint of the applicant's proposed accessory structures is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii.
- i. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., new garages and accessory structures should be designed in a manner that relates to the period of construction of the principle building on the property. Currently, the applicant has proposed two accessory structures which do not relate to the character of the primary structure on the property in regards to both materials and character. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. The windows and doors that the applicant has proposed feature profiles and materials that are not complementary of the primary structure; in addition to this, the applicant's proposed window placement as well as façade arrangement presents large blank walls on each side of the property that is not consistent with the precedent set by the primary structure nor other accessory structures found throughout the neighborhood. The proposed windows and doors as well as their placement is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv.
- k. The applicant has proposed to install a metal rolling garage door with two glass panels facing the street on the south side of the primary structure. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v. in regards to the proportions and materials of garage doors.
- l. The applicant has oriented the proposed accessory structures to be set back from the primary structure's front façade to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v. While the proposed vehicular entrance for the garage is not at or attached to the primary structure, staff recommends that the applicant reposition the garage in order for its front to be offset to the rear of the back of the primary

structure to create a clean separation in plane from the primary structure.

m. The applicant has not specified to location of any mechanical equipment associated with the proposed construction of the garage and accessory building. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B. in regards to location, siting and screening of mechanical equipment.

n. The applicant has proposed to restore the existing two-story front porch which is currently in disrepair. The restoration of the front porch will require the removal of the existing columns to complete the necessary foundation repairs prior to the two-story porch being reconstructed. The applicant has proposed to restore the two-story front porch with wood to match the original as well as to match the original detailing found on the decking, handrails and columns. This is consistent with the Guidelines. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A.and B.

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on finding f. While the proposed addition’s massing, scale and location are all consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, staff recommends that the applicant resolve various issues regarding fenestration and façade arrangement before conceptual approval is recommended.

2. Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 and #3 based on findings g and i through m.

Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the overall height of the proposed accessory structures to be subordinate to that of the primary structure, introduce materials that are complementary to the primary, historic structure, resolve issues regarding façade arrangement, introduce windows and doors, including the garage door that are complementary to the primary structure in profile and relate to those found throughout the King William Historic District and to reposition to garage’s front façade to not be in line with the rear façade of the primary structure.

3. Staff recommends approval of item #4 as submitted based on finding o.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to refer to the DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2015-008**

Applicant: Daniel Vela

Address: 121 E. Carolina

Withdrawn per the applicant. Applicant will return with detailed information.

**22. HDRC NO. 2015-056**

Applicant: Lazar Hausman/Hausman Homebuyers Inc.

Address: 140 E. Magnolia Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

- 1. Demolish existing garage and construct new garage
- 2. Remove non-historic siding to expose wood siding underneath. Repair and replace as needed. Paint exterior.
- 3. Remove existing stairway and door entering the house halfway up the staircase. Replace door with a window or siding.
- 4. Remove 5 windows on the rear and 3 windows on the left of the upstairs porch enclosure and infill with siding. Remove 3 windows on the rear and all windows on the left of the downstairs porch enclosure and infill with siding.
- 5. Replace metal roof. Replace areas that have composition shingles with metal.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The existing garage and shed are not of historic age and considered to be non-contributing to the historic district. The proposed demolition will cause no adverse effect.

b. The proposed garage is consistent with location and setbacks of other garages along the block and is appropriate in size and massing.

However, according to the Guidelines for New Construction garages should relate to the main building through the use of Complementary materials. Matching the metal roof on the main house would be more appropriate and consistent with the guidelines. In addition, in order to maintain the current rear setback a variance may be required.

c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, exposing original siding that has been covered by another material is recommended. The proposed removal of existing non-historic siding to expose the original wood siding underneath is consistent with the guidelines.

d. The existing side stair and entrance which leads halfway up the interior staircase is likely not original to the structure. Removal of this feature will not cause an adverse effect on the historic structure. The applicant has presented two options to address the existing wall opening after removal of the stair. Preserving the existing opening and installing a window instead of removing it is more in keeping with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

e. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing window openings should be preserved. Although interior pictures provided by the applicant show that the porch enclosures are likely not original to the structure, the wood windows appear to have gained historic significance on their own. The proposed changes will drastically change the appearance of the rear of the structure and although these changes will not be highly visible from the street they should be avoided. If the current window layout does not work with the new interior layout covering some of the windows on the inside only would be more appropriate and consistent with the guidelines.

f. The proposed metal roof replacement is in keeping with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations as long as the specified metal roof detailing is used.

1. Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b with the stipulation that the roof is metal.
2. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding c.
3. Staff recommends approval based on finding d with the stipulation that the door opening be covered with a window and not infilled With siding.
4. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on finding e. If existing windows do not work with the new interior layout staff recommends the applicant explore covering the windows from the inside only or explore ways to retain more windows on the exterior.
5. Staff recommends approval based on finding f with the following stipulations:
  - a. Panels are 18-21" wide with seams no taller than 2"
  - b. A double munched seam or low profile cap with no ridge vent are used

#### COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to 1. Approved as submitted in revised drawing with the stipulations that wood siding to match the house is used and final selection of garage door is submitted for approval prior to installation. 2. Approved as submitted. 3. Approved with the stipulation that the opening be covered with a wood window to match existing windows on the house. 4. Denial based on staff recommendations. 5. Approved with staff stipulations using double munched seam.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

#### THE MOTION CARRIED

#### 23. HDRC NO. 2015-058

Applicant: Joseph Huntington

Address: 218 Sweet

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the deteriorated wood siding on an existing later addition to the house located at 218 Sweet St. The proposed siding replacement material would be 5" wide, smooth finish hardieplank. The skirting around the entire house is proposed to be replaced with hardieboard.

#### FINDINGS:

- a. The building located at 218 Sweet is a designated historic landmark.
- b. According to San Antonio's Sanborn map, the subject addition appears to have been constructed sometime between 1924 –1951.
- c. Staff finds that the addition has achieved historic significance in its own right. This is consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standard* number 4.
- d. The wood siding on the addition is deteriorated beyond repair. The proposed hardieplank siding is a synthetic material that is not recommended to replace wood. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii. This guideline

states that wood elements should be replaced in-kind.

e. The proposed hardieboard skirting would consistent with 8.B.i. which states that replacement skirting should consist of durable, proven materials, and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact.

Staff does not recommend approval of the hardiboard siding based on findings a through c; however, staff does recommend approval of the hardiboard skirting.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2015-068**

Applicant: Fernando Marin

Address: 1241 Virginia Blvd.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Repair and level foundation. Repair stone pillar bases. Termite infestation treatment. Siding repair. Exterior paint.
2. Install a 250 ft. driveway to the east of the structure.
3. Apply an acid anti-corrosive treatment and an elastomeric coat to the existing metal roof and patch as needed.
4. Install a 12x6 inch concrete barrier on the three other sides to stop any further water infiltration/erosion; and
5. Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The proposed repairs to foundation, columns and siding, exterior paint and termite treatment is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations and will not cause an adverse effect to the historic structure.

b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, historic driveway configurations should be retained. Driveways on this block of Virginia Street are typically no wider than 10 ft. A driveway no wider than 10 ft located at the existing curb cut is consistent with the guidelines.

c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, foundations should be well vented to control moisture underneath the dwelling. The guidelines also recommend downspouts to be directed away from the foundation and soil to slope away to avoid moisture collection. The proposed concrete barrier will cause a significant impact aesthetically and functionally and may cause irreversible damage to the house by trapping water underneath the building rather than diverting it away. The proposed concrete barrier is not consistent with the guidelines and is not an appropriate method to deal with drainage issues in a historic structure.

d. The proposed repairs to the metal roof are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations which recommend metal elements to be repaired using appropriate methods for the specific type of metal.

e. The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

1. Staff recommends approval of item 1 based on finding a with the stipulation that paint colors are submitted to staff for approval prior to painting.

2. Staff recommends approval of item 2 based on finding b with the stipulation that the driveway is no wider than 10 ft.

3. Staff recommends approval of item 3 as submitted based on finding d.

4. Staff does not recommend approval of item 4 as submitted based on finding c. Staff recommends that the site is graded to direct water away from the foundation.

5. Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on finding e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve as submitted.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2015-062**

Applicant: Dominic Cortez

Address: 2222 W. Huisache

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace the original wood windows with vinyl windows.
2. Replace the deteriorated wood siding on the rear façade with wood-grain, hardiboard siding.
3. Replace and patch the deteriorated wood siding in-kind in various locations along the side and rear of the house.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. On January 22, 2015 the property owner at 2222 W. Huisache was given a stop work-order for the illegal replacement of windows and siding. The homeowner claims that the removed double-hung wood windows were deteriorated beyond repair.
- b. The proposed replacement windows are not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. & 6.A.iii. The guidelines state that historic windows and openings should be preserved. The proposed change would adversely alter the integrity of the structure by replacing the historic windows and enlarging the openings to fit stock size contemporary windows. The design, size and material of the proposed replacement windows are inappropriate for the style of the home.
- c. The applicant has expressed concern to staff regarding the need to improve the energy efficiency of the house. However, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a house. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows and thermal shades. In most cases, windows may also be retrofitted with new glass. In general, staff encourages the repair of historic wood windows. A wood window that is maintained over time can last for decades.
- d. The proposed use of hardiboard siding as a replacement material for the deteriorated wood siding is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii. & 1.B.iii. Hardiboard is a synthetic material that is not recommended to substitute original wood siding.
- e. The proposed patch and replacement work of the deteriorated wood siding in-kind is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii & 1.B.iii.

Staff does not recommend approval of the vinyl replacement windows or the hardiboard siding based on findings a through d; however, staff does recommend approval of the in-kind siding replacement based on finding e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to grant denial of items 1 & 2. Item 3 was approved.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2015-074**

Applicant: Rob Martindale

Address: 306 Austin St.

Withdrawn per the applicant.

**27. HDRC NO. 2014-400**

Applicant: Don Shin

Address: 510 E. Courtland Place

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 510 E. Courtland Pl.

- a. The property received Historic Tax Certification on December 17, 2014. Scope of work included kitchen and bathroom remodel, repair wood floors, and install central AC.
- b. The applicant submitted an itemized list of costs for repairs at the property including central AC installation, kitchen and bathroom remodel, install laminate floor, and repair closets. Exterior work such as re-paint and grout pool, landscaping and pool equipment was also included, however since this work will not extend the life of the historic structure it does not qualify to be included in the rehabilitation costs.
- c. No Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for work completed at the pool and landscaping. In addition, no proof of permits was submitted by the applicant.
- d. Although the work completed might qualify for Tax Verification, staff was not able to verify that work was completed according to UDC requirements since no approvals or permits were acquired for some of the work.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings a-d. Staff recommends that all necessary approvals and permits are acquired prior to Historic Tax Verification being approved.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with the stipulation that the applicant resolve all permit issues within 3 months.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

APPROVED

  
Michael Guarino  
Chair

