

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
AUGUST 7, 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 Guarino, Vice-Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

ABSENT: Cone, Zuniga, Connor

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-225 | 511 Dallas |
| 2. Case No. 2013-229 | 123 Losoya |
| 3. Case No. 2013-230 | 119 E. Craig Pl. |
| 4. Case No. 2013-231 | 307 Lakeridge Dr. |
| 5. Case No. 2013-224 | 523 E. Park |
| 6. Case No. 2013-245 | Wilderness Oak near Spencer Gate Road |
| 7. Case No. 2013-241 | 415 Mission St. |
| 8. Case No. 2013-232 | 129 Carolina |
| 9. Case No. 2013-205 | 103 W. Grayson |
| 10. Case No. 2013-233 | 240 E. Houston |
| 11. Case No. 2013-246 | 925 S. St. Mary’s, 114 Cedar |
| 12. Case No. 2013-190 | 109 W. French Pl. |
| 13. Case No. 2013-243 | 849 E. Commerce |
| 14. Case No. 2013-239 | 303 W. Gramercy |
| 15. Case No. 2013-226 | 418 Villita |
| 16. Case No. 2012-169 | 723 Donaldson |
| 17. Case No. 2013-218 | 1410 W. Rosewood Ave. |
| 18. Case No. 2013-244 | 818 E. Guenther |
| 19. Case No. 2013-234 | 237 W. Magnolia |

Items 2, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18 and 19 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2013-229

Applicant: Crazy Sam’s Seafood, Terry Corless

Address: 123 Losoya

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an outdoor bar to replace the existing outdoor bar at the former Crazy Sam's. The bar would have an approximate footprint of 18' by 11'-6" and feature a projecting arm and hanging sign. Materials consist of steel diamond plate, steel overhead doors and polished concrete. The current request is limited to the bar which would be the first phase of a larger construction that received conceptual approval from the HDRC on November 21, 2012.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed bar is located adjacent to a pedestrian walkway, but is oriented towards an open plaza. Any queuing at the bar would occur outside of the pedestrian walkway, consistent with UDC Section 35-672(a)(5).
- b. The proposed bar is modern in design and features materials and finishes consistent with UDC Section 35-674. A modern aesthetic is appropriate at this portion of the River Walk which was constructed circa 1980 as a pedestrian link to the Alamo.
- c. The illustrated signage is schematic. The applicant will apply for final signage separately.

Staff recommends approval based on the findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve as submitted based on findings a through c.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2013-245

Applicant: Marc Zak, Terra Design Group

Address: Wilderness Oak near Spencer Gate Road

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

Create a new City park on an area north of 1604, near Blanco Rd. The proposed park will include a new 3.1 mile long, 8 foot wide hike and bike trail with interpretive trail nodes. Along the trail there will be wayfinding signage, 1/4 mile markers and interpretive signs. The park will include a dog park at the northern end with a water trough, pavilion, picnic tables and rules signs. A new 8'2" metal fence with 9'11" masonry pillars is proposed to be installed along the existing dam and around the proposed dog park. New trailheads connecting to surrounding sites, including a YMCA, an elementary school, and a library, will be constructed as well as parking with shade structures and monument signs at the northern end of the park.

FINDINGS:

- a. The site of this proposed park is currently undeveloped and the proposed improvements are appropriate for this site and setting, in keeping with the UDC Section 35-642.a.
- b. The proposed fencing exceeds the 6' allowable fence height for public parks, as outlined in the Table of Heights in the UDC Section 35-514. A variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment will be required for the proposed 8'2" fence with 9'11" stone pillars.
- c. At this location, a taller fence than what is permitted by Code will not adversely impact any existing historic resources.
- d. The proposed new signage, including the entry monument and the interpretive pedestals, are legible and appropriate in terms of materials, scale and size for the site consistent with the UDC Section 35-645.d.

e. The proposed new shade structures and toilet enclosures are appropriate for the setting in terms of scale and materials, in keeping with the UDC Section 35-642.b.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a, c, d, and e. Staff also recommends in favor of a variance for the proposed 8'2" metal fence with 9'11" stone pillars based on findings b and c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Salas to approve as submitted based on findings with the stipulation that the applicant complete the necessary archaeological survey.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

9. HDRC NO. 2013-205

Applicant: Chris Erk

Address: 103 W. Grayson

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval for an expansion to the previously-approved scope of work at 103 W Grayson. The current request includes the addition of a 2nd-level cedar deck over the flat roof of an existing building as well as an elevated deck surrounding the existing heritage oak tree. The proposal also includes the installation of a new, 2-story structure on the northwest corner of the property composed of shipping containers.

FINDINGS:

a. A site visit was conducted by the Design Review Committee and the City Arborist on July 9, 2013, in order to assess the impact of the proposal to the existing heritage oak tree. A method for the installation of the four proposed piers was described which included removing dirt from around base of the tree to identify major root systems. These roots will be avoided when the drilling for the footings occurs. Each hole would be no wider than 8 inches in diameter and would extend 20-30 feet below grade. During the visit, it was noted that the tree had previously been completely surrounded by impervious concrete. The concrete has been removed as a result of this ongoing project, and the tree is in a much healthier state. It was determined that the installation of 4 piers in the method presented would not greatly impact the tree. There was some concern over future damage to the tree that could be potentially caused by patrons. Future signage encouraging the respect of the tree was encouraged.

b. This application was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on July 23, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant reiterated that the project has met the parking requirements, but also indicated that additional off-street parking had been secured at a nearby property for overflow. Air spading around the root zone of the tree had been completed and locations for footings for the deck had been finalized. The applicant presented a rendered 3d model with various views from the River Walk. Overall, the committee was comfortable with the proposal and agreed that presenting additional views and a section line drawing would benefit the application.

c. The existing heritage oak at this property is a significant feature along the River Walk, and its ongoing protection and preservation should be a priority. Staff finds that the proposed elevated deck will bring patrons up into the canopy and facilitate an interactive experience with the tree. Footings for the deck will be installed in a manner that is as minimally-invasive as possible. Attention will be given to the mulched bed around the base of the tree to prevent future foot traffic and other stressors. The overall improvements to the site will provide a healthier environment in which the tree can continue to thrive.

d. Overall, the proposed expansion of the approved deck adds an interesting element to the property that maintains a human scale, consistent with the design objectives for RIO-2.

e. Historically, the Taco Land site has had an eclectic mix of building types and imagery. The proposed shipping containers will maintain the existing street edge contribute to the eclectic ambiance of the site. The containers are minimally-invasive and can be removed in the future.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on the findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Salas to approve as submitted based on findings a through e.

1. The possibility of vehicular access through College Street is explored
2. The fenestration pattern along the west side of the front facade is revised to align as close as possible to the adjacent Maverick building.
3. Window proportions follow nearby historic facades
4. More articulation is incorporated on the east and south elevations to avoid large expanses of blank walls
5. Information on location of mechanical systems is submitted during final approval

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2013-190

Applicant: Venterra Realty Management

Address: 109 W. French Pl.

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

1. Replace existing blade at pole sign. The proposed blade will be a 28"x40" routed out dimensional sign. It will be painted to match existing colors.
2. Install a 32" tall arched wall at the corner of French Place and Main Avenue. The proposed wall will be brick to match existing and will be set back 4-5 ft. from the existing retaining wall. An aluminum sign with white acrylic routed out letters will be mounted on the wall. The proposed sign will be 20"x16 ft. and will read "French Place Apartment Homes". The existing wall mounted sign will be removed.

FINDINGS:

- a. This case was heard by HDRC on July 3, 2013. At that time it was recommended that the proposed monument sign be re-designed so that it was incorporated into landscape and the scale reduced.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Signage the proposed signs are compatible in material, design and scale to the building and the surrounding area.

Staff recommends approval of items 1 and 2 as submitted based on the findings above.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Salas to refer to the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2013-226

Applicant: Bruce Martin, Downtown Operations, City of San Antonio

Address: 418 Villita

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

Install a glass security door over the existing wood double doors on Building #4 in La Villita. This structure has four existing door openings—two on the south façade and two on the north façade. Three of the existing doorways have a glass door installed over them, similar to what is being requested here for the fourth door opening. The door in question is on the north side of the building.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed new glass door will be installed over the existing wood door in such a manner that it can be removed in the future without causing permanent alteration or damage to the existing door or frame, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 10.
- b. Building #4 is situated within La Villita, facing interior pedestrian areas, just east of Nueva St.
- c. The proposed glass door will be highly visible from the pedestrian areas to the north of the building within La Villita, but will not be highly visible from nearby Nueva St.
- d. The proposed glass door will significantly alter the appearance of the building from the exterior, which is not in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 6.B.i or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 2.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the existing wood doors be preserved in place and that more detailed information be provided as to how the doors will be installed to ensure that the change is reversible based on finding a.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Salas and seconded by Commissioner Shafer approve with staff recommendation based on finding a.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

16. HDRC NO. 2012-169

Applicant: Angela Whitaker-Williams, Perkins + Will

Address: 723 Donaldson

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

1. Demolish an existing 1956 classroom addition which was previously used as a band hall.

2. Construct a dance addition in the location of the existing 1956 former band hall. The Area J dance addition will occupy the same footprint as the 1956 classroom addition.
3. Construct an addition to the Area E architecture wing. The proposed addition will wrap the south and west sides of the existing building.
4. Replace the existing aluminum bleachers at Pony Field with new aluminum bleachers, seating between 600 and 800. The applicant also proposes to continue the 4' tall wrought iron ornamental fence along the west side of Pony Field.
5. Install security lighting on the campus' athletic fields as well as lighting for the track at Pony Field.
6. Install fencing around the existing baseball and softball fields. The fencing will be 5' high and vinyl-coated chain link with gated openings and sidewalks to allow for community connections. The fence will be planted to help screen it from view.

FINDINGS:

- a. A request for approval of the proposed campus master plan for Jefferson High School was approved by the HDRC on March 21, 2012, with requests for more detailed information relating to several line items in the master plan. Since that time, several applications have been submitted for conceptual approval of much of the work associated with the approved master plan.
- b. This application was reviewed by the DRC on May 24, 2012. At that meeting, the committee noted concern over the proposed perimeter treatment at the baseball fields since erecting fencing will limit the visibility and permeability of the campus, which functions in many ways as a common green for the community. The committee also noted concern over the proposed athletic field lighting, both in terms of what the lighting fixtures will look like and how they will affect the surrounding properties. The committee noted concern over the proposed ROTC field's location, noting that it seems to be unrelated to the geometry of the rest of the campus. The committee asked that the applicant provide a slight aerial view of the proposed addition and a section through the proposed dance addition to understand its relationship to the existing building. The committee found that the applicant's proposal for a more cohesive total plan for the campus will ultimately benefit the school.
- c. On June 6, 2012, an application for the demolition of the existing band hall, the construction of Area J and Area E additions, and athletic field improvements to both Pony Field and the existing baseball and softball fields was given conceptual approval by the HDRC. On July 6, 2012, an application with more detailed information regarding proposed lighting at Pony Field and fencing around Pony Field and the existing baseball and softball fields was given conceptual approval by the HDRC. Finally, on April 17, 2013, a request to reduce the previously proposed scope of work at Pony Field, install a wrought iron fence around the field, and construct a new concession stand and chiller enclosure was conceptually approved by the HDRC.
- d. Staff finds that this request for final approval is consistent with previous applications for work on this site that have been conceptually approved by the HDRC.
- e. The existing addition that is currently used as a band hall was constructed in 1956 and was not original to the historic campus.
- f. The proposed Area J dance addition will maintain the same footprint as the existing 1956 addition which is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 2.B.ii.
- g. The southern portion of the proposed Area E architecture wing addition steps down in terms of roof height to leave the roof of the original structure visible beyond, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 2.B.i.
- h. The proposed Area E and Area J additions both use brick and cast stone which are found on the historic campus, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 3.A.i.

- i. The proposed additions incorporate details similar to those found on the existing campus buildings. Staff finds, however, that the details should not mimic historic details, but be contemporary interpretations of the original detailing, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 4.A.ii, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 9.
 - j. The proposal to replace the existing aluminum bleachers and continue the existing metal fencing at Pony Field will not have a significant impact on the appearance of the western portion of the campus.
 - k. One concern voiced by the neighborhood and the HDRC at previous hearings related to this project was the impact of proposed athletic lighting at Pony Field on the surrounding properties. The applicant has provided a photometric study indicating that there will be very little light spillover from the proposed new lighting at Pony Field, which is in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, Section 6.D.vi.
 - l. The proposed use of vinyl-coated chain link for the fencing around the reoriented baseball and softball fields on the southeastern portion of the campus is typically not recommended for a property within a historic district. Staff finds in this case, however, the fencing is required for the safety of the players. Similarly, the proposed landscaping will help screen the fencing from view.
 - m. In the request for conceptual approval, heard by the HDRC on July 6, 2012, the proposed fencing at the baseball and softball fields incorporated ungated openings. Gates are required, according to the applicant, due to the use of the fields as a stormwater detention site. Staff finds that while the gates are necessary, they should remain unlocked or open as much as possible to allow for community access to the fields.
1. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings d and e.
 - 2 & 3. Staff recommends approval based on findings d, f, g, and h with the stipulation that the proposed cast stone detailing be simplified so as not to mimic the original detailing based on finding i.
 - 4 & 5. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings j and k.
 6. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the gates at the baseball and softball fields remain unlocked as much as possible based on findings l and m.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Salas and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to approve with the stipulations that the applicant return to staff with any further changes

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

18. HDRC NO. 2013-244

Applicant: Carlos Alvarez
Address: 818 E. Guenther

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

Remove the existing concrete front porch and steps and replace them with a new wood porch with a simple picket wood railing, front wood steps, and vertical wood skirting. The porch will be painted to match the existing trim.

FINDINGS:

- a. The home at 818 E. Guenther was built in the Craftsman style with simplified form and detailing and first appears on the Sanborn map dated 1912-1951. At that time, the home had a small front porch.
- b. According to the King William Historic District survey, the home at 818 E. Guenther was built c.1920. The survey lists this building as having a stucco exterior and a brick veneer on the porch.
- c. The existing concrete front porch is not original to the home. A small wood front porch is more in keeping with the style of this home and the surrounding homes.
- d. Staff finds that the proposed new front porch and steps are in keeping with the style of the home, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.v.
- e. The proposal to paint the front porch to match the existing trim is appropriate and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.5.
- f. A simple picket design for the proposed railing is in keeping with the simplified detailing on the existing structure, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.iv. The pickets of the railing should have appropriate dimension based on historic precedent and to be in keeping with the Craftsman architectural style.
- g. The proposed vertical skirting for the front porch is not consistent with the style of the home or with the skirting on the existing home. Houses built in the Craftsman style typically had skirting around the front porch to help integrate it with the rest of the structure. In this case, a simple lattice or horizontal skirting similar to what appears on the existing home would be appropriate and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.5.

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

- 1. That the porch railing design, which should be consistent with simple, historic precedent in the neighborhood, is approved by staff prior to construction based on finding e.
- 2. That lattice or horizontal wood skirting be installed around the front porch based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Salas to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through g.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

19. HDRC NO. 2013-234

Applicant: David Bogle, SYNCRO Architecture Studio

Address: 237 W. Magnolia

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

- 1. Replace an existing cedar picket fence with a 4'-0" perforated steel panel fence. The fence would be perforated for transparency and incorporate imagery associated with the school. The metal would be painted a cream color;
- 2. Install brick pavers in the parkway space on either side of an existing walkway to serve as a loading/unloading area. The pavers would be installed on a sand base, limited to a small area along the street;

3. Replace 2 exterior doors on the west façade with full-light aluminum doors; and

4. Replace 1 exterior door on the front (south) façade with a full-light wood door.

FINDINGS:

- a. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Commission on July 23, 2013. At the meeting, the committee members present noted the importance of understanding the context of the site. A metal fence of this nature may be more appropriate in a commercial setting versus a residential street. There was some concern that this material choice may not be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, although some members found it to be an interesting approach.
 - b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.v., fencing materials should reference those which were used historically within the district. Metal is an appropriate material in the district, although the proposed perforated metal fence would be a new application in the neighborhood.
 - c. The design and materials of the fence should respond to the design and materials of the main structure (Site Elements 2.B.i). In this case, the main structure has an institutional appearance with has had substantial alterations that express Mid-century detailing. A metal fence with a modern aesthetic would not be inconsistent with the design and materials of the main structure.
 - d. The proposed fence will be replacing an existing cedar picket fence that has brick pillars. The design calls for the reuse of the brick pillars in place. The applicant has previously received an administrative approval from staff to replace the cedar pickets with a 4'-0" wrought iron fence that is in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines. The scale of the proposed fence is consistent with those in the district and with the Historic Design Guidelines. The fence proposal is consistent with Site Elements 2.B.ii, 2.B.iii, and 2.B.i.
 - e. Because a sample has not been provided, it is difficult to predict the transparency of the requested material. Front yard fences should be predominately open. A sample of the material must be submitted to determine consistency with Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i.
 - f. Although specific desired imagery has not been determined, the applicant has provided several examples of the type of imagery that is possible through this application. It is difficult to predict the legibility of such images. This would also require a sample prior to installation.
 - g. The Guidelines for Site Elements 4.B.ii discourages the wholesale replacement of parkway space with hardscape. Staff finds the proposed pavers to be limited to a small area which functions as a loading/unloading area, which is difficult to maintain as a landscaped area.
 - h. The proposed door replacements are appropriate for the structure and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i.
1. Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through f with the stipulation that a sample is provided to ensure transparency and legibility.
- 2-4. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding g through h.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Valenzuela and seconded by Commissioner Salas to approve items 2, 3, and 4 based on findings g through h. Denial of item 1.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

20. HDRC NO. 2013-204

Applicant: Sameer Paya

Address: 325 Lavaca

Case was postponed at the applicant's request.

21. HDRC NO. 2013-240

Applicant: William "Doug" McClure

Address: 330 W. Gramercy

Case was postponed at the applicant's request.

22. HDRC NO. 2013-163

Applicant: Irma Sanchez

Address: 134 Thorain Blvd.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a ridge cap vent on a previously approved standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. This case was heard by the HDRC on June 19, 2013. At that time, the Commission approved the request to install a standing seam metal roof with the stipulation that the roof not have a ridge cap vent and use a double much seam with ridges less than 2" and panels that are 18-21" wide.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations Checklist for Metal Roofs, new metal roofs that adhere to the guidelines can be approved as long as the installation of a metal roof is appropriate for the style and period of construction. The checklist includes using a crimped ridge seam consistent with the historic application or a low-profile ridge cap with no ridge cap vent or end cap if a crimped ridge is not used.
- c. Attics were historically vented through gable vents. Ridge vents are predominantly exhaust devices that are commonly used on modern roofs. If sufficient intake air is not available, commonly provided through soffit vents on modern houses, air will be pulled from the interior conditioned spaces into the attic. Installing a ridge vent in this case may not be an efficient ventilation strategy and could potentially damage the historic resource.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on the findings above. Staff recommends that no ridge cap vent is installed and that other methods of venting the attic are explored.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Jacob and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to deny applicants request for a ridge cap vent based on findings a through c.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

23. HDRC NO. 2013-222

Applicant: Maria B. Munoz

Address: 623 VFW Blvd.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal roof. The proposed roof will be yellow.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 623 VFW Boulevard has a simple form with no particular architectural style and has been substantially modified.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, although a metal roof might be appropriate in this case the proposed yellow color is too bright and will detract from the pedestrian experience along the street and cause adverse effect to the district. According the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations new metal roofs should match the historic metal roof color or use the standard galvalume.

Staff recommends approval based on the findings above with the following stipulations:

- 1. The roof not incorporate a ridge vent common in modern roofs and use a double munch seam instead with ridges less than 2 in. tall
- 2. Panels are 18-21 in. wide
- 3. Color is standard galvalume

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Valenzuela and seconded by Commissioner Salas to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a and b.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

24. HDRC NO. 2013-219

Applicant: Daniel Sexton

Address: 845 E. Magnolia

Withdrawn by the applicant.

25. HDRC NO. 2013-217

Applicant: Luis Richard Garcia Jr.

Address: 2142 W. Magnolia

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 3' tall retaining wall on the front yard. The proposed wall will be concrete clad in brick to match the house.

FINDINGS:

- a. Work was begun without appropriate permits or approvals.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, sloped front lawns are a character defining feature of the Monticello Park Historic District that should be preserved. Topographic features, such as sloped front lawns help define the unique character of the district, street and block. Altering these features, such as through the installation of a retaining wall, interrupts the visual continuity of the historic streetscape and detracts from the character of the district.
- c. Lawns or low-plantings that are well maintained prevent erosion of sloped front yards.
- d. Although the majority of the houses in this block of West Magnolia that have a high grade change in the front yard have retaining walls, none of these walls existed historically or have received approval from the HDRC. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, walls should not be introduced in the front yard where not historically found.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on the findings above. If erosion is an issue, staff recommends that lawn or low-plantings suitable for the prevention of erosion are used.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Valenzuela and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to grant denial of applicants request for a retaining wall. The applicant is allowed to keep the existing sidewalk and walkway to front door, steps, and the return on the side of the steps.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

26. HDRC NO. 2013-216

Applicant: Henry Garcia

Address: 2210 W. Magnolia

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 2'3" tall retaining wall in the front yard. The proposed wall will be 6"x6"x24" square stones.

FINDINGS:

- a. Work was begun without appropriate permits or approvals.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, sloped front lawns are a character defining feature of the Monticello Park Historic District that should be preserved. Topographic features, such as sloped front lawns help define the unique character of the district, street and block. Altering these features, such as through the installation of a retaining wall, interrupts the visual continuity of the historic streetscape and detracts from the character of the district.
- c. Lawns or low-plantings that are well maintained prevent erosion of sloped front yards.
- d. Although the majority of the houses in this block of West Magnolia that have a high grade change in the front yard have retaining walls, none of these walls existed historically or have received approval from the HDRC. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, walls should not be introduced in the front yard where not historically found.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on the findings above. If erosion is an issue, staff recommends that lawn or low-plantings suitable for the prevention of erosion are used.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Valenzuela and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant denial of applicants request for a retaining wall. The applicant is allowed to keep the existing sidewalk and walkway to front door, steps, and the return on the side of the steps.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

27. HDRC NO. 2013-227

Applicant: Virgilio Ortiz

Address: 224 Quentin Dr.

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

Replace the original one-over-one wood windows on all sides of the home with new faux divided light, lattice pattern windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The lattice pattern of the proposed new windows is not in keeping with the style of the home or with the character of the original windows. The original windows were simple one-over-one wood windows.

b. The original wood windows have already been removed. At the time a stop work order was issued on July 12, 2013, a number of the original windows remained onsite.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted. Staff recommends that the original wood one-over-one windows be repaired and reinstalled in their original configuration based on findings a and b. If the original windows are beyond repair, staff recommends that new wood one-over-one windows be installed to match the original in size, profile, and configuration based on finding a.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to grant denial of applicants request for window replacement based on findings a and b.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

28. HDRC NO. 2013-228

Applicant: Nicole Ross

Address: 149 E. Lynwood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to extend the width of the existing 7'5" wide concrete driveway by 8ft. The total width of the proposed driveway will be 15'5".

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 149 E. Lynwood is located within the Monte Vista Historic District. According to City Directories it was built between 1951-1955. The Ranch style house was listed on the Monte Vista Historic District survey as non-contributing to the district.
- b. Although there is not a consistent pattern for the location of driveways on this block of Lynwood Avenue, the majority of the driveways are single car driveways. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements driveway configurations should be similar in material, width and design to those historically found. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 ft. Introducing a double car driveway in a block where the majority of the driveways are single will highly impact the continuity of the block and cause adverse effect.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on the findings above. Staff recommends that the driveway be increased to a width of no more than 10 ft.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to approve with the stipulation that the driveway be no more than 12' wide and should only extend to the sidewalk.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

29. HDRC NO. 2013-235

Applicant: Rupert Hernandez

Address: 1951 W. Summit

Replace the existing concrete tile roof with a metal concrete coated roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. According to City Directories the house at 1951 West Summit was constructed ca. 1927 in the Spanish Eclectic style. It is a unique resource and a contributing structure to the Monticello Park Historic District. This house features a concrete, cast tile roof in different shades of dark red and green designed to simulate the appearance of a clay barrel tile roof with finials at each gable. This roof is likely original to the structure.
- b. In its current state, some of the tiles are cracked and the roof is in need of repair. According to the applicant, repair has been unsuccessful and difficult. Staff finds that although some areas of the roof warrant replacement, many of the tiles could be reused.
- c. An in-kind replacement of concrete tiles may be difficult because similar materials are not common. However, the appearance of the roof is a character defining feature of this property and should be maintained. The proposed replacement material does not have the same thickness or color variations and has a much lower shadow line than the original tiles.
- d. HDRC approved the replacement of a similar roof with standing seam metal. However, that roof was highly deteriorated and the owner of the property had already tried using tiles from the garage to replace damaged tiles in kind. These in kind replacement options have not been exhausted in this case.
- e. Clay tiles are a common substitute material for concrete tiles in non-historic applications. Clay tiles that have a similar profile and thickness are available through several manufacturers. Although the product resembles the existing tiles in size, profile and thickness, the standard colors available do not have the same green and dark red color variations.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on the findings above. Staff recommends that in kind replacement options are explored. If reusing tiles is not possible, staff recommends that a more appropriate substitute product is used.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Salas and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant approval to remove existing concrete tiles to replace roof underlayment and re-install concrete tiles. If tiles are deteriorated and need replacement, tiles must be salvaged from the garage roof or a roof not visible from the street and concrete or clay tiles installed in these areas if necessary.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

30. HDRC NO. 2013-223

Applicant: Abel Obregon

Address: 600 E. Market

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage identifying the Ruth's Chris restaurant on the River level at the Grand Hyatt. Requested items include:

1. Install a new 3'-6" x 3'-6" circular aluminum sign on a column structure on Market Street. The sign will feature clear acrylic push-through letters illuminated internally with LEDs. This sign is intended to identify valet parking for the restaurant.
2. Remove an existing wall sign and repaint an existing awning facing the River Walk.
3. Install a new fabric awning over an outdoor entrance to the River level dining area. The awning will include signage measuring approximately 3'-4" x 6'-0" and will be back lit by a wall-mounted fluorescent lamp.
4. Install a new 5'-0" x 3'-5" double-sided, projecting aluminum sign on a column structure on Market Street. This sign will feature clear acrylic push-through letters illuminated internally with LEDs. The sign is intended to identify a self parking area within the Grand Hyatt.
5. Reface the existing totem sign to include an updated tenants list. Four vinyl applications measuring approximately 19" by 36" will be added to the four-sided monument sign.

Total requested square footage for the restaurant signage is approximately 94 sf . This calculation includes an 8 sf, non-lit sign on the River Walk which was approved administratively.

FINDINGS:

- a. Previous signage for the tenant at this location was approved by the HDRC on October 6, 2010, and included a menu board (with identifying signage) on the River level as well as space on the tenant monument sign. This signage has since been removed.
- b. Existing parking and directional signs along Market Street were approved by the HDRC on October 21, 2009 with the stipulation that no additional signage be approved without a master signage plan. Any new signs approved for this location, especially along Market Street, should not add to the number or square footage of previously-approved signage.
- c. An 8 sf, non-lit sign facing the River Walk was approved administratively by staff on June 10, 2013, and should be considered as part of the total signage calculations. This sign will replace the existing menu board at this location.
- d. The proposed painting of the existing awning does not alter the existing structure and represents a reversible condition.

e. According to UDC Section 35-681(c), for properties abutting the River, such as this one, only one identification sign fronting on the River Walk shall be allowed for each tenant. The previously-approved River Walk sign meets this standard. The additional requested awning with signage, described in item 3, exceeds the allowable signage on the River level. A blank fabric awning with no signage would be appropriate.

f. The proposed reface for the totem sign is appropriate and consistent with previously-approved signage for this location. Although four signs are proposed for this location, they are small and consistent with previously-approved signage. These signs will provide visibility for the restaurant from Market Street.

g. The proposed parking signs (items 1 and 4) would give the restaurant better presence on Market Street. However, the HDRC included a stipulation in 2009 that additional signs for tenants at the Grand Hyatt should not be approved without the approval of a master signage plan.

h. The proposed signs for valet and at the entrance to the parking garage at the Grand Hyatt (items 1 and 4) exceed the total recommended number of signs. Staff finds that an additional parking sign specific to the restaurant is not needed at this location because directional signs for the parking garage at the Grand Hyatt already exist. If the Commission finds that a sign oriented toward vehicles on Market Street is warranted given the scale of the building, staff finds that one or the other location would be sufficient and the reference to parking should be removed. A simple circle with the restaurant name/logo is sufficient given that other directional signs for parking at the Grant Hyatt are in place. This issue would be best addressed by a master signage plan.

1. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted of the valet parking sign based on findings g and h.
2. Staff recommends approval of repainting the existing metal awning as submitted based on finding d.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of the fabric awning sign based on finding e. Staff recommends approval of a non-lit, fabric awning with no lettering.
4. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted of the projecting parking sign based on findings g and h.
5. Staff recommends approval of re-facing the existing totem sign as submitted based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Judson and seconded by Commissioner Salas to:

1. Approval of valet sign per applicant's preference.
2. Approval as submitted based on finding d.
3. Denial based on finding e.
4. Denial based on applicant's preference.
5. Approved as submitted based on finding f.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

31. HDRC NO. 2013-248

Applicant: Patrick Christensen

Address: 300 E. Commerce

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage on the building at 300 E Commerce. The requested signage includes:

1. Install one (1), double-sided, internally-illuminated blade sign on the northwest corner of the building. The sign will read "CVS Pharmacy" and measure approximately 10 feet tall by 16 inches wide for a total square footage of approximately 26 square feet (both sides counted);
2. Install one (1), wall-mounted sign on the north façade facing Commerce Street. The sign, reading "CVS/Pharmacy" consists of internally-illuminated cabinet letters with a red, acrylic face. The sign will measure approximately 16'-8" long by

2 feet tall for a total square footage of approximately 33 square feet;

3. Install one (1), wall-mounted sign on the west façade facing Navarro Street. The sign, reading “CVS/Pharmacy” consists of internally-illuminated cabinet letters with a red, acrylic face. The sign will measure approximately 16’-8” long by 2 feet tall for a total square footage of approximately 33 square feet;

4. Install opaque window graphics featuring local black and white imagery in 4 windows on the north façade and 22 windows on the west façade. 7 of these windows would feature logo graphics reading “CVS Pharmacy”, each measuring 12.56” tall by 21.97” wide for an additional 13.44 square feet of signage. Included in the requested imagery are numerous red “dots” which appear in a random pattern. Total requested signage consists of ten (10) signs with a total square footage of 105.44 sf.

FINDINGS:

- a. According to UDC Section 35-678(e), only 3 signs totaling 50 square feet are typically allowed per applicant within the RIO districts. The HDRC may approve additional signage in RIO-3 for properties outside of the River Walk provided that they are designed appropriately for the size and scope of the site.
- b. Staff finds that this location is in an urban setting and that any signage should respond to pedestrian traffic. Staff finds that the proposed wall-mounted signs respond to vehicular traffic and would not be visible by pedestrians using the sidewalk immediately adjacent to the building due to an existing awning. Staff finds that a small hanging sign beneath the awning, oriented perpendicular to foot traffic, would be more appropriate.
- c. Staff further finds that the store will have only a single entrance off of Commerce Street. The additional proposed wall sign facing Navarro Street is excessive as it does not direct pedestrians towards the entrance.
- d. Staff finds that the proposed blade sign would effectively direct pedestrians towards the northwest corner where the entrance is located. Staff further finds that the proposed blade sign is appropriate for the age and style of the building and consistent with UDC Section 35-678(c)(1). However, the proposed internally-illuminated cabinet design is more typical to suburban areas, and not appropriate within Downtown San Antonio. A blade sign that is externally-illuminated by lamps concealed by a hood or diffuser would be more appropriate and consistent with UDC Section 35-678(k)(9)D.
- e. According to the applicant, the requested opaque window coverings are necessary in order block views to portions of the interior that are to be used for product shelving. Staff finds the use of local imagery in the window applications to be a creative solution for the coverings, but also finds that the added “spots” would contribute to visual clutter along the pedestrian walkway. Windows in the northwest corner of the building will be left uncovered. The proposed 7 logos included in the design of the window coverings are spaced appropriately and would be viewable by pedestrians traveling along the adjacent sidewalks.

- 1. Staff recommends approval of the blade sign with the stipulation that it be externally illuminated based on finding d.
- 2. Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b and c. Staff recommends a small hanging sign suspended from the existing awning located near the entrance to the store. If approved by the HDRC, staff recommends the added stipulation that any approved signs be externally illuminated by lamps concealed by a hood or diffuser based on finding d.
- 3. Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c.
- 4. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the red “dots” are eliminated from the design based on finding e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Salas to:

- 1. Approved with stipulation that sign be externally illuminated based on finding d.
- 2. Approved with stipulation that sign be externally illuminated based on finding d.
- 3. Denied based on finding c.
- 4. Approved with stipulation that the “dots/spots” be removed from the design based on finding e.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

32. HDRC NO. 2013-168

Applicant: Diane Wyrick

Address: 223 E. Summit

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval:

1. Demolish the circa 1950 rectory building, a contributing structure within the Monte Vista Historic District.
2. Construct a new facility in place of the former rectory building. The proposed new facility, called the, Faith Formation Center, will be two stories with a footprint of approximately 7,700 sf (for a total of 15,000 sf). The proposed facility will largely be flat-roofed with stucco siding and cut stone/cast stone details. An existing drive off of Summit Avenue will be reoriented to service the new building.

FINDINGS:

Findings relating to Request Item #1:

- a. The existing rectory building was constructed circa 1950 in the Monterey Style. It was designed by architects Julian & White of San Antonio who were well-known for ecclesiastical and institutional architecture in South Texas. The building is a two story, L-shaped building with brick veneer and cantilevered balconies on the south and west facades. Very few alterations have been made to the rectory over time. The rectory building is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic district. Located on a predominately residential street, the scale of the rectory at two stories is consistent with nearby single-family residences. The setback from Summit is also consistent with the residential character of the street one approaches McCullough Avenue.
- b. The rectory lacks a street-facing entrance. This, combined with the irregular fenestration pattern at the ground level, gives the rectory a somewhat institutional appearance.
- c. A site visit was conducted by staff and the Designation and Demolition Committee on January 11, 2013. At that time it was noted by the applicant that the existing rectory was not large enough to accommodate the church's needs for an educational center and that reuse of the building was not economically feasible. The need for a tree survey was expressed at that meeting. The request was referred to the Design Review Committee for review of the conceptual design for the replacement building.
- d. Attendance at the church has increased steadily between 2007 and the present day. Information presented to staff indicates projected student enrollment to be 293+ beyond the year 2013. The applicant has performed a number of studies in the past which explore the ongoing use of the existing rectory. The proposed new construction is estimated to meet the applicant's programmatic needs based on current and anticipated registration.
- e. In general, new construction should be limited to the interior of the property versus its outermost edges. The existing church property presents a number of challenges, both topographical and constructed, that restrict building options. Two options for an interior development have been presented by the Monte Vista Historical Association. Option A involves a two-story vertical addition to the existing Madonna Room. Option B which placed new construction in the main parking area to the north of the gym. A detailed written response by the applicant that addresses each of these options is available in the exhibits for this case.
- f. The loss of a contributing structure to a historic district constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of contributing structures should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved or, failing that, a loss of significance must be presented by the

applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in 35-614 (b) (3). In order for an applicant to establish an economic hardship argument, he or she must demonstrate the inability of the owner to obtain a reasonable return or a reasonable beneficial use from the property as required and discussed by the United States Supreme Court in *Penn Central Transportation Company vs. New York City*, 438 U.S. 104 (1978), and subsequent cases. When a claim of unreasonable economic hardship is made, the owner must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed; [The applicant claims to be unable to make reasonable beneficial use of the existing rectory due to the programmatic needs of the church, the estimated cost of a rehabilitation and expansion, and return in usable square footage. Recent studies by the applicant found that the proposed new construction provides the greatest usable square footage for the approved project budget. Similar new construction cannot be feasibly achieved elsewhere on the property without compromising other investments to the property or the tree-filled lawn on the southwest corner of the property.]

B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return; [Documentation submitted by the applicant details that attempts have been made to rehabilitate and adaptively reuse the rectory building. Information provided to staff states that rehabilitation of the rectory was first explored in 2007 but was not pursued because rehabilitation would not meet programmatic needs at that time. An addition to the rectory was explored between 2011 and 2012, but the applicant found that the gained useable square footage would not offset the estimated costs of such a project. While it is feasible for the applicant to rehabilitate the rectory for continued use as an office, the result of such a rehabilitation would not result in the classroom and meeting space that is needed.]; and

C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property. [This criteria is not applicable in this case].

g. The applicant may have a legitimate claim for economic hardship after presenting additional evidence and responding to remaining questions.

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 the requirements for new construction are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

Findings relating to Request Item #2:

i. This request for new construction was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 22, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant presented a design concept for a two-story, 18,000 square foot building sited further away from Summit Avenue than the existing building. There was concern about the increase in building height with the new construction. The applicant was encouraged to find ways to set the building into the landscape so that a lower profile could be achieved on the southern façade. One commissioner suggested that the parapet could be broken up to reduce the scale of the southern façade and that the incorporation of a pitched roof would relate more to the residential precedent of the block.

j. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on June 25, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant stated that studies investigating rehabilitation and additions to the existing rectory concluded that such efforts would not be feasible. New construction is the preferred option of the applicant because it would be more efficient and cost effective. The applicant presented the results of a recent tree survey, which identified five significant trees to be removed as a result of the new construction. None of these trees are classified as heritage trees as defined in UDC Section 35-523. The Committee was comfortable with the results of the survey. The applicant recounted conversations with the Monte Vista Historical Association. The applicant is working to explore some of the options presented by the MVHA. There was some concern over the increase in scale of the new building. The Committee recommended introducing additional elements that brought the design to a more human scale. The applicant also discussed existing site constraints related to the project. A utility easement is located between the rectory and the existing Madonna Room which prevents a large rear addition. The applicant also prefers to maintain as much existing lawn space as possible, and is concerned that new construction on the

northern edge of the property would require new surface parking closer to Summit.

- k. The proposed new construction is sited further north, away from Summit, than the existing building. However, the proposed new construction incorporates a much larger footprint than its predecessor, expanding westward towards McCullough and occupying the area where the existing driveway is currently located. The proposed new construction and relocated driveway would not require the removal of any existing canopy between the building and McCullough.
- l. As part of a greater campus, the proposed new construction has entrances located on the west, north and east facades. The final design could be more consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.1.B. by incorporating an additional point of entry on the south façade which faces Summit, as the majority of residences along Summit feature front-facing entrances.
- m. The proposed new construction is of a substantially larger scale than the residential precedents on this block of Summit. There is not an established standard for building scale on this block of Summit; the residences at this location vary in number of stories, architectural style and building setbacks due to topography. The proposed design features a cut stone and cast stone detail on the first level in an effort to bring the scale of the southern facade down to a residential level. The second level is further articulated by breaking up the parapet wall on the south façade into segments and incorporating a sloped roof supported by brackets. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.
- n. The proposed design incorporates a fenestration pattern that establishes symmetry on the south façade and is scaled appropriately for the building. Staff finds that this could be further developed to include openings on the south walls of the stair wells and the north façade which currently features blank walls which are inconsistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.
- o. The proposed materials are consistent with other materials found on the adjacent historic church property. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.
- p. The proposed new construction incorporates a stone arch motif that is found in the adjacent historic church property. This feature also provides a deep reveal for the ground-level windows. Staff finds that the proposal could be further developed to incorporate additional architectural details that reference nearby historic resources in accordance with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A. The addition of a buttress detail on the south (long) elevation was suggested by one of the Design Review Committee members. The applicant has agreed to explore additional options.
- q. Overall, the new construction, if approved, should make every effort to respond to the residential character of the resources along Summit Avenue. As proposed, it is very institutional in appearance and design.
- r. Staff finds that overall the proposed new development is well-sited among existing trees which provide a buffer between the building and the street. A tree survey has been completed by the applicant. Of the 14 trees identified for removal, none are of heritage caliper. According to the survey, four of the trees slated for removal are in various states of decline. Another seven of the trees are not large enough to be protected by ordinance. The remaining 3 trees consist of a small redbud, a significant live oak which grows at an angle and a crepe myrtle. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with the City Arborist regarding a tree preservation plan for the site as required by ordinance. The applicant has expressed interest in maintaining as much of the existing canopy as possible as well as the possibility of planting new trees along the southern property line.
- s. In an effort to reduce potential harm to ordinance-protected trees located on either end of the proposed structure, the building footprint has been reduced to its current 7,700 sf (down from approximately 9,200 sf). An updated site plan and elevation are available in the packets.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Demolition of a contributing structure is an irreversible decision. Staff does not recommend approval of demolition at this time. While the applicant has worked diligently to explore options to meet its needs and has clearly illustrated that preserving the rectory building in place presents significant challenges due to the constraints of the site, the provisions of UDC Section 35-614 which outline the requirements for a finding of economic hardship have not yet been met. Additional information may be presented at the hearing to prove economic hardship. Staff recommends that the HDRC Chair appoint a task force (as allowed by the Rules of Procedure) to ensure that all alternatives to demolition have been fully examined. The task force should include at a minimum a representative from the HDRC, Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church, the Monte Vista Historical Association, the San Antonio Conservation Society and the Office of Historic Preservation. The

task force should return to the HDRC with a recommendation within one month.

2. If conditions are met and the demolition is approved by the HDRC, staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed replacement plans based on findings j through r with the stipulation that the applicant make every effort to adjust the design with respect to the residential character of its neighbors and return to the Design Review Committee prior to applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Judson to refer to task force.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, 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 8:35 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Vice-Chair

