

July 1, 2015

1

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
JULY 1, 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, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson
ABSENT: Connor, Zuniga, Salas, Rodriguez

- Chairman's Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

1. Case No. 2015-269	7622 S. Presa
2. Case No. 2015-254	200/223 S. Alamo St.
3. Case No. 2015-267	112 King William
4. Case No. 2015-265	210 W. Market
5. Case No. 2015-263	434 S. Alamo
6. Case No. 2015-261	201 E. Grayson
7. Case No. 2015-260	318 E. Carolina
8. Case No. 2015-107	801, 803, 809, 815 S. St. Mary's
9. Case No. 2015-048	127 Crofton
10. Case No. 2015-231	636 Mission St.
11. Case No. 2015-272	918 N. Pine St.
12. Case No. 2015-266	415 Willow Dr.
13. Case No. 2015-251	312 N. Hackberry St.
14. Case No. 2015-255	100 Montana
15. Case No. 2015-259	1526 N. Walters
16. Case No. 2015-256	1527 W. Mistletoe
17. Case No. 2015-257	3100 Hiawatha
18. Case No. 2015-106	2202 Fredericksburg Rd.
19. Case No. 2015-270	504 Austin St.

Items 5, 8, 13 and 18 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

Item 10 was withdrawn per the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2015-263

Applicant: Dyal and Partners

Address: 434 S. Alamo St.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Install a wayfinding and donor recognition master signage system for the Hemisfair Historic District Redevelopment. The first implementation of the master plan signage system will be as a part of the Yanaguana Garden project and will then become the district standard for wayfinding and donor recognition and will be used in all future phases of the Hemisfair Redevelopment.

FINDINGS:

- a. According to the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.i. and ii., the proper usage and placement of freestanding signs are in areas that are set back from the street, in commercial districts and in areas that are pedestrian oriented that do not block the public right of way. The applicant’s proposed locations are consistent with the Guidelines.
- b. The applicant has proposed a number of signs that range from 1’ – 5” to 12’ – 2” in height. Per the UDC Section 35-678 regarding Signs and Billboards in the RIO, freestanding signs are allowed provided the sign does not interfere with pedestrian or vehicular traffic, shall be perpendicular to the street, two-sided and no taller than six feet in height. To become consistent with this section of the UDC, staff recommends that the applicant amend the overall proposed height of the freestanding to no more than six feet in height at any location.
- c. According to both the UDC Section 35-678(e)(4) and the Guidelines for Signage, total requested signage should not exceed more than fifty total square feet, however additional square footage may be approved given that signage does not interfere with the pedestrian experience. Given the size of the Hemisfair District, staff finds that the proposed additional square footage is appropriate.
- d. The applicant has proposed materials of limestone, board form concrete, fabricated and perforated panels, wide flange steel beams, Yellow Pine or Western Red Cedar and steel wayfinding panels. Each of these proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.D.ii.
- e. The Guidelines for Signage 1.D.iii. states that the number of colors used on a sign should be limited to three. The applicant has proposed four colors in the master signage plan; the original Hemisfair colors. On individual signage proposals, the applicant has not shown more than three colors together in a specific instance. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e with the stipulation that the applicant limit the height of all proposed signage to no more than six feet in height.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman
NAYS: Judson

THE MOTION CARRIED

8. HDRC NO. 2015-107

Applicant: Bryan Penn
Address: 801, 803, 809, 815 S. St. Mary’s

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

- 1. Install a wrought iron fence at the rear (south side) of the building to enclose a proposed herb garden.
- 2. Create 3 new window openings and install 3 new windows into the west façade.
- 3. Create 4 new window openings and install 4 new windows into the north façade.
- 4. Remove the existing brick planters along both S St Mary’s and Madison and plant trees.
- 5. Install canopies over the existing doors in both the south and north elevations.
- 6. Install a garden wall along Madison to screen the existing rear parking area from the public right of way.
- 7. Install a wall mounted restaurant sign along S St Mary’s reading “Brigid”.
- 8. Install a wall mounted restaurant sign along S St Mary’s reading “Francis Bogside”.

- a. The structure at 801/803/809/815 S St Mary’s, also known as the King William Professional Building was constructed circa 1940, underwent façade alterations circa 1970 and is located at the corner of S St Mary’s and Madison in the King William Historic District. This property received Historic Tax Certification on September 4, 2013, for roof replacement, the cleaning of the brick façade and exterior painting.
- b. This case was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 7, 2015. At that meeting, committee members expressed concern over the grouping and size of the proposed windows. Since that meeting, the applicant has reduced the number of proposed windows on both the S St Mary’s and Madison facades and has altered both the size and grouping of the windows on the Madison façade.

c. This case was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on May 6, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee and suggested that the applicant meet with the neighborhood to address concerns over parking and outdoor seating.

d. This case was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 9, 2015, for a second time where the applicant presented a number of altered or new elements. The new design changes were well received by the DRC.

e. The applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence on the rear (southwest) side of the building to enclose a proposed herb garden in the location of a previously proposed outdoor seating area. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements B., new fences should appear to be similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character and should be composed of materials that are complementary of those of the primary structure and other fences throughout the district. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

f. The applicant has proposed to create 3 new window openings in the west façade along Madison which currently features no windows. Staff finds that the creation of these four window openings as well as the installation of four new windows is appropriate given the proposed use of the structure which is a restaurant. The applicant has proposed for the window frames to be long leaf pine with clear glass. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.ii.

g. The applicant has also proposed to create 4 window openings in the north façade along S St Mary's which is to include the installation of a window at the corner of the building that forms at the corner of Madison and S St Mary's. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.ii.

h. Currently brick planters 6 brick planters located at the sidewalk along Madison and 2 along S St Mary's. The applicant has proposed to remove these and to replace them with native species trees. This request is appropriate according to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.ii. This applicant should select the specific specie of the trees with guidance from the City Arborist.

i. The existing façade currently features no door canopies. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii., new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be p proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. The applicant has proposed to install a garden wall system along Madison to buffer the rear herb garden and existing parking from the public right of way. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.i. The overall height of the garden wall system should be no taller than 4 feet at any location.

k. The applicant has proposed to install a wall mounted restaurant sign along S St Mary's reading "Brigid". The metal blade sign will have a copper finish and be back lit to provide halo lighting. Its dimensions are 2' – 6" x 1' – 10". The applicant's proposed signage is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage.

l. The applicant has proposed to install a wall mounted restaurant sign along S St Mary's reading "Francis Bogside". The metal blade sign will feature copper and steel and will be back lit to provide halo lighting. Its dimensions are 3' – 0" x 1' – 4".

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

i. That the proposed garden wall and wrought iron fence be no taller than 4 feet at any location.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through l.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2015-251

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 312 N. Hackberry St.

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Building Standards Board for the main structure at 312 N. Hackberry. The City of San Antonio Code Enforcement Division has determined that the wood frame main structure is unsafe and is recommending demolition per Chapter 6-156, subsections 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 15.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 312 N. Hackberry is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District and was designated under ordinance #57994.
- b. The main house is deteriorated and in need of repairs especially the front porch, rear fire damage and siding, however repairs appear to be feasible. Demolition of a contributing structure within a historic district constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of our community and should always be a measure of last resort.
- c. According to Sec. 35-614 of the UDC, in order for the demolition of a contributing structure to be approved, the owner must provide proof of economic hardship and evidence that repairs are not feasible. This information has not been provided to the HDRC for its consideration. If economic hardship cannot be proven, the UDC requires proof of loss of significance. Staff finds that overall the main structure has not suffered major modifications, the majority of its original material is intact and its historical and architectural integrity remain which retains the building's significance.
- d. According to Chapter 6, Article 8 of the City Code, a structure that is identified by Code Enforcement to be in violation of minimum maintenance requirements and dangerous structure codes will be presented to the Building Standards Board. The BSB will determine if the structure is dangerous and may issue an order to demolish the building unless the owner can provide proof of their ability to repair it.
- e. If demolished as a public safety hazard, the UDC Sec. 35-615 requires that no permits be issued for the property for a period of 5 years from the date of demolition. Furthermore, a demolition permit shall not be issued until all appropriate fees outlined in Sec. 35-614 (e) have been collected.

Staff does not concur with Code Enforcement staff's recommendation for demolition. Staff recommends repair of the structure.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman a recommendation to BSB repairs to be made to 312 N. Hackberry.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2015-106

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 2202 Fredericksburg Rd.

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property located at 2202 Fredericksburg Rd.

FINDINGS:

- a. The automobile service station located at 2202 Fredericksburg was constructed ca. 1940s.
- b. The DDC visited and reviewed the site February 25, 2015. A formal committee recommendation could not be made on site due to insufficient committee attendance, but it was noted that the structure was significant.
- c. The DDC met for the second time on June 5, 2015. The committee concurred that the structure is significant.
- d. The building's architectural type, as an early service station structure, is distinctive in character and is an exceptional example of a Moderne/Deco style gas station.
- e. Located along Monticello Park's major thoroughfare, Fredericksburg Road, the service station served one of San Antonio's early automobile suburbs and exemplifies the cultural, economic, and social trends of the neighborhood. The service station contributes contextually to the historic fabric of the Monticello Park Historic District.
- f. The service station features a Y-shaped floor plan with a central office/storefront, a three bay service garage that extends from the rear façade, and doors made of steel and glass.
- g. Significant character defining details include the half decagon shaped central office, the prominent five tiered dome and the two attached rounded canopies that extend and anchor the structure to the corner intersection between Hildebrand and Fredericksburg Street.

July 1, 2015

5

- h. The structure's significant details and materials are mostly intact and have high integrity.
- i. The automobile service station is a significant historic resource with high architectural and cultural integrity.
- j. The structure has been surveyed and identified by UTSA and the San Antonio Conservation Society as a significant historic resource eligible for landmark designation.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through k.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve a Finding of Historic Significance for the property located at 2202 Fredericksburg Rd.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Judson

NAYS: Cone, Feldman

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2015-149

Applicant: Pam Carpenter

Address: 600 Blk of Burseson at Olive

Postponed per the applicant's request.

21. HDRC NO. 2015-244

Applicant: Derek Elliot

Address: 130 Davis Court

A citizen is requesting the HDRC to make a recommendation regarding the significance of the property and its eligibility for designation as a historic landmark.

FINDINGS:

- a. A request for review of historic significance for 130 Davis Ct was submitted to OHP by a citizen.
- b. Consistent with the RID 2014-003, OHP will process the request from a citizen for review and will schedule on the HDRC agenda. If the HDRC does not concur with staff's recommendation, the process will end.
- c. The HDRC may concur that the property is eligible for landmark designation without the consent of the property's owner. According to the UDC Section 35-607(a) & (b)(1), initiation of landmark designation cannot begin without owner consent, unless a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation has been approved. If 130 Davis Ct. is found to be eligible for historic landmark designation and the property owner does not consent, the HDRC shall direct its secretary, the Historic Preservation Officer, to request a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation.
- d. The DDC reviewed the property on June 5, 2015. The committee concurred that the property was eligible for landmark designation.
- e. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b) 5, the property is a unique and valuable example of a craftsman style.
- f. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b) 8, the design of the building contributes to the historic integrity of the neighborhood and relays information about architectural and stylistic trends of the period.
- g. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b) 12, the house is an outstanding example of a unique craftsman style home in San Antonio.
- h. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b) the property at 130 Davis Ct. meets the criteria for landmark designation as a valuable and unique example of a craftsman style house with high architectural integrity.
- i. The character defining features include a gabled dormer with stick work, a limestone-faced porch and wood rafters that extend beyond the eaves with elaborate ornamentation.

j. The tripartite design pattern is evident in the majority of the architectural features, (ie. Windows, rafters, divided lite pattern).

Staff concurs that the property is eligible for designation based on findings a through g. If the HDRC chooses to approve the request, the HDRC will become the applicant for the designation application before City Council. OHP shall process the application on behalf of the HDRC.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Judson to Approved as submitted. The HDRC concurs that the property is historically significant and eligible for designation.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Judson

NAYS: Cone, Feldman

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2015-262

Applicant: Gustavo Mendoza

Address: 603 Mission St.

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

Install a roof mounted solar photovoltaic system to both the rear (east) roof the primary historic structure as well as the roof of an accessory structure and trellis system.

Option 1: Locate the entire array on the original roof structure extending to the front gable.

Option 2: Locate a portion of the array on the original roof structure with a setback of approximately 10 feet from the front gable and locate the remaining panels on the roof of the addition and rear of the house. With this option, the applicant has proposed to remove a large Pecan tree at the south side of the property.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to mount a solar photovoltaic system on the roof, at the side and rear (south) side of the house where its visibility will be lowest from the public right of way due to the low slope of the structure’s roof, existing vegetation and the neighboring house. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i. in regards to the location of solar collectors.

b. The applicant has proposed two options, the first of which staff finds will be too visible from the public right of way. Staff recommends that approval of Option 2, which locates a portion of the solar collectors at the rear of the original roof and on the roof of the rear addition, however staff does not recommend the removal of the existing large Pecan tree.

c. All efforts should be made by the applicant to preserve the existing Pecan tree while minimizing the visibility of the proposed solar collectors from the public right of way. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.i., existing mature trees and heritage trees are to be preserved and protected from damage. The applicant is responsible for complying with the section of the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of Option 2 based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant preserve the existing large Pecan tree.
- ii. That the applicant continue to explore arrangements that would reduce the number of solar collectors on the original roof.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve option 1.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2014-255

Applicant: Adrian Garcia

Address: 524 Leigh St.

July 1, 2015

7

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

Retain the current nine over nine vinyl windows installed at 524 Leigh. The applicant received an HDRC COA on August 6, 2014, for construction of a new house featuring six over six wood windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant received an HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness on August 6, 2014, for the construction of a two story, single family residence at 524 Leigh. Materials that were noted in the request and approved on that date were Hardi Board siding, wood windows and a standing seam metal roof.
- b. A stop work order was issued on Monday, June 8, 2015, for work being performed outside of the scope of what was approved by the HDRC. This work includes the installation of nine over nine vinyl windows. The applicant received approval for the installation of six over six wood windows.
- c. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., windows and door openings should contain similar proportions to those found throughout the district, and windows and doors should be composed of materials that complement the type, color and texture of those found traditionally in the district according to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i. The vinyl windows that are currently installed are not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval of the nine over nine vinyl windows. Staff recommends that the applicant adhere to the HDRC COA that was issued and install six over six wood windows.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to grant denial based on findings a through c.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2015-234

Applicant: Marcus Guerra

Address: 1902 San Pedro Ave.

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

1. Clean and patch exterior walls. Exterior paint. Replace existing tile detailing with new black tile to match existing pattern. Resurface parking lot. Repair existing storefront. Replace existing doors.
2. Infill two existing window openings on the side.

FINDINGS:

- a. The case was first heard by the HDRC on June 17, 2015, at that time the case was referred to the Design Review Committee. The applicant submitted revised drawings at the DRC meeting to address some of the staff and Commission's concerns. The DRC noted removing the side windows would be acceptable if properly infilled, and recommended that if installation of the canopy was still in the plan to look for historic photos. The Committee expressed concern regarding the modifications to the proportions of the front doors but found the proposed solution appropriate.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing door and window openings should be preserved. The proposed window repairs are consistent with the guidelines.
- c. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic doors should be repaired if possible. When deteriorated beyond repair, doors should be replaced in kind to match existing. Although the existing doors appear to be original, the proposed replacement doors will allow for placement of interior push bars which are required for emergency egress.
- d. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, filling in historic window or door openings should be avoided. The proposed infill of the existing windows should be avoided.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve item 1 as submitted. Approval of item 2 as submitted today with the following stipulations: a. The existing window sills at infill windows remain. Tile is kept, paint is removed and tile is repaired. If repair is not possible, come back to HDRC with information on tile condition and original colors.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2015-250

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 125 W. Mistletoe - Garage

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting review and recommendation of contributing status for the garage structure at 125 W. Mistletoe

FINDINGS:

a. The case was heard by the HDRC on June 17, 2015. At that time, it was referred to the Designation and Demolition Committee for an onsite visit. The DDC visited the property on June 25, 2015. At that time, the Committee noted there is no trace of the smaller building, the structure has studs and a concrete beam along the back, and that similar structures exist on adjacent properties. The DDC recommended the structure to be preserved and recommended it to retain its contributing status.

b. Sanborn Maps show the garage at 125 W. Mistletoe was constructed sometime between 1924 and 1951 to replace a smaller garage that was likely built around the time the main house was constructed.

c. According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, the main house was constructed in 1908. The garage is listed as a contributing structure to the district.

d. Consistent with Section 35-614 (f) of the UDC, demolition of a structure located within a historic district may be approved if the historic preservation officer determines the building does not possess historical or architectural significance either as a stand-alone building or as part of a complex of structures on site. The existing garage was built years after the main house was built to replace an earlier structure, and although it may be of historic age, the garage has been severely modified and these modifications have diminished the integrity of the structure.

e. The owner has also submitted an application for demolition of the structure in question.

Staff recommends the HDRC not approve the request for non-contributing status. If the applicant wants to pursue demolition of a contributing structure, there is a process in place in the UDC for doing so and that process should not be circumvented in this case. If the Commission recommends non-contributing status and the garage is demolished, staff recommends a stipulation that materials are salvaged during demolition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Judson to grant denial of contributing status change.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2015-023

Applicant: Jennifer Boone

Address: 415 E. Park Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-1/2 story single family residence. The proposed house will have hardi-plank siding, shingles and trim. The steep roof will be standing seam metal roof with 1/2 round gutters and downspouts. Site elements including walks, driveways, decks and landscaping will be submitted as a separate request.

FINDINGS:

- a. The project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 7, 2014, at that time Committee members were concerned with front yard parking, the disruption of historic pattern along the street, massing, the introduction of a front yard fence, and roof form. The Committee recommended extending the roof further over the deck, exploring adding more windows/articulation and revising the roof form. The project was presented to the DRC again on October 21, 2014, at that time committee members noted that front yard fencing, front yard parking, and the depth of the rooftop deck were a concern.
- b. The case was heard by the HDRC on January 21, 2015. At that time the case was forwarded to the Design Review Committee. The DRC reviewed updated drawings on February 10, 2015, at that time the Committee determined many of the previous issues had been addressed but was concerned with the proposed design for the columns.
- c. The case was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 23, 2015. The Committee was satisfied with the revised fenestration pattern but expressed concern regarding the proportions of the columns, using false divisions on the windows and the small mansard roof at the front elevation. The Committee recommended making the column tapers less dramatic, using one over one windows and simplifying the mansard hood.
- d. The project received conceptual approval on March 6, 2015. At that time, the HDRC noted concern regarding the design of elevations and architectural elements, uniformity and proportions of fenestration, lack of information on the design for the gable vent, parking, and porch column design.
- e. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, new buildings should have a similar height and scale to adjacent buildings. The majority of the houses on this block of East Park are large and over 2 stories tall. The proposed design is appropriate for its context and in keeping with the guidelines.
- f. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, front facades of new buildings should align with existing buildings when there is a consistent setback along the street. Houses on this block of East Park have an overall consistent setback that should be preserved. Although the house does not align directly with the adjacent houses due to the solid portion that extends along the east side of the house, the front setback is similar to the adjacent houses and is consistent with the guidelines.
- g. The foundation of the proposed house will align with adjacent houses consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. According to the guidelines, new construction should incorporate materials that complement historic materials in type, size and texture. The proposed hardi-shingle skirting material is consistent with the guidelines.
- h. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new buildings should incorporate similar roof forms and pitch that are consistent with other buildings on the block. The proposed gable roof design is typical of houses on the street and appropriate for this setting. The proposed metal roof is a traditionally used material in historic districts and consistent with the guidelines as long as the recommended detailing for metal roofs is used.
- i. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction window and door openings should have a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Windows, doors, porches, entryways, dormers, bays, and pediments shall be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The proposed fenestration pattern is consistent with the guidelines. However, the proposed false divided light pattern on the windows is not consistent with historic windows and should be avoided.
- j. As recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction, materials that complement the type, color and texture of materials traditionally found in the district should be used. The proposed cement board siding may be appropriate if proper dimension, finish and texture is used, however wood siding would be more appropriate.
- k. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new buildings should be of their time while respecting the historic context. In addition, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation #3, changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, should not be undertaken. The proposed craftsman columns and mansard roof on the front elevation create a false sense of history and are not an accurate representation of the building's architectural style or time of construction. Simplified architectural detailing that does not compete with its historic context would be more appropriate.
- l. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. The proposed massing for the front façade is vertical in design which is consistent with other two story historic homes within the district. However, the proposed porch columns break the verticality of the façade and are not consistent with other vertical elements on the elevation. Simplified columns that remain continuous from the first floor to the top of the second story porch would be more appropriate.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a-k with the following stipulations:

- a. One over one windows with no divisions are used

- b. Architectural detailing is simplified at porch columns and mansard roof cover.
- c. Front porch columns run continuously through the top of the second story porch
- d. Specifications for appropriate windows and doors are submitted for review
- e. The proposed cement board siding has proper dimension, finish and texture
- f. Standing seam roof has panels 18-21" wide, seams no taller than 2" and a low cap or munched seam with no ridge vent.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve revised drawings presented today with staff stipulations: a. Specifications for appropriate windows and doors are submitted for review b. The proposed cement board siding has proper dimension, finish and texture c. Standing seam roof has panels 18-21" wide, seams no taller than 2" and a low cap or munched seam with no ridge vent.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2015-271

Applicant: Bryan Mask

Address: 202 Mary Louise

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following exterior alterations:

1. Construct an architectural entry gate to flank the existing front sidewalk that faces Mary Louise Dr., and the rear sidewalk at San Antonio Ave. A corner gate feature will also be constructed on the northeast edge of the property. The gates will feature light fixtures, metal iron work and will be finished with stucco to match the home finish and color.
2. Landscape the front and side lawns. The lawn will be finished with native plants in decomposed granite mulch along the building's perimeter. The tree lawn will feature palms, mixed with turf and areas of decomposed granite mulch and native plants.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed entry gates are not consistent with the guidelines for site elements 2.B.ii. The introduction of a new gate feature would be an inappropriate addition to the subject property and neighborhood. Front yard gates are not typical in the Monticello Park neighborhood; therefore, the proposed gate would not be compatible. The design and scale of the gate is not appropriate within the context of the neighborhood.
- b. The proposed height of the fence does not comply with the guidelines for site elements 2.B.iii, or the UDC. The fence exceeds the maximum height permitted of four feet and if approved may require a variance.
- c. The proposed landscape plan would be consistent with the guidelines for landscape design 3.A. The plant palette will be varied but will be limited to designated planting areas around the perimeter of the house and tree lawn.
- d. The used of mulch and semi-pervious ground covering will be used in moderation. Small planting beds will be incorporated into the design.

Staff recommends approval of item 2. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1; based on findings a through d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve item #2 and denial of item #1.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2015-268

Applicant: Loren Drum

Address: 123 May

July 1, 2015

11

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 32ftx40ft shop/storage building. The proposed building will be single story timber frame construction with a loft. The structure will be clad in cedar planks finished in natural color and will have wood windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property is currently subdivided in multiple lots. The only existing structure is the house at 117 May. The existing house is built in the Minimal Traditional style with a low pitch hip roof, deep overhangs, and plank siding.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of height, massing and form. The proposed structure will be taller and appear larger than the main house; however it will be located on the opposite side of the property which will reduce the appearance of height compared to the main house. Although the proposed garage will be surrounded by mostly vacant lots, the existing adjacent structures are one and one-half story houses. Due to its location on the site and context, additional height may be appropriate.
- c. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new garages should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The proposed structure does not relate to the Minimal Traditional style of the main house in roof form, pitch, and overhang dimension which is not consistent with the guidelines.
- d. As recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction, windows and door openings should be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principle historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions. The proposed design is consistent with the guidelines.
- e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. There are no other garages on May Street and a predominant pattern along the block does not exist.
- f. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, the historic setback pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district should be followed. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the principal building. The proposed garage will be located on the front yard of the property and will align with the front of the main structure which is not consistent with the guidelines.

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time based on findings a-f. Staff recommends the following:

- a. New structure should relate to style and period of construction of the main house
- b. Reduce height to be more consistent with surrounding structures
- c. Garage should be located towards the rear of the property closer to Houston Street.
- d. Additional information including window specifications, foundation type, and dimensioned site plan is submitted for review.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman, Judson

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 6:05 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

