

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
15 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, Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**ABSENT:** Garza, Connor, Brittain, Grube.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Cherise Bell.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2017-D05 803 N CHERRY (POSTPONED BY APPLICANT)
- Item #2, Case No. 2017-D01 307 DWYER
- Item #3, Case No. 2017-448 925 BURNET (TAX CERTIFICATION)
- Item #4, Case No. 2017-449 925 BURNET (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #5, Case No. 2017-306 420 BROADWAY
- Item #6, Case No. 2017-555 113 LINDELL
- Item #7, Case No. 2017-560 436 DEVINE
- Item #9, Case No. 2017-572 715 GRANT
- Item #10, Case No. 2017-571 2119 N IH 35
- Item #12, Case No. 2017-568 411 BARRERA
- Item #13, Case No. 2017-548 423 E FRENCH PL
- Item #14, Case No. 2017-551 2915 E COMMERCE
- Item #15, Case No. 2017-559 409 FLORIDA
- Item #16, Case No. 2017-509 737 E MAGNOLIA
- Item #17, Case No. 2017-579 1506 E HOUSTON
- Item #18, Case No. 2017-453 618 DAWSON
- Item #19, Case No. 2017-563 511 MONUMENTAL

Items #8, #21, and #22 were pulled for citizens to be heard; item #11 was moved to individual by the applicant; item #20 was moved to individual by staff.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Note: Commissioner Grube arrived at 3:15 PM.

**8. HDRC NO. 2017-582**

**Applicant:** Seale

**Address:** 100 MONTANA

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Repair the historic wood windows to match the existing.
2. Install Lexan barriers behind each window openings.
3. Install public artwork behind each window opening to create a “jewelbox gallery”.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 100 Montana was constructed circa 1883 and originally addressed as 123 Nevada. The structure features a masonry façade and Folk Victorian architectural details. The applicant has proposed to restore the historic wood windows as well as to create a “jewelbox gallery” through the display of artwork.
- b. WINDOW REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to repair the historic wood windows and install Lexan panels behind the historic wood windows. Staff finds the proposed repair and installation of Lexan panels to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Modifications 6.A.
- c. ART INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to install public art to be displayed behind the historic windows and to be illuminated from within the structure. Staff finds the proposed public art display to be consistent with the Division 5 of the UDC regarding Public Art.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Virginia Van Cleave spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**11. HDRC NO. 2017-569**

**Applicant:** ACM Hub LLC

**Address:** 7615 Kennedy Hill

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an eight foot tall perforated screen around existing mechanical chillers.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The School of Aerospace Medicine Design Guidelines recognize the historic importance of the Brooks School of Aerospace Medicine Campus and San Antonio's legacy in the development of the Man-in-Space Program. They also encourage sensitive development that conforms to the setting of existing buildings, the conservation of historic resources, and investment in the campus. The applicant is requesting approval to install an eight foot tall perforated screen around existing mechanical chillers on the campus to feature perforated photo and graphic panels, including branding for the new University of the Incarnate Word School of Osteopathic Medicine, located in Building 150 to the north.
- b. LOCATION - The existing mechanical chillers are located immediate south of Kennedy Circle, just north of Building 155 near the north central portion of the district. The chillers are directly flanked by grass and pedestrian sidewalks on all sides. The secondary facade of Building 150, located to the north, faces the chillers. The chillers are currently enclosed by chain link fencing. According to Section 4.B.3 of the District Design Guidelines, several more recent mechanical and service additions to the campus did not receive screening that characterizes the district. The proposal is generally in accordance with plans to eventually screen these locations and staff finds the location appropriate.
- c. MATERIAL - The proposed screening is to be constructed of perforated aluminum panels measuring ¼" in thickness. Each individual panel will measure four feet in width. The design of each panel will follow a pattern, with every third, fourth, or fifth panel featuring a perforated photo panel depending on location, and all others featuring a perforated geometric graphic. The photo panels will contain imagery of John F. Kennedy Jr., the historic School of Aerospace Medicine campus, or the University of the Incarnate Word School of Osteopathic Medicine logo. According to District Design Guideline 5.A.7, screen walls around equipment and trash containers should be constructed of terra-cotta colored brick in patterns found on the historic campus. Staff finds that the proposed material could be appropriate with the integration of brick to conform with the Guidelines, but does not find the proposal in conformance as submitted.
- d. HEIGHT - The proposed screening measures eight feet in height. According to UDC Sec. 35-514(c), the maximum height allowed for fencing for school facilities is eight feet. Staff finds the proposed height consistent with the UDC.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed screening based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant integrates terra-cotta colored brick in patterns found on the historic campus as noted in finding c. The applicant must submit final drawings to staff for review and approval.
- ii. That the fence complies with School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District standards and is a maximum height of eight (8) feet. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve as submitted.

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

**NAYS:** None.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **20. HDRC NO. 2017-575**

**Applicant:** Xavier Gonzalez

**Address:** 3003 BROADWAY

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a one story commercial structure at the corner of Broadway and E Mulberry. The applicant has proposed for the commercial structure to feature onsite parking, outdoor seating and approximately 4,050 square feet in space.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a one story commercial structure at the corner of Broadway and Mulberry. The existing structure on the property will be demolished.
- b. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan which notes the connection of various functions of the site in a coordinated system. This is consistent with the UDC.
- c. **AUTOMOBILE ACCESS** – Regarding automobile access and parking, the UDC notes that automobile circulation should be efficient to minimize conflicts with pedestrians. Curb cuts should be limited to one on each street face not exceeding twenty-five (25) feet in width each. The applicant has proposed one curb cut on Mulberry Avenue and one curb cut on Avenue B. Staff finds the proposed locations of each curb cut appropriate; however, each should not exceed twenty-five feet in width per UDC Section 35-6732(b)(1)(B).
- d. **PARKING LOCATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(2), parking areas should be located toward the interior of the site or side or rear of the building. Additionally, parking locations must be screened if located within twenty foot setback from a property line adjacent to a street use per type B listed in table 510-2 of the UDC. The applicant has noted locations of landscaping buffers between each property line and each adjacent street; however, specifics regarding landscaping have not been provided to staff. Landscaping elements are to be included in the proposed buffer that are consistent with those noted in UDC Section 35-673(f).
- e. **BUILDING ORIENTATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(b), buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. A building's primary entrance should be oriented toward the street with secondary entrances oriented toward the interior of the site. A building's primary entrance is to be distinguished by unique architectural features. The applicant has proposed for the southeast corner of the building to be the primary entrance where architectural elements including a canopy and extended plan create an architectural focal point. The UDC notes that the placement of a building on a site should be considered within the context of the block, as well as

how the structure will support the broader design goals for the area. Staff finds that the structure should be shifted further toward the corner of Broadway and Mulberry to the minimum allowable setback to be consistent with the UDC as well as the design goals for the Broadway corridor.

- f. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Per the UDC section 35-673(e), a variety of landscaping materials should be included in site design. At this time, the applicant has not provided a landscaping plan. The applicant is responsible for complying with all landscaping requirements of the UDC section 35-673 (e) and (f). A landscaping plan must be submitted for approval.
- g. **STREET FURNISHINGS** – The applicant has noted the location of outdoor seating per the site and floor plans. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(i) in regards to street furnishings. Information regarding street furnishings is to be provided to staff for approval.
- h. **SITE AND ARCHITECTURAL LIGHTING** – The applicant has not provided information regarding site and architectural lighting. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to site and architectural lighting. Information regarding lighting is to be provided to staff for approval.
- i. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(n), all service areas and mechanical equipment must be screened from view from the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this requirement.
- j. **BICYCLE PARKING** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(a), on-site bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO districts. Bicycle parking shall be placed in a well-lit and accessible area. The applicant is responsible for complying with this requirement.
- k. **MASS & SCALE** – Per the UDC Section 35-674(b), a building shall appear to have a human scale. The applicant has proposed a one story commercial structure with entrances, architectural detailing and building massing that promotes a human scale. Staff finds the proposed scale to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- l. **BUILDING ALIGNMENT** – Per the UDC Section 35-674(b)(2), building elements should be aligned with others in the blockface to establish building scale. At least one horizontal building element must be aligned within three feet of another horizontal building element on the same block face. The applicant should ensure that a horizontal building element aligns with adjacent structures.
- m. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, tile, cut stone and other masonry materials. Generally, the proposed materials are appropriate and consistent with the UDC; however the applicant is to provide specifics to staff for each material.
- n. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-764 (e), building facades located in the River Improvement Overlay must be organized into three distinct segments; a base, mid-section, and a cap. Staff finds that the applicant has achieved this through varying planes and architectural forms at each level of the building's façade.
- o. **AWNINGS & CANOPIES** – The applicant has proposed to install a canopy of surround the structure and cover outdoor seating. Staff finds that the proposed canopy establishes a sense of human scale and adds architectural interest to the structure.
- p. **SIGNAGE** – Per application documents, the proposed structure will feature signage throughout the proposed canopy. The applicant is to submit an application specific to signage prior to receiving approval for the installation of signage.
- q. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District. Furthermore, the property is adjacent to the Brackenridge Park National Register of Historic Places District and Brackenridge Park State Antiquities Landmark. In addition, the project area is near to, and shares the same topographic and soil series setting as, previously recorded site 41BX1953. Therefore, the property may contain archaeological sites, some of which may be significant. Thus, archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That each curb cut not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width as noted in finding c.
- ii. That landscaping elements be included in the proposed buffer that are consistent with those noted in UDC Section 35-673(f) as noted in finding d.
- iii. That the structure should be further shifted toward the corner of Broadway and Mulberry to be consistent with the UDC as well as the design goals for the Broadway corridor as noted in finding e.
- iv. That the applicant submit a landscaping plan, site and architectural lighting plan, screen all mechanical equipment and service areas, provide information regarding site furnishings and provide onsite bicycle parking as noted in findings f through j.
- v. Archaeology – Archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction. 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.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve with staff stipulations, excluding stipulation #3.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2017-561**

**Applicant:** Hoda Cummings

**Address:** 431 ADAMS ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear accessory structure at 431 Adams Street.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 432 Adams was constructed circa 1920, is located at the corner of Adams Street and Barbe Street and features craftsman style elements. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure that is to feature an overall footprint of approximately 900 square feet. This request received conceptual approval at the June 15, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the stipulation that the applicant return for final approval.
- b. MASSING & FORM – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i. new accessory structure should be designed to be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form. The primary historic structure at 431 Adams features a single story with a foundation height of approximately two feet and an overall height of 21’ - 0”. The

applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to include two levels and an overall height of 23' – 1 ½". In terms of height, while the proposed structure is slightly taller than the primary historic structure, staff finds its height is generally appropriate in context with other accessory structures along both Adams and Barbe.

- c. **BUILDING SIZE** – The applicant has proposed an overall building footprint of approximately 900 square feet. The primary historic structure features a footprint of approximately 1,500 square feet. While the proposed footprint exceeds that recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii. staff finds that the overall massing does not overwhelm that of the primary historic structure.
- d. **CHARACTER** – New accessory structures should relate to the period or construction of the primary historic structure on the lot through the use of contemporary materials and simplified architectural details. Elements that should relate are façade materials, roofing materials, window and door openings and materials and overall architectural form.
- e. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include Hardi board and batten siding, wood windows and a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has provided information noting that the proposed board and batten siding will match the board and batten siding found on accessory structures that are addressed to Adams, but front Wickes where the primary structure is of craftsman influence. Staff finds the applicant's proposed siding profile appropriate; however, board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide. 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. The applicant has noted that the proposed wood windows will be inset two inches within the walls.
- f. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Since the time of conceptual approval, the applicant has proposed additional windows fenestration to prevent long expanses of blank walls. The applicant has proposed window proportions that are complimentary of those found on the craftsman structure. Additionally, the applicant has proposed elements such as eave brackets and craftsman style porch columns.
- g. **GARAGE DOORS** – Regarding the installation of garage doors, the applicant has proposed to install a steel paneled garage door with top row window lites. Staff finds that a wood door should be installed to match those found historically in the district.
- h. **ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines, the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Corner lots found along Barbe Street feature a primary structure orientation toward the intersecting streets while the accessory structure's orientation is toward Barbe. The applicant's proposed orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **SETBACKS** – Per the Guidelines, the historic setback pattern of similar accessory structures along the streetscape should be followed. The applicant has noted compliance with setback requirements while using a similar setback found throughout the district. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project area is within the King William Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Acequia del Alamo Acequia, a designated Local Historic Landmark, likely crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- 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.
- ii. That window trim feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail.

- iii. That a wood garage door be installed to match those found historically in the district.
- iv. ARCHAEOLOGY- 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.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2017-550**

**Applicant:** Sylvia Trevino

**Address:** 213 SWEET

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

- 1. Construct a two story, rear addition to the historic structure located at 213 Sweet Street in the Nathan Historic District.
- 2. Demolish an existing, rear accessory structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 213 Sweet Street was constructed circa 1910 and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features Folk Victorian architectural elements including a side gabled roof and a shallow hipped porch roof. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story, rear addition to feature a footprint of 503 square feet. The historic structure features a footprint of 738 square feet.
- b. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The lot at 213 Sweet features a rear accessory structure, which in its current location matches the location of an accessory structure found on the 1952 Sanborn Map. The applicant has proposed to demolish this rear structure. The structure features materials that are historic to the district such as wood board and batten siding and an original standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the structure to be contributing to the site.
- c. REAR ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a width that is subordinate to that of the historic structure and insets on both sides. As noted in finding a, the rear addition is to feature two stories with an overall height that exceeds that of the historic structure by approximately five (5) feet.
- d. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof facing Sweet Street, complementary of that of the historic structure’s porch and a rear gabled roof facing the rear alley. Staff finds the

overall proportion and form of both roof forms to be architecturally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines 1.A.

- e. **TRANSITION** – The Guidelines note that all additions should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed transitions that include insets from the wall planes of the historic structure and variations in siding materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- f. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that features a footprint that is 68 percent of the footprint of the historic structure and features two stories whereas the historic structure only features one. While the proposed footprint and height are not consistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that application documents provided by the applicant such as perspectives note that the proposed addition will not necessarily overwhelm the historic structure. Staff finds that the separation between the two structures should be increased to further reduce the perceived massing of the addition if a complete separation was proposed between the second story of the addition and the rear slope of the historic side gable. The roof structure that connects to the rear slope of the historic structure’s side gable should be reduced in height to be subordinate to the height of the historic structure’s ridge line and the east wall of the proposed second story should start clear of the rear of the historic, side facing gable.
- g. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal roof, fiber cement lap siding, fiber cement shingle siding, fiberglass doors, and two over two windows of which a material has not been specified. The proposed siding should feature a smooth finish and a four inch profile. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a galvalume finish.
- h. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant at this time has not specified window materials. Staff finds that 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.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings b through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That the separation between the proposed addition and historic structure be increased to further reduce the perceived massing of the addition through a complete separation between the second story of the addition and the rear slope of the historic roof. The roof ridge height of the new structure that connects to the rear slope of the historic roof to the addition should be reduced to be subordinate to the historic structure’s ridge line. The east wall of the proposed second story should not interrupt the roof line of the historic structure.
- ii. That the fiber cement siding feature a smooth finish and a four inch profile and that the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a galvalume finish.
- iii. That 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 every attempt be made to preserve the historic accessory in place. If the HDRC approves its removal, then the materials should be salvaged and reused where possible.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Virginia Van Cleave and Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to send the request to DRC.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2017-534**

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

**Address:** 533 NATALEN AVE, 437 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:** John Friesenhahn spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to approve the request for landmark designation.

**AYES:** Guarino, Lazarine, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** Bustamante, Fish, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**THE MOTION FAILED**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to deny the request.

**AYES:** Bustamante, Fish, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:**           **Guarino, Lazarine, Laffoon.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

Note: Commissioner Connor arrived at 4:11 PM.

**24.     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. A demolition application was submitted on September 8, 2017 to the Office of Historic Preservation (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:** John Friesenhahn spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to deny landmark designation.

**AYES:** Fish, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** Guarino, Lazarine.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2017-**

**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.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the proposed address numbers based on finding f.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve items #1-3 and deny item #4.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2017-565**

**Applicant:** Heidi Haese/Jenifer Earnshaw/Greystar

**Address:** 633 S ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a halo illuminated, channel letter wall sign on the southern façade to feature an overall size of 13.05 feet in length and 3.61 inches in height at its tallest. At its shortest point, the sign will feature an overall height of 2.45 feet. The total square footage of the sign as proposed is 47.2 square feet.
2. Apply a graphic to the new wall at the River Walk level to feature a total of 229.8 square feet. The graphic will be 28' – 5" in length and 8' – 1" in height.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 633 S St Mary's was constructed in 2015 and is located within the River Improvement Overlay. Previously-approved signage includes a monument sign near the public right of way on S St Mary's, wall signage at the River Walk level and a parking identification sign at the entrance to the parking structure. Each of these signs were approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the October 21, 2015, hearing. These three signs total approximately 100 square feet in size. The wall sign at the River Walk level has not been installed.
- b. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install two new signs. The first, a halo illuminated, channel letter wall sign is proposed to be installed on the southern façade to feature an overall size of 13.05 feet in length and 3.61 inches in height at its tallest. At its shortest point, the sign will feature an overall height of 2.45 feet. The total square footage of the sign as proposed is 47.2 square feet. The second, a wall graphic, will be applied to the new wall at the River Walk level to feature a total of 229.8 square feet. The graphic will be 28' – 5" in length and 8' – 1" in height. The proposed wall graphic will feature a green background, a multiple graphics and words.
- c. BUILDING WALL SIGN - The UDC Section 35-678 (e)(1) notes that each structure is permitted a total of three signs, one major and two minor for a total square footage of fifty (50) square feet. Staff finds the proposed new signage to be inconsistent with the UDC in regards to square footage when combined with the existing signage. Staff does not find that there is sufficient evidence that would warrant the additional signage at the proposed location. Staff also finds that building-mounted wall signs are generally discouraged in RIO. Wall signage for residential structures located in RIO tend to be human scaled and typically mounted at the street or river level. A wall sign of this proportion is not consistent with the UDC.
- d. RIVER WALK WALL SIGN – Per the UDC Section 35-681(c)(2), the maximum square footage for any sign on the riverside of property abutting the publicly owned River Walk and visible from the River Walk shall be eight (8) square feet. Staff finds that the overall size, scale and design of the proposed signage is inconsistent with those found along the River Walk. Signage at the River Walk level should be simple in design as to not distract from the character of the River Walk.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through d.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Virginia Van Cleave spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny item #1 and postpone item #2.

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

**NAYS:** None.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **27. HDRC NO. 2017-581**

**Applicant:** Bernice Block

**Address:** 223 W HOLLYWOOD AVE

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construction a 1-story rear accessory structure to measure approximately 264 square feet.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 223 W Hollywood Ave is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1925 in the Spanish Eclectic style. The house was designed by architects Carvel and Frost, who were prolific along Hollywood Ave. The house is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant has proposed to construct a new storage shed in the rear of the property to measure approximately 264 square feet.
- b. **CASE HISTORY** – A former representative of the homeowner submitted alternative rear accessory proposals in March and April of 2017. A structure with a sloping shed roof was denied by the HDRC on April 19, 2017. A modified proposal with a gable roof was reviewed by the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 25, 2017. The DRC responded favorably to the roof configuration change, which is common for rear accessory structures along W Hollywood Ave and in the district as whole. The DRC also supported the use of hardi siding on all four facades of the structure as a modern element that distinguishes the time of construction without detracting from the primary structure or the common materials used historically in the district. The representative withdrew the application prior to the May 17, 2017, hearing.
- c. **HEIGHT, MASSING, AND FORM** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the historic structure in terms of height, massing, and form, and should be no longer than 40 percent of the existing structure's footprint. The proposal is a modest design that will not detract from the primary structure on the property. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **FAÇADE MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install hardi board siding. Per the Historic Design Guidelines, new outbuilding should relate to the period of construction of the primary structure through use of complementary materials and simplified details. Materials should also not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. There is evidence of rear accessory structures with lap siding behind historic houses constructed of stucco in the district. Additionally, lap siding is common on W Hollywood and within the district for rear accessory structures. Staff finds the proposal appropriate with the stipulations listed in the Guidelines.
- e. **WINDOWS & DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION** – According to the OHP Window Policy Document, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and

profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. Staff finds the proposed windows and doors generally consistent with proportions and sizes found in the district.

- f. WINDOW: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install a wood window. According to the Historic Design Guidelines and OHP Window Policy Document, 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. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. DOOR: MATERIALS - The applicant has proposed to install a fiberglass doors, including fiberglass French doors on the west facade. Staff does not find the use of fiberglass consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. ROOF – The applicant has proposed a gable roof form with composite shingles to closely match the terracotta color of the barrel tiles found on the primary structure. The Guidelines state that materials should complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Staff finds the proposal of using modern shingles in a terracotta red color complementary to the primary structure and consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – 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 proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the smooth Hardie siding have a maximum reveal of 4 inches.
- ii. That the applicant submits a final wood window specification, shingle specification, and clay barrel tile specification to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iii. That the applicant installs wood doors as noted in finding g. The applicant must submit manufacturer information for the proposed doors to staff for final approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

Note: Commissioner Laffoon left at 5 PM.

**28. HDRC NO. 2017-544**

**Applicant:** Robert Moritz/DHR Architects

**Address:** 313 E LOCUST

**REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, 2-story duplex structures on the vacant lot located at 313 E Locust.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct two, 2-story buildings on the vacant lot at 313 E Locust, located within the Tobin Hill Historic District. The lot is flanked by a historic 2-story single family home designed in the Queen Anne style to the east, a parking lot and 2-story office complex to the west, and a residential alley to the north. The lot is located a distance of approximately one lot from the intersection of E Locust and McCullough Ave. This stretch of E Locust is characterized by historic 1-story and 2-story single family homes, designed primarily in the Queen Anne and Craftsman styles; historic 2-story multifamily homes with larger footprints; two 2-story apartment complexes, one of which is non-contributing to the district; and a non-contributing convenience store at the corner of E Locust and McCullough. Additionally, the corner of E Locust and Paschal features a modern infill development containing four 2-story townhomes, each oriented towards Paschal St.
- 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. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on June 28, 2017. Prior to the meeting, the applicant’s proposal included four total units – three 3-story units and one 2.5-story unit – oriented back-to-back on the lot, with one 3-story unit located directly adjacent to the E Locust right-of-way. At the DRC meeting, the applicant shared a revised site plan that included two 3-story units facing E Locust, and two 3-story units located in the rear of the property, all facing the direction of E Locust. This was the proposal that the DRC reviewed and discussed. The DRC noted that the proposal was a departure from the traditional development pattern of the district, which does not feature two single-family homes in the front of the lot with two single-family homes of the same height in the rear of the lot. The DRC also wanted more clarification on how the alley condition would be treated. The DRC suggested exploring a more traditional configuration of having two taller single family homes oriented towards E Locust, and shorter single family homes in the rear of the lot that took on the massing, form, and appearance of a rear accessory structure. Tall single family homes with shorter rear accessory structures, or rear accessory dwelling units, are historically common in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The applicant withdrew their previous design at the July 19, 2017, HDRC hearing.
- d. **CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – Of the historic structures on the immediate block of E Locust, bounded by McCullough to the west and Paschal to the east, one house is 2-stories in height, and the remainder are 1-story. Continuing east, on the block of E Locust bounded by Paschal and Gillespie, the historic homes are predominantly 2-stories in height. Of the historic structures on the immediate block of E Locust, bounded by McCullough to the west and Paschal to the east, one house is 2-stories in height, and the remainder are 1-story. Continuing east, on the block of E Locust bounded by Paschal and Gillespie, the historic homes are predominantly 2-stories in height. Additionally, each of these structures is architecturally unique from one another, which creates diversity and character along the streetscape.
- e. **SETBACKS** – 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. This block of E Locust contains historic structures that feature front yard setbacks of approximately 20-35 feet. Based on the submitted documentation, the neighboring historic structure to the east has a front setback of 32.11 feet. The historic 1-story structure two lots down has a setback of approximately 18.24 feet. The applicant has proposed a setback of 25’-4” inches. While the proposed setback is close to the median between those of the historic structures that exist on the same block of E Locust, its placement would be approximately seven feet closer to the sidewalk than the historic structure immediately adjacent to the east. Staff

finds that the setback should be increased to be compatible with the immediate context of the block.

- f. **ORIENTATION & ENTRANCES** – The applicant has proposed for the primary of the two units to face E Locust, and the rear unit to be oriented towards the interior of the lot, towards the direction of E Locust. The pedestrian entry of the front unit will be accessed from the south on E Locust. The pedestrian entry of the rear unit will be accessed from the south from an interior courtyard and driveway. The historic development pattern of the rear alley contains rear garages and parking spaces oriented towards the alley. Both of the two units contains rearloading attached garages on the first floor, each of which are accessed from the rear alleyway to the north. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade should be oriented to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. Typically, historic entrances are oriented towards the primary street. This is true for this particular block of E Locust. Staff finds the orientation to be generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed two 2-story units. One will be located along the street frontage of E Locust and one will be located at the rear of the property, directly adjacent to an existing alley. Per the submitted elevations, the ridgeline of the front 2-story unit is 31'-6 ¾". The ridgeline of the rear unit is 28'-10 ¾". Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Per the submitted elevations, the applicant has indicated that the 2-story historic structure directly to the east is approximately 35'-4" in height. The rear 2-story structure does not overwhelm existing alleyway structures in terms of height.
- 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. Throughout this block, the foundation heights of primary historic structures are between two and three feet. The elevations for the front unit indicated a foundation height of approximately 2'-2" (26 inches). Staff finds that the front unit has a foundation height consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof form for both the front and rear unit. The front unit also contains a front gable. These roof forms are found throughout the Tobin Hill Historic District as well as this block of E Locust. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window, as compared to nearby historic facades, should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed several window and door openings that generally feature sizes that are found on historic structures. However, the entry doors feature transom and side lite configurations that are found historically in the district. Staff finds that the configuration should be modified to more closely match those rooted in historic precedents.
- k. **WINDOW & DOOR MATERIALS** – The applicant proposed to install Milgard vinyl windows and doors. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows and wood doors would be the most appropriate per the OHP Window Policy Document.
- l. **LOT COVERAGE** – New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant has proposed to locate two units – one with a footprint of 2,905 square feet and one with a footprint of 1,230 square feet – on a lot featuring approximately 9,130 square feet. The proposed lot coverage is approximately 45.3%, which is generally consistent with the Guidelines. However, based on findings e and g, staff finds that the depth of the proposed carports should be reduced to eliminate overall mass.

- m. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite wood siding, standing seam metal roofs, and simple wood columns and railings. Staff finds siding and roofing materials to be generally consistent with the Guidelines and compatible for new construction in the district. Staff finds that the siding should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four inches.
- n. **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 nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The proposed front unit features a second story gable, front entry door transoms and side lites, and simple square columns with a capital and base. The rear unit features ganged windows, bracketed eaves, and simplified columns. Staff finds these architectural details to be generally consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that the small hipped porch projections on the public alley elevation should be lowered to be closer to the top of the door frame, which is more consistent with historic duplex patterns.
- o. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not indicated mechanical equipment on the submitted site plan. The applicant is required to provide this information for final approval.
- p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not provided staff with a landscaping plan at this time. The applicant is required to provide this information for final approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant increases the setback of the front unit to be more consistent with the adjacent 2-story historic structure as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant eliminates at least one of the car stalls in each of the front units to reduce the overall length, massing, and footprint of the structure as noted in findings e, g, and l.
- iii. That the applicant modifies the proposed entryway configurations to be more consistent with transoms and side lites found on historic precedents in the district as noted in finding j.
- iv. That the applicant lowers the hipped porch projects on the public alley elevation of the rear unit as noted in finding m.
- v. That the applicant submits a comprehensive landscaping plan for final approval. The landscaping plan should indicate all setbacks with dimensions, all locations and dimensions of proposed hardscaping, and the locations and species of plants. The applicant should indicate all mechanical equipment on the site plans and/or elevations for final approval.
- vi. That the applicant installs one-over-one wood windows or aluminum clad wood windows as noted in finding k. 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.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to postpone the case to December 6 and send it to DRC.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:**           **None.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**29.     HDRC NO. 2017-576**

**Applicant:**     Robert Murray

**Address:**     222 W GUENTHER ST, 201 NATHAN

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform exterior modifications to the structures at 222 W Guenther and 210 Nathan, both of which are located on one parcel.

Request items for 222 W Guenther:

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work including the installation of a new shingle roof, perform foundation repair, repair damaged wood siding, paint the exterior.
2. Replace the existing wood and vinyl windows with new vinyl windows.

Request items for 210 Nathan:

3. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work including the installation of a new shingle roof, perform foundation repair, repair damaged wood siding, paint the exterior.
4. Replace the existing wood and vinyl windows with new vinyl windows.
5. Construct a rear addition and a carport canopy to extend to the front of the historic structure.

General request items:

6. Demolish the accessory structure to the rear of 222 W Guenther.
7. Construct a new accessory structure on the property between the two historic structure to front Nathan Street.
8. Replace the existing, chain link fence with a cattle panel fence.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. **REHABILITATION** – The applicant has proposed rehabilitative scopes of work for both structures which include the installation of a new shingle roof, perform foundation repair, repair damaged wood siding, paint the exterior. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitative scopes of work to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.
- b. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The historic structure at 222 W Guenther currently features approximately half of its original wood windows. Vinyl replacement windows exist throughout the remaining windows openings in the structure. The applicant has requested to remove the original wood windows and install vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that wood windows should be preserved. Staff finds that existing wood windows should be repaired. The replacement of the existing vinyl windows may be appropriate if a replacement window that is consistent with the Guidelines is installed.
- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The historic structure located at 210 Nathan feature windows that include the historic wood windows and replacement vinyl windows. The applicant has proposed to replace all existing windows with new vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that wood windows should be preserved. Staff finds that existing wood windows should be repaired. The replacement of the existing vinyl windows may be appropriate if a replacement window that is consistent with the Guidelines is installed.

- d. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE DEMOLITION** – The applicant has proposed to demolish the accessory structure to the rear of the historic structure at 222 W Guenther. The structure features a standing seam metal roof and wood board and batten siding. An accessory structure is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map at this location; however, the structure features a narrower footprint than that which currently exists. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A.i. historic accessory structure should be preserved where they remain and should be repaired with like materials. Staff does not find the demolition of this structure appropriate.
- e. **ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a side addition to the historic structure at 210 Nathan to feature an extension of an existing rear and side addition. The applicant has proposed an overall addition of approximately 120 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. Staff finds that the proposed addition is generally sited in a location that does not detract from the historic forms of the shotgun house.
- f. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that generally features a footprint and height that are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal porch roof, horizontal siding and vinyl windows. Staff finds that roofing materials that match those of the primary historic structure should be installed and that siding for the proposed addition should match that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds that windows should be wood to match the profile of the historic wood windows found in the structure.
- g. **CARPORT ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a carport addition to the historic structure at 210 Nathan that is to extend to the front of the historic structure. Staff does not find this to be appropriate nor is it consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i.
- h. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure on an existing concrete slab between the structures at 222 W Guenther and 210 Nathan. The structure is to feature covered parking and a storage room. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. notes that the predominant location of historic accessory structures should be matched when constructing new accessory structure. While the general size and massing of the proposed accessory structure are appropriate, staff does not find the location appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant rehabilitate the historic structure accessory structure on the property.
- i. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, chain link fence with a new cattle panel fence. Staff finds this proposal to be appropriate. The proposed fence should not exceed four (4) feet in height. Staff does not find the installation of a privacy fence at this location to be appropriate. The top and bottom rails of the fence as well as posts should be wood.
- j. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – At this time the applicant has not provided an itemized lists of costs required for Historic Tax Certification. Staff finds that the applicant should provide this information prior to receiving Certification.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1 and 3 – Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #3, the rehabilitation of both structures with the stipulation that all materials are repaired to match the existing.

2 and 4 – Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 and #4 based on findings b and c. Staff recommends the historic wood windows be repaired. The replacement of the existing vinyl windows may be appropriate if a replacement window that is consistent with the Guidelines is installed.

5 – Staff recommends approval of item #5, the construction of a rear addition with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed carport is eliminated from the request.

- ii. That 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 addition feature roofing, siding and skirting materials to match that of the historic structure.

6 – Staff does not recommend approval of item #6, the demolition of a rear accessory structure based on finding d. Staff recommends the applicant repair the structure in place.

7 – Staff does not recommend approval of item #7, the construction of new accessory structure based on finding i.

8 – Staff recommend approval of item #8, the replacement of the existing, chain link fence with the stipulation that the height of the proposed fence does not exceed four feet and that all posts, top and bottom rails be wood.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve items #1, #3, and #8 with staff stipulations with the additional stipulation that the applicant submit the vertical privacy fence on Nathan to staff with height.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**30. HDRC NO. 2017-549**

**Applicant:** Michelle McKenna

**Address:** 305 LAMAR ST

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. Replace two existing wood windows with new vinyl windows.
- 2. Replace eight existing non-original aluminum windows with new vinyl windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located 305 Lamar is a 1-story single family home designed in the Folk Victorian style. The home features a front gable and side wing configuration and an asymmetrical front porch with spindlework detailing. The home is a contributing structure in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

- b. **WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant is requesting approval to replace three existing one over one wood windows with one over one vinyl windows with faux divided lites. The applicant has stated that the windows will match the size of the existing openings. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new windows should match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The existing wood windows are one of the few that remain in a structure that has been heavily modified over the years. Staff does not find the use of vinyl windows appropriate as replacement for wood windows.
- c. **ALUMINUM WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant is requesting approval to replace four non-original aluminum windows with one over one vinyl windows with faux divided lites. The existing aluminum windows are not appropriate for the style of the home in terms of profile, inset, and dimensions. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that vinyl windows may be appropriate for replacing incompatible aluminum windows if the windows meet all the required specifications listed in the recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the existing wood windows with vinyl windows based on finding b. Staff recommends that the windows be restored in place. If the windows are deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant should furnish evidence to that effect to staff. Staff recommends that windows deteriorated beyond repair be replaced with one over one wood windows. Final window manufacturer specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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. 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 2, Staff recommends approval of the replacement of non-original aluminum windows with vinyl windows based on finding c with the following stipulations:

- i. That the windows be one over one configuration and do not feature faux divided lites.
- ii. That final window manufacturer specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval and meet the following stipulations: that meeting rails be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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. 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.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**31. HDRC NO. 2017-567**

**Applicant:** Aaron Morosini

**Address:** 729 N PINE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing concrete ribbon driveway to install a roadbase and decomposed granite driveway.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 729 N Pine is 2-story single family home constructed circa 1907 in an American Foursquare configuration and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The property features a concrete ribbon driveway with natural grass between the ribbons.
- b. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing concrete ribbon driveway to install a new driveway featuring roadbase and decomposed granite. The Guidelines for Site Elements notes that driveway configurations – material, width, and design – must be retained or repaired on historic properties, while pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater filtration. The ribbon configuration is present on 8 of the 10 applicable properties on the N Pine Block between cross streets Nolan and Burnet; the other two driveways feature gravel and concrete. Staff does find the proposal to remove the ribbon configuration consistent with the Guidelines. Pervious paving can be considered for the center strip of grass between the concrete ribbons.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval to remove the concrete ribbon driveway based on finding b. Pervious paving or gravel may be considered for the center strip of grass between the concrete ribbons.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**32. HDRC NO. 2017-562**

**Applicant:** JB Woolf Sheds

**Address:** 293 W HERMOSA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct carport adjacent to historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 293 W Hermosa is a 1-story single family home designed with Spanish Eclectic influences. The home was constructed in circa 1939 and features a stone façade, red composition shingle roof, and a front porch with a low-sloped hipped roof and square stone columns. The home is a contributing structure in the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District.
- b. MASSING - The applicant has proposed to construct a detached carport adjacent to the primary structure and in the back of the driveway. The proposed carport is setback 30 feet from the public

right-of-way and 5 feet from the neighboring property line. The proposed carport is 14 feet wide, 32 feet deep, and 12 feet tall. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii. limits the footprint of new garages and outbuildings to no more than 40% of the principal historic structure. The proposed carport features 448 square feet, which is consistent with the Guidelines.

- c. LOCATION - The Guidelines 5.B.ii notes that outbuildings and garages on historic properties are located to the rear of the lot. Staff finds that the proposed location of the carport is too close to the front façade and detracts from the historic structure.
- d. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to construct the carport with 6” by 6” cedar posts with new concrete footings, white wood and yellow rafters and roof structure, and red shingle roofing material. The Guidelines 4.5.A.iii notes that new garages and outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. Staffs find the proposed design and materials of the carport consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the carport as proposed at this time based finding c. Staff finds that the proposed carport be relocated towards the rear of the property and set back substantially behind the front facade of the home based on the findings.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**33. HDRC NO. 2017-580**

**Applicant:**

**Address:** 1200 IOWA ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Alter the front façade by removing two doorways and installing a single center doorway.
2. Alter the rear façade with installation of new window and door openings.
3. Replace the existing wood windows with new wood windows, throughout the structure.
4. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 1200 Iowa is a single-story duplex that first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map. The front façade historically features a symmetrical configuration with concrete steps with subtle tile details, four wood square columns, four wood one-over-one windows, and two wood doors. Work had been performed on the interior by the previous and current owner to transform the

structure into a single family home from its duplex configuration. Major unapproved renovations had been performed before the applicant was notified of the violation.

- b. **EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS** - The applicant has proposed to remove the two front doors to install a centered primary door, to relocate the existing window openings, and to relocate the existing columns. The applicant had already begun work by removing the left-side door, the left side windows, and all of the columns and their respective porch roofs, and partially installing new siding. The Guideline for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations explicitly prohibits major changes to historic façade configurations whenever preservation, replacement in-kind, or repair is possible. Staff finds the proposed front façade alterations for the mere intention of converting the duplex into a single-family structure highly inappropriate.
- c. **WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wood windows with new wood windows. The applicant had already begun replacing the wood windows with vinyl windows before informed of the violation. Staff is unable to determine the condition or location of the original wood windows. If replacement windows are necessary, the applicant must adhere to the Guidelines and provide window specifications typical to the historic district or other structures with similar style and period of construction. The proposed windows feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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.
- d. **TAX CREDIT CERTIFICATION** – The applicant has proposed to receive Tax Credit Certification for the renovation of the structure. The applicant’s current projection of rehabilitation costs has not meet the 30% threshold to receive the Historic Tax Credit. The applicant can work with staff to pursue certification once an scope of work has been approved by the HDRC.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed reconfiguration of the front and rear façades based on findings b. Staff recommends that the original front porch elements be preserved in place.
2. Staff does not recommend window replacement based on finding c. The applicant has not provided documentation of the current conditions of the original wood windows which would warrant their replacement. Staff recommends that the original windows be repaired. Where repair is proven and verified by staff to not be feasible, staff recommends replacement wood windows with the stipulations that the new windows feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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. 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.
3. Staff does not recommend historic tax certification based on findings d. The applicant can work with staff to pursue certification once an scope of work has been approved by the HDRC.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** Grube.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**34. HDRC NO. 2017-574**

**Applicant:** Chris Castillo

**Address:** 211 N PECOS LA TRINIDAD

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an eight foot tall wrought iron fence to enclose an existing parking lot.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 211 N Pecos La Trinidad is a 2-story motel constructed in 1983. The structure is non-contributing to the Cattleman Square Historic District.
- b. LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a fence along the property line surrounding an existing parking lot. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the appropriateness of new fencing is dependent on conditions of the specific historic district. Fences are common in the Cattleman Square Historic District, which is commercial in nature. There are several fences enclosing parking lots in the district. Staff finds the location of the proposed fence consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. MATERIAL – The proposed fence is to be constructed of wrought iron per the submitted drawings. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, fencing materials similar to those historically used in the district should be selected. Wrought iron fencing is evident in the Cattleman Square Historic District and is appropriate for its location. Staff finds the material consistent.
- d. HEIGHT – The applicant has requested the fence height to be eight feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Staff finds that a six foot predominantly open fence is appropriate for this primarily commercial historic district, but finds eight feet to be excessive in height. Staff does not find the height consistent as proposed.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend the fence installation as submitted. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the height to six feet. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

If the HDRC recommends approval of the eight foot proposal as submitted, the applicant may be required to obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**35. HDRC NO. 2017-502**

**Applicant:** Ricardo McCullough

**Address:** 1021 N PALMETTO

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 2-story single family home on the vacant lot at 1021 N Palmetto.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family home to feature approximately 2,015 square feet on the vacant lot at 1021 N Palmetto, located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located at the intersection of N Palmetto and Burleson and is flanked to the west and the south by 1-story historic single-family homes. The blocks in the vicinity are predominantly defined by 1-story historic homes with a few 2-story historic homes, including one across the street from the vacant lot.
- 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 27, 2017. The DRC commented on the combination of stucco and lap siding, which is not common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, nor generally in historic districts in the city. The DRC suggested a more consistent window pattern, sizes, and placement that were more representative of those found in the district and more consistent with the Guidelines. The DRC suggested to utilize the curb cut off Burleson instead of introduce a new curb cut with pavers as a driveway on N Palmetto. The DRC emphasized the importance of studying the surrounding context and responding to the neighborhood conditions, including providing exhibits or drawings that convey reasoning for design choices.
- 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 proposed to orient the structure to face N Palmetto Street, which is consistent with the development pattern found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback that per the application documents is to be within five feet of the adjacent setbacks. The applicant is to provide field measurements to confirm setbacks of adjacent structures and proposed a setback that is consistent. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **ENTRANCES: ORIENTATION** – 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 N Palmetto. This is consistent with the Guidelines and the pattern of neighboring homes.
- f. **ENTRANCES: PORCH** – The applicant has proposed a front entrance that projects slightly from the primary setback of the front façade. Historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature distinct porches that engage the pedestrian streetscape and feature numerous widths, depths and roof styles. The proposed porch is limited in depth and features metal copping, which does not have a precedent in the district. Staff finds the proposal as submitted inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **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 a rooftop terrace. The highest point of the structure is indicated to be 28'-10 ½" without considering the foundation height. The height is

generally consistent with the two-story structures nearby; however, the block is predominantly single-family homes with a maximum height of 20 feet at the roof ridgeline. Additionally, the massing of the structure, primarily the right façade that will face Burleson, is not similar to historic structures.

- 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. Historic structures found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature foundation heights of two to three feet in height. The applicant has provided information that notes a foundation height of approximately 1 to 2 feet. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.
- i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a gable roof form and a habitable flat rooftop terrace. While the gable pitch is commonly found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, the treatment of the rear façade with the rooftop terrace, as well as the proportions and height, are deviations from common patterns. Guideline 3.A.iv states that new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof forms inconsistent with the Guidelines as proposed.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS: PROPORTIONS AND PLACEMENT** – 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 several window openings that are consistent with historic precedent, but several others that are not consistent, either in width, height, or configuration. Additionally, the left elevation features a first story that is almost completely void of fenestration with the exception of a horizontal rectangular window that does not feature proportions with precedent. Additionally, while several proposed windows are consistent in terms of proportion, many are single pane and do not feature configurations that are consistent with the district.
- k. **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.
- l. **MATERIALS** – In regards to material, the applicant has proposed materials to include horizontal siding and stucco for the walls, along with a standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the use of siding appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District; however, a material specification is required to make a final determination. Additionally, a mixture of stucco and siding is not a common pattern in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the installation of a standing seam metal roof appropriate; the roof should 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. The applicant has also indicated the use of metal brackets underneath the roof eaves, as well as a railing with balusters on the second floor. While roof eave detailing is common on nearby structures, metal brackets are not characteristic of the district. A material specification would need to be submitted for consideration of the railing for approval.
- m. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has not specified window materials; however, per the provided application documents, the applicant has proposed window that lack profiles that are consistent with those found on historic structures. The applicant should refer to the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy document to ensure that appropriate window materials and an appropriate framing depth is used. Staff finds the installation of wood windows to be appropriate.
- n. **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 nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The architectural details of the proposal are not consistent with context of the neighborhood, which features

Craftsman bungalows, Queen Anne cottages, and Folk Victorian homes in the direct vicinity. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

- o. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for accommodating mechanical elements when proposing a design for final approval.
- p. DRIVEWAY: LOCATION – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways that are similar to the historic configuration found on site or in the district should be incorporated. Currently, a curb cut exists off Burleson. The proposed new driveway placement is not consistent with the historic development pattern of the district. Staff finds the proposed location and configuration inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- q. DRIVEWAY: MATERIAL - According to Guideline 5.B.i, driveways similar in material find in the district should be used. Concrete driveways are characteristic of the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the material consistent with the Guidelines.
- r. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install one concrete walkway off Palmetto to meet the proposed front door. Poured concrete walkways are historically common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval based on findings a through r. The applicant should address the following items if they wish to return with a new design proposal:

- i. That the applicant submits a street elevation noting the proposed new construction in comparison with neighboring historic structures to determine the new construction’s impact and proposed a consistent setback.
- ii. That the applicant proposes a front porch and front massing that are consistent with the Guidelines and complementary of historic front porches found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District as noted in finding e.
- iii. That the applicant explores overall massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity as noted in finding f.
- iv. That the applicant reconfigures the roof form to be more consistent with the roof forms of the district as noted in finding h.
- v. That the applicant proposes a fenestration pattern and window sash configurations that are more consistent with the Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy document, and the historic examples found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District as noted in finding i.
- vi. That the applicant install windows that include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details as noted in finding l.
- vii. That the applicant explores ways to incorporate architectural details and materials that are representative of the historic context of the district as noted in findings k and m.
- viii. That the applicant utilizes the existing curb cut for a concrete driveway to be more consistent with the development pattern of the district as noted in findings o and p.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Connor to refer the case to DRC.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

## THE MOTION CARRIED

### 36. HDRC NO. 2017-573

**Applicant:** Ricardo McCullough

**Address:** 110 E MULBERRY AVE

#### REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Replace an existing non-original carport with a new carport.
2. Replace three existing wood windows on the historic structure.
3. Construct a 2-story addition on the west façade of the structure.

#### FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 110 E Mulberry Ave is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1923 by builder K. G. Granberg. The home is designed in the Colonial Revival style and features an accentuated front door with decorative pediment, a side-gabled roof, and several paired windows. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 2-story addition to the west façade of the existing structure, construct a new carport on the east facade of the existing structure, and replace three existing wood windows.
- 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. **NEW CARPORT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new carport in the general location of an existing non-original carport to be removed. According to the applicant, the proposed structure will measure ten feet (10'-0") tall from grade. The carport footprint is proposed to be flush with the front façade of the historic structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the reconstruction of porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres or carports should be based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. According to the 1911-1951 Sanborn Map, this home did not historically feature a carport. Additionally, historic carports typically were set back from the front façade. The proposed carport will conceal existing windows on the west façade of the historic structure. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines as submitted
- d. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to remove three existing wood windows on the west facade of the home. The windows are casement and feature nine divided lites. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing windows should be preserved unless deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant has proposed to replace the windows in-kind, but has not yet provided significant evidence to staff that the existing windows are deteriorated beyond repair.
- e. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The proposed addition is approximately one tenth of the existing footprint. However, the addition is located at the side of the structure. The north facade of the addition is completely visible from the public right-of-way. Staff does not find the proposed footprint consistent in terms of its location.

- f. **SCALE AND MASSING** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story addition to the existing 2-story historic structure. The height of the addition is slightly taller than the eaves of the front facade, but shorter than the existing structure’s primary ridgeline. The Historic Design Guidelines state that the height of side or rear additions should be limited to the height of the primary structure. The proposal is generally consistent with this Guideline; however, addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The width and solid-to-void massing visually competes with the design of the historic structure.
- g. **ROOF FORM** – The proposed addition features a second level pergola with a flat roofline. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure should be used for additions, particularly for those that are visible from the public right-of-way. Flat rooflines for occupiable space are not characteristic of Colonial Revival architecture, especially when viewed from the public right-of-way. Staff does not find the proposed roof form consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **WINDOWS AND DOORS: PLACEMENT AND PROPORTION** – The applicant has proposed to install two windows on the front facade of the side addition. The windows, as drawn in the submitted elevations, appear to have a similar divided lite pattern as existing windows in the historic structure, but also appear to be fixed or a configuration other than double hung. Additionally, the window size is more comparable to sizes on secondary facades of the structure versus the front facade. Colonial Revival architecture is characterized by large windows with double-hung sashes and multi-pane glazing. Staff does not find the configuration or proportion of the windows consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS** – The applicant has not yet specified the proposed new window and door materials. Staff finds wood to be appropriate.
- j. **FAÇADE MATERIALS** – The proposed addition will be clad in stucco. The submitted elevations do not yet specify a texture. According to the Guidelines for Additions, materials that match in type, color, and texture should be utilized, in conjunction with an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. Staff finds stucco generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. While the proposed addition incorporates a stucco facade, the design is more closely related to the non-original rear addition versus the historic structure. The pergola support brackets, roof form, and window proportions do not establish a relationship with the historic elements of the Colonial Revival style. The north facade of the addition, which is fully visible from the public right-of-way, is in discord with the historic facade. Staff does not find the architectural details as proposed to be compatible with the historic structure given the addition’s location.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval as submitted based on findings a through k. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant submits floor plans indicating the relationship of the proposed addition to the primary structure to qualify its placement and footprint as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the applicant modifies the roof form of the addition to be more consistent with roof forms commonly found in Colonial Revival architecture as noted in finding h.
- iii. That the applicant proposes window proportions and patterns that are more consistent with patterns on the existing primary facade and in Colonial Revival architecture as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the applicant proposes architectural details that are more compatible with the historic structure as noted in finding l.

- v. That the applicant modifies the carport design to be set back from the façade and incorporate design details that are reflective of Colonial Revival architecture.
- vi. That the applicant provides sufficient evidence that the windows to be replaced are deteriorated beyond repair.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to deny as submitted.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**37. HDRC NO. 2017-570**

**Applicant:** Criswell Humphrey/CCH Projects LLC

**Address:** 4052 E EVERGREEN

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install new French doors in the opening of one of two existing front doors.
2. Remove three non-original aluminum windows on the side and rear of the structure.
3. Remove two existing wood windows on the rear of the structure and relocate them in general location of the nonoriginal aluminum windows to be removed.
4. Install a new fixed wood window on the east façade in the former opening of a non-original aluminum window.
5. Relocate an existing rear door.
6. Install new wooden stairs and landing to conceal existing concrete stairs on the front porch and side landing facing Paschal St.
7. Demolish an existing 1-story rear accessory structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 402 E Evergreen is a 1-story single family home designed in the Craftsman style. The home appears on the 1911-1951 Sanborn Map. The house features several quintessential elements of the style, including a double gable front facade with overhanging eaves and exposed rafter tails, decorative wood window screens, and wide tapered brick front porch column bases with slender wood posts. The home is a contributing structure in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The property also contains a 1-story rear accessory structure, which appears on the 1911-1951 Sanborn Map in its present location and footprint. The rear accessory structure is also contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.
- b. **FRONT DOOR MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove one of two existing front doors and replace with French doors. The existing door is not original, but the opening is. Two doors are historically common in Craftsman-style homes of the era. However, the opening and trim is wider than the primary front door. The additional width appears to have been infilled with siding and likely replaced original French doors with a smaller width, which can be found in

historic Craftsman structures in the district and in the city. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new openings and doors should be compatible in size, scale, shape, proportion, material, and massing with historic entrances. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

- c. ALUMINUM WINDOW REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove three non-original windows on the rear and east façade of the structure. The windows are not appropriate in terms of size, material, configuration, inset, and sill detail. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- d. WOOD WINDOW RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate two existing one over one wood windows on the rear façade of the structure. The windows will be installed in the general location of the nonoriginal aluminum windows to be removed. Considering the proposal holistically, staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- e. NEW WINDOW – The applicant has proposed to install a new fixed wood window on the east façade of the structure, which will be in the location of a new bathroom. The window will be installed in the general location of a non-original aluminum window to be removed. Considering the proposal holistically, staff finds the proposal appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- f. NEW REAR DOOR – The applicant has proposed to relocate an existing door. Based on the submitted elevations, the door will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. STAIR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to install new wooden decking over existing concrete stairs at the front porch and a side entry facing Paschal Street. The existing stairs are constructed of concrete with brick and stone surrounds and are in a state of disrepair. The stair element has separated from the primary structure on the Paschal side. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, original concrete porch floors and stairs should be preserved. Original porch concrete elements should not be covered with carpet, tile, or other materials unless they were used historically. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. DEMOLITION OF REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - The existing rear accessory structure is 1-story and appears on a 1911-1951 Sanborn Map in the same footprint and location. Staff conducted a site visit on November 2, 2017 to assess the structure. The facade materials match those of the primary structure, including woodlap siding and a standing seam metal roof. The structure also features similar gable and eave detailing as the primary structure, including exposed rafter tails. The accessory structure also features wood carriage doors that match the quality, texture, and profile of the woodlap siding. Based on these considerations, staff has determined that this structure is contributing to the district. In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff does not believe this criterion for demolition has been met. Additionally, in accordance with UDC Section 35-614(b), in order for the unreasonable economic hardship requirement for demolition to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. The structure contains a substantial amount of original materials with a high quality of craftsmanship and is good condition for its age. The applicant has not provided documentation to meet the evidence criterion for UDC Section 35-614(b).

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends the front door replacement based on finding b with the stipulation that the French doors be made of wood and not exceed the width of the existing door trim. The applicant must submit final door specifications to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Items 2 through 5, staff recommends approval of the non-original window removal, window relocation, and new window and door installation based on findings c through f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits final measured drawings to staff for approval.
- ii. That the applicant submits final window specifications to staff. The window must be wood. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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 6, Staff does not recommend approval of the wood stair decking based on finding g. Staff recommends that the existing concrete steps be stabilized and repaired.

Item 7, Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition of the existing rear accessory structure and construction of a new rear accessory structure based on finding h. The applicant may present additional materials to the HDRC that provide evidence of an unreasonable economic hardship or loss of significance of the structure.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve items #1-5 with staff stipulations, approve item #5, and deny item #7.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**38. HDRC NO. 2017-558**

**Applicant:**

**Address:** 246 CLUB DR

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace the existing clay barrel tiles on the primary structure with composition architectural shingles.
2. Replace the existing three-tab shingles on rear accessory structure with composition architectural shingles.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property located at 246 Club is a 2-story single family home constructed circa 1930 in the Spanish Eclectic style. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including cross-gabled roof with red barrel tiles, an stone chimney with barrel tile top, limestone rubble façade on the first floor, and stucco façade on the second floor. The home is a contributing

structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing red clay barrel tile roof with a new composition shingle roof.

- b. **CONTEXT** - Staff performed windshield survey of the surrounding blocks within the Monticello Park Historic District on November 2, 2017 to determine if many of the roofs on Spanish Eclectic homes in the area had been replaced with composition shingles. On Club Drive and adjacent street North Drive, all of the Spanish Eclectic homes featured clay tile roofs. On adjacent street Mary Louise Drive, one roof of a Spanish Eclectic style has been replaced with composition shingle. This house is located approximately 1500 feet southeast of 246 Club. The replacement roof has resulted in a façade that features substantially less depth and texture, both of which define the Spanish Eclectic style. Additionally, the applicant has noted that that “75% of the roofs on the 200 block of Club Dr. are composition roofs”, but none of these homes are designed in the Spanish Eclectic style. Overall in the Monticello Park Historic District, it is rare to find homes of this style void of a clay barrel tile roof.
- c. **PRIMARY ROOF** - According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iv., roofing materials should be replaced in-kind whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Historic materials should be retained and reused when large-scale replacement of roof materials is required, specifically roofs constructed of slate or clay barrel tile. New roofing materials to the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile, and style, or select materials consistent with the building style, when in-kind replacement is not possible. The clay barrel tile roofs on the Spanish Eclectic homes on Club and within the Monticello Park Historic District overall are character defining features of the style. Staff finds that a composition shingle roof is not appropriate for this style of house, and finds that its installation would substantially alter the style and visual elements of the home.
- d. **ACCESSORY ROOF** – The applicant has also requested to replace the existing three-tab composition shingle on the rear accessory structure with architectural composition shingles. According to the Guidelines, staff finds the proposed replacement appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of replacing the primary structure’s clay barrel tile roof with composition shingle based on findings b and c. If the applicant cannot repair the existing tile or replace in-kind, a substitute material that is matching in appearance may be proposed.

Staff recommends approval of replacing the accessory structure’s existing shingle roof with shingle as submitted.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve item #2 and deny item #1.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**39. HDRC NO. 2017-566**

**Applicant:** Ricardo Turrubiates

**Address:** 402 CENTER ST  
406 CENTER ST  
139 N SWISS  
126 N CHERRY  
122 N CHERRY  
120 N CHERRY  
134 N SWISS  
130 N SWISS  
126 N SWISS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for a twenty-four unit townhome development to be partially bound by N Cherry, Center and N Swiss.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for a twenty-four unit townhome development to be partially bound by N Cherry to the west, Center to the north, intersected by N Swiss and bound on the east by a surface parking lot. Each lot is currently void of a structure. Information regarding height, massing and façade composition have not been submitted to staff and are not included in this conceptual review.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – 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. **MASSING, HEIGHT & FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT** – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding massing, height or façade arrangement. Staff finds that this information should be provided prior to the issuance of conceptual approval of site or building design.
- d. **SITE PLAN** – The applicant has provided a site plan that notes that construction of twenty-four residential structures in row house form. The ground level of each structure features an automobile garage. The applicant has proposed for thirteen of the proposed units to front N Cherry Street or N Swiss.
- e. **SETBACKS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new construction should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Where a variety of setbacks exist, the median setback of buildings should be used. The surrounding structures, many of which are not historic, feature varying setbacks. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a diagram noting the relationship of proposed setbacks with those found historically in the adjacent blocks. On N Swiss, the proposed new construction should feature a greater setback than the adjacent single family historic structure.
- f. **ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed an orientation that results in thirteen of the proposed twenty four units to front either N Cherry or N Swiss Streets. Eleven of the proposed units will feature an inward orientation. Generally, staff finds the units that have been proposed to front N Swiss and N Cherry to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. There are currently four units that are adjacent to Center Street but do not feature an orientation toward Center. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate porch and other architectural elements to reorient these units toward Center Street.
- g. **SITE DESIGN** – The applicant has noted the installation of natural lawn areas that are to include planting beds at the front of each structure. Additionally, the applicant has provided information regarding site design including the location of driveways, walkways and sidewalks and trees. Generally, the proposed locations of grass and plants are appropriate.

- h. WALKWAYS – The applicant has proposed sidewalks to extend between row structures as well as sidewalks to extend from front porches to the connecting sidewalks. Staff finds this appropriate; however, sidewalks that extend to Center Street should feature a width that is consistent with that found historically in the district.
- i. DRIVEWAYS – The applicant has noted driveway entrances that are to be located on N Cherry, Center and N Swiss Streets. Each of the proposed driveway widths as well as curb cut and apron widths are wider than what is found historically in the district. Staff finds the location of the proposed driveways to be generally appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information regarding exact widths, materials and curb cut and apron widths.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval based on findings a through h. Staff finds that without information regarding building heights, massing or façade arrangement, staff cannot recommend conceptual approval. If the HDRC finds that the provided information is sufficient for conceptual approval, staff recommends the following be addressed:

- i. That the applicant provide a diagram noting the relationship of proposed setbacks with those found historically in the adjacent blocks.
- ii. That the proposed new construction which fronts N Swiss feature a greater setback than that of the neighboring historic structure.
- iii. That units which feature a side elevation toward Center Street be reoriented to feature a primary orientation toward Center.
- iv. That all sidewalks which intersect the sidewalk at Center feature a width and profile that is consistent with those found historically in the district.
- v. That the applicant provide information regarding the width, profile and materials of each driveway, apron and curb cut.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made to adjourn.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**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.

APPROVED

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

Michael Guarino  
Chair