

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
1 November 2017**

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

**PRESENT:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**ABSENT:** Connor, Brittain.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Gary W. Houston spoke regarding the Hays St. Bridge.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda, which consisted of:

- Item #1, Case No. 2017-468            900 BROADWAY
- Item #2, Case No. 2017-542            222 ISABEL
- Item #3, Case No. 2017-531            9396 HUEBNER
- Item #4, Case No. 2017-538            8314 S PRESA
- Item #5, Case No. 2017-537            2057 W WOODLAWN
- Item #6, Case No. 2017-545            400 E HOUSTON
- Item #7, Case No. 2017-D05            803 N CHERRY (POSTPONED BY APPLICANT)

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**8. HDRC NO. 2017-543**

**Applicant:** Office of Historic Preservation

**Address:** 801 LAMAR ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Building Standards Board (BSB) for the repair of the rear accessory structure at 801 Lamar.

The City's Code Enforcement Division has determined that the rear accessory structure at this address has deteriorated beyond repair and is recommending demolition of the structure per Chapter 6-156, subsections 1, 2, 12, 15, 17 and 18.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The rear accessory structure at 801 Lamar was constructed circa 1925 and is first found on the 1935 Sanborn Map. The Dignowity Hill Historic District features many properties with accessory structures such as this. Many of these accessory structures feature significant architectural features that are contributing to the district. The location, materials and construction style are original to the site.
- b. Office of Historic Preservation Staff found the structure to be contributing through a Review of Contributing Status on July 10, 2017. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A. notes that existing accessory structures should be preserved where they remain. Additionally, accessory structures should be repaired in kind. When new materials are needed, they should match the existing materials in color, durability and texture.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends repair of the existing, contributing historic structure based on findings a and b.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Evelyn Brown spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to recommend BSB repair the structure.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**9. HDRC NO. 2017-534**

**Applicant:** Joan Brooks/Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association Board of Directors

**Address:** 437 NATALEN AVE 433 NATALEN AVE

**REQUEST:**

A request for review by the HDRC regarding eligibility of the property located at 433 and 437 Natalen Ave for landmark designation.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. A demolition application was submitted on September 8, 2017 to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner for the structure at 433 and 437 Natalen which is located in the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD-6). OHP Staff conducted research, met with the owner and contacted the neighborhood association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. A Request for Review of Historic Significance for 433 and 437 Natalen was submitted to OHP by the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association on October 12, 2017.

- c. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP shall forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- d. ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT – This two-story apartment building was built circa 1959 and contains eight units. The structure is typical of apartments constructed during this time, featuring front stone façade, faux wooden lattice, aluminum windows, a flat roof, asbestos siding on side and rear. An asphalt driveway leads to the rear with carports on basement level and two-story metal exterior balcony for access to units. The structure is setback significantly from the street, consistent with the development pattern on this block. It is located in Mahncke Park near Fort Sam Houston and is an example of the proliferation of multi-family housing stock after WWII.
- e. SITE CONTEXT – The structure is located in a residential neighborhood among other Post-WWII single and multi-family dwellings. Platted as Natalen Terrace, the neighborhood was surveyed as part of the Mahncke Park 2005 survey and was evaluated eligible to be a historic district. Demolition of post-war multi-family housing has occurred on Natalen and the adjacent street of Claremont, changing the context of the block and streetscape of the neighborhood.
- f. EVALUATION – The applicant proposed a list of three (3) criteria for eligibility. These include: (b)(10) Its character as an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united by culture, architectural style or physical plan and development; (b)(11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States; (b)(12) It is an important example of a particular architectural type or specimen. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b)(5) It’s embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials -- the property reflects the proliferation of post-World War II multi-family housing in San Antonio. The structure at 433 and 437 Natalen is a typical example of post WWII multi-family residential housing. While 433 - 437 Natalen is of the appropriate historic age and displays some characteristics and features of mid-century modern architecture, such as horizontal massing and composition, low-pitched roof, large windows on the principle façade, and parallel placement to street, it is not an exceptional example of the style and does not meet additional criteria required for landmark status.
- g. While the structure may not be eligible for landmark designation, it would certainly be a contributing structure to a local historic district. The property is located in a neighborhood conservation district currently. The district is eligible to become a local historic district.
- h. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the request. Staff finds that the property at 433 and 437 Natalen does not meet at least 3 of the 16 criteria for evaluation and is not eligible for landmark designation based on findings f through h. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) approves the request, the HDRC will become the applicant and will request a resolution from the City Council to initiate the designation process.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Jim Bastoni spoke in opposition.

**POSTPONED.**

## **10. HDRC NO. 2017-535**

**Applicant:** Joan Brooks/Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association Board of Directors

**Address:** 445 NATALEN AVE 447 NATALEN AVE

### **REQUEST:**

A request for review by the HDRC regarding eligibility of the property located at 445 and 447 Natalen Avenue for landmark designation.

### **FINDINGS:**

- a. (OHP) by the property owner for the structure at 445 and 447 Natalen which is located in the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD-6). OHP Staff conducted research, met with the owner and contacted the neighborhood association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. A Request for Review of Historic Significance for 445 and 447 Natalen was submitted to OHP by the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association on October 12, 2017.
- c. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP shall forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- d. **ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT** – This one-story Craftsman style house was built circa 1951. The structure is typical of Craftsman residences constructed during this time, featuring a gable on hip roof, exposed rafter tails, wood lap siding, one front door on front gable porch with wooden porch balustrade, wood one over one windows, and a rear basement access. The structure is setback significantly from the street, consistent with the development pattern on this block. It is located in Mahncke Park near Fort Sam Houston and is an example of the proliferation of multi-family housing stock after WWII.
- e. **SITE CONTEXT** – The structure is located in a residential neighborhood among other Post-WWII single and multi-family dwellings. Platted as Natalen Terrace, the neighborhood was surveyed as part of the Mahncke Park 2005 survey and was evaluated eligible to be a historic district. Demolition of post-war multi-family housing has occurred on Natalen and the adjacent street of Claremont, changing the context of the block and streetscape of the neighborhood.
- f. **EVALUATION** – The applicant proposed a list of three (3) criteria for eligibility. These include: (b)(10) Its character as an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united by culture, architectural style or physical plan and development; (b)(11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States; (b)(12) It is an important example of a particular architectural type or specimen. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b)(5) It's embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials-- the property reflects the proliferation of post-World War II multi-family housing in San Antonio. The structure at 445 and 447 Natalen is a typical example of post WWII single-family residential housing. While 445-447 Natalen is of the appropriate historic age, displays characteristics and features of craftsman and minimal traditional architecture and features some forms of the period of significance, it is not distinctive, unique or exemplary in its design, and does not meet additional criteria.

- g. While the structure may not be eligible for landmark designation, it would certainly be a contributing structure to a local historic district. The property is located in a neighborhood conservation district currently. The district is eligible to become a local historic district.
- h. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the request. Staff finds that the property at 445 and 447 Natalen does not meet at least 3 of the 16 criteria for evaluation and is not eligible for landmark designation based on findings f through h. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) approves the request, the HDRC will become the applicant and will request a resolution from the City Council to initiate the designation process.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Jim Bastoni spoke in opposition.

**POSTPONED.**

**11. HDRC NO. 2017-536**

**Applicant:** David Quinn/Sombrilla

**Address:** 540 S ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. Install wall signage to consist of 18” tall cut metal letters to read “Brown Legal Building”.
- 2. Install three fabric awnings above second floor window openings.
- 3. Install one fabric awning above the first floor storefront system to feature thermal applied white graphics to read “SCB Law Offices”.
- 4. Install one set of 28” tall cut metal address numbers.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 540 S St Mary’s was constructed circa 1890 and first appears on the 1892 Sanborn maps. The structure features a raised first floor with first floor storefront windows, second floor paired windows, a front facing balcony, a castellated parapet wall and parapet wall roof tiles. In recent years, the structure has been covered with vegetation.
- b. Per the Guidelines for Signage 1.A.i., each building will be allowed one major and two minor signs. Total requested square footage for signage should not exceed fifty (50) square feet. Additionally, per the Guidelines for Signage 1.A.ii., new signage should be designed to be based on evidence of historic signs. Signs should identify the tenant without creating visual clutter or distracting from building features and historic districts.
- c. WALL SIGN – Below the parapet wall, the applicant has proposed to install 18” tall aluminum cut letters. The proposed total square footage for this signage is approximately 38 square feet. Signage was previously installed at this location on the façade. Staff finds the proposed signage to be appropriately sized and located and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed signage should not feature a high gloss finish.
- d. FABRIC AWNINGS – The applicant has proposed to install fabric awnings above each façade opening on the east elevation of the second floor. The proposed fabric awnings will replace the existing, non-original awnings. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations

11.B.ii., new canopies and awnings should be installed based on evidence of the original. If not evidence exists, new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached. Generally, staff finds the proposed awnings to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. FABRIC AWNINGS – The applicant has proposed to install fabric awnings above the storefront system on the first floor. The proposed fabric awning will replace the existing fabric awning and will include valance signage to read “SCB Law Offices”. The signage will feature thermal applied white graphics. Staff finds the proposed awnings and signage to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. ADDRESS NUMBERS – At the southwest corner of the building, the applicant has proposed to install one set of aluminum cut numbers to be 28” tall. The numbers will read the structure’s address, “540” and are to wrap the corner of the structure. Staff finds this proposal to be inappropriate and recommends the applicant propose address numbers that are consistent with those found historically on neighboring structures. Staff has provided examples of appropriate address numbers in the exhibits.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings b through e with the stipulation that all cut aluminum signage feature a non-glossy finish.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED.**

**12. HDRC NO. 2017-539**

**Applicant:** Bryan Murphy and Angie Krech

**Address:** 229 NELSON AVE

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Modify the existing front porch columns on the primary structure.
2. Modify the existing entrance configuration on the primary structure.
3. Replace three aluminum windows on a rear addition with double hung windows.
4. Remove and/or modify existing one over one windows and their openings.
5. Enclose a rear porch on a rear addition.
6. Demolish the existing rear accessory structure.
7. Construct a new 2-story rear accessory structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 229 Nelson is a 1-story single family home constructed in the Craftsman style. The home features a double front gable, deep overhanging eaves with exposed rafter tails and decorative brackets, and an asymmetrical front porch. The home is a contributing structure in the Knob Hill Historic District. The property contains a 1-story rear accessory structure, which is also contributing to the district.

Findings for the primary structure, items #1-4:

- b. **PORCH COLUMNS** – According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, added porch elements, such as stairs and railings, should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The proposed railings and columns appear generally compatible with the style and materiality of the home, but staff has not seen dimensioned drawings that indicate the width or details of the columns.
- c. **ENTRANCE MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to switch the locations of the existing front door and front window. Currently, the front window with siding to match the material and profile of existing. According to Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS: NON-ORIGINAL WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to remove three windows from the rear and right elevations. These particular windows are aluminum and not original to the structure. The applicant has proposed to install two one over one windows in the general location of the removed windows. Based on the submitted elevations, the placement, configuration, and proportions proposed are consistent with the Guidelines, but staff has not received a window specification.
- e. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS: SIDE FACADES** – Based on the submitted elevations, the applicant is proposing to modify and/or remove existing one over one wood windows. The applicant has not provided a demolition plan or existing floor plan that indicates the extent of the modifications to the west and the east facades; however, the proposed left elevation contains new French doors and no window openings. The applicant has not submitted a window specification for any replacement windows nor a narrative explaining which windows will be restored, if any. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing windows should be preserved unless the window assembly is deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant has not furnished evidence that the existing windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The Guidelines also state that existing openings should be preserved. Staff does not find the proposal to modify or remove existing one over one windows consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **REAR PORCH ENCLOSURE** – The applicant has proposed to enclose an existing rear porch overhang to create new conditioned space. The proposal includes the installation of a vertical trim piece at the joint of the original structure’s form and the new addition. According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, side of rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

Findings for accessory structure, items #5 and #6:

- g. **DEMOLITION OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to demolish an existing 1-story rear accessory structure. The structure features the same deep overhanging eave dimensions as the primary structure. The accessory also appears on the 1911-1951 Sanborn Map in the same location, footprint, and height. The rear accessory structure is contributing to the district. According to UDC Section 35-614(b), the applicant must demonstrate unreasonable economic hardship. If this cannot be met, the applicant must demonstrate loss of significance of the structure. The applicant has not met either of these requirements in their submitted documentation. Staff does not find the demolition appropriate.
- h. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the rear of the lot. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds the proposal consistent.
- i. **ORIENTATION AND SETBACK** – The structure will be oriented towards Nelson St, which matches the orientation and entrance configuration of the existing accessory structure. The proposed structure will have a 5 foot setback from the side yard and a zero foot setback from the

rear property line. The rear of the lot provides access to an alley. A majority of the historic rear accessory structures on this block with alley access are located directly on the rear property line, which staff finds consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant may be required to obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

- j. **SCALE** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing one-story rear garage with a new two-story garage with a second story apartment. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. There is evidence of historic 2-story accessory structures in the Knob Hill Historic District, but they are primarily located behind 2-story houses with a much larger footprint and scale. Staff has also not yet seen a height comparison between the existing structure and the proposed accessory structure.
- k. **FENESTRATION** – The applicant has proposed to install two one over one windows on the front elevation of the proposed structure, and one door on the west elevation. The rear and east elevations are void of fenestration. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, new garages or outbuildings should include windows and door openings that are similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principle historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions. Staff does not find blank elevations to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- l. **MATERIALITY** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Based on the submitted elevations, the proposed accessory structure will feature lap siding. However, the applicant has not specified the material, profile, or dimensions of the siding at this time.
- m. **ROOF** – The applicant has proposed a front gable roof with overhanging eaves. The roof material will be composition shingles to match the primary structure. The guidelines stipulate that architectural details of new construction should keep with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should also be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the primary structure or adjacent structures. Staff finds the proposed roof form and material consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. **STAIRS** – The proposed accessory structure features a 2-story exterior staircase. The applicant has not yet provided material information on this structure, nor any detailed drawings with dimensions.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the front porch modifications based on finding b with the stipulation that the applicant submits final measured drawings of the columns to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the entrance modifications based on finding c.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the non-original aluminum windows on the rear and right facades based on finding d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits dimensioned drawings that clearly indicate where the proposed windows will be located.
- ii. That the applicant installs one over one wood windows. The applicant submits final window specifications to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the

opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Item 4, Staff does not recommend approval of the removal and/or modification of existing one over one wood windows based on finding e. The applicant must furnish substantial documentation that indicates the existing windows are deteriorated beyond repair. If the HDRC approves of any modifications to the existing wood windows, staff recommends that the following stipulation apply:

- i. That the applicant installs one over one wood windows. The applicant submits final window specifications to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Item 5, Staff recommends approval of the rear porch enclosure based on finding d.

Item 6, Staff does not recommend the approval of the demolition of the existing rear accessory structure based on finding f.

Item 7, Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed rear accessory as submitted at this time based on findings g through l. Staff recommends that the existing rear accessory structure be preserved. If the HDRC approves the demolition request for the existing rear accessory structure, staff recommends the following:

- i. That the top plate be reduced for a 1 ½ story accessory structure instead of a full two stories.
- ii. That additional fenestration be proposed for blank facades as noted in finding g.
- iii. That the applicant installs one over one wood windows. The applicant submits final window specifications to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- iv. That the applicant provides additional material specifications to staff for review, including siding type and size; window specifications; garage door specifications; and stair materials and dimensions.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve with staff stipulations with the additional note that the applicant is required to submit accurate elevation drawings.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2017-467**

**Applicant:** John Brearley

**Address:** 423 N HACKBERRY ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new two-story single family home on the vacant lot at 423N Hackberry.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 423 N Hackberry in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between E Houston St to the north and Glorietta to the south. The lot is flanked to the north by a 2-story historic single family home, to the west by a series of historic 1-story single family homes, to the south by two vacant lots, and to the east by a non-contributing 1-story warehouse structure. This area of Hackberry St is transitional and features both commercial and residential structures.
- b. 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.
- c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 12, 2017. The DRC mentioned that the existing context rhythm is mixed, but most commonly, foundations are 18-24 inches off grade. However, this project faces the issue of the ridge height being taller if the foundation were to be raised. A possible solution may be raising the porch entity and keeping the parking at grade. Regarding the parking configuration, the DRC noted that it is a departure from traditional development patterns. The DRC suggested a possible resolution of designing the front porch element as enclosed versus open to eliminate the issue of second story massing fronting the street, noting that there is precedent for this in historic districts. This approach may also offer more opportunity for fenestration on the front façade. The DRC did recognize the difficulties of shotgun lot, foundation considerations, nearby context, and the accommodation of a 2-story structure. The applicant was amenable to lowering the height to be more consistent with the context. The applicant met again with the DRC on September 26, 2017. The applicant brought a modified set of drawings to be presented at the HDRC hearing on October 4, 2017. The drawings added a front balcony, which the DRC received favorably. The DRC discussed windows, and came to a decision with the applicant to install a functional one over one window on the front façade in the kitchen to accommodate comments at the previous HDRC hearing. Other window comments included adding windows to a previously blank wall, simplifying the number and pattern of the overall fenestration composition, and utilizing appropriate window dimensions, inset, and profile. The DRC also agreed that while the front parking strategy is a deviation from historic development precedents in the district, the proposal is an economical solution to a site with dimensional constraints.
- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent

setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of approximately 10'-8" from the front façade to the front sidewalk. The historic structure immediately to the north of 423 N Hackberry features a side setback from the sidewalk of approximately 20'-0". This is the only historic structure that partially fronts N Hackberry on this block. According to a 1951 Sanborn Map, three 1-story residential structures occupied this block of N Hackberry and all featured a minimal front setback. Based on the historic development pattern and current context of the block, staff finds the proposed setbacks appropriate.

- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Hackberry. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not greatly exceed the historic precedent. The only remaining historic residential structure on N Hackberry between E Houston and Glorietta is 2 stories. The remaining historic structures in the vicinity on Glorietta are 1-story. The applicant has noted on the submitted drawings that the proposed ridge line will be 28'-10" from the finish floor, which is approximately one foot from grade, bringing the total height to approximately 29'-10" feet. Both the first and second stories will feature 10'-0" tall interior ceiling heights separated by a web truss measuring 1'-6". The neighboring 2-story historic structure features a first floor ceiling height of 10'-0" and a second floor ceiling height of 8'-0". Staff does not find the proposed height to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the overall height should be reduced through the shortening of the second story or the lowering of the top plate height to produce an overall height that is comparable with the heights of neighboring, historic structures.
- g. **PORCH CONFIGURATION AND MASSING** – The applicant has proposed to incorporate a front porch on the front façade of the new structure. The porch mass will be inset approximately 6" from the front façade. The Historic Design Guidelines state that porches on new construction should be reflective of the development pattern of the district. Typically in historic districts, including Dignowity Hill, residential porch massing elements project the furthest towards the streetscape to engage pedestrians. Two story structures feature a second story that is set back from the porch. As proposed, the structure's second story extends over the front porch, which increases the massing on the street. This is addressed in Guideline 2.A.ii, which states that step-downs in building height, wallplane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition should be utilized. There is no historic precedent in the district for this porch form or massing strategy. Staff finds the porch inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. The applicant has noted a foundation height of approximately one foot. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) inches. This is generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a primary gable roof form with an additional front gable. There are historic examples of this roof form throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposed roof form generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally consistent with those found on historic structures in regards to location and size with the exception of the right and left elevations, which feature several small fixed windows that are not consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document or historic

fenestration precedents in the district, as well as a series of ganged windows with minimal trim separation between them. All proposed window detailing can be modified to relate closer to historic examples, such as the use of approximately six inches of separation between double windows. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within walls to ensure that a proper façade depth is maintained.

- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance, and feature traditional trim and sill details. At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials; however, staff finds that one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows should be used based on the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy Document.
- l. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed new construction does not meet this Guideline.
- m. MATERIALS – Based on the submitted drawings notes, the applicant has proposed shake shingle siding, a composition shingle roof, and board and batten siding. However, the siding indicated as shake shingle is rendered as horizontal board siding. If horizontal composite siding is used, a smooth finished should be used along with an exposure of four inches for lap siding. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally the proposed architectural features are consistent with the Guidelines and relate to historic examples found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- o. COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed front porch columns. The columns will be wood with mitered corners, recessed panels, and a 1x4” cap wrap.
- p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant has indicated an A/C unit to the north of the proposed structure. The proposal includes a new 6’ tall privacy fence, which will screen the unit from the public right-of-way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment and submitting full details for final approval.
- q. DRIVEWAY & PARKING – The applicant has proposed a new front concrete driveway measuring approximately 10’-8” in length and approximately 10’-0” in width. The concrete terminates at the front façade of the proposed new structure’s carport and transitions into crushed granite. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new garages should follow the historic pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the principal building. There is no historic precedent for an attached garage in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The development pattern in the Dignowity Hill Historic District is most commonly for driveways to extend through the front yard to the side and rear yard of historic properties. Staff does not find the proposed front-loaded parking and driveway location to be consistent with the Guidelines or with the development pattern of the district.
- r. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not at this time provided information regarding landscaping. The applicant is responsible for submitting a landscaping plan when returning to the HDRC for final approval.
- s. FENCING – The applicant has noted per the site plan that a new privacy fence measuring 6’ in height is to be installed in the side and rear yard behind the front façade. Staff finds the proposed location and height appropriate; however, the applicant is to submit a detail of the proposed fence, including materiality and design, when returning to the HDRC for final approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual based on findings a through s. The applicant should address the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant provides information noting the setbacks of adjacent historic structures on a contextual site plan.
2. That the applicant reduces the proposed height through the shortening of the second story or the lowering of the top plate height to produce an overall height that is comparable with the heights of neighboring historic structures.
3. That the applicant sets the second story back from the front façade and modifies the front porch configuration and massing as noted in finding g. The porch should be the mass that projects furthest towards the streetscape to reflect the developmental context of the area.
4. That the proposed driveway extends along the side of the proposed new construction as noted in finding p.
5. That the applicant introduces window sizes and proportions that are more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy Document, and adjacent historic structures to the right and left elevations as noted in finding i.
6. That that a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used based on findings i and j. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
7. That the applicant provides additional information regarding exterior materials. Composite siding, whether lap or shingle, should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four inches for lap siding. Hardi shingles should not have a faux wood texture. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.**

**14. HDRC NO. 2017-478**

**Applicant:** Tobias Stapleton

**Address:** 205 OSTROM

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

- 1a. Demolish the historic structure located at 205 Ostrom.
- 1b. Construct a two story, primary residential structure on the east end of the lot.
- 1c. Construct a two story, primary residential structure on the west end of the lot.
- 1d. Construct two, two story, rear accessory structures at the rear of each two story structure.
- 1e. Install two driveways/parking locations on the site.

As an alternative to the above-listed request, the applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

- 1f. Construct a two story accessory structure at the rear of the existing, historic structure.

## **FINDINGS:**

### General findings:

- a. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was originally reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 21, 2017. At that meeting, committee members commented on the proposed architecture and noted concerns regarding the proposed massing and turrets. A site visit was conducted with HDRC Commissioners, members of the River Road Neighborhood Association, neighbors and Office of Historic Preservation Staff on March 22, 2017. At that site visit, access was provided to both the exterior of the structure as well as the interior. This request was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on April 25, 2017. At that time, a new design was presented to the committee and received positive feedback.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – A second site visit was conducted by the DRC on June, 28, 2017. At that site visit, committee members viewed the structure and commented on its structural condition. Committee members noted at that time that there was a loss of architectural and structural significance. This request was reviewed by the DRC on July 25, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted concern over the proposed setbacks in relationship to others found within the River Road Historic District and noted that the proposed flat roof of the second primary structure is not appropriate for the district.
- c. This request was heard at the August 2, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where the application was withdrawn by the applicant. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 12, 2017, where the applicant noted a change in the proposed roof form of one of the primary structures and provided additional information regarding structural analyses by structural engineers. This request was heard by the HDRC At the September 20, 2017, hearing where it was withdrawn by the applicant. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 25, 2017, where the committee noted that accurate survey information was needed, that diagrams noting changes and improvements since previous reviews should be included in the presentation documents, that the proposed single width garage doors were not appropriate and that the proposed two story accessory structure at the rear of the single story historic structure overpowered the historic structure.
- d. The River Road Historic District has been intensely opposed to the demolition of structures located within the district. The criteria outlined for the demolition of a contributing structure noted in UDC Section 35-618 is important to the public process.
- e. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

### Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The structure located at 205 Ostrom was constructed circa 1935 and is located within the River Road Historic District. The structure features architectural elements that are indicative of the Minimal Traditional Style that can be found in the district. The house features many of its original materials including wood siding and wood windows. However, modifications to the form of the historic structure have resulted in the removal and enclosing of the front porch, which now presents itself as a screened porch. Despite these modifications, staff finds the house to be a contributing resource within the River Road Historic District due to its construction date and architectural style.
- 1b. The loss of a contributing structure is 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 has provided detailed cost estimate for rehabilitation of the structure which is approximately \$589,242. This bid was provided by a contractor who was approved by the applicant's financing provider. The applicant has noted that the rehabilitation or new construction at this site is limited to a contractor that is recommended and approved by their financial provider. The applicant has noted that financing for the proposed rehabilitation and new construction has been limited due to the current condition of the structure. Staff finds that an alternative opinion by a third-party contractor may result in a lower estimate for repairs. The applicant has not submitted additional bids at this time.

*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 provided information in the form of a structural report from the selected contractor which notes that the structure is suffering from intense dry rot that has impacted the structure to the extent that certain beam joists and studs have been structurally compromised. Additionally, the structural analysis provided by the contractor notes the collapse of the floor in certain areas, the collapse of ceiling and the roof structure, infestation of wood worm and the presence of fungus throughout the structure. In addition to the report provided by the selected contractor, the applicant has provided structural analyses from two structural engineers. Neither report recommends repairs.]

*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 provided staff with information noting the active marketing of this property to potential purchasers. The applicant has noted that the structure has been vacant for approximately twenty-three years. The applicant has owned this property for approximately one year. The UDC Section 35-614 lists the criteria for establishing an unreasonable economic hardship in the context of long-term ownership of a property, not the purchase of a property with the intent to demolish the existing, historic structure.

- 1c. The applicant has provided additional information in the packet that summarizes financial losses should demolition not be approved. However, these losses are related to the acquisition of the property by the applicant and not the criteria established by the UDC. Staff finds that the applicant has not demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship in accordance with the UDC. When an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information which may show a loss of significance in regards to the subject of the application in order to receive historic and design review commission recommendation of approval of the demolition. If, based on the evidence

presented, the historic and design review commission finds that the structure or property is no longer historically, culturally, architecturally or archeologically significant, it may make a recommendation for approval of the demolition. In making this determination, the historic and design review commission must find that the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission that the structure or property has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Additionally, the historic and design review commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner, and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect.

- 1d. In general, staff encourages the rehabilitation, and when necessary, reconstruction of historic structures. Such work is eligible for local tax incentives. The financial benefit of the incentives should be taken into account when weighing the costs of rehabilitation against the costs of demolition with new construction.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed an orientation that is consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district. Regarding setbacks, this lot features an irregular shape, presenting itself as an island. The applicant has proposed a setback that is similar to setbacks found along a typical street in the front, while side setbacks and close to side streets.
- 2b. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – While the site plan provided is sufficient for conceptual review of design elements, concern has been expressed regarding the accurateness of the survey provided for the property and actual property lines may differ from those represented in the submitted site plan. Any final plans must represent accurate setback conditions and demonstrate compliance with the Unified Development Code prior to any request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 2c. **TREE SURVEY** – At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a tree survey. A tree survey must be provided to staff noting which existing trees will be impacted by the proposed new construction.
- 2d. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards the intersection of Ostom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2e. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with an overall height of 24’ – 3”. Many structures in the immediate vicinity feature either one or one and a half stories of height. While the applicant has proposed two stories, many of the neighboring structures feature additional height and steep pitched roofs. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2f. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundations. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of 1’ – 6”. This is appropriate for the district and is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2g. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include both front and side gabled roofs. Each street, Ostom, Magnolia Avenue and the intersection of the two will have a gable oriented towards them. Staff finds the proposed roof forms appropriate.

- 2h. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has featured window openings that feature historic heights and widths as well as window groupings that are found historically on Craftsman structures. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2i. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant’s proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- 2j. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the use of a standing seam metal roof and board and batten siding. Staff finds that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.
- 2k. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.
- 2l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in natural and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the proposed structure is consistent with the Guidelines; however.

Findings related to request item #3:

- 3a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has sited this structure in the middle of the lot. Generally, given the dimensions and shape of the existing lot, staff finds this arrangement appropriate.
- 3b. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – While the site plan provided is sufficient for conceptual review of design elements, concern has been expressed regarding the accurateness of the survey provided for the property and actual property lines may differ from those represented in the submitted site plan. Any final plans must represent accurate setback conditions and demonstrate compliance with the Unified Development Code prior to any request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 3c. TREE SURVEY – At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a tree survey. A tree survey must be provided to staff noting which existing trees will be impacted by the proposed new construction.
- 3d. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrances towards both Ostrom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 3e. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with an overall height of 24’ – 0” for the primary mass and 28’ – 9” for the two stair towers. Many structures in the immediate vicinity feature either one or one and a half stories of height. While the applicant has proposed two stories, many of the neighboring structures feature additional height and steep pitched roofs. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

- 3f. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundations. The applicant has not specified the foundation height for this structure; however, staff finds that it should be comparable to that of the first structure and be consistent with the Guidelines.
- 3g. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to modify the previously proposed flat roof form to include a gabled roof, consistent with the Guidelines.
- 3h. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has featured window openings that feature historic heights and widths as well as window groupings that are typical for historic structures in the district.
- 3i. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant’s proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- 3j. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the use of both vertical and horizontal siding; however, has not noted the material. Staff finds the use of wood or Hardi board siding to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- 3k. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.
- 3l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As previously noted, the applicant has proposed a flat roof in combination with horizontal and vertical siding. Typically, flat roofs that are found throughout the River Road Historic District feature Spanish Eclectic architectural detailing including decorative roof parapets. Staff does not find the proposed roof to be appropriate in relationship to the proposed materials and adjacent proposed structure. Staff finds that a second structure that matches the design of the structure in request item #2 would be more appropriate.

Findings related to request item #4:

- 4a. ACCESSORY STRUCTURES – To the rear (west) of the structure noted in request item #2 and to the side (south) of the structure noted in request item #3, the applicant has proposed to construct two, two story accessory structures to accommodate vehicular parking as well as a second level dwelling unit. The proposed accessory structures feature an overall profile and massing that is subordinate to the proposed, primary residential structures, feature appropriately detailed garage doors and feature architectural detailing that’s consistent with the historic examples found throughout the River Road Historic District. Staff finds the proposed accessory structures appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 4b. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – While the site plan provided is sufficient for conceptual review of design elements, concern has been expressed regarding the accurateness of the survey provided for the property and actual property lines may differ from those represented in the submitted site plan. Any final plans must represent accurate setback conditions and demonstrate compliance with the Unified Development Code prior to any request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 4c. TREE SURVEY – At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a tree survey. A tree survey must be provided to staff noting which existing trees will be impacted by the proposed new construction.

Findings related to request item #5:

- 5a. DRIVEWAYS – The applicant has proposed to introduce one new curb cut on the property to exist with an existing curb cut that is located on Ostrom Drive. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that historic profiles are to be used for the creation of curb cuts and that typical driveway widths are to be used, typically no wider than ten feet in historic districts; however, there are examples in the immediate area of curb cut and driveway widths that are wider than ten feet in width. Staff finds that the proposed driveway location are appropriate.
- 5b. TREE SURVEY – At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a tree survey. A tree survey must be provided to staff noting which existing trees will be impacted by the proposed new construction.

Findings related to request item #6:

- 6a. As an alternative to demolition with new construction, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story accessory structure at the rear of the existing, historic structure. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that accessory structures should be designed to be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure on the lot, should be no larger than 40 percent of the primary historic structure's footprint, should relate to the construction period and architecture of the primary historic structure and should feature windows and doors similar to those of the primary historic structure. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. notes that the prominent garage orientation of the block and the historic setback of accessory structures should be matched.
- 6b. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – While the site plan provided is sufficient for conceptual review of design elements, concern has been expressed regarding the accurateness of the survey provided for the property and actual property lines may differ from those represented in the submitted site plan. Any final plans must represent accurate setback conditions and demonstrate compliance with the Unified Development Code prior to any request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 6c. LOT LAYOUT – The lot at 205 Ostrom features an irregular shape and layout, inconsistent with the primary development pattern found in the district. The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure at the western portion of the site, to the side and rear of the primary historic structure, similar to the location of accessory structures found elsewhere in the district. While the general orientation of the accessory structure is skewed, staff finds the placement appropriate.
- 6d. TREE SURVEY – At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a tree survey. A tree survey must be provided to staff noting which existing trees will be impacted by the proposed new construction.
- 6e. MASSING & HEIGHT – The proposed overall height of the accessory structure is approximately twenty-five (25) feet in height. The proposed height is greater than that of the primary historic structure on the lot. Staff finds that the applicant should study ways to decrease the overall height of the proposed structure such as reducing the top place of the second floor for a 1 ½ story accessory instead of a full two stories.
- 6f. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that consist of an asphalt shingle roof, double hung wood windows, wood or Hardi board siding. Staff finds the proposed materials appropriate; however the proposed siding should feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. Staff does not recommend approval of demolition based on findings 1.a. and 1.c.

If the HDRC finds that a loss of significance has occurred or finds that the criteria for establishing an unreasonable economic hardship have been met and approves the requested demolition, then staff makes the following recommendations regarding the requested new construction:

- 2 – 3. Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #2 and #3, the construction of two, two-story primary residential structure on the lot based on findings 2a through 3l, with the following stipulations. This is only applicable if item #1, demolition is approved.
- i. That the applicant install board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish on the proposed structure in request item #2.
  - ii. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
  - iii. That the applicant should fully utilize architectural elements that are consistently found on structures with flat roofs throughout the district in a contemporary manner and incorporate materials that are appropriate for the proposed form for request item #3 as noted in findings 3e and 3j.
  - iv. That the applicant propose a design for the accessory structure that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 4a.
  - v. Archaeological investigations may be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
  - vi. That a site plan with accurate setback dimensions and a tree survey must be submitted prior to an application final approval.

- 4 – 5. If the HDRC finds that a loss of significance has occurred or finds that the criteria for establishing an unreasonable economic hardship have been met and approves the requested demolition, then staff makes the following recommendations regarding the requested new construction:

Staff recommends approval of items #4 and #5, the construction of two, two story accessory structures and the installation of a new driveway, based on findings 4a through 5b with the following stipulations. This is only applicable if item #1, demolition is approved.

- i. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- ii. That the single garage door be eliminated and a two-stall configuration with two separate door be used instead. The doors must feature materials and a profile consistent with historic examples found in the district.
- iii. That a site plan with accurate setback dimensions and a tree survey must be submitted prior to an application final approval.

6. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the placement and orientation of the proposed accessory structure, item #6 based on findings 6a through 6f with the following stipulations. This is only applicable if item #1, demolition is not approved.
  - i. That the applicant propose a way to decrease the overall height of the proposed structure such as reducing the top plate of the second floor for a 1 ½ story accessory instead of a full two stories.
  - ii. That a site plan with accurate setback dimensions and a tree survey must be submitted prior to an application final approval.
  - iii. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
  - iv. That the single garage door be eliminated and a two-stall configuration with two separate door be used instead. The doors must feature materials and a profile consistent with historic examples found in the district.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Mimi Quintanilla (David Schmidt and Sylvia Guzman yielded their time), Jim Cullum (Fermin Guzman and Bob Buchanon yielded their time), L. DeMartino, Christopher Green, George Nash (Fred Gonzales yielded his time), and Kim Wood spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to deny all request.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** Garza, Garcia.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2017-405**

**Applicant:** Adrian Garcia

**Address:** 131 KEARNEY ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a two story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 131 Kearney in the Lavaca Historic District.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a single family house featuring approximately 1,870 square feet on the vacant lot at 131 Kearney located in the Lavaca Historic District. This lot is

shares rear and side property lines with properties addressed to Carolina. This lot, 131 Kearney, is the only lot on Kearney that is zoned historic.

- b. A structure with a contemporary design was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at this location on April 5, 2017.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on October 10, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted that a detached garage may be too close to neighboring properties, noted that the porch should feature additional depth, that doors should be centered on the façade, that the frieze element should be replicated on the garage, that the massing is a result of the small lot conditions.
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. This particular lot does not feature the typical orientation and street frontage found on other lots located throughout the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant has noted a setback of ten (10) feet from the public right of way, consistent with houses found along the north side of Kearney. Generally, the proposed setback is consistent with those found on Kearney and neighboring streets in the Lavaca Historic District.
- e. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards Kearney. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two-story structure with an overall height of approximately twenty-six (26) feet. As previously noted, this lot is the only lot on Kearney that is zoned historic; however, there are historic, two-story structures nearby on Carolina. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate; however, the proposed width of forty-seven (47) feet is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. TRANSITIONS – Step downs in building height should be utilized to transition from the height of the proposed new construction to the single story height of the neighboring structure. The applicant has proposed a transition in height on the east elevation through the construction of a one story mass that will house the garage. There are not transitions on the north, west or south facades.
- h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. There are Folk Victorian style houses found on Kearney that each feature varying foundation heights, commonly between approximately twelve (12) inches to thirty-six (36) inches. The applicant has not noted a specific foundation height at this time. Staff finds that a foundation height of approximately two feet should be proposed.
- i. ROOF FORM – The majority of the historic structures throughout the Lavaca Historic District feature gabled or hipped roofs. The applicant has proposed a flat roof, inconsistent with the historic examples of neighboring historic structure.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window openings that are generally consistent with historic window openings found throughout the district; however, the proposed west elevation does not feature fenestration on the first floor. Staff finds that fenestration should be incorporated to become consistent with the Guidelines and to follow the historic fenestration patterns found throughout the Lavaca Historic District.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within

the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance, and feature traditional trim and sill details. At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials; however, staff finds that one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows should be used.

- l. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant’s proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- m. MATERIALS – In regards to materials, the applicant has proposed Hardi siding as the primary façade material. Staff finds the use of Hardi appropriate; however, the siding should feature a smooth finish and a four (4) inch exposure.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposed design to feature architectural elements that are not found throughout the Lavaca Historic District. Staff finds that the overall width, column design, roof form, and architectural style are not consistent with the surrounding historic examples. The installation of an attached, front-loaded garage is not appropriate architecturally for a historic district. Staff finds that a detached garage or a garage that is removed from the front façade plane would be more appropriate.
- o. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a front porch that features five (5) feet of depth. Front porches for double height historic structures often feature ten or more feet in depth. Staff finds that the applicant should study and incorporate additional front porch depth.
- p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this.
- q. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a concrete driveway to be ten (10) feet in width. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.
- r. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed a front sidewalk consisting of concrete pavers. Staff finds that a solid concrete front walkway would be more appropriate and recommends the applicant install a concrete walkway that is consistent with those found throughout the Lavaca Historic District in regards to material and width.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through r. Staff recommends the applicant address inconsistencies with the Historic Design Guidelines, primary architectural details, overall form and massing, garage placement and porch depth.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to deny the request.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** Lazarine.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2017-530**

**Applicant:** Cyrus Askin

**Address:** 925 BURNET ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install eight replacement wood windows to feature a two over two profile.
2. Install two replacement vinyl windows to feature a one over one profile.
3. Install three fixed vinyl windows.
4. Remove the transom window above the front door.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 925 Burnet was constructed circa 1920 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure currently features a porch that spans the front façade. At this time, the applicant is requesting the installation
- b. The repair of the original wood windows was approved at the July 15, 2015, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing along with the replacement of aluminum windows with one over one vinyl windows. At that time, the property was under different ownership. Work was not performed consistently with the Certificate of Appropriateness. The nine historic, two over two windows were replaced with new, two over two wood windows that feature a profile that does not match that of the original windows. Two one over one wood windows were replaced with one over one vinyl windows. The existing, one over one, aluminum windows were replaced with one over one vinyl windows, consistent with the original approval. Three fixed vinyl windows were also installed at locations where previous windows were not present.
- c. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved. Per 6.B.iv., new windows should be installed to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Per 6.B.vii., non-historic windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building.
- d. The historic structure previously featured a transom window above the door which has been removed. Staff finds that this window should be reinstalled.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not find the installed replacement windows to be a compatible replacement for the original wood windows. If the commission approves the windows as installed, then staff recommends that wood windows screens be installed as mitigation to maintain a more traditional appearance from the street.

Staff recommends approval of item #2. Staff finds that these windows have been installed in a manner that is consistent with the previous approval.

Staff recommends approval of item #3, the installation of three fixed vinyl windows where previous windows were removed.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the removal of the transom window above the front door. Staff finds that this should be reinstalled.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Liz Franklin spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by a commissioner to adjourn.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**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 5:20 PM.

APPROVED

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

Michael Guarino  
Chair