

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
OCTOBER 15, 2014**

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

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor

ABSENT: Zuniga, Valenzuela, Salas

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Case No. 2014-333 | 314 Nolan |
| 2. Case No. 2014-345 | 220 Broadway |
| 3. Case No. 2014-318 | Mission Reach Art |
| 4. Case No. 2014-279 | 223 Laurel Heights Pl. |
| 5. Case No. 2014-338 | 900 E. Market |
| 6. Case No. 2014-341 | 1111 S. Alamo |
| 7. Case No. 2014-342 | 1223 E. Houston |
| 8. Case No. 2014-343 | 1311 S. Alamo |
| 9. Case No. 2014-344 | 5102 Old Pearsall Rd. |
| 10. Case No. 2014-336 | 210 Adams |
| 11. Case No. 2014-339 | 937 W. Magnolia |
| 12. Case No. 2014-289 | 840 E. Mulberry, 731 E. Huisache, 743 E. Huisache |
| 13. Case No. 2014-334 | 121 Starr |

Item 2, 6, 10, and 12 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Connor, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2014-345

Applicant: Elizabeth Feldman

Address: 220 Broadway

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the Property at 220 Broadway (Traveler’s Hotel).

FINDINGS:

- a. Staff conducted a site visit on July 21, 2014. The building is overall in need of extensive repairs and staff commends the applicant for undertaking its rehabilitation.

b. While the scope of work includes a full rehabilitation of the building, exterior work is limited to repairs and restoration of original materials. Detailed designs for the restored storefront and canopy may be submitted as a later date. Work that is eligible for Historic Tax Certification includes repointing and repair of exterior masonry, window repair, restoration of the original interior lobby, and MEP upgrades.

c. The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Connor

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Feldman

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2014-341

Applicant: Meredith Siegel

Address: 1111 S. Alamo

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Construct a 750 sf rooftop addition to the St. Scholastica Convent / Liberty Bar building at 1111 S Alamo. The dwelling will have stucco exterior, wood-clad doors and window, and a hipped, standing-seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

a. A similar proposal received approval from the HDRC in July of 2010. The current proposal is larger than the previous version, and the fenestrations and roof form vary slightly from the original.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 7, 2014. At that meeting, the committee members present spoke favorably of the 2010 approval, noting that its setback and massing were appropriate. While the new design had a larger footprint, the setbacks had been maintained and the commissioners were comfortable with the scale. The commissioners noted that the original design featured a symmetrical roofline that respected the façade of the historic building. The current proposal includes an extension of the roof line to the north resulting in an asymmetrical roof form. The commissioners found this to be less appropriate. One commissioner encouraged the use of larger fenestrations to incorporate more areas of glass in the facades of the addition.

c. The historic St. Scholastica Convent / Liberty Bar building was constructed circa 1939, although portions of the building are older. The building features a strictly symmetrical façade with a central pediment entry. While not specifically addressed by the Historic Design Guidelines, staff concurs with the findings of the Design Review Committee that the symmetrical roof form shown in the 2010 design is more appropriate, and that currently-proposed roof slope should be reduced to a separate trellis or porch roof in order to emphasis the symmetry of the addition. This is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitations which state that new additions must be compatible with the original massing and architectural features of the historic building.

d. The proposed addition is set back 14 feet from the front façade and 8 feet from the side. This is a generous transition between the old and new construction consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.v. The difference in footprint also allows for the original parapet detailing to remain distinguishable consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.B.ii.

- e. The proposed addition height is less than 40 percent of the height of the original structure, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.B.i.
- f. The proposed stucco and wood-clad windows are complimentary and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i.
- g. While specifications for the standing seam metal have not been provided, staff finds the roof details should be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.ii. and meet the recommended specifications for metal roofs in historic districts, particularly with the use of a double munched ridge seam versus a raised ridge cap vent. This detail will allow the addition to better blend with the historic building.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the stipulations that the roof maintain a symmetrical form based on finding c and that the metal roof meet the specifications for historic metal roofs, including the use of a double munch ridge seam, based on finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to grant conceptual approval with staff recommendations that the roof maintain a symmetrical form based on finding c and that the metal roof meet the specifications for historic metal roofs, including the use of a double munch ridge seam, based on finding g.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

10. HDRC NO. 2014-336

Applicant: Stephen Colley

Address: 210 Adams

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

Construct a new, 2-story outbuilding in the rear of the property at 210 Adams Street. The footprint of the proposed structure is 672 square feet (24' x 28'). The height of the proposed structure is 21' 9". The proposed structure will have alley access and will be visible from the alley. The proposed 2-story outbuilding includes the following exterior materials: a standing seam metal roof (Galvalume finish), HardiePlank siding, and wood doors and windows. The existing garage at this location was determined by staff to be non-contributing and has been approved for demolition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed outbuilding is located at the rear of the property, to the east of the existing structure at 210 Adams Street with alley access. The proposed outbuilding has an overall height of 21'-9" whereas the height of the existing structure is 25'-6". The overall height and massing is subordinate to the primary structure consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i.
- b. The proposed outbuilding includes a footprint of 672 square feet in comparison to the existing structure's footprint of 1,918 square feet. This is roughly 35% of the existing structure's footprint and is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii.
- c. The proposed outbuilding appears to relate to the period of construction of the existing primary structure through the use of materials including smooth HardiePlank siding, a standing seam metal roof with a galvalume finish, and wooden windows and doors. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii.
- d. The proposed outbuilding is located at the rear of the property and follows a similar pattern of development as other nearby properties. This is consistent with the Design Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.i in terms of orientation and setbacks.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with the stipulation that the ridge be a munched seam detail.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2014-289

Applicant: Tom Guggolz

Address: 840 E. Mulberry, 731 E. Huisache, 743 E. Huisache

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

Construct a 4-story apartment building on the vacant lot at 840 E Mulberry. A pool house and amenity area will be located on the southern end of the property towards E Huisache. Proposed materials for the requested new construction consist of brick and cast stone. Surface parking for the units will be located internally within the site.

FINDINGS:

- a. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 26, 2014. At that meeting, the applicant indicated that the site plan was organized to preserve as many mature trees as possible. Further considerations were being made to reduce stormwater runoff on the site. The applicant indicated that there was a desire to connect the site landscaping to the adjacent park space and that fencing between the properties would be minimal. The committee members noted that the massing, placement and scale of the proposed buildings were appropriate and agreed that the site plan had been thoughtfully developed. The committee suggested that exterior walls that had limited fenestrations be reconsidered. The committee also requested that more detail regarding exterior finishes be provided.
- b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee again on September 9, 2014, to assess the proposed materials for the project. The applicant presented other examples located within the RIO which incorporate similar materials. The committee members present agreed that there was precedent and that the selected materials would provide sufficient shadow lines consistent with the intent of UDC Section 672(d). There was concern expressed over the length of unbroken facade, particularly along Mulberry. (The proposed materials have since been changed)
- c. The proposed site is in close proximity to Brackenridge Park. A landscaping plan has been submitted which includes preservation of heritage trees on site and bioswales for stormwater mitigation. The perimeter fencing treatment and landscaping design is consistent with the provisions of UDC Section 35-673, Site Design Standards.
- d. The proposed parking area is located towards the interior of the site consistent with UDC Section 35-671(b)(2).
- e. The proposed height and scale of the proposed new construction is consistent with UDC Section 35-672(b).
- f. UDC Section 35-672(d) requires that at least 75% of building surfaces implement exterior materials that are either traditional or convey a human scale. The currently proposed materials of brick and stone are consistent with this requirement.
- g. UDC Section 35-672(e) provides guidance for the façade composition of new buildings in the RIO. New buildings should have an articulated base, middle and cap. The base (ground floor) of the proposed new construction is clearly distinguished by a change in materials. However, staff finds that the proposed new construction lacks a traditional "cap". While a modern design is not expressly discouraged in the UDC, staff finds that the applicant should explore ways to incorporate this required cap element into the design.

h. The proposed fenestrations, although not of traditional dimensions, are recessed at least two inches within the exterior walls and are divided vertically and horizontally by mullions consistent with UDC Section 35-672(e)(2).

i. UDC Section 35-675 requires an archaeological survey wherever a property has potential of containing intact archaeological deposits. Due to the projects proximity to known archaeological resources and the potential for impact to previously-unidentified resources, an archaeological investigation will be required prior to any construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that an archaeological investigation occurs prior to any construction activity and that results are submitted to OHP staff for concurrence based on finding i. The applicant has taken steps towards fulfilling this stipulation.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff recommendations that an archaeological investigation occurs prior to any construction activity and that results are submitted to OHP staff for concurrence based on finding i. The applicant has taken steps towards fulfilling this stipulation.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: Rodriguez

THE MOTION CARRIED.

14. HDRC NO. 2014-256

Applicant: Cotton Estes and Michael Long

Address: 606 Dawson

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

Reconfigure the front porch of the house to replace the existing box columns with solid wood posts and raise the porch ceiling. Alterations to the porch were previously denied on August 20, 2014. The applicant has provided substantial new evidence and a revised design for HDRC consideration.

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 606 Dawson was constructed circa 1912 in the Craftsman Bungalow style. It features a full-width, inset front porch supported by two box columns. A knee wall clad in 117 double tear drop siding surrounds the porch on all sides and is in need of repair. An original, external brick chimney is located on the east façade and has been structurally compromised due to the settling of the house. Although once screened in, the original porch remains intact and is an important character-defining feature to the house. This type of porch can be seen on other local examples of the Craftsman Style.

b. This request was reviewed by the HDRC on August 20, 2014. At that time, the front porch was believed to be in its original condition. Contemporary alterations to the porch were generally discouraged. Since this public hearing, the applicant has submitted evidence that indicates that the front porch was likely a later addition to the home.

c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A. and 7.B., historic porches should be preserved. When repairs are needed, porches should be repaired using in kind materials. The addition of contemporary elements should be avoided. The current proposal maintains the knee wall and column base details that are found in the existing porch. While these details may not be original, they are consistent with the style of the home and are appropriate.

d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., porches should be reconstructed based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. The proposal to construct solid wood posts resting on column bases does have historic precedent with this style of home. However, given that the original conditions are unknown, and that the box columns do have precedent at this particular house, maintaining a box column detail is most consistent with this

Guideline. The raising of the porch ceiling will have minimal impact to the front façade. The applicant has indicated that the porch frieze will remain and terminate at the center of the knee braces.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the box column detail is maintained based on finding d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve as submitted.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2014-321

Applicant: John Britten

Address: 105 S. Flores

Reset to November 5, 2014

16. HDRC NO. 2014-291

Applicant: Lyndsay Thorn

Address: 604 S. Alamo

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for items related to the adaptive reuse of Fire Station No. 7 into a new restaurant space. Items affecting the exterior of the building include:

1. Construct a glass and steel elevator enclosure and light steel pergolas on the roof of the building;
2. Replace non-original metal overhead doors with aluminum storefront; and
3. Install an internally-illuminated LED blade sign on the west (S Alamo) façade.

FINDINGS:

- a. Fire Station No. 7 at 604 S Alamo was constructed in 1925. It is an architecturally and historically significant landmark sited on a prominent corner. Staff commends the applicant for pursuing the adaptive reuse of this important historic resource.
- b. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 9, 2014. Concern was expressed over the proposed placement of the trash chute and dumpster. It was noted that this building has three prominent facades and that the north façade could probably be considered to be the rear of the building. The applicant was also encouraged to explore other options for the placement of the elevator housing.
- c. This application was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on September 23, 2014, during an on-site visit to the property. At that visit, the applicant indicated that the elevator housing would consist of glass and be located towards the northern façade of the building. The enclosure itself had been reduced to 6 ½ feet above the parapet wall with a perforated metal housing extending approximately 12 feet above the parapet wall. The previously-proposed trash chute was eliminated from the proposal. Those present agreed that there wasn't a clear area for trash receptacles and that the site presented a number of challenges.

- d. This application was reviewed a third time by the Design Review Committee on October 7, 2014. The applicant indicated that the dumpster enclosure had been removed from the scope and relocated within the building. The applicant still desired to install aluminum storefront at the four existing openings. Likely only one of the openings would include doors. It was noted that the mullion patterns of the remaining openings should match the historic wood doors. The committee members present were divided on whether the proposed location of the elevator enclosure was appropriate. It was understood that there are genuine constraints on the property that make placement of the elevator difficult. There was some agreement that the appropriateness of the elevator would depend on the quality of its construction and execution of the design.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 5.A.i., new equipment should be located away from primary facades as to not be visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant has indicated that the glass enclosure would be located approximately at the exterior parapet wall and will be 6 ½ feet above the parapet. An internally-lit, perforated metal housing will be located on top of the glass enclosure with a height that is approximately 12 feet above the parapet. At this location, the proposed enclosure is expected to impact views of the S Alamo façade. A greater setback from the building edge would be more consistent with the guidelines. Staff finds that relocating the enclosure towards the northwest or northeast corner would alleviate the impact to views of the south facade, and that this option should continue to be explored by the applicant.
- f. Staff understands that site constraints limit the placement of the elevator within the building. The applicant is also concerned with the limiting rooftop views of the downtown skyline and prefers not to place the elevator on the northern end. Through consultation with the Design Review Committee, the applicant has presented an option that incorporates as much glass as possible in order to reduce the visual prominence of the elevator. Given that other locations have been explored, staff finds the current proposal to be an acceptable solution provided that the enclosure is designed to be as light as possible in order to become visually subordinate to the west façade. Likewise, structural members should be thin in order to reduce visual prominence. While the applicant has indicated that this is the desired effect, construction drawings must be provided which illustrate how these details will be executed.
- g. The metal overhead doors on the ground level are a non-historic replacement. The insertion of a new door element does not alter the size or dimensions of the original masonry openings consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. Therefore, replacement of the metal overhead doors with a new material is appropriate.
- h. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i., new door features should match the size, material and profile of the historic feature. The proposed storefront introduces a contemporary element that is not consistent with the original wood doors on the ground level. There are remaining examples of original wood doors on the building. The new entrances should appear similar in design and profile to the historic examples based on this guideline.
- i. Because the building is to be converted for commercial use, staff understands that signage will need to be added. The Guidelines for Signage recommend that new signs respect and respond to the character and/or period of the area in which they are being placed, and scaled to be subordinate to the overall building composition. Staff finds a blade sign at the proposed scale to be appropriate. The design of the sign should be further developed in conformance with the Historic Design Guidelines, including the Guidelines for Signage 1.A.ii. which recommend that signs feature traditional designs and 1.E.i. which recommend against internal illumination.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the elevator enclosure and pergola based on findings e and d. A submission for final approval must include detailed construction drawings that illustrate final detailing for the structure.
2. Staff recommends approval of the proposed storefront with the stipulation that the mullions on non-entry storefronts match the pattern of the original wood doors based on finding h.
3. Staff recommends conceptual approval of a blade sign on the S Alamo façade with the stipulation that any sign be externally illuminated based on finding I, or illuminated in a way that allows for a blade of traditional thickness instead of a cabinet.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to grant conceptual approval with staff recommendations.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2014-335

Applicant: Suzanne and Ash Dabbous

Address: 131 W. Lynwood

Postponed by the applicant.

19. HDRC NO. 2014-340

Applicant: Tom Mulica

Address: 1003 S. Main

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

Remove one (southern) brick chimneys from the house at 1003 S Main.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 1003 S Main was constructed circa 1910 in the Queen Anne style with simplified detailing and a hipped roof. The house features three brick chimneys which are character-defining features of the property.
- b. The applicant has indicated that the chimney will be removed from the interior for space planning. The applicant has not indicated that the chimney is structurally unsound which might otherwise necessitate its repair or partial removal. While the HDRC does not review interior work, any impact to original exterior features is a concern. In many cases, chimneys are modified to terminate in the attic space in order to preserve the exterior appearance of the house. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitations number 2, the removal of historic materials or alteration of character-defining features must be avoided. Maintaining the chimney in place is the most appropriate solution and interior planning should be altered to accommodate this original feature.
- c. The applicant has explored options for terminating the chimney in the attic space. Due to the height of the attic space at this location, additional structural support will be needed to bear the weight of the masonry. The applicant has submitted two options for HDRC consideration as well as projected costs for each. The applicant has made a claim for unreasonable economic hardship in maintaining the chimney based on the information provided. However, staff finds that if it is not economically feasible to terminate the chimney in the attic space, then interior space planning may be revised to incorporate the chimney.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b and c. Staff recommends maintaining the chimney in place.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to grant denial based on findings b and c.

AYES: Cone, Laffoon, Guarino, Connor
NAYS: Judson, Rodriguez, Feldman

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2014-337

Applicant: Robert Spermo

Address: 323 Leigh St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to repair the existing structure as well as construct an addition to the rear of the home at 323 Leigh. The requested repairs to the existing structure include:

1. Repairs to the cornice to replace the moisture damaged soffit and fascia with new cedar;
2. The addition of 3 front porch columns and wood railing;
3. Replacement of original wood windows with new wood windows;
4. Replacement of the roof with a standing seam metal roof; and
5. Construct a 565 sq ft addition to the rear of the home. Exterior materials will include smooth finish HardiePlank siding, standing seam metal roof, matching wood windows, and a crushed granite driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. Staff performed a site visit to the property on October 9, 2014. During the visit, the applicant indicated that he preferred replacement windows due to the increase energy efficiency. The applicant also presented a preliminary landscaping plan for future consideration.
- b. The proposed repairs to the cornice use in-kind materials consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii and iii.
- c. The existing metal columns are a non-original replacement. The proposed introduction of 6x6 wooden front porch columns and wood railing is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.i and ii., although staff finds that this porch likely originally featured only two columns instead of the proposed three.
- d. Staff performed a visit to the property on October 9, 2014, and observed the following damage to the windows: cracked/loose glass on some windows, minor water damage at sills, and paint peeling or chipping. The windows were found to be structurally sound, in very good condition, and fully repairable. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. The proposed replacement of the roof with a standing seam metal roof is appropriate for the style of the house and is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. The applicant has indicated that the checklist for metal roofs will be followed including the use of panels which are 18"-21" in width, seams that are an appropriate height for the slope of the roof (1"-2"), and a double munched ridge seam instead of a raised ridge cap vent.
- f. The proposed addition will occur at the rear of the house, utilize a matching roof form, and will be distinguished by a change in materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A. and 1.B.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of cornice repairs based on finding b.
2. Staff recommends approval of the replacement columns with the stipulation that two columns are installed instead of three based on finding c.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement based on finding d. Staff recommends repairs.
4. Staff recommends approval of the standing seam metal roof based on finding e.
5. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve items 1, 2, 4 and 5 with staff recommendations. Denial of window replacement based on finding d.

AYES: Cone, Laffoon, Guarino, Connor, Judson, Rodriguez, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2014-203

Applicant: Grace Rose Gonzales

Address: 723 Donaldson

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

Replace original asbestos tile flooring in the designated interior spaces at Thomas Jefferson High School with vinyl composition tiles (VCT). Areas to be replaced include the Library and main corridor in front of the Auditorium.

FINDINGS:

- a. The original flooring at Thomas Jefferson High School consists of asbestos tiles in a variety of colors. In many places in the building, individual or small sections of tile have been previously replaced with VCT. Major structural settling in the building has previously caused the asbestos tiles to chip, creating a potential health hazard for the building's occupants. Flooring in the library and main corridor were subsequently removed without approval in preparation for structural work to be done. Following the removal of the tile, OHP staff was consulted on two occasions to review progress on the proposed replacement tile. The applicant has researched a number of products with differing color selections in an attempt to match photographs of the original.
- b. The original flooring consists of a material that is no longer manufactured and a replacement material is necessary. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, new materials should match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Staff finds that the design of the proposed VCT is consistent with the historic conditions.
- c. The applicant has made a good effort to match the original colors as closely as possible using a modern-day product. The selected colors for the main corridor appear to be a good match for the historic condition. The selected colors for the library are also a good match, although it has been noted that the dark brown selected is not quite as dark as the original.
- d. VCT products have striations or flecks in order mask the appearance of wear and tear on the product. The original asbestos tiles were a solid color, so it is difficult to match find a matching VCT product. The applicant has selected a product that features minimal flecking. The selected black VCT which will be used for the borders has white flecking that is more pronounced. This will not be a close match to the original in terms of texture. The applicant has indicated that all flooring will be waxed. The waxing may help to reduce the noticeable differences in texture between the two flooring types.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that an alternative product for the black tile be explored by the applicant based on finding d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve with new black tile submitted on 10-15-14.

AYES: Cone, Laffoon, Guarino, Connor, Judson, Rodriguez, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2014-320

Applicant: Karl Graf

Address: 622 Nolan

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

Demolish the two-story building at 622 Nolan. The applicant has made a claim for an economic hardship in retaining the building and proposes to develop the vacant lot as a landscaped garden.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 622 Nolan was constructed circa 1905. It was likely originally constructed with Classical Revival detailing, although the building appears to have been substantially modified over time. A number of rear additions have been added and front porch has been partially enclosed. The porch itself appears to have been replaced with simplified details. The house was used as a boarding home for a number of years, and the interior space has been divided into multiple living quarters. Currently, the house is used for storage and a dining space.
- b. The City's Building Standards Board has previously ordered repairs to the house, including repairs to the foundation and structure. The house has begun to lean off of its foundation and encroaching into the neighboring property. The applicant will be responsible for accruing fines for any outstanding repairs.
- c. The Demolition and Designation Committee conducted a site visit to the property on July 23, 2014. The committee found that the house was contributing and did not find that a loss of significance, that would warrant demolition, had occurred. The committee recommended against demolition.
- d. The loss of a contributing building constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. A great number of demolitions have previously occurred within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, and this block of Nolan is especially threatened with future demolitions. 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 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 Catholic Worker House is a registered 501(c)3 organization, and the property at 622 Nolan is not an income-producing property. Formerly, the building served to house volunteers for the organization as well as five homeless families. Since 2008, the building has been solely used for storage. The applicant has indicated that, if demolition is not approved and funds are secured to rehabilitate the structure, then the building would continue to house volunteers. Currently, the Catholic Worker's House does not have sufficient funds to rehabilitate the building (see item B below).]
 - 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 property at 622 Nolan was purchased by a donor in 1985 for \$63,000. The Catholic Worker House currently does not owe any amount on the property. The annual budget for the ministry is approximately \$40,000 and is funded exclusively through donations. A majority of the funds are used for daily functions including utilities, gas, food and hygiene products. In order for the structure to be rehabilitated to minimum housing standards, a substantial investment would need to be made by the owner. The applicant has indicated that a contractor has estimated that rehabilitation costs would fall between \$200,000 and \$300,000. OHP staff has also worked with two experienced contractors to obtain a third-party assessment. Both contractors have concurred that a minimum investment of \$200,000 would be needed in order to stabilize and repair the structure to minimum standards. The house at 622 Nolan has not been considered for an income-producing property.

The applicant is therefore claiming that no amount of investment would result in a reasonable rate of return.]

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 property at 622 Nolan has not been made available for purchase. The Catholic Worker House currently uses the building for storage which will soon be relocated to another facility. The building rests on a deep lot, and the rear of the property is used daily as a dining area for visitors to the soup kitchen at 626 Nolan. The applicant has indicated an average of 150-200 visitors use the property on a daily basis. The applicant is not considering the sale of the property due to the need for space to host visitors.]

e. The applicant has submitted evidence and has made a legitimate claim for an unreasonable economic hardship. If the HDRC finds that the claim for an economic hardship has been thoroughly substantiated and that the conditions of UDC 35-614 apply, a recommendation for approval of any demolitions will not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A permit will not be issued unless the 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.

f. The house at 622 Nolan has become severely deteriorated during the time it has been owned by the Catholic Worker House. Staff finds that the current conditions of the property could have been prevented through routine maintenance. Local assistance is available in most cases, including a grants program offered by the San Antonio Conservation Society. However, City tax incentives for the rehabilitation of the property are not applicable in this case since the owner is a tax-exempt organization.

g. Notifications of this request were mailed to property owners within 200 feet of the subject property in accordance with UDC Section 35-403. Staff will maintain an inventory of responses and provide that information at the public hearing.

h. The proposed site plan, which includes landscaping, fencing and a trellis structure, are generally consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements. The curb cuts illustrated in the site plan appear to be consistent with existing conditions.

Karl Graf, Board of Trustees, Catholic Worker's House, stated he moved into the house 1986 and the house looked as it currently does. The house was in much needed repair. Catholic Worker's House has 6 full time resident volunteers and they live at 617 Dawson St. All of the services provided to the needy are performed at 626 Nolan.

Ruby Casteel, stated she owns property at 610 Nolan. She indicated that the Catholic Worker House approached her to purchase her property at 610 Nolan. Ms. Casteel indicated that the previous owners of 610 Nolan did not want to sell the property to Catholic Worker House for the reason that the large congregation that gathers is not good for the neighborhood. Ms. Casteel stated she is opposed to the demolition.

Jody Williams, San Antonio Conservation Society, read into the record a letter from Sue Ann Pemberton, President. San Antonio Conservation Society strongly objects to the request to demolish the building at 622 Nolan Street. The building located at 622 Nolan is not beyond repair, rather, it is suitable for rehabilitation and reuse. The building is currently in disrepair due to deliberate owner neglect. There appears to be a pattern of the current owner allowing buildings to deteriorate and later request demolition. The neighborhood has suffered from far too many demolitions leaving gaps in the continuity of many streetscapes. Institutions located amidst residential historic districts inherently lead to tensions between the neighbors and the institution, particularly as the institutions evolve their programs and administrative functions.

Dora Ruvalcaba, stated she would like to see 622 Nolan restored.

Commissioner Judson indicated 622 Nolan is a significant structure and is not beyond repair.

Commissioner Cone indicated if the property were to be sold then there would be no economic hardship. Commissioner Cone asked the applicant if they have made an attempt to sell the property.

Karl Graf, Board of Trustees, Catholic Worker's House, indicated that they have not tried to sell the property being that they utilize the structure located in the backyard. The guests use the structure as an eating area.

Commissioner Guarino stated that even though the organization utilizes the structure in the rear of 622 Nolan but HDRC has to think of the responsibility to preservation issues and the preservation of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Connor stated he does not support demolition.

Commissioner Feldman stated she believes the property in question can be sold and does not fall in economic hardship.

Commissioner Guarino stated that economic hardship is valid based on the cost to restore the house and lack of resources for the present owner. It's not to suggest that it's the only possible outcome. Since there is no note on the house, if it were to be sold, then the economic hardship goes away for the owner.

RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant has met the requirements of UDC Section 35-614 and has provided evidence of an economic hardship. If the HDRC concurs and recommends approval of demolition, then the applicant is required by UDC Section 35-614(d) to provide the following prior to the issuance of a demolition permit:

1. A salvage strategy for reuse of building materials deemed valuable by the historic preservation officer for other preservation and restoration activities. Materials to be considered include wood flooring, shiplap, doors, windows, siding and casework. The applicant must provide a timeframe for salvaging and specific plans for either reuse or storage;
2. Proof of financial ability to execute the presented replacement plans which include landscaping and a trellis structure;
3. Any required permits for the proposed trellis and fencing must be obtained in conjunction with the issuance of a demolition permit; and
4. A demolition fee in the amount of \$2,000 shall be assessed based on the proposed replacement plans.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Judson to grant denial based on finding that property could be sold per UDC Section 35-614(b)(3)(c).

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor
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 5:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair

