

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
OCTOBER 21, 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, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman (Commissioner Salas arrived 3:30pm)**

**ABSENT: Zuniga, Rodriguez, Judson**

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-416  | 806 E. Guenther       |
| 2. Case No. 2015-408  | 111 W. Crockett       |
| 3. Case No. 2015-402  | 510 Adams             |
| 4. Case No. 2015-358  | 645 E. Park           |
| 5. Case No. 2015-419  | 303 E. Grayson        |
| 6. Case No. 2015-413  | 312 Pearl Pkwy        |
| 7. Case No. 2015-410  | 210 E. Commerce       |
| 8. Case No. 2015-414  | 1003 Nolan            |
| 9. Case No. 2015-404  | 1115 Nolan            |
| 10. Case No. 2015-407 | 123 W. Mulberry       |
| 11. Case No. 2015-330 | 633 S. St. Mary’s     |
| 12. Case No. 2015-420 | 401 E. Locust         |
| 13. Case No. 2015-405 | 106 W. Gramercy Place |

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**14. HDRC NO. 2015-423**

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Briefing and action on proposed UDC Amendments as part of the 2015 Update Program

The Office of Historic Preservation is proposing UDC Amendments as part of the 2015 Update Program to provide clarifications and editing amendments in Articles IV, VI, and VIII which related to historic preservation and HDRC procedure. The proposed amendments have been recommended by the Planning Commission Technical Advisory Committee and have been made publicly available since May 2015.

Staff recommends approval.

**Cory Edwards, OHP, presented**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2015-424**

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Briefing and action on proposed UDC Amendments related to historic district designation and demolitions

The Office of Historic Preservation is proposing amendments to Article 6, Sections 35-605, 35-614, and 35-615, of the Unified Development Code (UDC), which impact the historic district designation process, application of penalties for demolition by neglect, and requirements for estimates related to economic hardship cases.

**SUMMARY:**

District 2 Councilman Alan Warrick has submitted a City Council Resolution (CCR) to amend the process for initiating a new historic district and to remove penalties associated with the demolition of historic properties. District 1 Councilman Roberto Treviño has also submitted a CCR related to demolition procedures which requires a minor amendment to Section 35-614. The Infrastructure and Growth Committee reviewed the CCRs on June 18, 2015, and recommended that the items be forwarded to a City Council B Session for further review. The B Session meeting took place on September 16. Prior to the scheduled A Session, a recommendation from the HDRC and Zoning Commission is required.

The current designation process outlined in UDC Section 35-605 was created by City Council in December 2012. Under the current historic designation process, once the City receives an application for an eligible historic district, the City conducts an informational meeting for all owners in the potential historic district. The proponents must submit a petition demonstrating support from owners of at least 30 percent of the properties within the proposed district boundary in order to initiate the public hearing process. The application shall remain valid for two years. Once the petition is verified, the City initiates the public hearing process at the Historic and Design Review Commission, the Zoning Commission, and the City Council. Ultimately, historic designation is a zoning change, which is a decision under the purview of the Mayor and City Council exclusively.

In June 2010, a number of changes were made to the UDC based upon recommendations from the Strategic Historic Preservation Plan (SHPP) adopted by City Council in 2009. The SHPP recommended a process consistent with the process for listing properties in the National Register of Historic Places, which allows an application to move forward if there was not significant opposition from owners. From June 2010 to December 2012, the process involved a public meeting hosted by the City followed by a 90-day period during which residents could submit forms in favor or in opposition of becoming a local historic district. If the City received opposition from at least 50 percent of the property owners, then the designation process would end. If not, the public hearing process would begin. Although not the case, some residents perceived that not voting would count voting yes. There was also concern by residents that the process focused on the negative and created controversy. After listening to their concerns, the Council determined that a change was necessary, which is when the current process was developed.

Prior to June 2010, once a district was nominated and an initial public meeting was held, advocates for the district were given one year from the date of the meeting to collect signatures in favor from at least 51% of the property owners or the owners of at least 51% of the properties.

The three changes proposed would require amendments to Section 35-605 of the Unified Development Code. The first would increase the percentage of owner support required to initiate the public hearing process from 30% to 51% of the properties located within the proposed district boundaries. The second would require the City to facilitate the voting process by providing a form to affected property owners to submit their vote in support or opposition of initiation of the process for district designation. The third proposal would change the length of time during which an application will remain valid from two years to one year. These changes would make the process comparable to the provisions in place prior to June 2010. Councilman Warrick has also indicated a desire to end an application where a clear majority of 51% has expressed verifiable written opposition.

The fourth proposed change would amend UDC Section 35-615, which outlines provisions for prevention of demolition by neglect and includes penalties for historic buildings that are demolished as a public safety hazard. Currently, Section 35-615(c)(3)(iv) states that if a historic building has been given notice to be in violation of this and other city ordinances and is demolished, then no application for a permit for a project on the property may be considered for a period of five years from the date of demolition of the building or structure. Earlier this year, there was confusion among stakeholders that this penalty applied to all demolition cases.

This five-year restriction on permits is intended to support the prevention of demolition by neglect. Additionally, this penalty is in place to ensure that owners do not use the BSB process to circumvent historic district regulations regarding demolitions. Councilman Warrick proposes to clarify this so as to avoid confusion in future cases and to ensure the penalty does not apply in all demolition cases.

To ensure clarity, staff proposes to amend the language to more clearly articulate when the penalty would apply and the notification requirements that would need to occur from both the Development Services Department and the Office of Historic Preservation in order for the penalty to apply. The current language requires at least two notices of violation of Section 35-615. Because this section is not commonly cited, this requirement created confusion about the application of the penalty in a recent case. Staff proposes to amend the UDC language to require at least two notices of violation of Section 35-615, at least two municipal court cases filed, and verified consultation with the owner of the property. The authority to notice an owner and file municipal court cases currently exists. The

proposal is to provide clear language under this specific section to ensure appropriate application of the penalty. This clarified language will eliminate confusion about when the penalty will apply.

In an effort to support investment and infill development while balancing the desire of citizens to preserve the character and quality their historic neighborhoods, this penalty only applies in extreme cases of demolition by neglect on the part of the owner. The fifth amendment outlines submittal requirements for demolition applicants that are providing rehabilitation estimates.

Staff recommends approval.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2015-386**

Applicant: James McNight – Brown & Ortiz, P.C.

Address: 1617 E. Commerce

The applicant is seeking HDRC recommendation to remove historic designation for the majority of the property at 1617 E Commerce (Friedrich Refrigeration Complex). The applicant proposes to maintain historic designation for the three buildings closest to E Commerce.

**FINDINGS:**

a) The Friedrich Refrigeration Complex is a local historic landmark and is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The earliest part of the complex was constructed in 1923 for the Edward Friedrich Refrigeration Company, which was founded in 1883. In 1925, this location became the consolidated operations for the business when the old plant nearby burned down. Architect Harvey P. Smith was hired to design a new showroom and office space. The plant was expanded over the next 30 years and remained in operation until its closure in 1990. The complex remains a prominent and important landmark on the City's East Side.

b) The Friedrich Complex consists of 14 buildings located on the property at 1617 E Commerce. Of these buildings, 11 are found by both the Office of Historic Preservation to be contributing. The entire property at 1617 E Commerce features a historic zoning overlay.

c) A request to demolish 8 contributing buildings within the Friedrich Complex was reviewed by the HDRC on September 17, 2014. The HDRC approved demolition for 4 of the requested buildings which were found to either be on the interior of the structure or to be of less significance. Prior to HDRC action, a task force met with the owner of three separate occasions to review the details of the request and thoroughly explore the claim for economic hardship. The applicant currently wishes to remove historic designation for the 8 buildings which were previously requested for demolition. In accordance with UDC Section 35-606, a zoning request to remove historic designation must first be recommended by the HDRC.

d) UDC Section 35-606 requires that new and compelling evidence and a negative evaluation according to the same criteria under which the property was designated is required for the HDRC to consider removal of designation. No new evidence has been provided by the applicant, and staff finds that no loss of significance as occurred which would result in ineligibility for designation.

e) Local historic designation necessitates HDRC review of demolition and places design controls for infill construction and additions. If an owner wishes to seek demolition, information supporting an economic hardship or loss of significance must be presented to the HDRC. Staff strongly encourages the owner of this property to continue to make applications to the HDRC through this established process.

f) The applicant has indicated that the current request for removal of historic designation is for "marketing" purposes. The Friedrich Complex is an excellent candidate for adaptive reuse using local, state, and federal historic tax incentives. However, utilization of the incentives is contingent on the retention of its contributing structures. Removal of local designation not only removes the property's candidacy for local tax incentives, it also releases a potential developer from any design-review requirements. The historic and design review process in place for historic landmarks and districts to ensure quality, compatible development in relation to the places the community wishes to protect. Removal of historic designation is a negative approach to economic development which undermines community efforts of the past.

Local historic designation is an important tool which protects historical and community resources from demolition, provides incentives for rehabilitation which spurs economic development, and places design review requirements on the property which ensure quality and

compatible construction. Staff does not recommend approval to remove the historic zoning overlay from any portion of this property.

If circumstances have changed and additional demolition is requested, staff recommends the applicant submit additional information to the HDRC substantiating that claim. If the HDRC does not approve a demolition request, the applicant has an opportunity for appeal through the established process.

James McKnight, applicant, presented the case.

San Antonio Conservation Society read into the record a letter by Janet Dietel, President. The San Antonio Conservation Society opposes the request to remove the historic designation. No new and compelling information has been provided by the applicant, as required by UDC Section 35-606, supporting removal of the designation.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to grant denial for removal of historic designation.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2015-421**

Applicant: James McKnight – Brown & Ortiz

Address: 1305 E. Houston

The applicant is seeking HDRC recommendation to remove historic designation for the majority of the property at 1305 E Houston (Merchant's Ice Complex). The applicant proposes to maintain historic designation for the oldest building which faces E Houston.

**FINDINGS:**

g) The Merchant's Ice & Cold Storage Company is a local historic landmark and is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The earliest part of the complex was constructed in 1909 along E Houston. Three additional storage buildings were constructed between 1944 and 1957, and are noteworthy for their lift-slab construction technique, an innovative method pioneered in San Antonio c.1950. The complex remains a prominent and important landmark on the City's East Side.

h) Local historic designation necessitates HDRC review of demolition and places design controls for infill construction and additions. If an owner wishes to seek demolition, information supporting an economic hardship or loss of significance must be presented to the HDRC. Staff strongly encourages the owner of this property to continue to make applications to the HDRC through this established process.

i) The HDRC has not reviewed any proposed plans, alterations, or a requests for demolition for this property. The current request for removal of historic designation is preemptive to an HDRC action and the property owner must first work through the appropriate channels to seek approval of a proposal for the site. If there is an economic hardship associated with rehabilitating the buildings on the site, then information substantiating that claim must be made to the HDRC.

j) UDC Section 35-606 requires that new and compelling evidence and a negative evaluation according to the same criteria under which the property was designated is required for the HDRC to consider removal of designation. No new evidence has been provided by the applicant, and staff finds that no loss of significance as occurred which would result in ineligibility for designation.

k) The Merchant's Ice complex is an excellent candidate for adaptive reuse using local, state, and federal historic tax incentives. However, utilization of the incentives is contingent on the retention of its contributing structures. Removal of local designation not only removes the property's candidacy for local tax incentives, it also releases a potential developer from any design-review requirements. The historic and design review process in put in place for historic landmarks and districts to ensure quality, compatible development in relation to the places the community wishes to protect. Removal of historic designation is a negative approach to economic development which undermines community efforts of the past.

Local historic designation is an important tool which protects historical and community resources from demolition, provides incentives for rehabilitation which spurs economic development, and places design review requirements on the property which ensure quality and compatible construction. Staff does not recommend approval to remove the historic zoning overlay from any portion of this property. If demolition is desired by the owner, then staff recommends that an application be made to the HDRC. If the HDRC does not approve a demolition request, the applicant has an opportunity for appeal through the established process.

James McNight, applicant, presented.

San Antonio Conservation Society read into the record a letter by Janet Dietel, President. The San Antonio Conservation Society is opposed to the request to remove the historic designation of the Merchant's Ice and Cold Storage Building. It maintains the characteristics it possessed at the time it was recognized as historic and maintains its architectural integrity.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant denial for removal of historic designation.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2015-273**

Applicant: Kenneth Brown

Address: 151 W. Gramercy Pl

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval for the following work at 151 E Gramercy Place:

Site Improvements

1. Modify the east vehicular entrance from McCullough by relocating the existing east driveway gate, removing the existing stone pilasters flanking the gateway, and widening the existing driveway from approximately 10' to 18' (25' curb cut). A new wrought iron gate flanked by 6' - 3 1/2" stone pilasters will be installed approximately 31' from the street edge. A 5'-11" stone wall will tie the pilasters into the existing 6-foot wall. The stone pilaster at the northeasternmost corner of property at the alley will remain at its current height;
2. Create a new vehicular entrance on the north alley side by disassembling existing stone pilasters, installing a wrought iron sliding gate, and constructing a new stone wall approximately 5'-11" in height with 6'-3 1/2" pilasters;
3. Construct a 34'-4"x22' detached carport located approximately 4' to the north of the home. The proposed carport will be constructed of rubble stone pillars, cedar timbers and a cedar ceiling. The parking area beneath the carport will consist of concrete pavers in a herringbone pattern;
4. Remove a mature cedar elm at the northeast corner of the property near the proposed carport;
5. Install a 4ft wrought iron fence between McCullough Ave wall and the main house to enclose northeast motor court. Install a 5ft wrought iron gate across Gramercy driveway and a fence mounted mailbox. Install a 5ft. tall wrought iron gate at the west entrance to the front porch and a 6ft. tall gate in the gateway to the east yard.
6. Modify McCullough Avenue wall by removing pilasters A and swept fantail, increasing the height of pilasters B to 66.75" and C to 78.75", and increasing the height of wall sections B-C and C-D. As an option, the applicant has also proposed to reconstruct these sections with a 30" stone wall topped with approximately 40" of wrought iron fencing.
7. Install wrought iron fence with stone pillars across the front yard and along Gramercy driveway. The proposed pillars will be 55" tall and the fence posts 52" tall.

Main House

8. Modify the existing roof at the northeast corner of the house to remove a valley condition and expand hip to include a corner addition which currently features a flat roof;
9. Modify the existing rear entrance at kitchen door to include an ADA ramp and new stairway;
10. Replace second story window over kitchen door with bathroom sized window. Replace kitchen door and storm door, widen existing opening and install two French doors with a full view patio storm door. Replace oversized second story window at northwest corner and install salvaged window and storm window. Remove door opening at first floor "renter's door" and reframe for replica double-hung wood window in similar size to adjacent windows. Replace aluminum storm door at front entry and dining room French doors with full view wood doors. Remove aluminum storm doors on southeast patio balcony and replace with full view wood doors;

## Carriage House

11. Replace glass on ally side windows with frosted glass for privacy;

12. Replace single-bay carriage doors with wood overhead door. Widen existing two single-bay carriage door opening and install a double-bay wood overhead door.

**FINDINGS:**

a) The applicant has also requested numerous minor alterations and repair items in addition to the current HDRC application which are eligible for administrative approval. Administratively-approved items include the following:

- Bury overhead lines, remove stone garbage receptacle platform, install trench grate at garage, install utility underground box and access hatch, remove abandoned utility poles, and sidewalk repair;
- Resurface rear alley and reconstruct pedestrian sidewalk to match existing;
- Install decomposed granite or cobblestones at existing planting strip along Gramercy driveway;
- Install a new walkway between the Gramercy driveway and the circular stairway in the front yard. Replace the existing walkway between the sidewalk and the circular stairway in the front yard. Replace concrete ring around circular stairway. -All existing stone edging will be reused.
- Align existing outdoor condensing units along eastern edge of proposed carport;
- Reconstruct pedestrian walkway and construct additional walkway accessing the Gramercy driveway;
- Repaint exterior of home, install new dryer vent over kitchen door, remove water heater vent at north wall, repair wood rot at southeast porch ceiling, remove unused screen hardware, and remove various exterior conduits from walls;
- Replace existing shingle siding with new stained cedar shingles;
- Replace asphalt roof with new asphalt roof, install three soffit vents on the north elevation, and replace existing screens at soffit vents;
- Remove synthetic turf from southeast patio balcony and replace with mineral roll surfacing and install a low profile deck;
- Relocate water heater vent at Carriage House, remove downspouts, remove gutters and remove 1x4 trim piece, remove conduits and exterior wiring, and redirect refrigerant line;
- Remove all security bars from first floor alley windows at Carriage House. Reinstall bars at northernmost window and install matching bars on all other first floor alley side windows;
- Replace balcony flooring at Carriage House with mineral surface roll and replace the non-original wrought iron guardrail to match proposed Gramercy driveway gate design.

## Findings related to Site Improvements

b) In general, site improvements may be performed with little impact to historic resources. However, the addition of new elements such as fencing has the potential to reduce the visibility of buildings within a historic district and alter the streetscape. New site elements should complement, not detract from, historic site elements, the character of the historic structure they serve, and the surrounding district. When considering specific site elements, the surrounding context is important, since the integrity of various elements varies from block-to-block.

c) A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on March 3, 1999, to reconstruct the entryway stone wall (northeast corner of the property) which was destroyed by an auto accident and construct a new wall along the east property line. The approved wall is 6ft tall until reaching the front setback line where it drops to 3ft. tall. According to the elevation drawing submitted at that time, the only original portions of the wall include the four stone pillars adjacent to the driveway. Two of those pillars were reconstructed using original stone after the auto accident.

d) In order to address safety concerns regarding access to the McCullough driveway, the applicant proposes to widen the existing drive and curb cut, relocate the existing gate further inside the property to allow vehicles to pull into the driveway from McCullough, and reconstruct the existing pillars. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i., historic driveway configurations should be retained. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10ft. However, modifications to the existing driveway and gate may be appropriate due to high traffic and vehicular speed along McCullough Avenue. The increased driveway width should be kept at a minimum in order to maintain the integrity of the original configuration while accommodating safety concerns. The proposed width of the driveway (18 feet with a 25-foot curb cut) could be reduced in conformance with the guidelines. Staff finds that dismantling the existing stone pillars for reuse in the proposed design is appropriate. The addition of a vehicular entry on the north (alley) side of the property is consistent with the guidelines.

e) The Guidelines for Site Elements recommend that new walls are constructed of similar materials to other walls used historically within the district and compatible with the main structure. The proposed stone wall along the rear alley and new vehicular entrance are consistent with the guidelines. According to Section 35-514 of the Unified Development Code, the maximum allowable wall height on a rear yard is 6ft excluding decorative features affixed to the top of any column, pillar or post. Portions of the proposed wall will exceed the UDC allowable height, and if approved by the HDRC, its construction may require a variance.

f) According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal structure in terms of height, massing and form. In addition, they should be no larger than 40% of the principal historic structure footprint, and relate to the period of construction of the main house. The proposed carport, while large in plane, is consistent with the guidelines in height, materials

and design. It features a simple design which will maintain a low profile from the street.

g) Generally, removal of mature trees can have a negative impact on the character of a historic district. Every attempt should be made to protect and maintain mature trees that are in good health consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.i. Sufficient evidence to warrant removal of the cedar elm has not been provided. Should the HDRC determine its removal to be appropriate, replacement trees should be selected and planted consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.ii.

h) McCullough Ave is a busy thoroughfare with a higher traffic volume and vehicles moving at a much faster speed than the east-to-west streets. A number of solid fences exist along this section of McCullough Ave. The existing stone wall along McCullough Ave conforms with the historic design guidelines because it drops to a lower height past the front plane of the house and maintains views to the historic building. Because this wall is not historic, staff finds that modifications are appropriate provided that the current views to the house are maintained. The applicant has provided an option which incorporates wrought iron into a 3-foot solid stone wall for a total height of approximately 6 feet. This is consistent with the guidelines provided that no portion of the new fence exceeds 6 feet in total height.

i) The Guidelines for Site Elements recommend avoiding installing fences in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Throughout the Monte Vista Historic District, most residential properties do not have front yard fences. Sloping, open lawns are the typical way properties in this district meet the street. Two houses on this block of Gramercy (106 and 135 W Gramercy) feature low, ornamental fences in the front yards. However, these properties are not within close proximity to 151 E Gramercy to warrant a similar installation. In addition, according to Section 35-514 of the Unified Development Code the maximum allowable fence height on a front yard is 4ft. The proposed fence will exceed the UDC allowable height, and if approved by the HDRC, its construction may require a variance. The proposed gate across the existing Gramercy driveway and wrought iron fence enclosing the northeast motor court are appropriate as they are located behind the front façade of the house, consistent with established patterns in the district.

#### Findings related to Main House

j) According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, the house and carriage house at 151 E. Gramercy Pl. were built in 1922 by architect Carleton Adams in the Prairie style. Both structures are listed as contributing to the historic district.

k) The applicant wishes to alter the existing roof form in order to remove a flat-roof condition at an addition to the northeast corner which is prone to water infiltration. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs should be preserved when replacement is necessary. Although alteration of the roof on the 1957 addition may be appropriate, the proposed design will substantially alter the original roof form of the house which is not consistent with the guidelines. Staff finds that minimal changes to the pitch of the addition roof are more appropriate.

l) According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, damage to the historic character and materials, and modifications to existing door openings should be minimized when compliance with accessibility requirements is necessary. In addition, new ramps should be located at the side or rear of the building, designed to complement the historic character of the building, be visually unobtrusive to minimize visual impact and be screened from view. The proposed modifications to the rear kitchen door entrance are consistent with the guidelines in location, character and visual impact.

m) As recommended by the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing window and door openings should be preserved. Non-historic windows or doors should be replaced with new windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. The existing window located above the "renter's door" is larger than other windows throughout the house and is likely not original to the structure. In addition, the replacement of the "renter's door" with a window to match existing is in keeping with the original configuration of the home. Also, the existing metal storm doors are not original to the structure and their replacement with full-view wood storm doors will not negatively impact the structure. The proposed replacements are consistent with the guidelines.

#### Findings related to Carriage House

n) As recommended by the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved. When deteriorated beyond repair they should be replaced in kind to match existing. In addition, when replacement glass is necessary, the color and clarity of the new glass should match the existing glass. No information on the current condition of the windows or feasibility of repairs has been submitted by the applicant. If the operability of windows is the main concern, the existing windows should be maintained and repaired, fixed from the interior only and interior window film may be used for privacy.

o) According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, distinctive features of outbuildings should be repaired or replaced in kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement garage doors should be compatible with those found in adjacent historic garages. In addition, historic door openings should be preserved. The proposed materials and design for the overhead doors is consistent with the guidelines. However, if removal of the central post for the double doors is necessary, the new double car door design should follow the existing configuration and appearance of two single doors in order to maintain the scale of the existing opening.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

Site Improvements

1. Staff recommends approval of the proposed modifications to the northeast gate and motor court with the stipulation that the existing driveway and curb cut on McCullough be increased in width by no more than 50% based on finding d.
2. Staff recommends approval of alley side entrance with the stipulation that no portion of the new fence and gate exceed 6 feet in height based on finding e.
3. Staff recommends approval of the proposed carport based on finding f.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of tree removal based on finding g. If additional daylight is desired, staff recommends that the tree be lightly pruned.
5. Staff recommends approval of all of the proposed fences and gates behind the front plane of the house. Staff does not recommend approval of any side yard fence which extends past the front plane of the house based on finding i.
6. Staff recommends approval of modifications to the existing wall along McCullough with the stipulation that no solid portion of the fence exceed 3 feet in height and that the overall height not exceed 6 feet based on finding h.
7. Staff does not recommend approval of a front yard fence based on finding i.

Main House

8. Staff does not recommend the proposed roof alterations based on finding k. Staff recommends that the flat roof of the addition be minimally altered to increase its slope.
9. Staff recommends approval of the rear ADA ramp and stairway based on finding l.
10. Staff recommends approval of rear fenestration changes based on finding m.

Carriage House

11. Staff recommends that windows be maintained in their current configuration based on finding n. Staff recommends that the interior window film be used.
12. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the design of the new garage door mimic the appearance of a two-bay entrance based on finding o.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulations:

Site Improvements;

1. Approval of the proposed modifications to the northeast gate and motor court with the stipulation that the existing driveway and curb cut on McCullough be increased in width by no more than 50% based on finding d.
2. Approval of alley side entrance with the stipulation that no portion of the new fence and gate exceed 6 feet in height based on finding e.
3. Approval of the proposed carport based on finding f.
5. Approval of all of the proposed fences and gates behind the front plane of the house.
6. Approval of modifications to the existing wall along McCullough with the stipulation that no solid portion of the fence exceed 3 feet in height and that the overall height not exceed 6 feet based on finding h.

Main House;

10. Approval of rear fenestration changes based on finding m to include widening of kitchen doorway.

Carriage House;

11. Approval of windows as submitted.
  12. Approval of overhead doors as submitted.
- Items not approved: 4. Tree removal; additional information may be considered. 7. Front yard fence referred to committee. 8. Alterations to roof form and pitch not approved. 9. Concrete and stone ADA ramp not approved; temporary solution recommended.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Executive Session 4:51 – 4:58**

**19. HDRC NO. 2015-400**

Applicant: Jonathan Branson

Address: 317 Lexington

Withdrawn per the applicant.

**20. HDRC NO. 2015-291**

Applicant: Brian Kuehl

Address: 100 E. Crockett

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to rehabilitate the Crockett Street Bridge over the San Antonio River. The bridge is a lenticular pony truss that was built in 1891 and is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Within this rehabilitation, the applicant will:

1. Remove and replace the concrete slab and sidewalks as well as the iron stringers
2. Repair and replace structural connections
3. Clean and paint existing elements
4. Improve the existing drainage system
5. Install new approach pavement
6. Install illumination
7. Landscape under the bridge within ten feet

At this time, the applicant has not requested final approval of the previously proposed mural nor river projection.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant received conceptual approval at the August 5, 2015, HDRC hearing for the rehabilitation of the Crockett Street Bridge. Within this, the applicant received conceptual approval to remove and replace the concrete slab and sidewalks as well as the iron stringers; repair and replace structural connections; clean and paint existing elements, improve the existing drainage system, install new approach pavement and landscape underneath the bridge within ten feet. At that time, the applicant did not receive conceptual approval to install a mural nor project lighting onto the river.
- b. The applicant has proposed to repair the existing iron floor beams, repair the existing iron truss members, repair various abutments, bearings and vertical end posts, install new stringers, remove all rust, repaint all new iron and steel to match the existing and cast a new concrete deck and sidewalk. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35- 643 as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards regarding alteration, restoration and rehabilitation.
- c. In addition to the structural repair requests noted in finding b and exhibit 3.1 on page 3, the applicant has proposed to install a trench drain across Crockett street approximately five feet behind the eastern abutment, mill existing asphalt pavement from Losoya to N Presa, replace curbs from the western abutment to N Presa and install 2 inches of new asphalt pavement from Losoya to N Presa. The applicant has proposed general roadway and drainage repairs that are to match the existing. Staff finds these improvements appropriate.
- d. Per the UDC Section 35-673(f) regarding plant materials, projects along the Riverwalk should incorporate existing vegetation and use indigenous and noninvasive species. The applicant has proposed to replant the existing planters beneath the bridge while preserving a row of existing vegetation. The applicant has provided information regarding plants materials consistent with the UDC.
- e. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing flood lights underneath the bridge that currently shine onto the fountains and install new lights in the fountains, replace the existing holiday lights on the bridge edges with similar lights, replace the existing lights in the top chords of trusses with similar lights and remove the existing can shaped lights under the bridge and replace them with architectural fixtures. This is consistent with the UDC.

Staff recommends final approval of items #1 through #7 based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff with information regarding the size, materials and mounting mechanisms for the proposed lighting.
- ii. That the applicant provide specific details to staff regarding installation methods to ensure any potential damage to historic fabric is avoided or mitigated.

The applicant must satisfy both of these stipulations prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2015-394**

Applicant: Celia Mendoza

Address: 609 E. Guenther St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to selectively demolish a non historic rear addition and construct a new, second story addition to the rear of the historic structure. The new addition is to be located above the non historic portion of the house.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary historic structure at 609 E Guenther currently features a non historic rear addition that the applicant has proposed to selectively demolish. Staff finds this request appropriate.
- b. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on October 7, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee after commissioners voiced concern over the proposed massing and roof form of the addition. At the October 14, 2015, DRC meeting concerns regarding the proposed structures roof interfering with the historic structure's roof was noted as well as concerns regarding the north façade's dormer being out of place. The applicant was advised to provide a drainage diagram for the HDRC's review.
- c. The applicant has proposed to construct a new second story addition to the rear of the primary historic structure to be located above the existing non historic addition. Given its location at the rear of the property and the existing heights of roof located throughout the King William Historic District, staff finds this request appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i. and ii.
- d. The applicant has provided staff with a line of sight study as requested to ensure that the proposed addition's roofline will not be superior to that of original house. Staff finds that the applicant's proposal will not be viewable from the public right of way.
- e. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a rear gabled roof as well as various transitions between the primary historic structure and the proposed addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii and iv.
- f. Generally, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B. in the fact that the applicant has proposed an addition whose façade is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure, has located the addition at the rear, has proposed an appropriate footprint and has a height which staff finds appropriate.
- g. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of salvaged wood lap siding, new wood board and batten siding a composition shingle roof and aluminum clad wood windows. Generally, these materials are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, however, staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the window materials found throughout King William.
- h. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A., additions should be designed to reflect their time while incorporating contemporary interpretations of traditional architectural elements. Staff finds that the applicant has proposed siding, a façade arrangement and architectural forms that are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.

Staff recommends final approval with the stipulation that the applicant provide the HDRC with the requested drainage diagram to ensure that the addition's roof forms do not produce water drainage that will damage the original house's roof structure.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2015-355**

Applicant: Douglas McCormick

Address: 407 Mission St

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

1. Modify the front façade to restore it to its original arrangement, featuring a single front door with two windows.
2. Repaint the exterior of the house.
3. Construct a screened, rear porch.
4. Remove the non original rear porch addition.
5. Demolish a non original rear accessory structure.
6. Install new, aluminum windows to the rear façade.
7. Receive Historic Tax Certification

**FINDINGS:**

- a. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on October 7, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. On October 14, 2015, the DRC noted that the existing located column was appropriate as well as wood windows throughout the structure. Committee members noted that the applicant's construction documents should be updated.
- b. The applicant has proposed to restore the front, street facing façade. Within the restoration, the applicant has proposed to eliminate a non original front door opening, maintain the current location of the front porch steps and install a window consistent with what is historically appropriate. Staff finds this request appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install a wood window in the existing door's location.
- c. The applicant has proposed to repaint the exterior of the house as well as replace many damaged or rotten wood elements to match the existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1. A. and 1.B.
- d. The applicant has proposed to remove a non original rear porch and construct a new, rear screened porch. The applicant has proposed for the new rear porch to consist of 4" x 6" inch wood posts and a screening material which has not been specified. Staff finds that the location, footprint and massing of the proposed screened porch addition are consistent, however, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the selected screen material.
- e. At the rear of the structure the applicant has proposed to make various exterior modifications to accommodate the proposed rear addition. Within this request, the applicant has proposed to include non original window and door openings and install new, aluminum windows. Staff finds that the enclosure of non original window and door openings is appropriate to accommodate the rear addition, however, the installation of aluminum windows is not appropriate according to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. and vii. An appropriate window material would be wood.
- f. Currently, the property features an accessory structure towards the rear of the property, consistent with the location of contributing accessory structures throughout King William. At this time, staff does not find that its removal is appropriate. If demolition is necessary, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the loss of structural integrity or a non contributing status.
- g. The applicant has requested Historic Tax Certification, however, at this time has not met the thirty percent investment of the appraised value. Staff recommends the applicant submit additional financial information addressing the entire scope of rehabilitation in order to receive Historic Tax Certification.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on findings a through c with the following stipulations to be met prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness:

- i. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed new columns and their detailing to be architecturally appropriate.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

October 21, 2015

12

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve items #1 through #4 with staff recommendations. Withdrawal of item #5 at the October 21, 2015, HDRC meeting by the applicant. Approval of item #6 with the applicant's proposal to install wood windows. Administrative approval for item #7, Historic Tax Certification when the applicant provides the required documents and has met the financial threshold.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2015-358**

Applicant: Eddie Daley

Address: 3211 Roosevelt Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate and perform exterior modifications to an existing mobile structure and install a new, pre-engineered metal building.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to relocate the existing mobile trailer office from the current location in front of the existing storage building to 30'-0" in front of the new concrete slab. Along with this relocation, the applicant has proposed to paint and add stone veneer to the base of the trailer as well as paint the existing shed to match.
- b. The applicant has proposed to orient the proposed pre-engineered metal building and relocated mobile trailer toward Roosevelt to generally be consistent with the predominant setbacks found long Roosevelt.
- c. The Guidelines for New Construction state that primary building entrances, porches and landings should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the mobile trailer's primary entrance to front Roosevelt, consistent with the Guidelines regarding entrance orientations.
- d. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. Staff finds that at a height not exceeding that of a one story tradition structure, the proposed mobile trailer and pre-engineered building are consistent with the Guidelines regarding height.
- e. Per the Guidelines, materials that complement those found historically throughout the district should be used in new construction. These materials would include wood siding, standing seam metal roofs, shingle roofs and wood windows. The applicant's proposal of a pre-engineered building as well as modifications to an existing, mobile trailer are not consistent with the Guidelines regarding materials. Staff recommends the applicant adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A. regarding materials.
- f. The Guidelines for New Construction 4.A. addresses architectural details and historic context. Staff finds the addition of stone veneer to a pre-engineered structure is an inappropriate proposal which visually competes with nearby historic structures. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. While the existing, mobile trailer on site is a non contributing element, staff finds that any modifications or relocations of non contributing structures should comply with the Historic Design Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through g.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset to November 4, 2015 so that the applicant may be present.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2015-411**

Applicant: Paul Vidal – Custom Signs & Consultants

Address: 8535 Mission Rd.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at Stinson Municipal Airport to include the following:

1. An internally illuminated wall mounted cabinet sign that is to measure seven feet in height and five feet in width on the south facing facade of the existing Hangar 2. The face is to be white polycarbonate pan with a cabinet depth of five inches.
2. Reface an existing pole sign with a new located to the immediate west of Hangar 2, white polycarbonate pan face. The dimensions of the replacement sign is to be 6'-2 1/2" in height by 6'-4" in width.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to install an internally illuminated wall mounted cabinet sign that is to measure seven feet in height and five feet in width on the south facing façade of Hangar 2 as well as reface an existing, pole mounted sign to the immediate west of Hangar 2. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.A., each building will be allowed one major and two minor signs with the total square footage to not exceed fifty square feet. With the existing pole signage which has been proposed to be replaced as well as the proposed new signage, the new tenant, AV Fuel would have approximately 120 square feet of signage. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.A. and D., new signage should be designed appropriately regarding scale and should not be constructed of synthetic materials such as plastic, fiberglass or highly reflective materials. The applicant has proposed this sign to be approximately 36 square feet which is consistent with the Guidelines, however, the applicant has proposed polycarbonate as the sign's primary material. The applicant's proposed signage materials are not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant adhere to the Guidelines for Signage regarding materials.
- c. The existing pole sign currently features 108 square feet of available signage, however, the tenant has only proposed to occupy approximately 84 square feet of this signage by refacing the existing signage. Given that this request is to reface the existing pole sign, this request is appropriate.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve item 2 based on finding c and denial on item 1 based on finding b.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2015-406**

Applicant: Xavier Gonzalez – GRG Architecture

Address: 975 E. Southcross

Withdrawn by the applicant.

**26. HDRC NO. 2015-403**

Applicant: Heather Holdridge

Address: 129 E. Carolina

Withdrawn by the applicant.

**27. HDRC NO. 2015-409**

Applicant: Fedel Leal

Address: 2046 W. Mistletoe

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new concrete driveway that is 32' ½" long by 18' wide.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The driveway located at 2046 W Mistletoe is currently unpaved and the applicant is proposing to remove the existing dirt and gravel and install a concrete driveway. The proposed driveway will measure 32 ½ feet long by 18 feet wide.
- b. There is an existing 17 foot wide concrete approach that will remain as is.
- c. The established pattern for driveways on the 2000 block of W Mistletoe exhibits single-car paved driveways and single-car ribbon driveways.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements B.i., driveways should be no wider than 10 feet. The proposed width of 17 feet is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding a through d. Staff would recommend a concrete driveway of 10 feet wide starting from the west side of the existing concrete border.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**28. HDRC NO. 2015-368**

Applicant: Daniel Diaz

Address: 1014 Burnet St

Withdrawn per the applicant.

**29. HDRC NO. 2015-422**

Applicant: Macario Rosas – VR Construction

Address: 247 E. Kings Hwy

The applicant is requesting to amend a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on June 18th, 2014, to change the location and width of the driveway, approach and sidewalk.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The HDRC granted approval of new construction at 247 E Kings Highway at the June 18, 2014, meeting. The approval includes a 10' driveway with a 12' curb cut along the west edge of the lot.
- b. The City Arborist has recommended that a tree in the right of way, in the location of the approved apron, should be preserved and not removed.
- c. In order to preserve the tree, the applicant has proposed to move the drive way and apron to the center of the lot and increase the width to 18' feet. The drive and approach would be in front of the main structure, which is not typical in Monte Vista. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5, B, i. state that historic driveways should be no wider than 10 feet. The proposed width for the driveway and approach are not consistent with the guidelines. Staff recommends that the driveway be no wider than 10 feet and the curb cut no wider than 12 feet
- d. The revised site plan proposed an increase to the amount of hardscaping in the front yard of the property. The Guidelines for Site Elements 3, A, ii., state that historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50%. The proposed hardscaping is not consistent

with the guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that the applicant develop a site plan that includes a linear driveway no wider than 10 feet with a curb cut no wider than 12 feet. A curved option may be appropriate to avoid the significant tree.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

Approval of Meeting Minutes

- July 15, 2015

- August 5, 2015

- August 19, 2015

- September 2, 2015

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve the minutes.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, 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 6:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair

