

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
March 2, 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, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube**

**ABSENT: Cone, Rodriguez, Salas, Salmon**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
  - SApreservation 5K- Lions Field- March 5-8AM
  - 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
- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2016-076  | 302 Leigh St       |
| 2. Case No. 2016-072  | 314 Callaghan Ave  |
| 3. Case No. 2016-066  | 925 S St. Marys    |
| 4. Case No. 2016-079  | 1438 Napier Ave    |
| 5. Case No. 2016-069  | Alazan Creek       |
| 6. Case No. 2016-073  | 203 McDonald       |
| 7. Case No. 2016-074  | 123 Losoya St.     |
| 8. Case No. 2016-078  | 332 Adams St       |
| 9. Case No. 2016-082  | 822 N Pine St      |
| 10. Case No. 2016-089 | 1170 E Commerce St |
| 11. Case No. 2016-088 | 401 E Locust       |
| 12. Case No. 2016-091 | 103 W Agarita      |

**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, Brittain, Feldman, Lazarine, Laffoon, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**2. HDRC NO. 2016-067**

Applicant: Roland De La Garza

Address: 100 Montana

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to expand the concourse to the east and west and to expand the field level to the north.

The proposed additions will feature:

1. Preassembled metal rain screen and masonry burnished block system
2. Curtain wall and glazing system
3. Vertical fabric sun shading panels and supports (on west addition only)
4. Prefinished metal louvers
5. Aluminum and glass railings at the terrace with a raised paver system
6. Single-ply TPO roofing membrane
7. Small terrace adjacent to the new mechanical mezzanines at all quadrants

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant received conceptual approval on July 1, 2015; the HDRC approved as submitted with no stipulations.
- b. The DRC reviewed the case on June 9, 2015. The design was supported by the committee. Concern was mentioned over the proposed accent color.
- c. Consistent with the UDC Section 35-642 b, the proposed additions are in scale with the existing structure. The height and massing are appropriate for the building. The proposed design, style and materials are compatible with the building's existing design condition.
- d. Consistent with the UDC Section 35-642 b, the proposed materials are suitable for the style building. The metal wall panels, curtain walls, trellis, and glass railing are compatible with the existing building.
- e. Consistent with the UDC Section 35-642 a, the proposed additions respond to the urban character and program of the structure.
- f. **ARCHAEOLOGY-** The project area is either within or in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX928, 41BX955, 41BX892, 41BX927, 41BX885, and 41BX930. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. This is public property and will require coordination with the Texas Historical Commission.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e with the stipulation that the proposed cisterns are not screened.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulation that complete landscape plan be provided by next hearing.

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

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**5. HDRC NO. 2016-018**

**Applicant:** Aarin Teague/San Antonio River Authority

**Address:** 100 E Guenther St.

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install on site sustainable stormwater best management practices. This will include the installation of permeable pavement parking stalls in a portion of the parking lot, bioretention (rain gardens) around the building structure and five rainwater cisterns. The applicant has noted that educational signage will be installed post construction to inform the public on site sustainable stormwater best management practices, however, at this time this is not part of the request.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. A request for conceptual approval of the installation of onsite sustainable stormwater best management practices was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on January 20, 2016, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 9, 2016, where committee members noted that they did not believe that the cisterns needed to be hidden or obscured from sight, that the cisterns should be fully viewable by the public to serve as an educational element and that plant materials should be labeled to be identifiable by the public. Committee members had questions regarding the functionality of the proposed installation of the cisterns as well as the permeable pavers.
- b. The applicant has proposed install on site sustainable stormwater best management practices. This installation will include the installation of five (5) rainwater cisterns, seven (7) rain gardens and twenty-two (22) permeable pavement parking stalls. Per the UDC Section 35-673(c)(5), stormwater management facilities are to be designed as a landscape amenity. Staff finds that the applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC.
- c. Regarding the proposed rainwater cisterns, the applicant has proposed three cisterns to be five feet in diameter and two cisterns that are to be nine feet in diameter and approximately eleven feet in height. Staff finds the proposed size and locations of the proposed cisterns appropriate. Additionally, staff finds that the screening of the proposed cisterns will remove potential educational opportunities for the public regarding sustainability and responsible best

management practices. Staff finds that the proposed cisterns should not be screened or obscured from the public right of way.

d. In seven (7) location on the property, the applicant has proposed to install rain gardens throughout the site to facilitate the absorption of stormwater runoff. Per the UDC Section 35-673(f)(1), landscape materials, including plants, shrubs and trees that are used in the public areas of the river are to be extended onto adjacent private areas to form a cohesive design. The applicant has provided information noting proposed materials that are both native to South Texas as well as consistent with the UDC.

e. In regards to paving materials, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing asphalt paving in twenty-two (22) parking stalls and install permeable pavement parking stall. The impacted area will be the existing parking location closest to Guenther Street. Per the UDC Section 35-673(g)(1), pervious paving is encouraged where feasible and appropriate for the site. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e with the stipulation that the proposed cisterns are not screened.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Cherise Bell, King William Association, spoke in opposition of the proposed project.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with stipulation that cisterns are screened as proposed

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

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**6. HDRC NO. 2016-065**

**Applicant:** Kimberlee Lorenz/ReVamp Design Build

**Address:** 133 Devine St

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story rear addition to the structure at 133 Devine. The applicant has proposed materials to include wood windows, wood siding and a standing seam metal roof.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The house at 133 Devine is of the Folk Victorian style and was constructed circa 1915 and is a contributing structure in the Lavaca Historic District.

b. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 17, 2016, where the applicant presented updated architectural documents. The HDRC moved to refer this request to the Design Review Committee. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 23, 2016, where...

c. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a new, two story addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., residential additions should be located at the rear of the primary historic structure to minimize view from the public right of way. The applicant has located the proposed addition at the rear of the existing structure, however, staff is concerned with the overall height of the proposed structure. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a line of sight study to ensure that the proposed addition will not impact the street facing façade of the primary historic structure.

d. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., new residential additions should be in keeping with the existing historic context of the block. This block of Devine primarily features single story historic structures; however, there are historic structures in the immediate vicinity that feature both multiple stories as well as tall single height floors. Staff finds that an addition with two floors may be appropriate in this location, however, the applicant should provide additional information to ensure that the proposed structure's massing is appropriate and subordinate than that of the original structure's.

e. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a series of low pitched gable roofs. Per the applicant’s updated documents, the proposed ridgeline of the second level addition is at the same height of the ridgeline of the primary historic structure. Staff finds this proposal sensitive to the primary structure, however, the applicant should provide a line of sight study as mentioned in finding c to ensure that the proposed addition will not impact the street facing façade of the primary structure.

f. Regarding a transition from the original structure to the addition, the applicant has proposed various vertical trim pieces as well as façade elements that will facilitate in a transition and distinguish the addition from the original structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv.

g. The applicant has proposed materials that include reclaimed double hung wood windows, repurposed French doors, wood siding and trim and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds these materials appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.

h. Regarding window fenestration, staff finds that generally the applicant has proposed window openings that are appropriately sized and placed, however, staff finds that the applicant should provide a window section and framing information to ensure that all windows are framed to include an appropriate depth.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the applicant’s proposed materials and overall footprint are appropriate, however, staff finds that the applicant should provide line of sight study as mentioned in finding c to ensure that the proposed addition will not impact the street facing façade of the primary structure prior to a recommendation for approval.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**10. HDRC NO. 2016-071**

**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. 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.
- f. Regarding windows and doors, the applicant has proposed to generally retain all original window and door openings as well as all original window frames. 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 exterior wall and 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. 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. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional documentation to clarify the size and location of the existing openings in relationship to the proposed openings.
- j. 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 to for this canopy to be blue in color, feature differently sized holes and be supported by three sets of gables. 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.
- k. 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, however, the proposed tower feature will not. Staff finds that the existing tower shall remain.
- l. 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.
- m. 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.

n. 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. In regards to the addition, the applicant has proposed to place windows on both the third and fourth levels at this corner as well as incorporate two vertical façade breaks, however, staff finds that the angle at which the wall is designed and constructed for the third and fourth levels should match that of the primary historic façade and be parallel with the back wall of the tower feature.

o. 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.

p. 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 address the addition's façade with an identical angle as that of the primary historic structure as noted in finding m.

q. The applicant has proposed horizontal banding of a different colored stucco than the primary stucco color on the third and fourth levels that are to group the proposed window openings. Given the fact that the applicant has not proposed window sizes that match those of the original in neither location nor size, staff finds this approach appropriate to separate two differently located and sized groups of window openings.

r. In addition to the applicant's proposed horizontal window bandings of metal siding, staff finds that an appropriate approach to the proposed façade arrangement and window fenestration includes windows that are framed to feature an appropriate façade depth. Staff recommends 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.

s. 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. The second, third and fourth levels feature vertical fins that are proposed to include architectural lighting and a variation of color panels. Positioned slightly in front of the façade is an architectural element which will house future hotel signage. Staff finds each of these proposals appropriate, however, staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information regarding signage and lighting prior to returning to the HDRC.

t. 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 appropriate, however, staff finds 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.

u. 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 t 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 provide additional documentation to clarify the size and location of the existing openings in relationship to the proposed openings on the east façade of the east facing façade as noted in i.
- iii. That the applicant retain the tower feature as noted in finding k.

- iv. That the angle at which the wall is designed and constructed for the third and fourth levels should match that of the primary historic façade as noted in finding n and p.
- v. 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.
- vi. 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.
- vii. That the applicant provide a detailed signage plan as well as a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.
- viii. Archaeological investigations are required.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Susan Beavin, SACS- Spoke in opposition of the current plans for this project, as they stand.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to refer this applicant and the current plans for a second DRC meeting.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**12. HDRC NO. 2016-086**

Applicant: Kelly O'Connor

Address: 1005 Nolan

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove 18 wood windows from the home and replace them with new vinyl windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting to remove 18 original wood windows from the primary structure and replace them with a vinyl window that has a similar design, outline and pattern. A total of four (4) windows will be replaced on the first floor and 14 windows will be replaced on the second floor.
- b. Staff provided the applicant with the Window Policy Document adopted in December 2015.
- c. According to the Guidelines 6.A.iii. and 6.B.iv., historic windows should be preserved and replacement of original windows should only occur when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff conducted a site visit on February 24, 2016, from the public right of way, and the windows appeared to be in good, repairable condition. The request to remove the original wood windows is not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to table this case for the next HDRC meeting due to applicants absence,

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2016-075**

Applicant: Krishnakant Patel

Address: 2727 Roosevelt Ave

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a wood privacy fence to front E

Southcross that is to be eight (8) feet in height.

**WITHDRAWN:**

Applicant will meet with DRC.

**14. HDRC NO. 2016-077**

Applicant: Randy Andrews/Quick Signs

Address: 1219 SE Military Dr.

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install two (2) sets of channel letter, both to be 36" x 152", approximately thirty-eight (38) square feet each reading "BINGO". Both signs are to be individually mounted to the façade of the building, one facing south toward SE Military and the other facing east toward the parking lot and eventually Mission Road.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to install two (2) sets of channel letter, both to be 36" x 152", approximately thirty-eight (38) square feet each reading "BINGO". Both signs are to be individually mounted to the façade of the building, one facing south toward SE Military and the other facing east toward the parking lot and eventually Mission Road. Per the Guidelines for Signage 1.A., each building will be allowed one major and two minor signs that should not exceed fifty (5) square feet. Additionally, signage should be designed to be proportional to the scale of the building's façade on which it will be mounted.

b. The applicant has proposed a total of approximately seventy-six (76) square feet of signage, more than recommended by the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant's proposal to mount signage of approximately thirty-eight (38) square feet toward SE Military Drive is appropriate given its commercial nature, however, staff finds that the applicant should reduce the size of the proposed signage facing Mission Road, a more rural setting, to reduce the amount of the proposed square footage to be no more than fifty (50) square feet.

c. Regarding placement, the applicant has proposed to place both signs on the existing storefront entrances, consistent with the examples in the immediate area. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 2.

d. Regarding the design and construction of the proposed signage, the applicant has proposed to install aluminum channel letters with red 3/16" plex faces to be back lit by LED's. While the Guidelines do not recommend sign faces of plastic-like materials, staff finds that there are examples in the immediate area of similar signage.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed signage based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the applicant reduce the size of all signage to not exceed more than fifty (50) square feet.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2016-080**

Applicant: Beverly Schantz/LK Design Group

Address: 534 Mission St.

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform various rehabilitative measures and exterior modifications to the historic structure at 534 Mission Street. Included in this request, the applicant has proposed to:

1. Repair the structure's foundation.
2. Remove the existing vinyl siding and repair the original wood siding.
3. Repaint the exterior of the house.



4. Replace the existing wood privacy fence to match existing as well as remove the chain link fence.
5. Modify an addition's roof pitch to match that of the historic structure.
6. Remove the existing standing seam metal roofs and install a dimensional shingle roof.
7. Replace the existing, original wood windows
8. Modify the existing, rear detached accessory structure constructed circa 1980.
9. Xeriscape the front and rear yards.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed a number of rehabilitative scopes of work that include foundation repair, the exposing and repair of the original wood siding, the painting of the exterior of the primary historic structure and the removal of a chain link fence and the replacement of an existing wood privacy fence with a new wood privacy fence. Staff finds each of these proposals appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant should ensure that the proposed replacement privacy fence does not exceed six (6) feet in height.

b. The property currently features an addition at the rear of the primary historic structure that features a low sloping roof. The applicant has proposed to construct a rear gable roof to be consistent with the roof of the historic structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions, a similar roof form should be utilized in an addition as that of the historic structure. This request is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The applicant has noted that the structure currently features a red shingle roof which covers an existing grey roof (trying to confirm if standing seam or not). The applicant has proposed to install a new asphalt shingle roof to be "Weatherwood" in color. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, roofing materials should be replaced in kind. A craftsman style house such as the one at 534 Mission would have originally featured a standing seam metal roof, however, staff finds that a shingle roof is also appropriate.

d. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, original wood windows and to install new double hung wood windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved. Staff performed a site visit on February 24, 2016, and found the windows to be in repairable condition. The applicant's proposal to replace the existing wood windows is not consistent with the Guidelines. Original wood windows should not be replaced unless they are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff recommends the applicant refer to the Guidelines for Windows policy document regarding wood window repair and replacement.

e. The applicant has proposed to modify the existing rear accessory structure, reducing its overall size to be 20' x 20' to accommodate a rear yard drive and a parking for two vehicles. At this time the applicant has not provided specific information to the new design and appearance of the rear accessory structure. Staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information regarding the rear accessory structure modifications.

f. The existing rear yard is covered primarily by concrete. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing concrete and perform various landscaping tasks that include xeriscaping, the installation of sod and other materials throughout the rear yard as well as the xeriscaping of the front yard. The applicant has not provided staff with a detailed landscaping plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the proposed replacement fence does not exceed six (6) feet in height.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #7 through #9 based on findings d through f. Staff recommends the applicant restore the original wood windows and that the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed rear accessory structure modifications and the proposed landscaping modifications.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Cherise Bell, King William Association & Rose Kanusky, neighborhood member- both spoke in opposition of the current application. Both citizens support staffs recommendations to use in-kind roofing and to retain wood windows.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve 1-6 & 7 with stipulations to retain wood windows. Applicant must return with site & landscape plan.

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

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2016-081**

Applicant: Charlotte Yochem

Address: 233 Florida St.

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace twenty-one (21) deteriorated and rotten single and double hung windows with new custom made wood windows that are to be Spanish Cedar, painted white to match the existing.
2. Remove the existing, deteriorated vinyl siding from the entire house as well as the rotten and deteriorated wood siding underneath, repair framing as necessary, install new insulation and sheathing and install new, smooth, Hardi Board siding.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to replace twenty-one (21) deteriorated and rotten single and double hung windows with new custom made wood windows that are to be Spanish Cedar, painted white to match the existing. Sizes of the windows that have been proposed to be replaced vary, however, they are located on both the first and second level of the primary historic structure on each façade.
- b. On March 6, 2015, staff administratively approved the removal of a non original door and the installation of a custom fabricated wood window to match the existing wood windows. This window is noted in the exhibits.
- c. Staff made a site visit on Wednesday, February 10, 2016, where staff found that predominantly, the windows were in repairable condition. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved. Furthermore, new windows should only be installed when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff finds that the existing windows are in the condition to be repaired with new wood being used when necessary. Staff recommends the applicant refer to the Guidelines for Windows policy document regarding wood window repair and replacement.
- d. The original wood siding at 223 Florida has been covered by vinyl siding and has suffered deterioration and rot. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing vinyl siding, remove the existing wood siding and install new Hardi Board siding. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B., façade materials that are in good condition should not be removed, in-kind materials should be installed when the original woodwork is beyond repair.
- e. Staff finds the removal of the existing vinyl siding as well as the replacement of damaged wood siding with Hardi Board appropriate, however, staff recommends that the applicant reuse and salvage all original wood siding that is in a condition that is repairable.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend the removal and replacement of the noted twenty-one windows based on findings a through e. Staff recommends that the applicant repair each window using existing wood that is salvageable as well as the proposed new cedar materials as noted in finding c. Staff recommends approval of the removal of the existing vinyl and damaged wood siding with the stipulation that the applicant reuse and salvage wood materials that is not beyond repair.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with stipulations that applicant make an attempt to salvage windows and siding, while replacing unsalvageable. Applicant is instructed to create a window schedule with replacement & salvaged windows marked for staff.

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

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**30. HDRC NO. 2016-083**

Applicant: Paul Franklin/Franklin Architects

Address: 217 W Elsmere Pl

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. modify the front facade dormer
- 2. add a rear addition

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Paul Kinnison, neighborhood member- Spoke in opposition regarding the current plans for this project.

**WITHDRAWN:**

Applicant withdrew application, will meet with the DRC.

**18. HDRC NO. 2016-085**

Applicant: Patrick Moore

Address: 410 E Courtland Pl

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval to construct a 927 square foot addition to the rear of the house.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Richard Moore spoke in support

**WITHDRAWN:**

Applicant withdrew application and will resubmit to staff with proper changes in drawings in regards to revised east elevation.

**19. HDRC NO. 2015-087**

Applicant: Maria Wiegand

Address: 420/422 E Locust

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace and widen the existing front yard walkway.

**WITHDRAWN:**

Applicant withdrew application and will resubmit.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes – February 17, 2016**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve February 17, 2016 minutes.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, 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.

March 2, 2016

12

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 P.M.

APPROVED

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Guarino', written in a cursive style.

Michael Guarino  
Chair