

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
March 16, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

ABSENT: Cone, Salas, Rodriguez

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - San Pedro Creek Design Guidelines Public Input Meeting - 1901 S Alamo - March 29 - 5PM
 - SApreservation Rehabber Club March Meeting - 430 Austin Street - March 31 - 5:30 PM
 - STAR - Mission Historic District April 2-3 and 9-10
 - SApreservation Rehabber Club April Meeting - 1344 S Flores - April 7 - 5:30 PM
- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2016-093 | 323 Leigh St |
| 2. Case No. 2016-096 | 1415 Fulton Ave |
| 3. Case No. 2016-090 | 226 Club Dr. |
| 4. Case No. 2016-067 | 100 Montana/Alamodome |
| 5. Case No. 2016-092 | 918 Hays St |
| 6. Case No. 2016-099 | 974 E South Cross |
| 7. Case No. 2016-094 | 314 E Carolina St |
| 8. Case No. 2016-098 | 234 W Kings Highway |

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

7. HDRC NO. 2016-097

Applicant: Stan Albus/Rialto Studio, Inc

Address: 3700 N St. Marys

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the repair and renovation of specific park features at Brackenridge Park that were constructed between 1915 and 1937. These park features include park entry monuments, Dionico Rodriguez Sculptures and public restrooms located on N St Marys.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the repair and renovation of specific park features at Brackenridge Park that were constructed between 1915 and 1937. These park features include park entry monuments, Dionico Rodriguez Sculptures and public restrooms located on N St Marys.

b. Currently, there are two entry monuments at the N St Mary's entrance near the San Antonio Zoo that were constructed circa 1915, two at the Avenue B entrance on Broadway constructed circa 1930 and two at the Tuleta entrance on Broadway constructed circa 1935. Each of these monuments is unique and feature different designs and elements such as decorative metal work, roof structures and lighting. Each of these entry monuments have some degree of stone masonry decay and are in need of repair. The applicant has proposed to repair the existing structures which will include roof and lighting repair, the repair of red sandstone masonry, the straightening and shoring of walls and the replacement of damaged or missing stone. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitative work to

be appropriate and consistent with the UDC Section 35-676.

c. There are four Dionicio Rodriguez sculptures located within Brackenridge Park, each constructed circa 1920. These pieces include the Upper Labor Acequia Bridge, the Palap Bench, the Palapa Table and the Hollow Tree Bench. Each of these sculptures are showing weather related damage. Previously each of these items were repaired, many in the 1960's and the bridge in 2003 and since each of these elements have experienced cracking and damage. The applicant has proposed to repair each of these sculptures, restoring their original finish and integrity. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-676.

d. There are two restroom structures located along N St Marys which were constructed circa 1920 after the dedication of Otto Koehler Park. Both of these structures are structurally sound, however, do not comply with Texas Accessibility Standards and are in disrepair. Both structures will undergo interior improvements as well as roof replacement to match the existing and minor cosmetic repairs. This is consistent with the UDC.

e. The applicant has noted that landscaping will be improved, however, at this time has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. The applicant should provide this information prior to returning to the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That none of the interior restroom modifications impact the exterior façade or façade elements.
- ii. That the lighting fixtures at the Koehler gates are repaired and retained.
- iii. That no original stone materials are removed; that they are repaired and restored in place.

COMMISSION ACTION:

This case was pulled due to a recusal. The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

RECUSAL: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

10. HDRC NO. 2016-104

Applicant: Ramon Torres/Turn Key Pros

Address: 208 Bushnell

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a second story addition atop an existing one story accessory structure located to the rear of the lot.

FINDINGS:

a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setbacks). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

a. The primary structure located at 208 Bushnell was built circa 1930. Both the primary structure and the accessory structure are on the Sanborn map dated 1935, and the footprints are the same. Additionally, both the primary and accessory structures feature materials of stucco and wood windows.

b. The applicant has proposed to construct a new second story addition on the existing rear single story accessory structure. The footprint of the addition will match that of the existing accessory structure. The existing accessory structure is located at the rear of the property. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i. say to site residential additions at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. The proposed addition to the existing rear accessory structure is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i and v., additions, including porches and balconies, should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass, and the height of a new addition should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. In this case, the height of the new rear accessory structure addition should not be taller than the primary structure. The applicant has not indicated this in the elevations.

d. The existing accessory structure is one story and has a stucco exterior. The second story addition will feature stucco exterior, a clay tile roof and wood windows. The clay tile roof will match the existing roof of the primary structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3A.i., which states that complementary materials should match the type, color and texture and should be compatible with the architectural style of the original structure.

e. The new addition will feature a clay tile roof, wood windows and a stucco exterior. The Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. states to use materials that match in type, style and texture and should be compatible with the architectural style of the original structure. The existing accessory structure has stucco walls, wood windows and a flat roof. The roof of the primary structure features clay tiles and is pitched. The proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings b through e with the stipulation that the height of the new addition not exceed the existing height of the primary structure.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Paula Bondurant, Ernest Parker, Clint Lawson, Bill Baine – all speaking in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to refer case to the DRC to review site plan.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

11. HDRC NO. 2016-059

Applicant: Ruben Carrillo

Address: 938 Dawson St

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval to add approximately 800 square feet to the rear of the house.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval to add an 800 square foot addition at the rear of the primary structure located at 938 Dawson. The addition will feature materials that are complementary to those found on the primary structure, including wood siding, wood windows and an asphalt shingle roof.

b. The applicant received conceptual approval at the HDRC hearing on February 17, 2016, with staff's stipulations that the applicant simplify or lower the ridge height.

c. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that residential additions should be sited at the side or rear of the primary historic structure whenever possible, that views of the addition should be limited from the public right of way and that additions should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block all while featuring a transition between the original structure and the addition. The applicant has proposed to site the addition to the side and rear of the original structure, has limited the amount of the addition that will be viewable from the public right of way and has designed the addition that is appropriate in regards to historic context all while featuring aspects that distinguish it from the original structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

d. In regards to scale, massing and form, residential additions should be designed to be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot and should feature a height that is consistent with the original structure. The applicant has designed the addition in a more modest form regarding detailing and has designed it at 800 square feet.

e. The existing square footage of the living area is approximately 738 square feet. Although the addition would double the square footage of the living area of the primary structure, the lot is approximately 7,160 square feet. This is appropriate with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.

f. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v., the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure; an addition's height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The applicant has proposed an overall height that is in line with the existing ridge height. This is

consistent with the Guidelines.

g. The applicant has proposed an addition that is in keeping with the historic context of the block as well as an addition that incorporates appropriately scaled architectural details. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends final approval based on findings a through g with the stipulation that a vertical trim piece is added on the east and west facades of the addition in order to differentiate between the original structure and the new addition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

12. HDRC NO. 2016-055

Applicant: Stevie Bear/Community REI LLC

Address: 220 Hermine Blvd

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove front deck and rebuild front porch.
2. Demolish walls of the addition and repurpose as an exterior covered deck.
3. Replace existing light fixture with new oil rubbed bronze fixture with a frosted shade.
4. Replace garage door.
5. Replace front door.
6. Relocate 19'-8" x 20' carport and wrap posts in cedar to create square cedar posts.
7. Replace wood windows with vinyl double hung windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The main structure at 220 W Hermine is a mid century house of modest size featuring one front gable and a shed roof over the front porch.
- b. At the front of the primary historic structure there is currently an existing deck. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing non-contributing deck and restore the front porch to its original configuration with three concrete steps and a concrete landing. The applicant is proposing to rewrap the two existing posts in cedar. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original, such as a photograph. The applicant has provided a historic photo exhibiting the original porch. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to demolish three walls of the rear of the house, and repurpose as a 20'-3" x 20'-4" covered deck, with lumber decking, 6 new lumber posts, 6 recessed lights in existing ceiling, and two ceiling fans. The applicant area to be exposed is an addition as there are masonry walls enclosed in the interior.
- d. The applicant has proposed to install a sliding glass door. Staff recommends that the applicant provide product specifications regarding this door.
- e. The applicant is proposing to remove two existing front light fixtures and replace right fixture with similar fixture that has oil rubbed bronze finish and a frosted shade. According to the Guidelines historic light fixtures should be preserved and maintained when possible, and if fixtures must be replaced that they be replaced with fixtures that match the original in appearance and materials, and in same mounting location when in-kind replacement is not feasible. Staff finds the proposed replacement fixtures appropriate.
- f. The existing front door is solid wood painted white, with an existing white storm door. The applicant is proposing to replace the solid front door with a minimal front door with one decorative lite, and removing the storm door. Staff finds the proposed door similar to the historic front door in the 1969 photograph. Staff finds the proposed front doors appropriate for the mid-century style house.

g. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing rotted garage door with a white, minimal door with two window lights. The garage door would not be functioning as the applicant is converting the garage into living space. Staff finds that the proposed door is appropriate architecturally for the primary historic structure.

h. The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing, 19'-8" x 20', non-contributing carport from in front of the garage onto the driveway to side of the east façade as well as wrap the posts in cedar to create square posts. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., new outbuildings should relate to the period of construction to the main structure. Staff finds this placement appropriate. Staff made a site visit February 8, 2016, and found that carports are prominent on the street; however staff finds that a prefabricated carport structure is not appropriate for the historic structure's architecture style or the district. The applicant's proposal to locate the prefabricated carport structure to the side of the primary historic structure is not appropriate.

i. The applicant is proposing to replace 12 wood windows with wood double hung windows. According to the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved unless 50% or more of a window's components must be reconstructed. Staff made a site visit on February 8, 2016, and found that windows in the front are in poor condition, but repairable. Staff recommends the historic windows be repaired.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval for items #1 and #5 based on findings b through g with the stipulation that the applicant provide specifications for the rear door to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff does not recommend approval of items #6 and #7 based on findings h and i. Staff recommends the applicant repair existing windows as noted in finding i.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve items 1-5. Regarding item #7 applicant must use existing windows. Item #6 will be remanded to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2016-086

Applicant: Greg Shue/Open Studio Architecture

Address: 901 E Houston St.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to rehabilitate the primary historic structure at 901 E Houston and construct an addition of two additional stories on top of the two story, primary historic structure as well as a four story addition at the rear (east) of the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed a new overall height of approximately fifty-five (55) feet.

FINDINGS:

a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. The structure located at 901 E Houston also known as the Gillespie Ford and Bimbi Shoes building was constructed circa 1930, is of the Spanish Eclectic style and features exterior materials that include cement and ceramic tile, industrial style metal windows, plaster covered brick, decorative moldings and other façade elements that speak to this structure's former industrial use.

c. On December 18, 2015, Office of Historic Preservation staff processed an application for a Determination of Non-Contributing Status for two rear additions, addressed as 911 and 921 E Houston. Staff found that these two additions did not exhibit the architectural nor structural integrity that the primary structure, 901 E Houston does. Staff found both 911 and 921 E Houston were not contributing structures. A determination of non-contributing status constitutes that both 911 and 921 E Houston are eligible for demolition.

d. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 9, 2016, where committee members had questions regarding the screening of existing and new mechanical equipment, landscaping, potential hotel design branding, signage and materials. Committee members noted that an all stucco façade was not the best approach and that the proposed new façade needed some degree of separation.

- e. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on March 2, 2016, where commissioners expressed concern of the proposed addition's massing, window fenestration, architectural details and the restoration of the primary historic structure. At the hearing, this request was referred to the Design Review Committee.
- f. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 9, 2016, where committee members noted that the original windows should be repaired, that the color of the proposed canopy was reversible, that the updated, reduced signage is much more appropriate, that the proposed window fenestration is improving, that updated color renderings should be provided, that the rear, E Houston façade needs revising, that the windows should contain some type of vertical orientation and that a finish or cap was needed for the building. The committee noted that noted changes had addressed many previous concerns.
- g. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations regarding commercial facades, all character defining features should be preserved. The applicant has proposed to preserve and restore the original façade which fronts E Houston and Star. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.i., however, staff wants to ensure that all decorative tile work, façade molding and distinct ornamental features are preserved.
- h. Regarding windows and doors, the applicant has proposed to generally retain all original window and door Openings. On the street level, the applicant has proposed to return to the original Chicago Style windows shown in the photograph from the 1930's. On the E Houston Street façade (facing southwest) The applicant has proposed to maintain three original door openings as well as four groupings of storefront window openings. At the far right of this facade, the applicant has proposed to create a new door opening in an existing, yet modified window opening. On the Star Street façade the applicant has proposed maintain all window and door openings with the exception of an existing, inset door opening which the applicant has proposed to make flush with the the removal of an existing industrial rolling door which will be filled in. Staff finds that the proposed modifications are minor in nature and will not negatively impact the architectural character of the existing structure. Staff finds these proposed modifications appropriate.
- i. The southeast façade which is currently adjacent to the previously mentioned non-contributing additions features two second story window openings that are currently enclosed. On the first level, the applicant has proposed to create one double door opening and six window openings. On the second level of the southeast façade, the applicant has proposed to create eight window openings, six of which will align with the proposed six first level windows. These window openings will be consistent with the proposed window openings featured in the addition.
- j. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.ii., non-historic facades should be returned to the original design based on photographic evidence. Some non-original facades may have gained historic importance and should be retained. When evidence is not available, ensure the scale, design, materials, color, and texture is compatible with the historic building. Consider the features of the design holistically so as to not include elements from multiple buildings and styles. Staff finds that the creation of new window and door openings on this façade is appropriate due to the lack of architectural elements and ornamentation that are present in the E Houston and Star Street facades and that a non matching size and fenestration pattern is appropriate to distinguish original and non original openings. Staff finds that the applicant should inset the proposed new windows to a depth that is consistent with those of the original façade and provide a detailed wall section noting the depth.
- k. The east façade which faces Elm Street and IH-35 currently features a total of seven window openings. This façade, like the southeast facing façade lacks the architectural ornamentation shown on the two primary facades and is the location of the proposed two level rear addition. A small portion of this east facing façade will not be impacted by the proposed addition; at these locations the applicant has proposed two upper level window openings. Per the provided elevation drawings, two existing windows are located near the location of the proposed windows, however, these windows differ in size and approximate location. The applicant has provided elevations noting the locations of these window openings and their retention. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- l. Along the Star Street façade near the intersection of Star Street and E Houston Street, the applicant has proposed to install a flat canopy to be approximately six inches thick. The applicant has proposed for this canopy to be blue in color and be supported by two sets of cables. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 11.B.ii., the design of new canopies should be based off of the architecture of the historic structure and be proportionate in shape and size to the façade in which it will be attached. The primary structure's façade features horizontally emphasized clean lines of similar thickness that act as horizontal banding which staff finds provides adequate reference for the proposed canopy. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. The primary historic structure's most prominent architectural element is the primary entrance which fronts the intersection of Star Street and E Houston Street. At this entrance, quoins, decorative molding, a decorative parapet

and a tower feature address the corner. Staff finds that each of these previously mentioned façade elements are contributing and should be retained and restored. The applicant has noted that the first and second level façade elements will be restored. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

n. As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed to construct a two level addition on top of the primary historic structure as well as a four level addition on the rear (east facing) façade. According to the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should be located at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize the impact on the original structure from the public right of way, should feature a similar roof pitch, form and orientation as the principle structure, be subordinate to the principal façade of the historic structure and feature transitions between old and new. Generally, the applicant has proposed an addition that is consistent with the Guidelines.

o. The applicant has proposed for the two story addition atop the primary historic structure to feature significant setbacks from the existing parapet wall of the primary historic structure, has proposed for the four story addition at the rear of the primary structure to feature significant setbacks and has proposed floor heights that are comparable to those of the historic structure. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.B.

p. The primary historic façade features a unique footprint that presents the primary entrance at the point at which E Houston Street and Star Street meet. This narrow façade portion features detailed ornamentation, an ornamental parapet and a small tower. The applicant has proposed to incorporate similarly proportioned façade elements to relate the addition's west-most facing façade plane with that of the existing, original structure's entrance. Staff finds this appropriate.

q. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., materials that match in type, color and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure should be used whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. The applicant has proposed materials primarily consisting of stucco, metal siding and aluminum windows. Staff finds that with the original structure's industrial use, the use of metal siding throughout the facades of the addition is appropriate. Given the plaster façade of the original structure, the use of stucco, a like material is consistent, however, staff finds that the applicant should match the texture and color of the original plaster as closely as possible.

r. Additions should be designed in a manner which reflects their time, however, respects the historic context of the structure and incorporates character defining features. One prominent character defining feature of this structure is the primary entrance and the intersection of E Houston Street and Starr Street. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to address this façade plane and incorporate architectural elements that feature contemporary interpretations of the original structure's primary entrance as mentioned in findings p.

s. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature similarly proportioned Chicago Style windows as those found on the primary historic structure's street level. Where a break in window fenestration patterns occurs, the applicant has proposed to incorporate façade grills, as used on the historic structure's façade to accomplish façade rhythm. Staff finds the implementation of similarly scaled and designed window openings as well as the implementation of similar grills appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

t. In addition to the applicant's proposed window fenestration, staff recommends the applicant install windows that feature depth where the window pane is not flush with the wall plane of the addition.

u. Facing east toward Elm Street and IH-37, the applicant has proposed a more contemporary approach to the addition's façade arrangement. This façade is to feature a first level façade consisting solely of metal panels, a second level façade consisting of dark gray stucco and facades of window openings, lighter gray stucco and metal panels for the third and fourth levels. On the southeast side of the rear façade, the applicant has proposed to place signage. Staff finds that the proposed materials and signage placement are appropriate, however, staff finds that the applicant should continue explore ways to introduce additional façade separation and fenestration to the rear façade.

v. At the ground level fronting the public right of way at E Houston and Elm, the applicant has proposed to construct a fence featuring fence panels of metal and brick to be approximately six feet in height which is to enclose an outdoor landscaped area which will include a swimming pool. To the immediate south of the fence and the immediate north of the public right of way at E Houston, the applicant has proposed to install a monument sign. Staff finds the location of the proposed fence, its materials and the proposed location of the monument sign that the applicant should provide specifics to both signage and landscaping. Staff recommends the applicant fully develop a signage plan as well as a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.

w. ARCHAEOLOGY-The Acequia Madre or Alamo Acequia, a City of San Antonio Local Landmark, traverses the project area. In addition, the property is within the battlefield area of the Battle of the Alamo. Therefore,

archaeological investigations are required. The applicant must coordinate the archaeology scope of work with the OHP prior to the commencement of construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the applicant's general proposal to rehabilitate the primary historic structure as well as the proposed massing and materials of the proposed addition based on findings a through w with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant inset the proposed new windows on the primary historic structure to a depth that is consistent with those of the original façade and provide staff with a detailed wall section noting the depth as noted in finding h.
- ii. That the applicant match the texture and color of the proposed stucco to the original plaster as closely as possible as noted in finding o.
- iii. That the applicant install windows that are inset two to three inches from the façade's exterior wall plane and are accompanied by the proposed metal panels, also to be inset as noted in finding r.
- iv. That the applicant provide a detailed signage plan as well as a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.
- v. Archaeological investigations are required.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

James Pianta, spoke in support and with suggestions.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Salmon to approve conceptual approval with staff stipulations and that applicant continue working with staff regarding the depth of windows.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2016-101

Applicant: Scott Thompson/Powers Brown Architecture

Address: 101 & 123 Lexington

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a mixed use tower on the San Antonio Riverwalk at the intersection of N St Mary's and Lexington to be approximately 275 feet in height. The applicant has noted that the proposed tower will include luxury hotel facilities, onsite parking, commercial space, sixty-one residential units and a sky-bar on the nineteenth floor.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a mixed use tower on the San Antonio Riverwalk at the intersection of N St Mary's and Lexington to be approximately 275 feet in height. The applicant has noted that the proposed tower will include luxury hotel facilities, onsite parking, commercial space, sixty-one residential units and a sky-bar on the nineteenth floor. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 8, 2015, where committee members noted that the tower's orientation was an appropriate response to the river, that the details of the parking garage needed more attention, that massing was approaching the correct scale, that an appropriate and unique top was needed, that the lack of punched windows was appropriate, that the proposed street wall needed to be addressed, that the loading dock was appropriately placed and that the installation of street trees is appropriate.
- b. This request was heard a second time by the Design Review Committee on Wednesday, March 8, 2016, where committee members had questions regarding parking access, public access areas and the proposed zinc garage cladding. Additionally, committee members noted that the proposed garage levels are problematic with their current lack of façade separation and fenestration and that the proposed design had progressed to a form with appropriate massing.
- c. Per the UDC Section 35-672(a), pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. Additionally, the various functions and spaces on a site must be linked with sidewalks in a coordinated system. The applicant has proposed a footprint that covers the entire site, however, the applicant has noted proposed connections to existing sidewalks on the river facing, Lexington and N St Mary's sides of the site. This is consistent with the UDC.

d. Given the location of this tower being bounded by N St Mary's to the north, Lexington to the east and the San Antonio River to the south, many focal points will be created with its construction. According to the UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), properties that appear to be the terminus at the end of the street or at a prominent curve in the river shall incorporate into their design an architectural feature that will provide a focal point at the end of the view. The applicant has proposed two glass curtain wall systems forming a cylinder that are to be located on the tower's façade at the corner of N St Mary's and Lexington as well as on the corner of the tower that faces south, toward the Riverwalk. Staff finds both of these proposals appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. At this time the applicant has not provided a solar study; this must be provided to staff prior to any approvals. Given its location north of the San Antonio River, a solar study is not likely to impact height at this location.

f. According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has proposed located primary entrances along Lexington with architectural features such as overhangs and canopies, curtain wall systems and other architectural elements to distinguish entrances, however, staff finds that the overall lack of façade separation and fenestration along Lexington as well as the proposed rear black wall featuring approximately eighty feet of height do not contribute to the pedestrian characteristics of the Riverwalk nor animate the street scene, build pedestrian scaled street walls, nor define active street edges. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant address the overall lack of a human scale and fenestration at the pedestrian level as well as the levels immediate to the street wall.

g. Currently, the site is used for surface parking and is relatively void of any landscaping materials. The applicant has provided a detailed landscaping plan noting the removal of two Crape Myrtles along Lexington and a small fan palm at the top of the river bank. Additionally, the applicant has noted per the provided landscaping plan the retention of other trees on the site, the relocation of an existing palm tree at the top of the riverbank and the installation of other landscaping materials throughout the site. This is consistent with UDC Section 35-673(f).

h. The applicant has proposed an outdoor patio seating area to be located above the Riverwalk level within the existing wall at the Riverwalk level. The applicant has proposed to connect to the existing staircase connecting the Riverwalk with Lexington Avenue above. For this connection as well as the proposed outdoor seating areas, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(g) in regards to paving materials. Additionally, the applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(i) in regards to street furnishings.

i. Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. While a detailed lighting design has not been proposed at this time, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to lighting.

j. The UDC Section 35-673(l)(3)(A) addresses access to the public pathway along the river. There is an existing pedestrian staircase leading from the Riverwalk level to the street level above at Lexington Avenue. The applicant has proposed to connect pedestrian paths from within the site to those currently existing at the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.

k. The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section.

l. According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a "human scale". To comply with this, an building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river.

m. At the street and above garage levels which fronting Lexington and N St Mary's, the applicant has proposed the primary façade material of zinc panel, primarily to screen the proposed parking podium from view. Staff finds this material appropriate, however, the applicant's proposed façade composition at these levels, up to a height of approximately sixty feet creates a blank wall along Lexington lacking a human scale and depth. This is not consistent with the UDC. Additionally, staff finds that a formless wall spanning an entire block adjacent to the San Antonio Riverwalk does not promote a pedestrian atmosphere nor complement the character of the San Antonio Riverwalk. Staff recommends the applicant introduce additional façade elements throughout the garage cladding to promote a human scale, similarly to what has been proposed from level five through the roof level.

n. According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. While the current proposal is taller than fifty (50) percent of the other facades along the block face, staff finds that there are other buildings of similar height in the area, particularly at the corner of McCullough and N St Mary's, at the intersection of the San Antonio River and Avenue A and at the intersection of N St Mary's and Convent. At this time the applicant has not provided staff with a solar study. A solar study is mandatory per the UDC in regards to determining an appropriate height, however, given its location north of the San Antonio River, a solar study is not likely to impact height at this location.

o. In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant has proposed materials to include an aluminum composite material, spandrel glazing, vision glazing, zinc panels, limestone and thermocromex limestone high performance cladding. The use of these materials are consistent with the UDC.

p. According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. The applicant has proposed for both glass cylinders to terminate at the roof, has proposed a change in materials and has proposed a modified massing at the roof level which includes a slanted portion clad in aluminum panels. This is consistent with the UDC.

q. Regarding façade composition, specifically window fenestration, the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) states that windows shall be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them and shall be used in hierarchy to emphasize their importance on the façade. The applicant has proposed recessed balconies as well as façade openings that correspond the interior spaces of each level; larger openings are featured in the residential spaces while smaller openings are featured in hotel spaces. The applicant is responsible for inseting each window at least two inches within solid walls.

r. The south elevation as noted by the applicant is adjacent to an existing structure. The applicant has noted the roof line of the neighboring structure to be approximately fifty feet in height. The applicant has proposed a blank wall to rise approximately eighty-four feet in height; to the sixth level. While this space may not be used in a similar manner as the hotel and residential space, staff finds that the addition of window fenestration or a façade element that adds depth and separation is appropriate. Additionally, staff finds the same application should be applied to the corner of the structure that meets N St Mary's; the west elevation as the applicant has noted.

s. The applicant has proposed structured parking to be clad in a zinc cladding. Staff finds the applicant should provide additional information regarding screening materials, their application and façade lighting in addition to information regarding automobile traffic entering and existing the garage and its impacts on pedestrian traffic.

t. ARCHAEOLOGY- The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District and is along the San Antonio River. In Addition, the project area is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological site 41BX1818, a desague of the Upper Labor Acequia, and a military redoubt. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The applicant should coordinate the archaeology scope of work with the OHP prior to the commencement of construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That the applicant provide additional information regarding site furnishings, their placement and materials.
- ii. That the applicant provide additional information regarding architectural and site lighting.
- iii. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the screening of any mechanical equipment.
- iv. That the applicant provide a solar study including both the summer and winter solstice.
- v. That the applicant provide wall sections noting the depth at which each window will be inset.
- vi. That the applicant introduce window fenestration and façade elements to separate the façade and add depth on the noted north and west elevations on the parking garage levels.
- vii. That the applicant provide additional façade separation and fenestration patterns that will promote pedestrian traffic and activate Lexington Avenue throughout the length of the site.
- viii. That the applicant provide additional information on the impact that traffic will have on pedestrian traffic.
- ix. That the applicant provide additional information on the proposed metal screening that is to screen the parking garage elevations.
- x. An archaeological investigation is required.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2016-020

Applicant: KHI, Inc

Address: 139,141,143,145,147,149,151 Commerce St. & 106 Riverwalk

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the structures addressed as 139 and 141 E Commerce. These structures are individually designated historic landmarks, however, they do not feature a common name.
2. Construct a mixed use tower to span from the 139 to 151 E Commerce that is to feature a total of ten levels including one level at the Riverwalk level. The applicant has proposed for the tower to include river level, street level and second level commercial space as well as seven levels of residential space.

FINDINGS:

General findings:

- a. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 5, 2016, where committee members expressed concern over the existing stone walls that hold historic characteristics, asked questions regarding parking, the introduction of pedestrian traffic from E Commerce to the Riverwalk through the site, the connection of new paving materials to existing Hugman materials, how the existing Witte Building's façade might be translated into that of the new construction and noted that overall the proposal was attractive.
- b. UDC Section 35-680 refers to the demolition of historic features along the Riverwalk as well those throughout the River Improvement Overlay. This section specifically notes that the demolition of architectural features, artwork, furniture and other items that are products of Robert Hugman, the WPA, CCC, National Youth Administration and those dating back to the Spanish Colonial times constitutes an irreplaceable loss. The following findings specifically relate to architectural and landscaping features that fall within the previously mentioned eras.
- c. The structures at 143 through 151 E Commerce as well as 106 Riverwalk are zoned Downtown and are located in the River Improvement Overlay. Like 139 and 141 E Commerce, these structures have lost their architectural integrity on their E Commerce facades with the installation of contemporary storefront systems, however, there are significant elements that remain on the Riverwalk façade including stone walls that staff finds are architecturally significant that the applicant should salvage and attempt the use throughout the new design.
- d. In addition to the existing stone walls, there is an existing fig tree that is growing from within the lower exterior stone wall at 145 E Commerce. The UDC Section 35-680(a) specifically states that the removal of or damage to heritage trees at the top of the river bank or along the Riverwalk is prohibited except where the tree is damaged due to disease, age or physical condition and must be removed. The HDRC may grant approval of the removal of the tree with a recommendation from the city arborist. In addition to a recommendation from the city arborist, the HDRC may take into consideration unusual or compelling circumstances. Staff finds this instance, the heritage tree growing from within the stone wall at 145 E Commerce an unusual circumstance that warrants demolition given that any modifications to the wall itself would negatively impact the tree.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The structure at 139 and 141 E Commerce is zoned Historic Significant and are located within the River Improvement Overlay – 3; this structure features no common name. Originally, 139 and 141 E Commerce featured architecturally ornate and significant facades, similar to those featured on other prominent structures on E Commerce including the Dwyer and Witte Buildings, however, similarly to other structures on this block, the original architectural features were removed in the 1950's and 1960's for a more contemporary commercial storefront system.
- 1b. At the Riverwalk level, 139 and 141 E Commerce feature a wall of approximately five feet in height that has been determined to predate the Hugman features of the Riverwalk. A pre Hugman era photograph notes an existing stone foundation, potentially incorporated into the stone wall currently at the site.
- 1c. The loss of a historic landmark constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio.

Demolition of any contributing buildings 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 must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant 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 that without the demolition of 139 and 141 E Commerce, the owner would not be able to develop an economically viable project at this location. The applicant has noted that multiple attempts to adapt the property while maintaining the existing structures were determined to be non-feasible due to existing structural conditions and limitations. A June 2014 summary of the fair market value of the structures and property at 139 through 151 E Commerce and 106 Riverwalk was determined to be \$3,290,000. In 2014, the total assessed value was \$1,400,060. The applicant has provided an income and expense statement for both 2014 and 2015 for each of the properties in the request, including 139 and 141 E Commerce. Income for 139 and 141 in 2014 and 2015 totaled \$27,564. It should be noted that 141 E Commerce was vacant during both years. Total income for 139 through 151 E Commerce and 106 Riverwalk totaled \$183,578.40 in 2014 and 178,418.40 in 2015. Net income after taxes and expenses was \$54,848.78 in 2015 and minus \$11,720.25 in 2015.]

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;

[The applicant has noted that each both 139 and 141 in addition to the other addressed structures have fallen into disrepair and are in need of renovation to maintain their integrity and value with consideration to increased assessed values and property taxes. On February 12, 2012, the restoration of the river level façade as well as other modifications to create a new restaurant space was conceptually approved by the Historic and Design Review, however, the applicant found that the expense to execute the design could not produce a reasonable return on the investment. The applicant has noted that other studies to determine an alternative use for the property which would maintain the existing structures were found to be non-feasible.]

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.

[The applicant has not actively marketed the site to potential purchasers, however, as previously noted alternative proposals that would have adaptively reused the existing structures have been studied and proposed. Additionally, the applicant has noted that a loss of structural and architectural integrity has occurred and that superficial maintenance modifications have occurred to the rear facades which includes measures to prevent the façade from collapsing, the removal of original foundation materials, the removal of original brick and stone work, the removal of many original windows and doors as well as the creation of a new stucco façade covering much of not only 139 and 141 E Commerce, but the other addresses as well.]

1d. Staff finds that the applicant has provided information which supports a legitimate claim for an economic hardship based on Criterion A, B and C. While there is little to no architectural significance on the E Commerce façade of 139 through 151 E Commerce, there are significant irreplaceable elements, notably the existing stone wall that is a remnant of a previous porch as well as a significant, historic tree. Staff finds that the applicant should make every effort to preserve the existing stone elements that should either be retained in place, reconstructed in place or used throughout the new construction in a manner in which they are presented as part of the fabric of the Riverwalk as they are now. Staff finds that the applicant should provide information prior to returning to the HDRC that outlines the plan for the retention of the existing stone wall, either in place as it is now, or in a new location as previously noted.

1e. If the HDRC finds that the claim for an economic hardship has been thoroughly substantiated in the application and at the public hearing and that the conditions of UDC 35-614 which would warrant demolition apply, a recommendation for approval of the request for demolition will not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A 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.

1f. In regards to the documentation of the demolition of any historic landmark, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-614 prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Findings related to request item #3:

2a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

2b. The applicant has proposed commercial space, outdoor and patio seating space and a pedestrian route leading from the street level at E Commerce Street to the Riverwalk level below. The proposal is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(a)(2) in regards to pedestrian circulation and linking the various functions and spaces on a site with sidewalks in a coordinated system. UDC Section 25-672(a)(5) addresses pedestrian access along the Riverwalk pathway and how it shall not be blocked by queuing, hostess stations and tables and chairs. The applicant has noted that pedestrian access at the Riverwalk level will not be obstructed.

2c. According to the UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), properties that appear to be the terminus at the end of the street or at a prominent curve in the river shall incorporate into their design an architectural feature that will provide a focal point at the end of the view. Given the unique location of this property immediately adjacent to the flood gate, near the intersection of E Commerce and the flood channel as well as being near the reconnection of the San Antonio River with the flood channel, various focal points exists. The applicant has proposed many architectural features which comply with this section of the UDC including variations in materials, the change in axis orientation from the base throughout the tower and alternating façade depths.

2d. The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study noting the proposed development's shadow on the San Antonio River for both the summer and winter solstices, however, the Drury Plaza Hotel at 154 E Commerce casts an existing shadow that entirely covers the site during the winter solstice. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC.

2e. According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. As previously noted, the applicant has created an open air pedestrian route through the site provided access to and from the Riverwalk level and the street level at E Commerce. Staff finds that in addition to the proposed outdoor commercial, dining and patio space, the applicant's proposed pedestrian access route as well as its proposed materials are consistent with the UDC.

2f. Per the UDC Section 35-673(e) regarding landscape design, a variety in landscape design must be provided with no more than seventy-five (75) percent of the landscape materials, including plants being the same as those on adjacent properties. Additionally, according to the UDC Section 35-674(f), indigenous, non invasive plant species and tropical plant species are permitted. The applicant is responsible for complying with these sections of the UDC as well as providing a landscaping plan noting all landscaping materials that are to be installed.

2g. The applicant has proposed to create a dining and outdoor patio area the Riverwalk level where materials are to include concrete, stone and patio furniture. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(g) and (i).

2h. Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. Staff finds that the applicant should include site lighting information within a detailed landscaping plan.

2i. The UDC Section 35-673(l)(3)(A) addresses access to the public pathway along the river. The applicant has proposed to include dining areas at the Riverwalk level, therefore a clearly defined from the site onto the public right of way must be included into the design with either an architectural or landscape element. The applicant has proposed a change in materials that designate the public pathway along the river from the pedestrian and patio area of the site. This is consistent with the UDC.

2j. The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

2k. According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a "human scale". To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed many human scaled elements at the river and street levels including human scaled proportions for materials and human scaled façade elements and openings, aligned the front façade with the facades of existing structures on E Commerce, created horizontal façade elements that separate levels and has divided the façade to represent the various sections of internal

uses.

2l. While the applicant has oriented the proposed structure's wide side to be prominent to the Riverwalk, the amount of solar access to the river will not be negatively impacted by the proposed structure's width. Staff finds this orientation appropriate, however, staff has concerns regarding the creation of a deep canyon effect on at the Riverwalk level. Staff finds potential building setbacks that increase with the structure's height may be appropriate.

2m. According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. This structure is in immediate proximity of structures that feature significant height, primarily, the Drury Plaza Hotel. Staff finds the applicant's proposed height of approximately 120 feet appropriate.

2n. In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. However according to 35-674(2)(B), glass curtain wall panels are allowed in RIO-3 as long as the river and street levels comply with 35-674(d)(1). The applicant has proposed for each façade to feature a cementitious wall panel, stone, board formed concrete, glass windows and a glass curtain wall system and has proposed for the river level façade and E Commerce street façade to feature primarily all cementitious elements. The upper levels of the tower, those used for residential units will predominantly feature a glass curtain wall system.

2o. According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed modulating features throughout both the Riverwalk façade and E Commerce façade, however, the applicant has proposed facades with limited fenestration or depth for the east and west facades. Additionally, the applicant has inset the curtain wall systems of the Riverwalk facing façade to create an inset roof feature to serve as a terminus for that facade, however, the applicant has not provided a cap feature for the other facades.

2p. As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed east and west facades that lack the level of proposed depth that the north and south facades possess. On the southeast corner of the structure, the applicant has proposed to locate an automated parking system. The applicant has proposed to clad this parking space with a metal screen. To the north of the proposed metal screen, the applicant has proposed a glass curtain wall system and eventually a portion of the east facing façade that features six window openings. Staff finds that the applicant should explore increasing the size of these openings or additional depth to further relate this façade to the Riverwalk and E Commerce façades.

2q. Similar to the east facing façade, the applicant has proposed for the west façade to lack little depth and feature seven window openings. Staff finds the applicant should explore the addition of more window openings and façade elements to this façade to further relate it to the Riverwalk and E Commerce façades.

2r. The applicant has proposed to create a curb cut on E Commerce to facilitate vehicular access to the proposed automated parking system. Given the confines of the site, the only possible access point is from Commerce. In general, vehicle access across downtown sidewalks should be avoided and staff recommends that the applicant pursue alternatives to onsite parking such as leased parking opportunities nearby. If parking is approved on-site, staff finds the proposed curb cut may be appropriate, however the applicant must take multiple steps to minimize any impact to pedestrian access at the public right of way. Staff finds that the applicant should provide information on the anticipated volume of vehicular traffic accessing the site as well as diagrams addressing proposed steps to mitigate the queuing of automobiles that may impede on the public right of way. Additionally, coordination with and approval by Transportation and Capital Improvements is required to ensure the traffic flow on Commerce is not impeded.

2s. Archaeology - The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District, is adjacent to the San Antonio River, and is within the Spanish Colonial Potrero area. In addition, the project area is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological site 41BX483 and 41BX984. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The applicant should coordinate the archaeology scope of work with the OHP prior to the commencement of construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through 2r with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant provide information prior to returning to the HDRC that outlines the plan for the retention of the existing stone wall, either in place as it is now, or in a new location as noted in finding 1d.

- ii. That the applicant provide landscaping plan noting all landscaping materials and site lighting as noted in findings 2f and 2h.
- iii. That the applicant produce information and massing diagrams regarding additional setbacks that will both reduce the dominating effect that the tower will have on the Riverwalk level below as well as produce a building cap as noted in findings 2l and 2o.
- iv. That the applicant produce information regarding the screening of mechanical and service equipment as noted in finding 2j.
- v. That the applicant address the lack of façade depth and fenestration as noted in findings 2p and 2q.
- vi. That the applicant explore alternatives to on-site parking such as leased parking and provide additional information regarding the anticipated vehicular traffic volume accessing the site, ways to mitigate the interruption of pedestrian traffic by vehicular traffic entering the site and that the applicant coordinate with Transportation and Capital Improvements prior to receiving an approval from the HDRC to ensure that traffic on Commerce is not impeded by the parking access.
- vii. An archaeological investigation is required.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Susan Beavin, Chris Hill, and Patrick Shearer spoke in support and with suggestions.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

RECUSAL: Guarino,

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2016-105

Applicant: Ray Garza

Address: 328 W. Elsmere Place

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing six foot tall wooden privacy fence with a new wood privacy fence that is to be eight feet in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 328 W Elsmere currently features a side yard and rear yard wooden privacy fence that is six (6) feet tall. This fence does not project in front of the primary façade. Side and rear yard fences are found historically through the Monte Vista Historic District and are features on many of the properties in the vicinity of 328 W Elsmere Place. These fences are predominantly constructed of wood and wrought iron elements and are a maximum of six feet in height.
- b. The applicant has proposed in the narrative to replace the existing side and rear yard wood privacy fence that is six feet in height with a new wood privacy fence that is to be eight feet in height. According to the UDC Section 35-514, the maximum permitted height of a side and rear yard fence for a property zoned for a single family residential structure is six feet in height. Additionally, the Guidelines for Site Elements states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. The proposed materials and placement are consistent with the Guidelines; however, the proposed height of eight (8) feet is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements or the UDC.
- c. UDC Section 35-514, the maximum permitted height of a solid, front yard fence for a property zoned for a single family residential structure is three feet in height. Additionally, the Guidelines for Site Elements states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. The applicant has indicated on the site plan that the new fence would extend along the side property line to the front property line. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial based on findings a and b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Grube to deny applicants request

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

17. HDRC NO. 2016-102

Applicant: Brightstar Development LLC

Address: 610 Dawson

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, two story units on the vacant lot at 610 Dawson.

FINDINGS:

- a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setbacks). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- b. The applicant has proposed to construct two, two story single family homes on the property located at 610 Dawson. The property has been re-platted into two separate lots with one fronting Dawson and the second fronting the rear alley.
- c. The applicant has provided staff with floor plans and elevation drawings for one proposed residence at 610 Dawson. The applicant is responsible for submitting floor plans and elevation drawings for both proposed structures prior to receiving final approval.
- d. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately 20 feet from Dawson, consistent with the existing, historic structures on the block. Staff concurs that the proposed setback appears consistent but documentation must be provided at final of adjacent setbacks. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- e. The Guidelines for New Construction state that primary building entrances, porches and landings should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the primary entrance of the house that fronts Dawson to be oriented toward Dawson. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i.
- f. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. This particular section of Dignowity Hill features a variety of homes that are single and two stories. The applicant has proposed for both new structures to be two stories and approximately eighteen (18) feet in height. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. Foundation heights of new construction should be within one foot of floor to floor heights of the historic adjacent structures. The applicant has illustrated a foundation height on the elevations; however the exact measurement is not indicated. Staff finds that the applicant's foundation height is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., and recommends that the applicant provide additional information regarding the exact foundation heights prior to receiving final approval.
- h. New construction in historic districts should include a similar roof form to those found historically throughout the district. The housing stock on this block of Dawson features a combination of hipped and gabled roofs. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to include a hipped roof. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. states that window and door openings of new construction should feature a similar proportion to those of historic structures found throughout the district. Both structures feature double-hung windows, side by side on the front and west elevations and double-hung windows on the east façade. However, the drawings show windows of various proportions throughout and must be clarified for final approval. Window proportions must be consistent throughout. Staff finds that generally the applicant has presented window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines; however, the applicant should provide information regarding all window sizes and materials.
- j. The south elevation of the structure closest to Dawson is void of any fenestration. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., incorporate window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. The lack of fenestration on some facades is not appropriate and is not consistent

with the Guidelines. This elevation should be revised prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

k. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of wood and Hardi Board siding, wood windows and composition shingles. These materials are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.

l. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.D.i., new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

m. A single car garage will be constructed on each lot and will be located at the rear of the house that is closest to Dawson Street. Each garage will feature Hardi siding, exposed rafters, an asphalt shingle roof and an overhead garage door. New garages should feature complementary materials that relate to the period of construction of the principal structure. The principal structure features Hardi board siding and an asphalt shingle roof. The proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii.

n. New garages should match the predominant orientation found along the block. The proposed rear orientation of both garages is consistent with the orientation in the Dignowity Hill historic district and is also consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.i.

o. The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan at this time; however it has been noted on the site plan that several trees and shrubs will be located

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That fenestration is added on the elevations that are void.
- ii. That the window proportions are consistent throughout both structures.
- iii. That the foundation heights of both proposed structures are modified to be consistent with the character of the block.
- iv. Plans for all facades of all structures being proposed are submitted.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman for conceptual approval with staff stipulations that the applicant review the design of the garage and return to staff with the alternate for a carport.

AYES: Guarino, Salmon, Connor, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2016-095

Applicant: David Whitworth

Address: 415 Mary Louise

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to increase the footprint and height of an existing non-historic carport. The new carport will be 22'x25' with a 15' ridge height.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant demolished the existing carport and began to construct a carport prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

b. The applicant constructed a new carport where one previously existed. The previous carport was not original to the property per the 1944 Sanborn. According to the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations 9.A., existing historic outbuildings should be preserved and repaired. Because the carport is not historic, staff finds the proposal to remove the pre-existing carport and build a new one consistent with the guidelines.

c. The primary structure is a two-story stone, Spanish eclectic with minimal detailing and ornamentation with a green asphalt roof and a second story front balcony. There is an existing accessory structure at the rear of the lot, with white shingle siding, a front gable with a 13' ridge, and green asphalt roof shingles; only the garage portion of the accessory structure is found on the 1944 Sanborn.

d. The previous carport had a flat roof, and was 18' x 17' x 8' and located at the end of the existing driveway, with a 5' side setback.

e. The applicant is proposing to rebuild the carport in the location of the previous carport with the same access. Staff made a site visit on March 5, 2016, and found that rear garages and carports along the block. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B, which recommends new outbuildings match predominant garage and carport orientations.

f. The applicant is proposing a carport with a front gable roof with green asphalt shingles, white hardi plank siding on the front gable, and 10' metal posts. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A., complementary and similar materials should be used; hardie board may be appropriate for new construction in some locations as long as new materials are visually similar to the traditional material in dimension finish, and texture. Staff finds the materials consistent with the guidelines.

g. The applicant is proposing to build a new carport that is not attached to the garage. The new carport is 22' x 25', 550 square feet, has a front gable roof with a 15' ridge height and a 10' clearance to accommodate a new vehicle. The side setback remains at 5 feet. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40% of the principal historic structure's foot print, and should be visibly subordinate to historic structures. In regards to height and massing, staff finds the proposed carport 15' ridge height overwhelms the historic garage. This is inconsistent with the guidelines. Staff recommends that the applicant consider a flat roof which would be transparent from the public right-of-way and relate to the historic garage.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to postpone this case due to the absence of the applicant

AYES: Guarino, Salmon, Connor, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2016-108

Applicant: Andrew Goodman/Feast

Address: 1024 S Alamo St.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an addition and perform minor site modifications to the property at 1024 S Alamo. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following

1. Enclose an existing, open air porch.
2. Construct a 420 square foot addition on the northeast side of the historic structure
3. Expand the existing brick paved area.
4. Install a steel framed structure to run the length of the brick paved area fronting S Alamo.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 1024 S Alamo is commonly known as the Horn House, features a front, street facing addition of the Art Modern style that was constructed circa 1950 and features many contemporary façade elements including aluminum storefront windows. The items of this request for Certificate of Appropriateness have been previously constructed.

b. According to the Guidelines for Additions, commercial additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should be placed at the side or rear of the primary historic structure, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the principle façade and should feature a transition from the original structure to the new structure. The applicant has proposed to construct an addition of approximately 420 square feet to the side of the primary historic structure that is to be subordinate in massing to the original structure, feature a sloped roof which includes elements of the existing Art Modern addition as well as nearby historic roof structures and feature a transition from the existing structures to the proposed addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The applicant has proposed materials that are to include horizontal lap siding, vinyl windows, a standing seam metal roof and doors featuring a composite material. The applicant's proposed materials of lap siding and a standing seam metal roof are appropriate, however, staff finds that aluminum windows and doors or those constructed of a metal material would be more appropriate than the proposed vinyl windows and doors.

d. Architecturally, the applicant has proposed for the addition as well as the side enclosure to feature architectural elements that are complimentary and subordinate those of the existing structures. These elements include like materials and similarly proportioned façade elements. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The applicant has proposed to modify the existing landscaping and hardscaping in order to accommodate additional outdoor seating as well as construct a steel structure run the length of the brick paved area fronting S Alamo to be eight feet in height and eighty feet in length. Staff finds the proposed modifications appropriate, however, staff finds the addition of plant materials would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install aluminum or metal windows into the side addition to match those of the primary addition constructed circa 1950.
- ii. That the applicant install additional landscaping plant materials throughout the site. These plants should be native to South Texas.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to postpone this case due to the absence of the applicant

AYES: Guarino, Salmon, Connor, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2015-068

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 500 N Zarzamora/ Basila Frocks

WITHDRAWN:

Applicant withdrew until the next HDRC meeting.

21. HDRC NO. 2016-109

Applicant: VIA Metropolitan Transit

Address: Various Locations

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to place 4 prototypes of the Next Gen Shelters at various existing bus stop locations throughout the VIA system. There are no specific locations for installation requested at this time.

FINDINGS:

a. Consistent with UDC Section 35-640(b), a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be required for actions affecting the public right-of-way where the design of the proposed construction exceeds typical City standards. A Certificate of Appropriateness shall also be required for all actions located within a historic district. The prototype of the Next Gen Bus shelter modular design received HDRC approval on February 15, 2012. Following a public comment period, VIA requested approval to install Next Gen shelters at 38 locations in the downtown area. The HDRC approved these initial locations on October 2, 2013.

b. Subsequent installations of the previously-approved prototype have been approved administratively by staff. In some instances, a shelter installation has been referred to the HDRC for review and approval. For example, a proposed shelter at Pedro Huizar Park was referred to the HDRC due to the neighborhood association's preference for the traditional shelter design.

c. The current request is for approval for four final configurations of the Next Gen prototype. If approved, a Certificate of Appropriateness will be required for each future installation of the approved shelter designs in accordance with the Unified Development Code. OHP staff will continue to review future installation requests for administrative approval on a case-by-case basis and will reserve the right to refer a specific installation to the HDRC should there be concerns about the proposed location and its potential impact to a historic district or historic feature in the right-of-way.

d. The flexibility of the proposed shelters makes them very functional for locations within the urban core where sidewalk widths and available open space vary greatly. The installation of these shelters will create more uniformity among VIA stops, helping to reduce the amount of visual clutter in the urban core, consistent with the UDC Section 35-646(a).

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on these findings. The applicant is responsible for submitting future requests for installations at specific locations to staff for review and issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

This was just an informational briefing for the Commission and therefore there were no motions made.

Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 2, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve March 2, 2016 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair