

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
MARCH 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, Rodriguez, Feldman, Lazarine

ABSENT: Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Judson

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-106 | 2202 Fredericksburg Rd. |
| 2. Case No. 2015-105 | 2602 N. Flores |
| 3. Case No. 2015-074 | 306 Austin St. |
| 4. Case No. 2015-097 | 13203 Blanco Rd. |
| 5. Case No. 2015-095 | 900 S. Ellison Dr. |
| 6. Case No. 2015-091 | 129 E. Ashby Pl |
| 7. Case No. 2015-092 | 223 E. Summit |
| 8. Case No. 2015-103 | 238 Weaver St. |
| 9. Case No. 2015-100 | 111 Forcke |
| 10. Case No. 2015-101 | 223 Florida |

Item 1 and 2 were reset to April 1, 2015.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Rodriguez, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

11. HDRC NO. 2015-090

Applicant: Diana Webb

Address: 216 W. Mariposa

Reset to April 1, 2015

12. HDRC NO. 2015-094

Applicant: Aurora Morales

Address: 1203 E. Crockett St.

Withdrawn per the applicant.

13. HDRC NO. 2015-096

Applicant: Porter Dillard/Dillard Architect Group

Address: 821 N. Pine St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: install new windows on the house with new single hung windows to have the same exterior appearance as the previous original windows (i.e. wood sills, trim and molding) and with the same muntin window pane grid. The proposed windows will be fibrex, a composite wood and vinyl material. Existing windows on the first floor front elevation of the house will be retained and repaired.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 821 N Pine first appears on the 1912-1951 Sanborn maps. This property was identified as contributing in terms of design, detail, material, and scale in the Dignowity Hill Historic District survey.
- b. In 2013, the main house suffered a fire. The rear elevation as well as portions of the sides and roof had to be removed due to fire damage. On February 19, 2014, the case was heard by the HDRC. At that time, an approval was issued to reconstruct the rear, enclose an existing second story porch on the north side, and construct a small rear porch. New windows throughout the house were proposed to be wood to match existing.
- c. Pictures provided by the applicant in 2014, show that some original wood windows remained in place after demolition of fire damaged areas was completed. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved. If deteriorated beyond repair, they should be replaced in kind to match existing in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. Although the proposed windows will match the historic windows in terms of size and configuration, the proposed fibrex material which is a composite of wood fibers and vinyl is not consistent with the guidelines and is not an appropriate replacement for wood windows. In areas where the original windows were lost due to fire, the proposed new windows may be an appropriate replacement and would provide a clear distinction between the original and the new areas of the house.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings a-c. Staff recommends that all original windows remaining after the fire that are deteriorated beyond repair are replaced with wood windows to match existing and that only windows that were lost in the fire are replaced with the proposed material.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Rodriguez, Feldman, Lazarine
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2015-080

Applicant: Long Standing Properties
Address: 205 Camargo

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

- 1. Demolish the existing rear addition and rebuild it at 160 square feet on the first level.
- 2. Repair the foundation, wood siding, wood front door and wood windows of the original structure.
- 3. Restore the front porch to its original state.
- 4. Remove the existing chain link fence and replace it with a six (6) foot wood privacy fence.
- 5. Install a four (4) foot tall cattle panel fence on the south side of the property.
- 6. Install a crushed granite driveway.
- 7. Repair the concrete sidewalks and walkways.
- 8. Structurally improve the existing carport.
- 9. Construct an upstairs family/living area.
- 10. Xeriscape the rear of the lot.

FINDINGS:

- a. A stop work order was issued at 205 Camargo on February 10, 2015, for various unapproved exterior modifications and the partial demolition of an existing rear addition.
- b. This project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 24, 2015. At that meeting, the Committee noted that their main concern was over the height and mass of the proposed second level addition. Committee members noted that at the appropriate height and scale, second level additions may be appropriate. Also, at the meeting, the applicant agreed to many of staff's stipulations noted in the recommendation.

- c. This project was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission on March 6, 2015. At that meeting, the HDRC noted the progress that had been made, particularly to the height and scale of the proposed second level addition, however, the HDRC requested that the applicant's construction documents be corrected to reflect the house as it exists, that the applicant reduce the size of the proposed front porch columns, redesign the front porch column layout as well as remove one column. The HDRC also requested that the applicant provide a landscaping plan.
- d. This project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 10, 2015. At that meeting updated drawings were presented per staff's recommendation.
- e. The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing, non original rear addition and replace it with an addition that will bring the total square footage of the first level of the house to 1,566 square feet, including the original structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A., residential additions should be sited at the side or rear of the original structure, should be designed in a manner that is keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should clearly show a transition between the original structure and the addition. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines. In regards to height, footprint and relationship in scale to the principal façade of the original structure, the applicant's proposal is subordinate in each aspect and is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.
- f. The original structure's foundation, siding, wood windows and wood front door are in disrepair. The applicant has proposed to restore each of these items to their original state. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.i in regards to woodwork, 6.A.ii and ii in regards to wood windows and doors and 8.A. in regards to foundation repair. In the event that a wood window is beyond repair, the applicant has proposed to install wood double hung windows. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with staff on the replacement of windows that are beyond repair.
- g. The original front porch has been partially enclosed. The applicant is proposing to restore the front porch to its original state by removing the exiting vinyl siding and enclosure and to replace the existing, non original wrought iron columns with square wood columns. The applicant's proposal to restore the existing porch to its original state is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.
- h. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing chain link fence on the east and north sides of the lot and replace with a six (6) foot wood privacy fence. On the south side of the lot, the applicant is proposing to install a four (4) foot tall cattle panel fence to be consistent with the placement of other front yard fences. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2. B.
- i. The applicant is proposing to install a crushed granite driveway in the location of the existing driveway, which is gravel. The applicant is also proposing to restore the concrete sidewalks and walkways. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A. and B.
- j. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new standing seam metal roof. This is consistent with the Guidelines. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi.
- k. The applicant has proposed to structurally improve the existing carport. The carport will remain as framed (metal channel) with a standing seam metal roof. While this would be an improvement to an existing feature, staff recommend that the applicant provide more information on the structural improvements.
- l. Homes found along Camargo and throughout Lavaca are of different sizes and architectural styles. Many feature ground level additions. The applicant has proposed to add a second level addition of a family and living room to the house at 205 Camargo. According to the Guidelines for Additions, additions should be sited in a way which minimizes visual impact, is in keeping with the historic context of the block, is subordinate to the principal façade and have a height that is generally consistent with the existing structure. The applicant has submitted revised drawings that present the second level addition in a manner that staff finds is appropriate. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. The applicant has proposed to Xeriscape portions of the rear of the lot, but has not provided a site plan showing these proposed alterations. Staff recommends that the applicant refer to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3 in regards to landscape design.
1. Staff recommends approval of request items #1 through #9 based on findings e through j and l with the following Stipulations:
- i. That the applicant submits more information to staff and a detail of the columns proposed for the front porch.
 - ii. That the privacy fence height exceed no more than four (4) feet once it approaches the south side of the lot at the front window on the east façade.
 - iii. That the applicant maintain a standing seam metal roof throughout the property.
 - iv. That all siding be wood or Hardie Board with a smooth finish.
 - v. That the applicant provide information regarding the structural improvements of the existing metal framed carport.

2. Staff does not recommend request item #10 based on findings k and m.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Rodriguez, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2015-104

Applicant: Michael Garansuay

Address: 803 E. Park Ave.

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

Construct 6 new townhome units on the 10,000 square foot lot at 803 E Park where there is currently a single family residence for which demolition has been approved. The proposed new construction will have a footprint of 5,243 square feet, stucco facades and a standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. This current request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 10, 2014. At that meeting, committee members expressed concern over a parking and driveway buffer as well as the lack on an architectural site plan.
- b. The applicant has noted that the existing structure at 803 E Park, a single family dwelling is to be demolished. Administrative Approval for the demolition of the structure was given on January 30, 2015. Due to its location within the River Improvement Overlay, no HDRC review is required by the UDC.
- c. According to the UDC Section 35-672 (a)(1)(A), pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. A sidewalk connection from one (1) side of the applicant's property to the other, parallel to the public right of way shall be provided in all river improvement overlay districts. As shown in the application documents, the applicant has proposed to provide a concrete sidewalk connection from one side of the property to the other. This is consistent with the UDC.
- d. The applicant has proposed three (3) curb cuts along E Park. According to the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(A), curb cuts should be limited to two (2) on parking areas or structures facing only one (1) street and one for each additional street face. The applicant's proposal of three (3) curb cuts is not consistent with the UDC. If the applicant is seeking a third curb cut, it should be located on E Euclid.
- e. Automobile parking in new developments should be located toward the interior of the site or to the side or rear of a building. The applicant has proposed garage parking for one automobile per unit with designated driveways. Individual driveways with street access promote parking that is not toward the interior, side or rear of a building and is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-672 (b)(2).
- f. Due to the unique street pattern and this lot being a corner lot, a focal point is formed, particularly when driving southeast on E Park. According to the UDC Section 35-672 (c)(1), when a property appears to be at the terminus of a street, an architectural feature is to be included in the design to provide a focal point. This can be achieved including additional height, the creation of a tower, variation in roof slope, a change in color or materials, embellished entrance areas, articulated corners or recessed or projecting balconies and entrances. The applicant has not shown an architectural feature to act as a focal point. The applicant must do so in order for this proposal become consistent with Section 35-671(c)(1) of the UDC.
- g. Primary entrances to buildings in the River Improvement Overlay should be oriented toward the street with secondary entrances oriented in the interior of a site. The applicant has specified that each primary entrance is to be recessed from the main exterior wall and have an awning with wood brackets to serve as a canopy. While the primary entrance is oriented toward the street, they are still secondary to the vehicular entrance, the garages. This is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(2) in regards to primary entrances.
- h. The applicant has not specified landscaping plans nor plant materials. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(e) regarding landscape design and Section 35-673(f) regarding plant materials.

i. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to site lighting, site lighting should define activity areas and provide interest at night. Site lighting should also be designed in a manner that facilitates safe and convenient circulation for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. Overspill of light and light pollution should be avoided. The applicant has not submitted information regarding site lighting and is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

j. The applicant has noted that mechanical equipment is to be located at ground level at the rear (northeast) of the proposed building. According to the UDC Section 35-673(n), service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Furthermore, mechanical equipment that generates noise, smoke or odors shall not be located at the pedestrian level. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the UDC.

k. Regarding scale and mass, in order to provide a human scale, buildings should be designed in a manner where their facades contain a pattern of mass to void, a distinction between upper and lower floors and a wall plain that divides the building's facades into modules that express traditional dimensions. While the proposal contains elements that meet each of these requirements, they are met by nontraditional elements, particularly the use of aluminum garage doors. This is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(b)(4).

l. The applicant has proposed building materials which include stucco, wood trim, stucco trim and a standing seam metal roof. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d) in regards to materials and finishes.

m. According to the UDC Section 35-673(e), buildings should contain three distinct façade elements; a base, a midsection and a cap. The proposal has met these standards and is consistent with the UDC.

n. Windows not only facilitate the separation of a building's façade, but also help provide a human scale. Per the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2), windows shall be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, should relate in design and scale to the space behind them, shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and shall be grouped to establish rhythm. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC in regards to window arrangement and fenestration.

o. The applicant has proposed to place wood awnings at each primary entrance. The proportions as well as materials of the proposed awnings are consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(g).

p. 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 as well as Sections 35-606, 35-630 and 35-634.

Staff does not recommend final approval as submitted at this time based on findings d through k and n. Staff recommends that the applicant return to the Design Review Committee once the above noted inconsistencies with the UDC have been addressed. The applicant needs to show more developed architectural drawings providing detail regarding onsite parking, the buffering of onsite parking from the pedestrian right of way, the rearrangement of parking on the primary façade, site lighting, the screening of mechanical equipment and window arrangement and fenestration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to refer to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Rodriguez, Feldman, Lazarine
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2015-102

Applicant: Katherine Valadez/Eden Lawn & Landscape, LLC
Address: 511 Adams St.

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

1. Install an 8" brick edger along the proposed decomposed granite pathway from the west side of the house to the rear of the property, around a proposed area of sod in the rear yard and from the northeast corner of the house to the property line.
2. Install a decomposed granite pathway through the side and rear yard and between the existing concrete drive strips in the front yard.
3. Install bedding areas on the west side of the house.
4. Plant purple heart between the existing drive strips and the existing concrete walk in the front yard.
5. Install river rock on the west side of the garage.
6. Create a circular sod area in the rear yard that is to be bordered by the proposed 8" brick edgers.
7. Install a bedding area in the rear yard.

8. Install a stone path in the front yard.
9. Install a bedding area beneath the existing olive tree in the front yard.
10. Completely remove the existing front yard turf and replace it with river rock.
11. Completely remove the existing sidewalk turf and replace it with decomposed granite.
12. Completely remove the existing rear yard turf between Wickes and the rear fence and replace it with decomposed granite.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed various landscaping additions and modifications including the installation of an 8” brick edger, a decomposed granite pathway, multiple small bedding areas, the planting of purple heart, the installation of river rock, the creation of a circular sod area, the installation of bedding areas and the installation of a stone path. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3, low growing planting should be used in historic lawn areas, new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible and should incorporate small plantings into the design. The applicant’s proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A. and 3.B.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50% and rock mulch or gravel should not be used as a wholesale replacement for lawn areas. The applicant’s proposal to completely remove the front yard turf and rear yard turn south of the existing wood privacy fence bordering Wickes is not consistent with the Guidelines 3.A.ii. and 3.B.ii.
- c. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing sidewalk turf strip and replace it with decomposed granite. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 4.A.ii, which states that the use of traditional lawns in planting strips should be maintained in residential streetscapes.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #9 based on finding a. Staff does not recommend approval of items #10 through #12 based on findings b and c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve items 1 – 9 and denial of items 10-12.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Rodriguez, Feldman, Lazarine

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 5:45 P.M.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair