

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
MAY 1, 2013**

- 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 Cone, Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor
ABSENT: Carpenter, Laffoon

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-111 | 115 Plaza de Armas |
| 2. Case No. 2013-121 | 215 Lindell Pl |
| 3. Case No. 2013-120 | 603 Barbe |
| 4. Case No. 2013-116 | 2315 Avenue B |
| 5. Case No. 2013-115 | 1931 E. Houston |
| 6. Case No. 2013-113 | 310 W. Mitchell |
| 7. Case No. 2013-096 | 532 Devine |
| 8. Case No. 2013-117 | 226 Madison |
| 9. Case No. 2013-013 | 337 W. Commerce |
| 10. Case No. 2013-103 | 1515 Fulton Ave. |
| 11. Case No. 2013-124 | 2486 Gillingham |

Commissioner Guarino pulled items 1 and 6 from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2013-111

Applicant: Allison Chambers

Address: 115 Plaza de Armas

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

1. Restore the circa 1928 storefronts on the south elevation which were added when the building was shortened to accommodate the widening of Dolorosa St. The existing window configuration on this elevation is the result of 1979 alterations to the structure. The applicant also proposes to extend the existing canopy to cover the restored storefront.

2. Infill three openings doorways on the west (rear) elevation. These openings were created when a 1979 rear addition was constructed. These openings will be filled in with reclaimed brick. The applicant proposes to replace the second floor window that was removed to create a new doorway in 1979. On the first floor, the applicant proposes to restore the original opening and install an outside air intake louver to supply the mechanical system.

3. Install metal canopies above the three operable doors on the west elevation. As part of the renovations of the building, the ground floor height in portions of the structure is being lowered. To accommodate that change, two existing west-facing doors will be lowered. The applicant proposes to extend the existing transoms above the lowered doors and install flat metal canopies above the three, operable rear doors.

FINDINGS:

a. The Plaza de Armas buildings appear on the 1885 Sanborn map. At that time, they housed the Fashion Theatre with a wool warehouse on one side and several stores, a gambling room, and a billiard hall/saloon on the other. According to the 1912-1951 Sanborn map, by 1929, the structure housed several small shops, a book binding factory, a leather workshop and a wholesale grocery. By 1929, Dolorosa St. had been widened. The south façade of the southernmost Plaza de Armas building had been pushed back and the southeast corner had been chamfered.

b. In 1885, according to the Sanborn map, these buildings had awnings on the eastern façade, facing Military Plaza. By 1929, there was an awning which wrapped around the southeast corner of the building. The proposal to extend an awning across the south side of the building represents a change from the original condition of the building, but is in keeping with the existing architectural elements on the structure, in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 11.B.ii.

c. The proposed modifications to the rear fenestration are minor and will help to restore this building to its original condition, in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 6.A.i.

d. The lowering of two doors on the west façade will not have a significant adverse effect on the historic character of the structure. Similarly, the installation of metal canopies over the three operable doors on this façade will not obscure any original detailing, in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 11.B.v, and will establish some consistency between the operable doors on this façade.

e. The rear 1979 addition that necessitated the creation of new openings on the west elevation has been removed as part of this renovation project.

Staff recommends approval of all items as submitted based on these findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez as submitted based on findings a through e.

AYES: Cone, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2013-113

Applicant: Stuart Johnson

Address: 310 W. Mitchell

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to develop a vacant lot at 310 West Mitchell into an educational park space. The development will include 5 pavilion structures and maintenance facility. Other improvements include a rainwater collection system, concrete planters, walkways, surface parking and other topographical elements.

FINDINGS:

- a. Staff finds that the proposed park development incorporates a number of innovated low impact development features and sustainable techniques, consistent with UDC sec. 35-670(b)(3).
- b. Staff finds that the park will incorporate a variety of plant species for interpretation, and will be a point of interest near the San Antonio River.
- c. A Phase I archaeological survey will be completed prior to any construction activities.

Staff recommends conceptual approval as submitted based on the findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Connor to grant conceptual approval as submitted based on findings a through c.

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

11. HDRC NO. 2013-124

Applicant: Greg Hammer, Brooks Development Authority

Address: 2486 Gillingham

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish Building 175E, a contributing property to the Brooks School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. An original request for demolition of Building 175E was denied by the HDRC on March 21, 2012, due to a lack of replacement plans or a campus master plan. At that time, the applicant was strongly encouraged to develop a master plan and design guidelines for the Brooks School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District. A master plan and historic design guidelines for the campus were reviewed by the HDRC and given conceptual approval on April 17, 2013.
- b. In preparation for the original HDRC hearing, a site visit was conducted by the Demolition and Designation Committee on March 14, 2012, along with representatives from the Brooks Development Authority. At the site visit, the representatives of the Brooks Development Authority reiterated their case for economic hardship and the remediation of environmental issues surrounding the structures as the reasons for demolition. The committee had concerns regarding the lack of replacement plans and the potential demolition of future structures that would compromise the viability of the district. The committee also had concerns about requiring the rehabilitation of buildings with potentially serious environmental issues, which could prove problematic in the future.
- c. The applicant is requesting demolition of this building due to environmental concerns related to the building's history as a center for research and laboratory activities, as well as the difficulty to reuse the building due to its design for specific use as a laboratory. Brooks Development Authority staff has attempted to market this property for new use since taking over the site from the Air Force. The applicant has reported that potential new users have considered trying to reuse the laboratory space but could not do so because it is out-dated and did not wish to do so because of the negative perception.
- d. The applicant has provided detailed documentation illustrating that the cost difference between demolition of Building 175E and decommissioning/abatement of all environmental hazards is approximately \$965,000.. This is a compelling economic hardship argument.

e. The conceptually-approved master plan indicates proposed footprint for potential new construction to replace Building 175E. New construction would be identical in footprint and mass to the original building, and maintain the existing breezeway. Staff finds that, based on a rigid new footprint of approximately 21,000 square feet, this proposal does meet the requirements of UDC Sec. 35-614(e). Demolition fees will be applicable based on a 21,000 square foot building.

f. As part of the mitigation for the release of the property from federal control to the Brooks Development Authority, Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was developed with a stipulation that a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation be completed all the buildings at Brooks City-Base. The HABS documentation meets the requirements of UDC Sec. 35-614(d).

g. This project was reviewed by the Texas Historic Commission under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in April of 2012. THC has expressed interest in reinstating the 2002 MOA to continue provisions for mitigation, including the maintenance of Hangar 9 or the rehabilitation of Building 165 (Power Plant) as recommended in draft historic design guidelines, if demolition is approved.

h. If the HDRC, after hearing evidence at the public hearing, finds that these conditions apply and recommends approval of the request for demolition, a demolition permit will not be issued until replacement plans for the new construction are approved and all applicable fees are collected. The UDC states that permits for demolition and new construction shall be issued simultaneously if requirements of section 35-609, new construction, are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

Staff recommends approval based on the findings with the stipulations that:

1. Bricks be salvaged and retained for use in future new construction;
2. Special care be given throughout the demolition process to avoid damaging the existing breezeway which is identified as an important feature of the building in the conceptually-approved SAM Historic Design Guidelines as well as any existing trees; and
3. The applicant coordinate with the SHPO regarding any mitigation required through a reinstated MOA.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to approve demolition of Building 140 located at 2350 Gillingham

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2013-079

Applicant: Daniel Monreal

Address: 1124 Perez St.

Postponed per the applicant.

13. HDRC NO. 2013-125

Applicant: Greg Hammer, Brooks Development Authority

Address: 2350 Gillingham

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish Building 140, a contributing property to the Brooks School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. An original request for demolition of Building 140 was denied by the HDRC on March 21, 2012, due to a lack of replacement plans or a campus master plan. At that time, the applicant was strongly encouraged to develop a master plan and design guidelines for the Brooks School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District. A master plan and historic design guidelines for the campus were reviewed by the HDRC and given conceptual approval on April 17, 2013.
- b. In preparation for the original HDRC hearing, a site visit was conducted by the Demolition and Designation Committee on March 14, 2012, along with representatives from the Brooks Development Authority. At the site visit, the representatives of the Brooks Development Authority reiterated their case for economic hardship and the remediation of environmental issues surrounding the structures as the reasons for demolition. The committee had concerns regarding the lack of replacement plans and the potential demolition of future structures that would compromise the viability of the district. The committee also had concerns about requiring the rehabilitation of buildings with potentially serious environmental issues, which could prove problematic in the future.
- c. The applicant is requesting demolition of this building due to environmental concerns related to the building's history as a center for research and laboratory activities, as well as the difficulty to reuse the building due to its design for specific use as a laboratory. Brooks Development Authority staff has attempted to market this property for new use since taking over the site from the Air Force. The applicant has reported that potential new users have considered trying to reuse the laboratory space but could not do so because it is out-dated and did not wish to do so because of the negative perception.
- d. The applicant has provided detailed documentation illustrating that the cost difference between demolition of Building 140 and decommissioning/abatement of all environmental hazards is approximately 1.4 million dollars. This is a compelling economic hardship argument.
- e. The conceptually-approved master plan indicates proposed footprints for potential new construction to replace Building 140. However, this proposal does not provide clear enough indication as to the actual footprint and square footage of the new construction in order to meet the requirements of UDC Sec. 35-614(e).
- f. As part of the mitigation for the release of the property from federal control to the Brooks Development Authority, Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was developed with a stipulation that a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation be completed all the buildings at Brooks City-Base. The HABS documentation meets the requirements of UDC Sec. 35-614(d)
- g. This project was reviewed by the Texas Historic Commission under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in April of 2012. THC has expressed interest in reinstating the 2002 MOA to continue provisions for mitigation, including the maintenance of Hangar 9 or the rehabilitation of Building 165 (Power Plant) as recommended in the draft historic design guidelines, if demolition is approved.
- h. If the HDRC, after hearing evidence at the public hearing, finds that these conditions apply and recommends approval of the request for demolition, a demolition permit will not be issued until replacement plans for the new construction are approved and all applicable fees are collected. The UDC states that permits for demolition and new construction shall be issued simultaneously if requirements of section 35-609, new construction, are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on finding e. The proposed footprints for new construction seen in the conceptually-approved master plan do not provide enough information regarding the actual footprint and square footage of the new construction in order to meet the requirements of the demolition permitting process outlined in UDC Sec. 35-614(e). If the Commission finds that the circumstances constitute an economic hardship then demolition may be given conceptual approval, but no demolition permit would be issued until replacement plans are approved.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez to approve to demolish Building 175E located at 2486 Gillingham.

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

14. HDRC NO. 2013-114

Applicant: Jason and Tamara Riggan

Address: 230 W. Kings Hwy

Reset. Applicant was not present.

15. HDRC NO. 2013-122

Applicant: Maria de Jesus Soto

Address: 321 Callaghan

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

Remove all of the one-over-one wood windows on the home at 321 Callaghan and replace them with new, six-over-six faux divided light vinyl windows. The wood windows on the home are in poor condition and many of them have broken glass.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed replacement vinyl windows do not match the original wood windows in terms of material, configuration, or detail, as recommended in the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 6.B.iv and v. Similarly, the original wood windows were a one-over-one configuration, not the six-over-six configuration of the vinyl windows.
- b. The house at 321 Callaghan is in the Craftsman style. It first appears on the 1912-1951 Sanborn map with a simple rectangular footprint and a small front porch. Today, the home has a deep side carport and a small rear addition.
- c. The original one-over-one wood windows are a character defining feature of the home and consistent with its architectural style.
- d. While multi-light windows are not always incompatible with Craftsman style homes, this particular house has simple one-over-one windows which relate to the simple layout and detailing of the building.
- e. The proposed vinyl windows are a similar dimension to the original wood windows.
- f. The windows that open onto the front porch are partially obscured by an existing tree.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings c and d. Staff recommends that the applicant repair and reuse the existing wood windows.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez to approve the installed windows with the exception of the front windows to be replaced with in kind 1 over 1 wood windows.

