

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
April 20, 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, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube  
ABSENT: Feldman, Salas, Brittain**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
  - S.T.A.R. Update
  - Preservation Month Kick-off Celebration - Cool Crest Mini Golf - April 29 - 6:30PM
  - Preservation Month in San Antonio (Mosaic) - May 2016
- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |                             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2016-112  | 127 Crofton                 |
| 2. Case No. 2016-149  | 228 S Laredo                |
| 3. Case No. 2016-148  | 803 S St. Marys             |
| 4. Case No. 2016-138  | 120 King William            |
| 5. Case No. 2016-140  | 217 Elsmere Place           |
| 6. Case No. 2016-142  | 600 Hemisfair Plaza Way     |
| 7. Case No. 2016-132  | 1203 E Crockett St          |
| 8. Case No. 2016-143  | 3901 Broadway, Witte Museum |
| 9. Case No. 2016-144  | 3100 Roosevelt Ave          |
| 10. Case No. 2016-134 | 609 Donaldson Ave           |
| 11. Case No. 2016-073 | 203 Mcdonald                |
| 12. Case No. 2016-137 | 726 E Woodlawn              |
| 13. Case No. 2016-145 | 311 Barrera                 |
| 14. Case No. 2016-147 | 300 San Fernando St         |

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**1. HDRC NO. 2016-D03**

**Applicant:** Encore Multi-Family, LLC

**Address:** 300 BLOCK OF S. FLORES / 400 BLOCK OF S. MAIN

**REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new 338-unit, five-story multifamily residential development wrapped around a six-story parking garage, located in the 300 Block of South Flores Street and the 400 Block of South Main Avenue (property bound by South Flores Street, Stumberg, South Main Avenue, and Old Guilbeau Street). The proposal includes entirely new development of a full city block.

**FINDINGS:**

The proposed development and design meet the purpose and intent of the **Downtown Design Guide** required standards and encouraged guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposal as submitted and as shown in the attached exhibits, with the understanding that the development name shown in the signage exhibits will change, and with the following stipulations:

- If possible, the alignment or existing structural stone elements (if extant) of the acequia should be incorporated into the development design.
- As the project proceeds, and when parking is not an impediment to construction activities, backhoe trenching to locate and determine if the acequia is, in fact, extant throughout the property will be required in the southern parking lot.
- In order to facilitate the development of this project footprint, in regard to cultural resources, archaeological monitoring will be required.
- Proactive testing may occur on the property in areas not currently occupied by standing structures (parking lots, open space). Archaeological monitoring is partially required during demolition, specifically if impacts exceed 1 foot or more below the surface level for the removal of structural elements or infrastructure-related utilities, and for new construction activities involving excavations.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**3. HDRC NO. 2016-146**

Applicant: Nic Whittaker/Greystar

Address: 633 S ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval of an interpretation plan commemorating the former KCOR / Univision site to include:

1. One pair of bi-lingual panels with a rendering of the studio at the River Level. This panel will be mounted to a previously- approved retaining wall at the pedestrian access point for the development;
2. A second identical pair of bi-lingual panels at the street level to be mounted to a previously-approved masonry wall surrounding the existing telecommunications yard; and
3. A third window installation which incorporates a bi-lingual narrative with an art display of historic photos. This installation is located at the clubhouse for the complex and faces S St. Mary's Street.

**FINDINGS:**

a) The multi-family development at 633 S St. Mary's originally received HDRC approval on December 18, 2013. The approval authorized the demolition of the former KCOR / Univision studio building on the property. As a stipulation to the approval, the applicant was required to develop an interpretation plan for the site. According to the 2013 Certificate of Appropriateness:

*The interpretive element will include, at a minimum, 3 interpretive panels accessible by the public from the river level and/or the street level and integrated into the fencing or screening for the telecommunications yard where the tower is located. It should also include a public art component using materials from the site to the extent possible. The panels should include text and photographs similar in design to the interpretive panels already installed along the River Walk as part of the wayfinding initiative.*

b) The panel content was developed based on community feedback facilitated by the UTSA Center for Cultural Sustainability. The OHP Cultural Historian has provided assistance with reviewing and finalizing the content.

c) The proposed interpretation plan is consistent with the approved stipulation cited above. The public art component does not incorporate salvaged materials as originally recommended. However, staff finds that both the panel and window installations incorporate a substantial number of historic images which satisfies requirements for a visual element.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**6. HDRC NO. 2015-314**

Applicant: Victor Sosa

Address: 101 E LULLWOOD AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to widen the existing concrete driveway by one foot on either side for a total width of 10 feet. Short retaining walls will also be added to either side of the driveway within the lawn area. The curb cut and apron will not be widened.

**FINDINGS:**

a) According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.1., historic driveway configurations, widths, and curb cuts should be maintained. In the proposal, the curb cut and apron are maintained and are consistent with the guidelines.

b) In the Monte Vista Historic District, many original concrete driveways and ribbon drives have been altered over time. In many cases, driveways are allowed to be widened up to 10 feet by installing either sections of concrete or pavers. The immediate neighbors of 101 E Lullwood feature driveways that have been widened.

c) The proposed widening of the driveway does not exceed 10 feet as recommended by the Guidelines, and does not result in a negative impact to the streetscape.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through c.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:**

Paul Kinnison- spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to deny applicants request.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**14. HDRC NO. 2016-130**

Applicant: Carmen Varela-Rivas/COSA - TCI

Address: 2137, 2141, 2151, 2155, 2150 W MAGNOLIA AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install concrete retaining walls at five properties on West Magnolia as part of a current right-of-way improvements project. Each wall will be approximately 15 inches in height.

**FINDINGS:**

- a) Generally, the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements do not recommend adding new landscape or topographical elements that alter the streetscape in a historic district. New retaining walls a generally discourages where there is no historical precedent.
- b) There are currently 11 retaining walls that have been added on this block W Magnolia. This portion of the Monticello Park Historic District was designated in 2008, and many of these existing retaining walls were installed prior to designation. None of the existing walls appear to be of historic age.
- c) The requested retaining walls are proposed for properties that are adjacent to those with existing retaining walls. The installation of the requested walls is not expected to greatly alter the character of the block due to the number of walls that have already been added.
- d) The proposed retaining walls will not exceed 15 inches in height, and for properties on the north side of W Magnolia which feature a greater change in elevation, some sloping berm will remain along the street-facing edge of the property.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Salmon, Grube

**NAYS:** Cone, Laffoon

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**10. HDRC NO. 2016-149**

Applicant: Pam Carpenter

Address: 600 Block of Burleson at Olive

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to approval of Prototype 5 to be included as a house option in the approved development at the 600 Block of Burleson and N Olive.

**FINDINGS:**

- a) A similar request for this prototype was reviewed by the HDRC on February 17, 2016. The item was withdrawn at that time in order to address concerns brought up at the hearing. The proposed new prototype would be the fifth house type included in the development that received HDRC approval on July 15, 2015. A total of three prototype 5 homes would be incorporated into the approved site plan, and would be oriented along an existing alley perpendicular to Olive Street.
- b) The current proposal eliminates an overhanging porch on the front façade and incorporates a new, front-gabled bump out at the first floor entrance and 2nd floor space above. The full-width porch on the front façade has been eliminated.
- c) Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, front facades of new buildings should align with adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established. Although there are no buildings facing Burleson on this

block, buildings on the next blocks east and west are set back from the street approximately 15-20 ft. The proposed townhomes follow the setback pattern on adjacent blocks and are consistent with the guidelines.

d) The Guidelines for New Construction recommend new buildings have roof forms including pitch, overhangs, and orientation that are consistent to those predominantly found on the block. The proposed front gabled roof form is consistent with the Guidelines.

e) According to the Guidelines for New Construction, materials that complement the type, color and texture of materials traditionally found in the district should be used. The majority of houses within the Dignowity Hill Historic District are clad in wood siding. The proposed cement board plank and panel siding may be appropriate if proper dimension, finish and texture is used. The incorporation of additional wood architectural elements, such as eave brackets and porch materials is appropriate. In addition, different colors for each unit should be incorporated in order to provide variety and enhance each unit's character.

f) Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, roof materials that are similar in terms of form, color, and texture to those traditionally used in the district should be used. The proposed composition shingle roof is consistent with the guidelines in material and form.

g) Window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Windows and doors should be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades as recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction. The proposed window sizes and pattern is consistent with the guidelines.

h) According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new garages should match the predominant orientation found along the block. The prototype features an attached garage with an overhead door that is oriented to the rear of the structure. Although the garage is attached to the primary structure, staff finds that its orientation toward the alley is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

i) Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, windows used in new construction must maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and should be recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding page from the adopted windows policy document has been added to the exhibits for this request. A window detail or wall section which illustrates conformance with the guidelines for window has not been submitted.

j) The Guidelines for New Construction recommend that architectural details and building forms follow the established pattern found within the district. In the current prototype proposal, the front porch has been eliminated and replaced with a stoop. A larger front porch, or a porch that has traditional proportions, would be more appropriate. Furthermore, the submitted drawings do not provide sufficient detail regarding the materials and dimensions of the proposed concrete stoop.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant submit a window detail or section that specifies the use of a block frame window that has a minimum recess of 2" based on finding i;
2. That a larger front porch be incorporated instead of a stoop based on finding j. Sufficient detail regarding the design of the porch must be presented to staff.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Liz Franklin, spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor for approval as submitted.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2016-020**

Applicant: KHI, Inc

Address: 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 151, E COMMERCE ST &amp; 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. At an HDRC hearing on March 16, 2016, concern as expressed regarding the treatment of the river level and the extent of the proposed removal of historic stone walls. The item was referred back to the Design Review Committee which met and reviewed this request a second time on March 22, 2016. The applicant provided updated drawings which address the stated concerns included the re-use of additional stone elements at the river level, creating additional articulation at the east and west facades, clarification on the parking garage driveway design, and an illustration that shows the alignment of canopies along Commerce Street.
- 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. The updated documentation illustrates efforts to salvage and maintain the stone wall at its approximate location.

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 and has provided updated elevations for both the east and west facades that staff finds provides additional fenestration, façade separation and a human scale. 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 façade. Updated drawings provided by the applicant also indicate the inclusion of a building cap consistent with the UDC.

2p. As previously mentioned, the applicant has provided updated elevations that include additional façade openings and materials. 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. The applicant has proposed to include façade materials that separate the levels of the east façade. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the UDC. The updated elevations for the west façade feature a combination of additional materials, façade separation and additional window openings as well as the inclusion of wrap around balconies. This is appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

2q. The updated elevations for the west façade feature a combination of additional materials, façade separation and additional window openings as well as the inclusion of wrap around balconies. This is appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

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 landscaping plan noting all landscaping materials and site lighting as noted in findings 2f and 2h prior to a request for Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant produce information regarding the screening of mechanical and service equipment as noted in finding 2j prior to a request for Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iii. Approval of the curb cut and parking access on E Commerce is contingent on coordination and permitting from Transportation and Capital Improvements and Development Services Departments to ensure that the pedestrian experience on Commerce is not impeded by the parking access in any way. The proposed parking access must also align with and contribute to the forthcoming Commerce Street improvements project. The applicant should continue to explore alternatives to on-site parking such as leased parking and develop ways to mitigate the interruption of pedestrian traffic by vehicular traffic entering the site.
- iv. An archaeological investigation is required prior to any ground-disturbing activities.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube for conceptual approval based on findings a-2r with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. 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 Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approval with windows as submitted by applicant and the stipulation that applicant returns to HDRC with landscape plan & materials.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2016-119**

Applicant: David Komet/1921 Deco Building LLC

Address: 1921 FREDERICKSBURG RD

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Build a single story, 1,324 square foot commercial building on a corner lot, with a height of 23.3', consisting of corrugated metal siding, black tiles, vue glass block, and a sheet metal awning, with 5 parking spaces.
2. Place one 2.5' by 7.75' wall mounted sign with externally lit dimensional lettering on the front façade.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant received conceptual approval on April 6, 2016; the HDRC approved with the stipulations that the applicant enhances the street presence of the building on Elmendorf Street, that the applicant explores the functional use of the corner element, that the applicant provided further lighting details and landscape details before returning to the HDRC for final approval, and that the applicant meet with the Design Review Committee before the next HDRC hearing in order to review the metal details and how the structure relates to the historic landmark.

b. The DRC reviewed this case on April 13, 2016, where committee members found the new construction to relate well to the neighboring landmark, commented on plant material details, ground cover details, siding material and lighting.

c. The Monticello Park Historic District was created by ordinance in 5 phases starting in 1995, and the last phase designated in 2010. The district includes a mixture of uses and building types. The commercial node around Fredericksburg Road features various examples of art deco architecture and is known as the Deco District. Art deco is a decorative architecture style that is characterized by sharp angular or zigzag surface forms and ornaments. The Historic Design Guidelines apply to all local historic districts, including Monticello Park Historic District.

- d. The applicant is proposing to build a one story building at the corner of Fredericksburg Road and Elmendorf Street. The existing lot is a vacant lot, void of trees or structures.
- e. The proposed structure neighbors the historic landmark, Gallagher-Blaize Drug Company, at 1909 Fredericksburg Road.
- f. The applicant is proposing to build a one story building with a 24' prow at the corner of the building nearest the intersection. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A., new construction in historic districts should feature a similar height and scale as the surrounding structures. Staff made a site visit on March 28, 2016, and found that the surrounding properties on Fredericksburg Road are typically one stories. The applicant's proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. Commercial structures found along the Fredericksburg Rd commercial corridor, all generally feature a common orientation, fronting the street and angular corners, with a setback that is consistent with the structures sited on adjacent properties. The applicant is proposing to orient the building to front Fredericksburg Road but not to front Elmendorf Street. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A., the front façade orientation should be consistent with historic buildings along the street frontage. Staff finds the proposed footprint and orientation is a missed opportunity to take advantage of a uniquely shaped and placed lot. Staff finds that the applicant should continue the building around the corner and address both Fredericksburg Road and Elmendorf Street. Changing the footprint to have some street presence on Elmendorf would be done without impact to the overall site plan.
- h. The applicant is proposing to orient the primary entrance for the commercial building along the façade that fronts Fredericksburg Road and is proposing a secondary rear entrance to face the proposed parking lot. While the applicant's proposed entrances are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., staff finds that it would be appropriate for the corner to have function.
- i. In regards to historic context, the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.i. state new construction should be designed in a manner which reflects its own time, but is complementary of the surrounding district. Staff finds that the proposal gives a nod to elements found in the Art Deco style, such as the marquee banding on the front façade and the building prow, however at this time the proposed orientation and footprint is not consistent with examples of art deco commercial buildings.
- j. The applicant is proposing that the new building have a floor to ceiling storefront along Fredericksburg Road, a glass rear double door, and ribbons of glass block between the wall planes on the corner façade. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.ii., blank walls should be avoided on elevations that face the street and new construction should feature window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as found in historic facades. The proposed façade configuration is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. The applicant is proposing materials consisting of corrugated metal siding, black tile, Pittsburgh coming glass block, sheet metal awning, and a grid storefront glazing on each side of the rear door. The wall cladding is galvanized corrugated metal cladding, that are horizontal and 24-gauge. The glass blocks are clear and are 12' x 12". According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A., contemporary materials may be appropriate as long as new materials are visually similar to the traditional material. Staff finds the materials appropriate and consistent with the guidelines.
- l. The applicant is proposing a roof form that is consistent with those typically found along Fredericksburg Road. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i.
- m. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.ii., architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style. The applicant is proposing an office building with black tiles at the base of the building, with a marquee awning covered in sheet metal, and featuring a prow consisting of 10 vertical fins separated by glass blocks. Staff finds the tile base and marquee awning consistent with the art deco architectural style.
- n. Mechanical equipment and roof appurtenances should be screened from the public right-of-way per the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B. The applicant noted the equipment will be interior and not placed on the exterior.
- o. In regards to off-street parking, the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. state that parking areas should be placed at the rear of the site, behind primary structures. The applicant is proposing to place 5 parking spaces behind the new construction, with access from Elmendorf St. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- p. In regards to landscaping, the Guidelines for Site Elements 6., state that streetscape elements should be consistent and continuous along the street. The applicant is proposing to plant four trees to shade the western façade and parking lot, install a two-tier rounded planter bed at the street intersection and install an ivy planter bed along the façade that faces the neighboring landmark at 1909 Fredericksburg Road. Staff finds the planters consistent with the Guidelines; however the applicant has not provided details of plant materials or ground cover. Staff

recommends that the applicant installs plants that are native to South Texas.

q. In regards to lighting, the applicant is proposing to install interior light between planar walls, recessed exterior can lights under the front and rear awning shining downward. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 6.D., lighting should be scaled for pedestrian walkways and light spill on adjacent properties should be limited. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

r. The Guidelines for Signage state that each building is allowed up to three signs, which a maximum total square footage of 50 square feet. The Guidelines also reference appropriate materials and lighting. The applicant is proposing at 7.75' x 2.5' (19.4' sq ft) major wall mounted sign to be placed on the front façade. The sign will be dimensional lettering and externally lit by either a wall sconce or lighting hidden between the "fins" of the parapets. The signs will be made of colored acrylic shaped on a CNC mill. Staff finds the proposed signage consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval at this time. Staff recommends:

- i. That the applicant install plants that are native to South Texas and provide details of the ground cover.
- ii. That the applicant enhance the street presence of the building on Elmendorf Street.
- iii. That the applicant explore the functional use of the corner element.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone for approval as submitted.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2016-136**

Applicant: Lorraine Ytuarte

Address: 2051 W GRAMERCY PLACE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to build a 382 square foot accessory building with stucco siding and a flat roof.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is proposing to build a 384 square foot rear accessory building with stucco siding and a flat roof, and one side open facing the existing pool. The applicant is replacing a rear accessory structure that was built in 2004, and was recently destroyed in a fire.

b. In regards to massing and form, the Guidelines state that new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal structure. The new structure will be 8'-6" in height, and is subordinate to the house. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. In regards to orientation, the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. state that new outbuildings should match the orientation found along the block. Staff finds that other properties along the block have rear accessory structures along the rear property line. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. In regards to setback, the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.ii. state that new outbuildings should follow historic setback patterns. The applicant has not provided a full site plan noting the setbacks. Staff has requested this information and has not received it.

e. In regards to lot coverage, the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D. state that new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The applicant is proposing that the accessory building be 34 foot wide and 12 foot deep, detached from primary structure. Staff found that other outbuildings along the block have similar lot coverage. The proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

f. In regards to character and materials, the Guidelines state that the new outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the principal building. The applicant is proposing an outbuilding with stucco siding and a flat roof. The principal structure has a gabled roof and wood siding. This is not consistent with the Guidelines as stucco is not found on the main structure. Staff recommends that applicant create a structure that relates more to the main structure.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings d and f. Staff recommends that sufficient information be provided by the applicant as requested by staff.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**25. HDRC NO. 2016-150**

Applicant: David McKay/Painting N More

Address: 334 W ELSMERE PLACE

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Remove larger gable roof line and leave existing rounded gable over porch.
2. Replace an asbestos shingle roof with a 24 gauge galvalume standing seam metal roof with 18 inch panels.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 334 W Elsmere Place is craftsman style one story home, with an asphalt shingle roof. The configuration at the entrance includes a gable over a brow arch supported by columns.
- b. The applicant is proposing to remove the gable and continue existing roof slope to meet the bow. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.ii., historic roof forms should be preserved. Staff made a site visit on April 12, 2016, and found that roof form change would be appropriate for the craftsman architecture style of the home, and that there are other homes on the block with similar roof forms. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. The home at 334 W Elsmere was identified in the Monte Vista National Register Nomination in 1990. The photo from the nomination indicates the existing top gable.
- d. The applicant is proposing to install a standing seam metal roof on the main structure at 334 W Elsmere Place to feature the standard galvalume color and 18 inch panels. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs are to be used on structures that historically had metal roofs or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. During the site visit, staff found standing seam metal roofs on craftsman style homes, but did not find the combination of this architectural style and a standing seam metal roof. The proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on findings a and b. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on finding c. If the HDRC approves the request to install a standing seam metal roof, staff recommends that it's approved with stipulations that the applicant ensure seams are one to two inches, use a a crimped ridge seam, and use a low-profile ridge cap with no ridge cap vent or end cap.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

Paul Kinnison, spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2016-139**

Applicant: Gustavo Mendoza/Smartworld Eneergy

Address: 201 DELAWARE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 24 solar panels on the west and east slopes of the hipped roof.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to install 24 solar panels on the standing seam metal roof of the primary structure. Four panels will be installed on the slop facing east, and 20 panels will be installed on the slop facing Staffel Street. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.

b. Staff visited the site on April 13, 2016, and found that house is on a corner lot interior to the historic district and that the panels will be highly visible from the public right-of-way on the front and side. Staff also found that since the panels are mounted on a hipped roof, the solar panels are more highly visible than they might be on a different roof form. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The home at 201 Delaware is in the Lavaca Historic District and is viewable from surrounding historic structures.

d. The applicant is proposing to mount the panels flush with the pitched roof. This is consistent with Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii, which states solar collectors should be flush with the roof surface.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube for denial as submitted

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Grube**

**NAYS: Lazarine**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**27. HDRC NO. 2016-036**

Applicant: Ruben Carrillo

Address: 931 HAYS ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a single family residence on the vacant lot at 931 Hays, at the corner of Hays and Muncey.

**FINDINGS:**

a. This request received conceptual approval on February 3, 2016, with the stipulations that wood windows be used and that the foundation heights and setbacks be consistent with the Guidelines.

b. The applicant has increased the front setback to be consistent with the adjacent properties on the block, consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i.

c. The orientation of the structure features the primary entrance facing Hays Street. The proposed primary entrance orientation is consistent with those found on the block, in a north-south orientation.

d. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii foundation and floor to floor heights should be aligned within one foot of floor to floor heights on adjacent structures. The historic example common throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District is a prominent foundation height of at least 12 inches, often times with the exposed concrete foundation or an architectural foundation skirting. The applicant has increased the foundation height in response to this recommendation.

e. New construction should be designed so that its overall scale and height are consistent with nearby historic structures.

931 Hays is a corner lot that is surrounded by single family residences. The front gabled roof and single story height of the structure are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i. and the existing examples of historic single family residences in Dignowity Hill.

f. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C. window and door openings should be similar in proportion to those on nearby historic facades. The applicant has proposed window and door openings along the front, rear and side façades that are consistent with those found throughout the neighborhood. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i.

g. New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic structures in terms of building to lot ratio. The proposed building footprint should not cover more than 50% of the total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.

h. The applicant has proposed materials that consist of Dutch lap wood siding, an asphalt shingle roof, Craftsman style wood doors and single hung vinyl windows. Although many of the materials are consistent with the Guidelines, staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows per the Guidelines.

i. The applicant has included a side yard wooden fence in the site plan. Side yard fences are a typical site element found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, and this request is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i and ii.

j. The applicant has included a decomposed granite front driveway and a new approach in the site plan. Many driveways on this block of Hays are unpaved, paved or feature a ribbon driveway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, 5.B.i. it is important to retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives. Incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration. Currently there is no existing driveway or approach. Adding these elements is appropriate according to the Guidelines.

k. Staff finds that the applicant has proposed architectural details that are appropriate to the architectural housing stock found along Hays Street as well as throughout this section of Dignowity Hill.

l. At this time, the applicant has not provided landscaping information. Staff recommends the applicant follow the Guidelines for Site Elements while developing a landscaping plan.

m. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, windows used in new construction must maintain traditional dimensions and profiles and should be recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding page from the adopted windows policy document has been added to the exhibits for this request. A window detail or wall section which illustrates conformance with the guidelines for windows has not been submitted.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that wood windows or a window that is consistent with the guidelines be installed versus the proposed vinyl windows based on finding m. The applicant must submit a window detail or section that specifies the use of a block frame window that has a minimum recess of 2", and which eliminates a faux-divided light configuration in favor of a traditional one-over-one configuration.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**28. HDRC NO. 2016-132**

Applicant: Nathan Bailes/Gerloff Inc

Address: 314 DONALDSON AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 20 existing wood windows with new wood windows.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is proposing to replace 20 wood windows with wood windows. The home was damaged by a fire. 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.

b. Staff made a site visit on April 12, 2016, and found that the front windows (#1 to 5) are in poor condition, but repairable and covered in metal screens. Staff found that the windows on the left and right facades (#6-11, 19 and 20) were damaged significantly in the fire. Staff finds the proposal to replace the deteriorated windows consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the historic windows #1 through #5 be repaired. The applicant has not provided details of the configuration of the wood windows to be installed, and recommends that the applicant provide to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff finds a one over one configuration appropriate.

c. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, replacement windows must maintain original dimensions and profiles, feature clear glass, and should be recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. A window detail which illustrates conformance with the guidelines for windows has not been submitted.

This recommendation was amended on 1/13/2017 to reflect the correct recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval with the stipulations that the applicant repair windows #1 through #5, provide specifications on the wood windows to be installed to staff prior to receiving the Certificate of Appropriateness, maintain the original dimension and profile, feature clear glass, and maintain the original appearance of window trim and sill.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes – April 6, 2016**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve April 6, 2016 minutes.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Salmon, Laffoon, Lazarine, 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 5:15 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair

