

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
NOVEMBER 5, 2014**

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

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Feldman, Connor
ABSENT: Valenzuela, Salas, Rodriguez

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2014-363 | 806 E. Guenther |
| 2. Case No. 2014-332 | 306 E. Johnson |
| 3. Case No. 2014-365 | 1115 Mission Rd. |
| 4. Case No. 2014-346 | 3801 Broadway |
| 5. Case No. 2014-347 | 1221 Broadway |
| 6. Case No. 2014-350 | 1215 E. Sunshine |
| 7. Case No. 2014-351 | 120 Queens Crescent |
| 8. Case No. 2014-353 | 646 S. Main Ave. |
| 9. Case No. 2014-214 | 215 W. Lullwood Ave. |
| 10. Case No. 2014-358 | 322 Mary Louise |
| 11. Case No. 2014-359 | 322 Florida |
| 12. Case No. 2014-361 | 230 Callaghan |
| 13. Case No. 2014-022 | 819 E. Magnolia Ave. |
| 14. Case No. 2014-364 | 555 Funston Place |
| 15. Case No. 2014-349 | 630 E. Guenther |
| 16. Case No. 2014-355 | 613 Mission |
| 17. Case No. 2014-348 | 926 E. Grayson |

Item 1, 2, 4, 8, 15, and 12 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2014-363

Applicant: Jason Robert Hull
Address: 806 E. Guenther

The applicant is seeking Historic Tax Certification for the property at 806 E Guenther.

FINDINGS:

- a. The scope of work largely consists of restoration work that has been approved administratively which includes repairs to and the leveling of the foundation, replacement of the standing seam metal roof and repainting of the exterior.
- b. The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

November 5, 2014

2

Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on findings a and b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2014-332

Applicant: Roy Pachecano

Address: 306 E. Johnson

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

Construct a garage with wood trellis carport at the rear of the property at 306 E Johnson. Both structures will be accessed by two existing curb cuts on Johnson. The garage is proposed to have a white stucco exterior, standing seam metal roof and wood garage door.

FINDINGS:

- a) This request received conceptual approval on October 1, 2014. The current request is consistent with that approval.
- b) The proposed garage and trellis carport are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. and 5.B. in terms of massing and form, building size, character, orientation and setback. The proposed materials palette is similar to the primary structure without mimicking the historic construction.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a and b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

4. HDRC NO. 2014-346

Applicant: Allison Chambers/Ford, Powell & Carson Architects

Address: 3801 Broadway

Reset to November 19, 2014

8. HDRC NO. 2014-353

Applicant: Dale Carse/HEB Construction

Address: 646 S. Main Ave.

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

Implement a master signage plan for the HEB Arsenal campus. Signs include directional and way finding signs, identification signs and historical information signs.

FINDINGS:

- a) The use of freestanding signs within the HEB Arsenal campus is an appropriate response to vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the site, consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.i. and 4.A.ii.

November 5, 2014

3

b) In general, the proposed signs are scaled appropriately for their uses. According to the Guidelines for Signage 4.B.i., freestanding signs should be limited to 6 feet in height. UDC Section 35-678(e)(4) requires that freestanding signs be limited to 6 feet. Several of the proposed directional signs and historical information signs exceed the 6 foot limitation and should be reduced. Street signs and general traffic signs are exempt from this requirement.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that no freestanding sign be taller than 6 feet based on finding b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with the stipulation that the HEB corporate logo not be used on signs identifying the Commander's House. The applicant has verbally agreed to this stipulation.

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

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2014-349

Applicant: Catherine Nored/ Nored Architecture

Address: 630 E. Guenther

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to: Renovate the existing house. The applicant has proposed to remove the additional room at the rear. The existing wood siding and wood windows are to remain and be painted and repaired as needed. The existing roof will also remain. The applicant is also proposing the addition of an open screened porch as well as to rebuild the front porch.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposal to demolish the existing addition at the rear of the structure at 630 E Guenther is appropriate due to the fact that the rear addition is a non original component of the house. The existing wood siding, wood windows and wood door should be salvaged to be consistent with the Design Guidelines for Additions Materials and Textures 3.C.i.
- b. The proposed repairs to the wood siding are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii and iii.
- c. The proposed repair of the wood windows is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii.
- d. The proposed repair to the existing standing seam metal roof is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.A.i and 3.B.i.
- e. Given its location at the rear of the original house, its subordinate state to the principal facade, and its use of like materials, the proposed addition of an open air screened porch is consistent with the Guidelines for Massing and Form of Residential Additions 1.A. and 1.B. and should remain consistent with the Guidelines for Materials and Textures 3.A and 3.B.
- f. The proposed reconstruction of the front porch is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B.i,iii,iv, and v and should remain consistent with the Guidelines for Materials and Textures 3.A and B and 4.A.i,ii, and iii.

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the stipulations that the wood decking from the existing porch, existing siding, wood windows and wood door be salvaged.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulations: Conceptual approval with staff stipulations that the wood decking from the existing porch, existing siding, wood windows and wood door be salvaged as well as the Commission's stipulation that the ornamental complexity of the porch be reduced to a more appropriate level for Guenther Street.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

16. HDRC NO. 2014-355

Applicant: Kimberlee Lorenz

Address: 613 Mission

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to: replace the existing shingle roof with a metal standing seam roof and to remove (2) non-historic doors from the east side of the house and replace them with historically appropriate single hung windows and age appropriate stained glass windows. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 613 Mission Street.

FINDINGS:

- a. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i recommend that historic door openings be preserved. Given that the façade appears to have been previously altered, the proposal to remove a non-original opening is appropriate.
- b. The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer. A majority of the work has been approved administratively which includes re-roofing, siding repair, foundation repair and porch repair.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2014-356

Applicant: Alfred Castellano

Address: 1330 E. Pyron

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new two-story, single-family residence on the vacant lot at 1330 E Pyron. The 4,516 square foot house will have a footprint of approximately 4,850 square feet which includes a covered patio and front porch. The proposed new house will have an overall height of approximately 24 feet. Materials consist of stucco facades, tile roof, wood doors, and stucco covered metal windows.

FINDINGS:

- a) The Mission Historic District was created by ordinance in 1977 and covers a large area. Roughly following the path of the San Antonio River to include the four southern Mission sites, the district includes a mixture of uses and building types. Each residential area within the district has a unique context and development pattern. Once a more rural setting, home along this portion of E Pyron were originally constructed circa 1945 and were modest in design. Newer homes have been added over time and vary in terms of style and scale. The Historic Design Guidelines apply to all local historic districts, including the Mission Historic District. The proposed residence generally follows the established building setback along the street. The proposed house also features a front-facing entry, similar to the majority of homes located nearby. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A. and 1.B. in terms of building setback and orientation.
- b) According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., the height and scale of new construction in residential districts should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. At two stories, the height of the proposed house is appropriate. However, the Guidelines also recommend that the overall scale of new residences be consistent with the scale of nearby historic homes. At over 4,500 square feet, the proposed house greatly exceeds the size of the historic homes on E Pyron and is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- c) The proposed house features a hipped roof with clay barrel tiles as wells as a Mission Revival parapet above the front entry. There is no precedent for this style of roof in the nearby historic homes. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i.
- d) Stucco is an exterior material that is commonly found in historic homes in this area. In many cases, stucco has been added to homes with wood siding over time. The proposed use of stucco is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and

Alterations 3.A.i. However, the selected arched metal windows with stucco trim do not have historic precedent in the area. The majority of historic homes in area feature traditional one-over-one wood windows with wood trim. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

e) According to the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.ii., new construction should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found within the district are inappropriate. The majority of homes in this area are modest in design and feature simplistic, traditional details. The proposed Spanish Eclectic and Mission Revival details are more ornate than the historic precedent established in this area and are not consistent with the Guidelines. Overall, the proposed design is more characteristic of a suburban development instead of an infill development within a residential historic district.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings b through e. Staff does recommend approval that the case be forwarded to the Design Review Committee for further review

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2014-321

Applicant: John Britten

Address: 105 S. Flores St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install three signs identifying a business at 105 S Flores. The requested signs include:

1. One flag-mounted, internally illuminated cabinet sign installed above the canopy at this location. The sign will be mounted to an area which was previously a transom window and measure 3 feet long by 2 feet tall;
2. One set of vinyl lettering mounted to the front door measuring approximately 1'-10" by 9". Incidental signage is not included in these measurements; and
3. One LED-illuminated hanging sign to be positioned in the window. This sign measures 24" x 36".

The total requested square footage for all three signs is approximately 19 ½ square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. In general, the proposed number and size of the requested signage is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.A. and are scaled appropriately to the tenant space in this building.
- b. The proposed flag-mounted cabinet sign, while sized appropriately, features internal illumination that is not consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.E.i. The internal illumination also necessitates a much thicker cabinet that would normally be found in a projecting sign. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.D.ii. Additionally, the placement of this sign in the area that formerly served as a transom window is not consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.C.i. This type of sign above a canopy is not appropriate.
- c. The proposed vinyl lettering on the door is scaled appropriately and will be easily viewed by pedestrians. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.A. and 1.C.
- d. The proposed window sign is internally illuminated which is not consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.E.i. A non-illuminated sign would appropriate.

1. Staff does not recommend approval of the flag-mounted cabinet sign based on finding b.
2. Staff recommends approval of the vinyl lettering as submitted based on c.
3. Staff recommends approval of the window sign with the stipulation that internal illumination is not used based on finding d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to: 1. Denial of flag-mounted sign; 2. Approved as submitted; 3. Approved with stipulation that internal illumination is not used.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2014-306

Applicant: Samantha Beal/Statewide Remodeling

Address: 410 E. Arsenal

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

Construct a 320 sf addition to the south (side) façade of the house at 410 E Arsenal. Exterior materials will include a synthetic siding material with a stucco texture and aluminum windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 410 E Arsenal was constructed circa 1990 and is non-contributing to the King William Historic District. The proposed addition will not impact any historic structures or site features, but must continue to respect the standards and guidelines established by the applicable zoning overlays.
- b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 23, 2014. At that meeting, concern was expressed over the selected materials, in particular the synthetic stucco product. The committee requested that additional materials be submitted for review, including additional information regarding the selected siding.
- c. The proposed sunroom will be constructed at an existing covered patio. While not visible from Arsenal Street, the addition will be visible along the pedestrian walkway along the San Antonio River at this location. Its placement and scale is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- d. The applicant has clarified that traditional stucco will not be used on the addition, but rather a synthetic siding with a faux stucco texture. This type of material does not meet the intent of UDC Section 35-674 which requires traditional materials to be used within the RIO. In particular, the samples provided by the applicant indicate that the siding will have a plastic-like sheen. There is also concern that the factory-produced pattern will be recognizable as a nontraditional application.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that traditional stucco to match the main house is used based on finding c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with stipulations: That authentic stucco finish be applied to exterior. The applicant has verbally agreed to meet this stipulation.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2014-357

Applicant: Ruby Casteel

Address: 610 Nolan

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: install relocated metal fencing in the front yard of the property at 610 Nolan. The metal fencing will be relocated from another property on 4th street. The relocated fence will measure approximately 6 feet tall and include a front gate leading to a future front walk way as well as a 20' gate to accommodate a future driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a) According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii., new fences should not be installed where they did not historically exist, particularly in the front yard. Although many properties within the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature small yards which likely once contained front yard gardens, there is not strong evidence that indicates that front yard fences were common within the district. Some front yard fences within the district have been added over time. On this block of Nolan, three properties feature front chain link fences. A nearby property at the corner of Nolan and Hackberry features an iron fence that appears to be of historic age. Because there is some precedent for front yard fences at this location, an appropriately-designed front yard fence at 610 Nolan would be consistent with the Guidelines.
- b) The applicant is using fencing salvaged from another property and has submitted photographs for reference. The photographs submitted by the applicant indicate that the fence features thicker members that are more common to a commercial fence. There is concern that the selected fence may not be appropriate in a residential application.
- c) The applicant has indicated that a 20-foot vehicular gate will be located on the eastern edge of the property at an existing curb cut. Although plans for the driveway have not been submitted for review at this time, staff notes that there is precedent at this location for a six to seven foot driveway. A wider driveway may not conform to the Historic Design Guidelines.
- d) The applicant has indicated that the front yard fence will be approximately 6 feet tall. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., the height of new fences within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The proposed height is not consistent with the Guidelines and is not appropriate at this location. If approved by the HDRC, a variance for the requested height will also be required before a permit may be issued.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b through d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to reset to November 19, 2014.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2014-354

Applicant: Catherine Nored/Nored Architecture

Address: 1005 S. Alamo

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

1. Install a 3-foot, wrought iron front yard fence;
2. Install a 6-foot, horizontal wood plank backyard privacy fence along the north and south property lines;
3. Install a 6-foot, horizontal wood plank and corten steel fence in the front yard along the north property line;
4. Reconfigure the front porch to include a wood screen and bench on the north end and enlarged front opening with front concrete steps. The steps will be accessed by brick pavers on a sand base;
5. Replace existing gravel driveway with brick pavers on a sand base; and
6. Enclose existing open carport with welded wire panels and wood garage doors.

FINDINGS:

- a) This area along S Alamo features a mix of commercial and residential building types. The building at 1005 S Alamo is a former residence that is currently used as office space. It is bordered by commercial properties to the north and south. The HDRC has previously reviewed and approved dumpster screening at the property immediately to the north. The screening has not been installed by that property owner.
- b) Many business and offices along S Alamo feature front yard fences or low walls. There is precedent for front yard fences on S Alamo and within the King William Historic District. The proposed front yard fence design features an appropriate material and height consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii., 2.B.iii., and 2.B.v.
- c) The proposed wood privacy fence will not be highly visible from the street and is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.

d) The Guidelines for Site Elements do consider the screening of incompatible uses. The location of a trash area immediately to the north of the property does present a design challenge for the applicant. The applicant proposes to screen the dumpster by constructing a 6-foot privacy fence partially located in the front yard of the property. The fence will consist of horizontal wood planks and corten steel. However, the proposed fence design features materials that are not compatible within the district and is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.v. Additionally, the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.ii. discourage the use of privacy fences in front yards. The applicant should consider screening the dumpster with a hedge or other landscape element instead. Most landscaping items are eligible for administrative approval.

e) The building at 1005 S Alamo has been modified over time and features an irregular façade. Sanborn maps indicate that the front porch is a later addition to the building. The proposed reconfiguration to include front steps is appropriate and will help to orient the building towards the street. The proposed wood screen incorporates existing materials and detailing consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.i. and 7.B.iv., and will not greatly impact views of the front of the building.

f) The propose brick pavers are and appropriate paving material that is commonly found within the district. The use of a sand base allows for the pavers to remain semi-pervious consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i.

g) The proposed alterations to the carport do not impact any historic buildings or features and are not easily viewed from the public right-of-way. The selected garage doors are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.B.i.

- 1. Staff recommends approval of the front yard fence based on finding b.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of the backyard privacy fence based on finding c.
- 3. Staff does not recommend approval of the 6-foot fence in the front yard based on finding d.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the porch modifications and walkway with the stipulation that the pecan tree is protected during construction based on finding e.
- 5. Staff recommends approval of the brick paver driveway based on finding f.
- 6. Staff recommends approval of carport modifications based on finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulations: That the front fence / screen feature wood cladding instead of metal.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2014-360

Applicant: Daniel Diaz
Address: 1014 Burnet St.

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

Construct a 586-foot rear addition to the house at 1014 Burnet Street.

FINDINGS:

a) The house at 1014 Burnet was constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman Bungalow style. It has been substantially modified over time. Many of the original windows have been replaced and the raised wood porch has been removed. Some window and door openings also appear to have been filled with wood siding.

b) The proposed addition is located entirely at the rear of the house and respects the scale and context of the block face consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., 1.A.ii., and 1.A.iii.

c) According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., new additions should utilize a setback or recessed area to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Plans submitted by the applicant indicate that the exterior walls of the addition protrude from the existing wall planes. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. At minimum, the addition should occur within the same wall plan and utilize a trim piece to provide for a clear transition between old and new. Furthermore, the existing setback conditions do not appear to support further encroachment into the side yard.

d) The house at 1014 Burnet rests on a deep lot that can support a rear addition that conforms to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv. The footprint of the proposed addition is also scaled appropriately in comparison to the original house.

e) The height of the proposed addition does not exceed the height of the existing house, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v.

f) The original house at 1014 Burnet features 117 “double teardrop” wood lap siding. According to Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., the materials used for additions should be compatible with the original building in terms of type, color, and texture. Furthermore, the Guidelines for Additions 3.B.i. discourage the use of synthetic materials in new additions. The proposed hardi board siding material is not compatible with the existing siding and is not consistent with the Guidelines.

g) The Guidelines for Additions 3.C.i. recommend that salvaged materials be incorporated into the addition where possible. The proposed addition will replace an existing rear wing that features identical siding as the primary structure. Staff finds that these materials could be reused in the addition, along with matching wood siding, consistent with the Guidelines.

h) According to Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. The proposed vinyl windows at the sides and rear of the addition are not consistent with this guideline. Wood windows that are compatible with the original house would be more appropriate.

i) The Guidelines for Additions 4.A. recommend that the architectural details of any addition complement those that are found in the original structure. It is unclear in the drawings submitted whether the proposed addition conforms to this guideline. For instance, the original house feature exposed rafter ends that are characteristic of the Craftsman style. This detail is not illustrated in the drawings submitted. At minimum, this detail should be incorporated into the addition in conformance with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

1. That the addition be limited within the existing side wall planes and incorporate a wood transition piece based on finding c;
2. That salvaged and matching wood siding be used in the addition based on findings f and g;
3. That wood windows be used instead of vinyl based on finding h; and
4. That the addition feature exposed rafter ends based on finding i.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulations: 1. That east wall be within existing wall plane and use transition strip; 2. That hardi-board siding used on the addition be compatible with wood siding in dimension and texture; 3. That vinyl windows be of compatible profile with wood windows and feature wood trim and wood screens; 4. That the addition feature exposed rafter ends.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2014-352

Applicant: Jan Edwards

Address: 233 E. Houston

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

Install a fabric canopy enclosure over the existing sidewalk dining area at 233 E Houston. The proposed enclosure is 8-feet tall and covers an area that is approximately 8'-9" deep by 40'-9" wide.

FINDINGS:

a) According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii., new awnings may be added where there is historical evidence. Historic photographs provided by staff indicate that fabric awnings were historically located over the first floor storefront. However, the first floor of this building also appears to have been modified over time.

b) An introduction of an awning at the proposed location would not obscure any historical architectural features consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.v.

c) The selected fabric material is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.iv.

d) As submitted, the proposed awning would incorporate a steel frame with columns and allow for the dining area to be fully enclosed by roll-up curtains. There is not historical precedent for this type of enclosure on Houston Street. While a traditional fabric canopy would be appropriate, the proposed enclosure is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii. as it

introduces a contemporary element to the front façade for which there is no precedent. Furthermore, there is concern that the enclosure would impact the spatial relationships and views that characterize the Houston Street streetscape.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c. A traditional fabric awning that requires no columns should be considered instead.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulation that columns and roll-down curtains are eliminated. Applicant provided drawings on 12/8/2014 which illustrate that the stipulations have been met. The awning will implement structural members that are flush with the non-original storefront of the building. Columns will not be used to support the front of the awning.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2014-328

Applicant: Daniel Ortiz/Brown & Ortiz, P.C.

Address: 903 Labor

Postponed per applicant.

26. HDRC NO. 2014-366

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 1432 E. Commerce

The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) is requesting the review and recommendation for historical significance of the Reus-Sterling buildings at 1432-1434 E Commerce and the Reus House at 105 S Hackberry in accordance with UDC Section 35-606.

FINDINGS:

a) A completed demolition application was received by OHP staff on October 9, 2014, for the buildings on the property at 1432 E Commerce. The application includes the three contiguous buildings fronting E Commerce (known as the Reus-Sterling buildings) as well as a wood-framed residential building (Reus House) at 105 S Hackberry. The Reus-Sterling buildings include a single-story cluster at the corner of E Commerce and Hackberry (1434) and a two-story building to the west (1432).

b) A site visit to the property was conducted by the Demolition and Designation Committee on October 8, 2014. The committee observed the interior and exterior of the buildings along E Commerce. The committee members present noted that the buildings had historical value and contributed to the historic streetscape along E Commerce. The committee recommends landmark designation.

c) In accordance with UDC Section 35-606(C)(3), OHP has provided a statement of significance for the Reus-Sterling Buildings on E Commerce for HDRC review and recommendation. This property meets more than the three required criteria for landmark designation (cited above), as per UDC Section 35-607(b), and is eligible for historic designation.

d) The wood-framed residential building at 105 S Hackberry was constructed circa 1925 as the residence for August and Agnes Reus. It is a 1 ½ story Craftsman style home with a large, inset porch, decorative eave brackets and woodshingled gables. This property also meets more than the three required criteria for landmark designation (cited above), as per UDC Section 35-607(b), and is eligible for historic designation. If the HDRC does not recommend historic designation for the structure, staff finds that it is a good candidate for relocation as an alternative to demolition.

e) The City of San Antonio previously contracted with Alpha Engineering and Raba Kistner Consultants to assess the structure integrity of the foundation components of the buildings on E Commerce. Reports from 2012 and 2014 are provided in the exhibits for this request. The reports conclude that the buildings are in need of substantial foundation repair. In particular, the foundation of the single-story building (1434) is in need of a complete retrofit or replacement (incorrectly identified as 1432 E Commerce in the report).

f) An additional structural report has been provided by a potential purchaser of the property. Conducted by Sparks Engineering, the report concludes that substantial repairs are necessary in order to adapt the building for future use. Recommended repairs include retrofitting wood-framed walls, constructing new concrete footings in 1434 (consistent with the Raba Kistner assessment), installing concrete pilasters and bond beam, reroofing and replacing stucco. A representative of the potential purchaser has provided a cost estimate

of approximately \$3.7 million for the rehabilitation of the buildings.

g) A representative of the potential purchaser has also provided a proposal for demolition with new construction at this property. The proposed new buildings maintain the general massing and form as the existing Reus-Sterling buildings along E Commerce but differ in terms of fenestration scale and pattern. The proposed scheme also necessitates the removal of the residential building at the rear of the property for surface parking. The proposed scheme has an estimated cost of \$2.4 million.

h) Because the property does not currently have historic designation, the requirements for demolition of a landmark that are outlined in UDC Section 35-614 do not directly apply in this case. However, the HDRC may consider information presented at the public hearing, including evidence pertaining to an economic hardship on the property owner, in making a recommendation for historic designation.

i) Historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its corridors. Staff acknowledges that there may be additional costs associated with a rehabilitation of the Reus-Sterling buildings versus the proposed new construction. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties which may help to offset some costs. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation work may be eligible for the incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.

Staff recommends approval of a Finding of Historic Significance for the Reus-Sterling buildings at 1432-1434 E Commerce as well as the Reus House at 105 S Hackberry.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve a Finding of Historic Significance.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair