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

16. HDRC NO. 2013-051

Applicant: Chris Oviatt

Address: 106 Alamo Plaza

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a tower addition on top of the historic Joske's Building. The existing façade of the original 4 stories will be retained to serve as the base for the tower. The tower is broken into two distinctive masses: a 10-story tower oriented towards Alamo Street and a larger, 26-story tower which runs along the eastern edge of the current Joske's building. A two-story podium level will flank the 10-story tower on either side. The total height of the addition with the original 4 stories will be approximately 390 feet.

FINDINGS:

a. A preliminary design for this project was presented to the Design Review Committee on October 23, 2012. At that meeting, the applicant presented a 12-story tower addition to the top of the 4-story Joske's Building. It was explained by the applicant that the existing building is split into two structural types. The older construction, at the corner of South Alamo and Commerce Street, doesn't meet the loading requirements and would have to be fully replaced with steel structure. This portion of the building would support the tower itself. A later addition to Joske's, which faces Alamo plaza, has a concrete frame which can support two additional stories; it would not be restructured as part of the proposal. The proposed tower addition featured a glass and steel design and would be composed of timeshare/extended stay units. The commissioners present questioned the necessity of the addition at this location, and whether other locations had been fully investigated. The applicant reported that other additions to the mall site would be disruptive to business. One commissioner also asked whether fewer stories with a larger footprint had been explored. The applicant confirmed that it had been explored, but wanted to avoid casting a shadow over Alamo Plaza. The other commissioner present stated that stepping the tower further back from the historic façade might be a better solution. Further discussion addressed concerns over the increased need for parking at this location, and how guest arrival had been addressed in the preliminary design.

b. This application was presented a second time to the Design Review Committee on February 12, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant presented a proposal for a 21-story addition to the top of the 4-story Joske's Building. The revised proposal called for a 2-story addition to the existing 4-story building with a footprint that is similar but inset within the full footprint of the Joske's Building. Levels 5-6 would be comprised mostly of public spaces such as the lobby, bar/restaurant, ballroom and pool deck. The remaining 19 stories of the tower addition would be organized in an L-plan footprint centered over the older portion of the Joske's Building, open towards the intersection of South Alamo and Commerce Street. The majority of the levels in the tower addition would consist of hotel rooms, while the uppermost levels would consist of timeshare units ranging between 1 and 4 bedrooms.

The L-plan was the result of working with the tenant plan for the bottom floors to allow for as much open retail space as possible in the 4-story Joske's Building. The Committee members expressed concern regarding alterations to the street-level façade. It was recommended that adding new doors for hotel egress should be avoided, and that the existing fenestration pattern should remain. There was also concern that the wings of the L-plan tower did not seem to respond to the existing historic façade. It was recommended that the applicant attempt to realign the structure in order to maintain symmetry in façade. It was noted that setting the tower further back from the historic façade would help to reduce the tower's impact. There was further concern that the design of the tower had changed multiple times, this being the 3rd iteration. The current proposal did not seem to be developed as an aesthetic response to the historic context of the Joske's Building. A single blade configuration set back from the Alamo Street façade was deemed to be a more sensitive solution.

- c. This application was presented a third time to the Design Review Committee on March 12, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant reiterated that the L-plan was the preferred configuration due to the constraints of the existing column grid, the sizing of structural components and the impact to existing and future tenants at Rivercenter Mall. Overall, the Committee found that the design had not been greatly altered from the previous meeting and indicated that there were still issues related to the overall massing, scale and setback of the addition. The Committee expressed the desire to see the tower set back further from the Alamo Street façade. The applicant indicated that stepping the tower further back would increase its height and require larger columns in the retail space. The applicant has provided various options for cladding, but noted that materials had not yet been selected for this project. The Committee did not indicate preference on materials at this point in the process. The Committee expressed concern over the visual impact of the tower to Alamo Plaza, further noting that shadows from the tower did appear to affect the Plaza during the winter months based on the shade study submitted. It was noted that the buildings surrounding Alamo Plaza have a relatively uniform height at a pedestrian scale. There is concern that a tower at this location with the proposed proximity to the street edge would disrupt the current scale of the Plaza. The Design Review Committee did not recommend approval to the HDRC based on remaining concerns regarding the scale, massing and overall impact to Alamo Plaza.
- d. This application was presented a fourth time to the Design Review Committee on April 9, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant, along with a new design team, consulted with the Committee regarding changes to the previously-reviewed design that would address some of the early concerns. The applicant noted that the column grid had been established, and the programmatic requirements of the project have not changed. One commissioner noted that this was an important location and that he was encouraged that the applicant had decided to take a step back and re-examine the project. Scale and height continued to be a concern of all commissioners present, although it was noted that it may be acceptable for the building to become taller in certain areas in order to increase the setback from the historic façade of the Joske's Building. It was also noted that the L-plan should not be maintained in future designs.
- e. This application was presented a fifth time to the Design Review Committee on April 23, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant presented a schematic design for an L-plan tower split into two masses oriented towards Alamo Street and East Commerce Street. A 10-story tower was shown as being centered on the western façade of the Joske's building, while a much larger, 26-story tower runs along the eastern edge of the building, adjacent to St. Joseph's Church. The bulk of the large tower was shown to be set back behind the front façade of the nearby Menger Hotel. The two towers would both rest on a two-story podium level set back approximately 11 feet from the historic façade. Materials, although not finalized, would consist of limestone and/or cast stone veneer to relate to the historic façade. Overall, the towers would express verticality in reference to the Art Deco style. The Committee members present noted that this proposal was an improvement to previous designs, having incorporated previous recommendations from the Committee. In particular, the bulk of the mass of the tower had been pushed back from Alamo Street, which now featured a symmetrical composition. Those present also expressed that there was still general concern regarding the scale of the project in relation to the historic building itself and to Alamo Plaza, which features a relatively consistent building height, and the impact of shadows on the plaza during the winter months.
- f. The Joske's store at this location was constructed circa 1888 at the corner of Alamo and Commerce Streets. As the store grew, numerous additions were constructed including an 1890's addition by Alfred Giles. Two floors were added to this design in 1909, bringing the building to its current height. As part of a major expansion of the building, the facades facing Alamo and Blum Streets were altered to reflect the art deco style in 1939. A decorative metal screen was added to the façade facing Commerce Street to unify the style of the building in preparation for Hemisfair '68 and is believed to conceal the circa 1909 brick façade. The Joske's Building is a local historic landmark and is a contributing resource to the Alamo Plaza Historic District. The district is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
- g. The proposed site is a highly trafficked area in downtown. A high-rise development at this location would be highly visible from Alamo Plaza, Hemisfair Park and the River Walk and would become a part of many iconic views within the City. This is further evidenced by the schematic renderings submitted by the applicant which illustrate how the proposed tower will be viewed from those locations.
- h. The Alamo complex and Alamo Plaza are included as part of the potential World Heritage Site designation for the San Antonio Missions. There is concern that new construction at this scale and proximity to the Alamo could threaten the success of the nomination.
- i. The applicant has submitted a solar access/shade study which illustrates that shadows cast by the tower would impact the southern portion of Alamo Plaza. The afternoon shade pattern during the winter solstice appears to have an impact on the Alamo grounds but is not shown to directly impact the chapel. The afternoon shade pattern during the summer months

would have a direct impact on the adjacent St. Joseph's church, which is also a contributing building to the National Register District. This impact of solar access on Alamo Plaza should be closely examined in all stages of the design process.

- j. The majority of historic buildings in the Alamo Plaza Historic District are between 2 and 3 stories tall. The proposed tower addition diverges from the scale of the block and nearby historic landmarks including the historic Dullnig Building and St. Joseph's Church, which will be directly impacted by shadows cast by the tower addition. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.i.
- k. The proposed tower addition is not subordinate to the historic building in scale and mass and is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.iv. New additions should be sympathetic in nature to the historic building to which they are added and should setback in order for the historic building to remain the focal point. This may be addressed by considering a greater setback from Alamo Street and/or a greater reduction in the height of the 10-story tower.
- l. The proposed setback for the 2-story base of the tower will establish a visual break to distinguish the old from the new, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.v. However, staff finds that tower should be further stepped back to minimize the visual impact on the historic façade and the street edge, especially along the Alamo Street façade.
- m. The 1920's Art Deco façade of the Joske's building features rigid bilateral symmetry distinguished by the two prominent entry bays facing Alamo Street. Although the Art Deco façade is not original to the building, it has achieved significance over time and is a character-defining feature of the building. The 10-story tower and podium base relate to the symmetry of the Alamo Street façade. Additionally, both towers feature strong, vertical lines in reference to the historic Art Deco façade which is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i.
- n. The Guidelines for Additions section 2.B.i recommends that rooftop additions be limited to no more than 40 percent of the height of original structure. The proposed tower addition to the Joske's Building exceeds this limit and is approximately 5 times the height of the original structure.
- o. Proposed materials for the tower addition are either a smooth limestone or cast stone veneer. Because the Joske's building features masonry and plaster detailing, a materials palate that incorporates masonry elements as proposed in the exterior skin of the building is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. and should be maintained.
- p. The applicant provided updated drawings to staff on May 1, 2013, illustrating two options for addressing some of the concerns regarding the smaller tower oriented towards Alamo Street. Option 1 reduces the smaller tower by 4 stories, and increases the larger tower by 2 stories. The building setback from the Alamo Street facade would remain the same in this option. Option 2 reduces the smaller tower by 1 story and increases the larger tower by 1 story. The building setback from the Alamo Street façade is increased to 16 feet (from 11 feet) in this option. Staff has not received enough information illustrating the changed impact to shadows on Alamo Plaza to recommend either option.

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval as submitted based on the above findings. The current proposal is more consistent with the guidelines than previous proposals, but there are still concerns that could be further addressed. The applicant should reconsider the proposed setback from the historic building façade particularly along Alamo Street, the proximity to Alamo Street and St. Joseph's Church and the overall scale. If granted conceptual approval by the HDRC, staff recommends that the applicant continue to work closely with the Design Review Committee to alleviate some of the identified concerns. Due to the scale of the project, the applicant should apply for various levels of conceptual approval as the design is developed, particularly relating to final building setbacks, footprint and articulation of the podium level, materials selection, and façade composition. If the design is altered from what is conceptually approved, the applicant will be required to submit any revisions for HDRC review prior to requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny.

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Rodriguez

THE MOTION FAILED.

May 1, 2013

10

The motion was made by Commissioner Rodriguez and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to refer to DRC.

AYES: Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas, Rodriguez

NAYS: Cone, Guarino, Shafer, Connor

THE MOTION FAILED.

The motion was made by Commissioner Valenzuela to provide no recommendation from HDRC.

THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND.

The motion was made by Commissioner Rodriguez and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to not approve conceptual approval .

AYES: Cone, Guarino, Zuniga, Shafer, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: Salas, Valenzuela

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 7:05 P.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair