

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
20 December 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, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia

ABSENT: Lazarine, Bustamante, Brittain, Kamal, Laffoon

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in support of National Register nominations.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2017-634 105 N ALAMO
- Item #2, Case No. 2017-642 306 E MYRTLE (TAX CERTIFICATION)
- Item #3, Case No. 2017-643 306 E MYRTLE (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #4, Case No. 2017-639 401 S ALAMO
- Item #5, Case No. 2017-638 326 LEXINGTON
- Item #6, Case No. 2017-620 403 GILLESPIE
- Item #7, Case No. 2017-614 740 S ALAMO
- Item #8, Case No. 2017-637 555 FUNSTON
- Item #9, Case No. 2017-188 116-132 E HOUSTON (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #10, Case No. 2017-645 714 DAWSON
- Item #11, Case No. 2017-613 219 FLORIDA (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #12, Case No. 2017-647 1147 CAMARGO
- Item #13, Case No. 2017-632 1146 S ALAMO
- Item #15, Case No. 2017-550 213 SWEET (POSTPONED BY APPLICANT)
- Item #16, Case No. 2017-660 231 E HOUSTON
- Item #17, Case No. 2017-654 130 WICKES
- Item #18, Case No. 2017-621 348 THOMAS JEFFERSON
- Item #19, Case No. 2017-622 239 CENTER
- Item #21, Case No. 2017-625 534 LEIGH
- Item #22, Case No. 2017-502 1021 N PALMETTO
- Item #23, Case No. 2017-650 900 BROADWAY
- Item #24, Case No. 2017-651 222 E MITCHELL
- Item #25, Case No. 2017-652 715 STADIUM

Items #14 and #20 were pulled for citizens to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Note: Commissioner Lazarine arrived at 3:14 PM.

14. HDRC NO. 2017-595

Applicant: Tobias Stapleton

Address: 205 OSTROM

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two story, rear accessory structure. The existing, one-story historic structure on the property will be retained and rehabilitation plans will be submitted at a future date.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 205 Ostrom was constructed circa 1935 and is located within the River Road Historic District. The structure features architectural elements that are indicative of the Minimal Traditional Style that can be found in the district. The house features many of its original materials including wood siding and wood windows. However, modifications to the form of the historic structure have resulted in the removal and enclosing of the front porch, which now presents itself as a screened porch. Despite these modifications, staff finds the house to be a contributing resource within the River Road Historic District due to its construction date and architectural style.
- b. A request to demolish the primary historic structure and construct four new structures on the lots was denied by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the November 1, 2017, HDRC hearing. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story, rear accessory structure at the rear of the lot with plans to rehabilitate the primary historic structure on the lot.
- c. This case was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on December 6, 2017, where the motion was made to postpone action on this item until a result from the December 18, 2017, Board of Adjustment hearing is determined.
- d. **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.
- e. **REHABILITATION** – The applicant has noted in the provided written narrative that an attempt will be made to rehabilitate the historic structure on the site. No specifics to the rehabilitation have been provided to staff at this time. Staff finds that the applicant should adhere to the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Many rehabilitative scopes of work are eligible for Administrative Approval. Through substantial rehabilitation, the structure would become eligible for a local tax incentive.
- f. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that accessory structures should be designed to be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure on the lot, should be no larger than 40 percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint, should relate to the construction period and architecture of the primary historic structure and should feature windows and doors similar to those of the primary historic structure. The Guidelines for New

Construction 5.B. notes that the prominent garage orientation of the block and the historic setback of accessory structures should be matched.

- g. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – To the rear (northwest) of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story accessory structure to accommodate vehicular parking as well as a second level dwelling unit. The proposed accessory structure features an overall profile and massing that is greater than that of the primary historic structure, which features one story; however, staff finds that the proposed structure is appropriate given the proposed roof form and architectural details, which not only reduce its perceived massing, but also relate it to historic structures found throughout the district.
- h. **LOT LAYOUT** – The lot at 205 Ostrom features an irregular shape and layout, inconsistent with the primary development pattern found in the district. The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure at the western portion of the site, to the side and rear of the primary historic structure, similar to the location of accessory structures found elsewhere in the district. While the general orientation of the accessory structure is skewed, staff finds the placement appropriate.
- i. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – Staff finds the proposed setbacks and orientation of the accessory structure to be appropriate. Any final plans must represent accurate setback conditions and demonstrate compliance with the Unified Development Code prior to any request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- j. **MATERIALS** – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that consist of an asphalt shingle roof, double hung wood windows, wood or Hardi board siding. Staff finds the proposed materials appropriate; however the proposed siding should feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish to remain consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
- k. **TREE SURVEY** – The applicant has provided staff with a tree survey noting the location of existing, significant trees. Per the application documents, none of the existing, significant trees will be impacted by the proposed new construction.
- l. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed accessory based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- ii. That the single garage door be eliminated and a two-stall configuration with two separate door be used instead. The doors must feature materials and a profile consistent with historic examples found in the district.
- iii. **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: Larry DeMartino (Aisha Roberts yielded her time), Hector Hugo Gonzalez, Christopher Green (David Brogan yielded his time), Jim

Cullum (Fred Gonzales and Lea Brogan yielded their time), Mimi Quintanilla (David Schmidt yielded his time), and Ana Ramirez spoke in opposition.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

20. HDRC NO. 2017-623

Applicant: FDN Home, LLC

Address: 925 LAMAR ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear addition to feature approximately 300 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 925 Lamar was constructed circa 1920 and features Folk Victorian architectural elements include both a front and side gabled roof and a shed porch roof. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature 300 square feet.
- b. 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. The applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature a hipped roof that is to feature a ridgeline that per the construction documents is slightly greater than that of the primary historic structure. For a rear transition, the applicant has proposed for the width of the proposed addition to be subordinate to that of the historic structure and has proposed to construct the majority of the addition’s massing separate from the massing of the historic structure. Staff finds that the addition should feature a roofline that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure.
- c. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature an overall footprint and massing that is subordinate to that of the historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal roof, vinyl siding, wood windows, one aluminum window and one steel exterior door. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., materials that are compatible with the architecture style and materials of the original structure should be used on the addition. While currently found on the historic structure, the use of vinyl siding on the addition is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant use wood or a cementitious siding to feature an exposure of four (4) inches and a smooth exterior finish.
- e. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, 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 standard galvalume finish. A large ridge cap should not be used. Regarding windows, the applicant has proposed to install wood windows with the exception of one aluminum window in a bathroom shower. Regarding window installation, 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. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

- f. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, the applicant’s proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines in regards to massing, design and materials; however, the above noted inconsistencies are to be addressed prior to approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the rear addition feature an overall height that is consistent with or subordinate to that of the primary structure as noted in finding b.
- ii. That the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish as noted in finding e.
- iii. That the addition feature wood or a cementitious siding that features an exposure of four inches and a smooth exterior finish as noted in finding d.
- iv. That the proposed wood and aluminum windows follow specifications noted in finding e.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to postpone the case to the next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2017-636

Applicant: John Brearley

Address: 423 N HACKBERRY ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-story single family home on the vacant lot at 423 N Hackberry.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 423 N Hackberry in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between E Houston St to the north and Glorietta to the south. The lot is flanked to the north by a 2-story historic single family home, to the west by a series of historic 1-story single family homes, to the south by two vacant lots, and to the east by a non-contributing 1-story warehouse structure. This area of Hackberry St is transitional and features both commercial and residential structures.
- b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 12, 2017. The DRC mentioned that the existing context rhythm is mixed, but most commonly, foundations are 18-24 inches off grade. However, this project faces the issue of the ridge height being taller if the foundation were to be raised. A possible solution may be raising the porch entity and keeping the

parking at grade. Regarding the parking configuration, the DRC noted that it is a departure from traditional development patterns. The DRC suggested a possible resolution of designing the front porch element as enclosed versus open to eliminate the issue of second story massing fronting the street, noting that there is precedent for this in historic districts. This approach may also offer more opportunity for fenestration on the front façade. The DRC did recognize the difficulties of shotgun lot, foundation considerations, nearby context, and the accommodation of a 2-story structure. The applicant was amenable to lowering the height to be more consistent with the context. The applicant met again with the DRC on September 26, 2017. The applicant brought a modified set of drawings to be presented at the HDRC hearing on October 4, 2017. The drawings added a front balcony, which the DRC received favorably. The DRC discussed windows, and came to a decision with the applicant to install a functional one over one window on the front façade in the kitchen to accommodate comments at the previous HDRC hearing. Other window comments included adding windows to a previously blank wall, simplifying the number and pattern of the overall fenestration composition, and utilizing appropriate window dimensions, inset, and profile. The DRC also agreed that while the front parking strategy is a deviation from historic development precedents in the district, the proposal is an economical solution to a site with dimensional constraints.

- c. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of approximately 10’-8” from the front façade to the front sidewalk. The historic structure immediately to the north of 423 N Hackberry features a side setback from the sidewalk of approximately 20’-0”. This is the only historic structure that partially fronts N Hackberry on this block. According to a 1951 Sanborn Map, three 1-story residential structures occupied this block of N Hackberry and all featured a minimal front setback. Based on the historic development pattern and current context of the block, staff finds the proposed setbacks appropriate.
- d. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Hackberry. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not greatly exceed the historic precedent. The only remaining historic residential structure on N Hackberry between E Houston and Glorietta is 2 stories. The remaining historic structures in the vicinity on Glorietta are 1-story. The applicant has noted on the submitted drawings that the proposed ridge line will be 28’-10” from the finish floor, which is approximately one foot from grade, bringing the total height to approximately 29’-10” feet. Both the first and second stories will feature 10’-0” tall interior ceiling heights separated by a web truss measuring 1’-6”. The neighboring 2-story historic structure features a first floor ceiling height of 10’-0” and a second floor ceiling height of 8’-0”. Staff does not find the proposed height to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the overall height should be reduced through the shortening of the second story or the lowering of the top plate height to produce an overall height that is comparable with the heights of neighboring, historic structures.
- f. **PORCH CONFIGURATION AND MASSING** – The applicant has proposed to incorporate a front porch on the front façade of the new structure. The porch mass will be inset approximately 6” from the front façade. The Historic Design Guidelines state that porches on new construction should be reflective of the development pattern of the district. Typically in historic districts, including Dignowity Hill, residential porch massing elements project the furthest towards the streetscape to engage pedestrians. Two story structures feature a second story that is set back from the porch. As proposed, the structure’s second story extends over the front porch, which

increases the massing on the street. This is addressed in Guideline 2.A.ii, which states that step-downs in building height, wallplane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition should be utilized. There is no historic precedent in the district for this porch form or massing strategy. Staff finds the porch inconsistent with the Guidelines.

- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has noted a foundation height of approximately one foot. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) inches. This is generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a primary gable roof form with an additional front gable. There are historic examples of this roof form throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposed roof form generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally consistent with those found on historic structures in regards to location and size.
- j. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum-clad wood windows. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance, and feature traditional trim and sill details. Staff finds the proposed windows appropriate.
- k. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed new construction does not meet this Guideline. However, the overall lot is narrow relative to existing lots in the nearby vicinity. The footprint of the building is generally consistent with the historic structures found on Hackberry and adjacent blocks. Staff finds the proposed lot coverage acceptable given these site-specific considerations.
- l. **MATERIALS** – Based on the submitted documents, the applicant has proposed smooth horizontal composite board siding, board and batten siding, wooden columns, and a standing seam roof. Staff finds the materials consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the proposed architectural features are consistent with the Guidelines and relate to historic examples found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- n. **COLUMNS** – The applicant has proposed front porch columns. The columns will be wood with mitered corners, recessed panels, and a 1x4” cap wrap. Two pilasters on either side of the front door also features this detailing. The columns are appropriate for the style of the structure.
- 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 has indicated an A/C unit to the north of the proposed structure. The proposal includes a new 6’ tall privacy fence, which will screen the unit from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposed screening method appropriate.
- p. **DRIVEWAY & PARKING** – The applicant has proposed a new front concrete ribbon driveway measuring approximately 10’-8” in length and approximately 10’-0” in width. The concrete terminates at the front façade of the proposed new structure’s carport and transitions into crushed granite. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new garages should follow the historic pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the

principal building. There is no historic precedent for an attached garage in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The development pattern in the Dignowity Hill Historic District is most commonly for driveways to extend through the front yard to the side and rear yard of historic properties. Staff does not find the proposed front-loaded parking and driveway location to be consistent with the Guidelines or with the development pattern of the district.

- q. **LANDSCAPING & HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed a front concrete walkway from the sidewalk to the front door that is consistent in width and placement with the Guidelines. The applicant has proposed to plant two additional trees on the property. The rest of the landscaping on the property will be grass. No other significant landscaping is proposed at this time. Staff finds the proposal acceptable, but finds that the applicant should confirm with landscaping permitting requirements that their proposed canopy percentage meets code for new construction.
- r. **FENCING** – The applicant has noted per the site plan that a new privacy fence measuring 6’ in height is to be installed in the side and rear yard. The fence and gates are set back significantly from the front façade of the structure. Staff finds the proposed location and height appropriate and eligible for administrative approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the applicant proposes an alternative solution for the driveway and parking configuration that responds to the predominant historic development pattern in the district and maintains a traditional porch form instead of the proposed covered parking.
- ii. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, and a crimped ridge seam.
- iii. That the applicant installs smooth composite board siding with an exposure of four inches for lap siding. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- iv. That the applicant submits a final window specification for the proposed aluminum-clad wood windows to staff for review and approval. 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: Lulu Francois spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve items #2-4 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2017-604

Applicant: Vernon Bryant/BRC Remodeling Group

Address: 212 E ROSEWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove an existing non-original carport structure.
2. Construct a porch canopy on existing rear accessory structure.
3. Remove the existing woodlap siding on the rear accessory structure and install smooth Hardie plank siding.
4. Modify the existing roofline of the rear accessory structure to accommodate a new addition in the same approximate location and footprint of the non-original carport to be removed.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 212 E Rosewood Ave is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1930 in the Tudor style. The home is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The property also contains a 1-story rear accessory structure, formerly a maid's quarters, constructed circa 1930. The structure appears on the 1911- 1955 Sanborn Map in the same location and footprint. The structure features a non-original metal carport structure on the north façade. The original portion of the structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **CARPORT REMOVAL** - The applicant has proposed to remove a non-original metal carport on the north façade of the rear accessory structure. The carport is constructed of incompatible materials. Staff finds its removal appropriate.
- c. **NEW PORCH STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new porch structure on the south and west façades of the rear accessory structure. The proposal will replace an existing pergola. The porch will feature a low-sloped roofline and simple wooden posts. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements should be simple and compatible in design as to not compete with the historic structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **SIDING REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing woodlap siding on the rear accessory structure and install smooth Hardie board siding. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic wood siding should be preserved. When deteriorated beyond repair, new wood siding should be installed to match the profile, dimensions, material, and finish. The existing siding is in good condition and features a profile and dimensions commonly found on historic structures in the district. Staff does not find the proposed removal and replacement with Hardie siding consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **ROOFLINE MODIFICATIONS** - The applicant has proposed to modify the north roofline of the existing rear accessory structure to accommodate a new addition. The roofline north of the ridgeline will be modified to include a lower pitch that extends over the length of the new addition. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing garages and outbuildings should be preserved, and their distinctive features should remain. The proposed design will significantly alter the original configuration of the historic structure. Staff does not find the roofline modification consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **ADDITION: FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new addition in the same general location and footprint of the non-original carport to be removed. Based on the existing context of the site and the block, staff finds the proposed footprint generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **ADDITION: MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install composition shingle roofing to match the existing accessory structure and smooth Hardie plank siding. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, materials that match in type, color, and texture and include 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.

- h. ADDITION: GARAGE DOORS** – The applicant has proposed to install three overhead metal panel garage doors. The doors will face E Hollywood Ave. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, garage doors should be compatible with those found on historic garages in the district. E Hollywood Ave is a secondary street which features a streetscape of carports and both attached and detached garages. There are no primary facades facing this street. Additionally, there are several overhead metal panel garage doors directly facing the street. Staff finds the proposal acceptable based exclusively on the existing context of this portion of E Hollywood Ave as bounded by McCullough to the west and Shook Ave to the east.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends removal of the non-original carport based on finding b.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the new porch structure based on finding c with the stipulation that the applicant submits final drawings that indicate all dimensions, including the location and size of the columns.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the existing woodlap siding and installation of new Hardie siding based on finding e. Staff recommends that the woodlap siding be preserved and that matching siding be utilized on the addition.

Item 4, Staff does not recommend approval of the roofline modifications and new addition based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant propose an addition that has a roofline that is subordinate to the rear accessory structure.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

28. HDRC NO. 2017-635

Applicant: Guadalupe I & Willie A Francois

Address: 705 N PINE ST, 817 NOLAN

REQUEST:

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

1. Amend a previously approved fencing design to include metal fence posts instead of wood fence posts for a hog wire fence.
2. Install a prefabricated, metal gazebo on the vacant lot at 705 N Pine.
3. Install a driveway to feature a width at the existing concrete approach and apron of fourteen (14) feet to taper to ten (10) feet in width.
4. Install red brick pavers beneath two mature pecan trees instead of concrete.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 817 Nolan first appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps and originally features a double height front porch and Craftsman elements including roof brackets and large, square Craftsman style columns. The structure is in the process of being substantially rehabilitated. The

lot at the corner of Nolan and N Pine Streets is addressed as 705 N Pine and is currently void of any structures.

- b. At the March 1, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness to install fencing, an open air porch, a front sidewalk, a rear accessory structure, a concrete driveway and landscaping. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to amend the previously approved fencing and portions of the sidewalk as well as to install a metal, prefabricated gazebo on the lot.
- c. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to amend the previously approved COA for cattle panel fencing to feature wood posts and rails for metal posts and rails. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.A.i. notes that new fencing should appear similar to those used historically throughout the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. Wood fences are found commonly throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District; both in the form of wooden picket fences and cattle panel fences. A cattle panel fence that features metal posts and rails is a fencing detail commonly found on commercial or industrial properties. Staff finds the originally approved, wood fencing to be appropriate.
- d. GAZEBO – The applicant has proposed to install a prefabricated, metal gazebo on the vacant lot at 705 N Pine, the lot at the corner of N Pine and Nolan. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that new accessory structures should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. Staff does not find the use of metal to be appropriate for the proposed structure. Metal is not a building material found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- e. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a driveway to feature an initial width of fourteen (14) feet to taper to ten (10) feet in width that will feature a slight curve. At the March 1, 2017, HDRC hearing, the applicant proposed a straight driveway. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i. notes that driveways in historic districts typically do not exceed ten (10) feet in width. Additionally, the Guidelines note that new driveways should be similar to those found historically in the district in regards to their materials, width and design. Staff finds that a tapered, curved driveway is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should install a straight driveway that features ten (10) feet in width.
- f. BRICK PAVERS – The applicant has proposed to install brick pavers beneath two mature pecan trees where concrete was previously approved to remove the ability for tree roots to displace the concrete. Staff finds this request to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3, the proposed fencing modification, installation of a prefabricated, metal gazebo and driveway modifications based on findings c, d and e. Staff finds that the previously approved fence with wood posts and rails as well as a straight driveway to feature ten (10) feet in width to be appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of item #4, the installation of brick pavers beneath two mature pecan trees to replace previously approved concrete.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to deny items #1 and #2 and approve #3 and #4 with drawings of modifications submitted to staff.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2017-646

Applicant: Frank Velez/Ability Construction & Iron Works

Address: 524 E EVERGREEN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install front yard wrought iron fence at 5 feet in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 524 E Evergreen was constructed circa 1925 in the minimal traditional architectural style and a contributing structure to the Tobin Hill Historic District. The structure is a corner lot at crossstreet Kendall and featured a chain-link fence prior to the installation of 6-foot tall metal fence posts in November 2017.
- b. FENCE – The applicant is requesting to replace the existing chain-link fence with 5-foot tall wrought iron fencing spanning the front yard on E Evergreen to the rear corner on cross-street Kendall, including an arched driveway gate towards the rear of the property. Any replacement must be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and development standards related to front yard fencing. Per the Guidelines, front yard fences should not exceed four feet in height. Staff finds the proposed height should be reduced to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. DESIGN/MATERIAL–The applicant proposed to use wrought iron fencing with an arched gate. Wrought iron fences are found throughout the Tobin Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the proposed fence is appropriate provided that no portion of the fence exceeds fought feet in height including the rear gate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the installation of a front yard wrought iron fence on this corner lot with the stipulation that no portion of the fence exceeds four feet in height.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2017-640

Applicant: Kyle Voorhees

Address: 256 E MYRTLE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove an original standing seam metal roof and install a composition shingle roof in its place.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic building located at 526 E Myrtle is a 1-story duplex structure constructed circa 1935. The home is designed in the Craftsman style and features a side gabled roof with half hipped peaks, two half hipped porch roofs with decorative bracketing, and paired windows on the side facades. The structure is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.
- b. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The applicant is requesting to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new composition shingle roof. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, when roof replacement is required, the roof should be repaired in-kind. According to Sanborn Maps, this property historically had a metal roof. The roof also appears to be original or has been in place for several decades. Metal roofs in the existing configuration are typical of the style of the home. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. If replacement is necessary, staff recommends that the applicant install a new standing seam metal roof to match the existing. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. The applicant must contact staff 24 hours prior to installation in order to schedule an inspection to verify that metal roof specifications are met.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner spoke in opposition.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

31. HDRC NO. 2017-597

Applicant: Pablo Garza Jr

Address: 2247 W WOODLAWN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing wood siding in the gables with Hardie plank siding.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2247 W Woodlawn is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1940 in the Minimal Traditional style. The home features steel casement windows, roughly tooled stone siding, and an asymmetrical front porch. The structure is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wooden Dutch lap siding on the side gables of the roof with Hardie plank siding. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, wood siding should be replaced in-kind, matching in profile, dimensions, material, and finish. Staff does not find Hardie plank consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant replace the existing wood siding with new wood siding that matches the profile, dimensions, material, and finish of the existing.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Fish to deny.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

32. HDRC NO. 2017-616

Applicant: Thomas Gandy

Address: 363 NORTH DR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing front window with two new one over one vinyl windows with faux divided lites.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 363 North Dr is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1945 in the Minimal Traditional style with Craftsman and Neoclassical influences. The house features a hipped roof, asymmetrical façade, and enclosed front porch. The home is a contributing structure to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant is requesting approval to replace an existing steel casement window on the front façade. The window features two 2 by 8 casements with a transom above with four divided lites. The proposed replacement windows will be vinyl double hung with faux divided lites to mimic the existing lite configuration. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, install new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds that the existing window is not deteriorated beyond repair and can be restored in place.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. Staff recommends that the applicant restore the existing window, including transom, in place.

If the window cannot be feasibly restored or the HDRC recommends approval of replacement, staff recommends that the applicant install a window that meets the following stipulations:

- i. That the window matches the dimensions, profile, inset, configuration, and materiality of the original, features true divided lites, features clear glass, and maintains the original appearance of the window trim and sill. Vinyl windows with faux divided lites are not appropriate in any circumstance.

- ii. That the transom with four divided lites is retained or replaced with a fixed window that matches the dimensions, profile, inset, configuration, and materiality of the original.
- iii. That the applicant submits a final window specification to staff for review and approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to deny.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

33. HDRC NO. 2017-649

Applicant: Jennifer Gonzalez/Alamo Area Mutual Housing Association

Address: 214 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace damaged windows with new, aluminum clad wood windows on floors two through six. This replacement will impact 120 historic wood windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 214 Broadway is commonly known as the Calcasieu Building and was constructed in 1914. The structure was design by Atlee B. Ayres and is currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. At this time, the applicant has proposed to replace 120 original, wood windows with new, aluminum clad windows. The applicant has noted durability and energy efficiency as the primary reasons for the proposed replacement.
- b. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iii. note that historic windows should be preserved. OHP staff performed a site visit on October 25, 2017, with representatives of the owner, window manufacturers and Texas Historical Commission staff. At that time, staff viewed original wood windows, which staff found to be in good condition. Staff finds that the existing, historic wood windows should be repaired to be consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b.

If the HDRC approves the replacement of the original wood windows, staff finds the proposed replacement windows to be an appropriate replacement. All removed wood windows are to be salvaged for reuse in local historic structures.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

34. HDRC NO. 2017-644

Applicant: Kelly Johnson

Address: 1125 N OLIVE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Install 6 vinyl windows into existing window openings.
2. Install 7 wood window screens.
3. Replace wrought iron columns with wood columns.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 1125 N Olive is a one-story residential structure constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features a cross gable roof with composition shingle roofing material, a concrete porch with a shed roof and wrought iron columns, and a rear addition added at an unspecified time. The home first appears on a 1912 Sanborn map and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. VIOLATION - According to an investigation report and site visit conducted by staff on October 10, 2017, non-original window replacement, window screen installation, and column replacement have occurred prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- c. WINDOW MATERIAL - The applicant has proposed to install 6 vinyl windows into existing window openings. Of the twelve (12) total window openings, five (5) non-street facing windows were approved for vinyl replacement on September 1, 2015, one (1) rear wood window remains intact, and the remaining six (6) are requested at this time. Of the six windows in question, two (2) are located on the front façade and four (4) on the driveway-facing elevation. There is evidence that suggests the original windows were previously replaced with aluminum windows. According to the Guidelines 2.B.vii., nonhistoric incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that a replacement window with an alternative material is appropriate in this case provided that the following specifications are met: the proposed windows should 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 which will allow for the installation of an appropriate wood screen. 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. WINDOW SCREENS – The applicant has proposed to install seven (7) wood window screens onto the two front-façade windows, the four driveway-side windows, and one on the opposite side elevation. The screens are framed in an unconventional way that causes them to protrude beyond the window frames. The design also features a 6-over-1 configuration that is disproportionate to traditional window lights. The Guidelines for window screens notes that replacement or

installation of new screens should match in profile, design, and size to those historic found on the structure or structures with similar architecture styles. While staff finds the installation of window screens appropriate and a good solution to obscure the proposed non-original windows, the proposed protruding configuration and proportions are not consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wrought iron columns with cedar columns. According to the Guidelines for replacement of porch elements, the replacement material should be compatible in scale, massing in detail when the existing element has deteriorated beyond repair. Staff does not find that wrought iron columns to be a character-defining feature of this structure or its architectural style. Staff finds the proposed wood columns consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- i. Staff recommends the approval to install vinyl windows based on finding c, with the stipulation that they are consistent with Guideline’s specifications noted in finding c: the proposed windows should 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 which will allow for the installation of an appropriate wood screen. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- ii. Staff recommends the approval to install window screens with the stipulation that the new screens are mounted appropriately with traditional window screen hardware, inset within the window frame, and redesigned to feature a configuration that is more similar to the proportions of a traditional divided light window.
- iii. Staff recommends approval of the column replacement.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Conner and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC NO. 2017-607

Applicant: Cameron Leigh Smith, AIA

Address: 126 MAGNOLIA DR

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Replace the existing, concrete stoop with a new wood porch and stairs.
- 2. Construct a side addition of approximately fifty (50) square feet.

3. Re-clad the existing, fireplace and chimney with brick.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 126 Magnolia Drive was constructed circa 1924 and features simple Craftsman elements. The structure features an original eyebrow porch roof, asbestos siding which covers the original wood siding and material modification to both windows and the original fireplace and chimney.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 12, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted that the proposed side addition and chimney restoration was appropriate; however, voiced concerns regarding the proposed porch addition. Committee members noted that the addition of the porch would alter the historic façade and character defining features of the historic structure.
- c. PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The porch at 126 Magnolia Drive features a concrete stoop with an eyebrow porch roof that spans the approximate width of the stoop. The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch which would include a wider, wood porch and porch steps, four groupings of four by four porch columns and a depth of 7' – 1 ½". The proposed new porch would span approximately 26 feet in width, nearly the width of the historic structure, featuring a new, shed porch roof. The original eyebrow porch roof would remain; however, the existing, concrete stoop would be removed. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A.i. notes that existing porches should be preserved and that new porches should not be added where not historically present. Staff does not find the proposed porch modifications to be consistent with the Guidelines. While simple in design, the eyebrow porch roof is a character defining feature of Craftsman structures found throughout the River Road Historic District.
- d. ADDITION – On the east elevation of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a small bathroom 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. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a hipped roof that is subordinate to the existing, side bay roof, has set the addition back from the front façade of the historic structure and has proposed offsets from the wall planes of the historic structure. While the proposed addition will be visible from the public right of way, staff finds its general placement and massing to be appropriate.
- e. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature overall scale, mass and form that is consistent with the Craftsman style of the structure. The proposed addition will not negatively impact massing as viewed from the public right of way, will be distinguished from the historic structure and will feature an overall height that is subordinate to that of the historic structure. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- f. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include #117 wood siding, salvaged windows and window screens from the existing facades and asphalt shingles to match the existing roof. The historic structure is currently clad in asbestos shingles. Staff finds the proposed wood siding will distinguish the addition from the historic structure. The proposed salvaged/relocated wood windows are to match the installation depth and profile of though found in the historic structure.
- g. CHIMNEY – The existing chimney and fireplace are both currently clad with a painted siding material which replaced the original, deteriorated brick in previous years. At this time, the applicant has proposed to replace the existing, painted siding with brick. The second, rear chimney on the historic structure still features brick. Staff finds that the brick color should match that of the existing chimney.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the construction of a new front porch based on finding c.

Staff recommends approval of item #2, the construction of a side addition based on findings c through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the salvaged/relocated wood windows match the installation profile and depth of those in the historic structure.

Staff recommends approval of item #3, the re-cladding of the historic side chimney with brick based on finding f with the following stipulation:

- ii. That the brick profile (including color and joint profile) feature that of the original, rear chimney.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve item #1 as submitted and items #2 and #3 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

36. HDRC NO. 2017-624

Applicant: Raquel Atchison

Address: 418 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Install brick pavers in the location of an existing front concrete walkway.
2. Install a three foot tall wooden picket fence in the front yard.
3. Install an eight foot tall wooden privacy fence in the side and rear yard.
4. Pour a new concrete driveway in the present driveway location and extend the width to 11'-1".

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 418 E Huisache is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1924 in the Colonial Revival style. The home features a side-gable roof, asymmetrical front façade, and front porch with Doric columns. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **BRICK PAVERS** – The applicant has proposed to install brick pavers in the location and configuration of an existing concrete walkway. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, portions of walkways that are deteriorated beyond repair should be replaced with materials that match the existing sidewalk color and material as closely as possible. Staff does not find the removal of the existing concrete walkway and the use of brick pavers appropriate.
- c. **FRONT FENCE** – The applicant has proposed to install a three foot tall white picket fence in the front yard adjacent to the sidewalk. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist should be avoided, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should

not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. Front yard fences of the proposed height and wood picket design are not common in Monte Vista. Additionally, front yard fences that only front the sidewalk and do not turn to enclose the side and/or rear yards do not historically characterize the district. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

- d. **PRIVACY FENCE** – The applicant has proposed to install a wooden privacy fence to measure eight feet in height in the side and rear yard. According to the UDC, privacy fences in residential settings should be no taller than six feet unless it meets a requirement outlined in section 35-514(c)(2). According to Zoning Review staff, this particular property does not qualify for a variance based on its internal slope. Additionally, Historic Design Guidelines state that fences should be consistent with the height found on the property, in the vicinity of the property, and with those found in the historic district. Wood fences eclipsing 6’ are not common in the district. Staff does not find an 8’ fence consistent with the Guidelines or UDC requirements.
- e. **DRIVEWAY** –The applicant has proposed to pour a new concrete driveway over the present location of the existing concrete driveway. The proposal also includes widening the driveway to a total width of 11’-1”. The current driveway is approximately ten feet wide. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new driveways should incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Staff finds that re-pouring the driveway is consistent, but finds the widening of the driveway beyond ten feet inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the concrete walkway and installation of brick pavers based on finding b. Staff recommends that the concrete walkway be repaired to maintain the existing materiality, configuration, and appearance.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the three foot tall wooden picket fence based on finding c.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the installation of a wooden privacy fence based on finding d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the fence complies with Historic Design Guidelines standards and the Unified Development Code and is a maximum height of six (6) 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.
- ii. That the fence is set back from the front plane of the historic structure.
- iii. That the applicant verifies whether or not the proposed location of the fence is located within the property line boundary.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of re-pouring the concrete driveway with the following stipulations:

- i. That the driveway measure no wider than ten feet and matches the aggregate ratio and coloration of the existing concrete driveway. No historic curbing on the property or adjacent property should be removed to accommodate the new driveway.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Fish to deny items #1 and #2 and approve items #3 and #4 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

37. HDRC NO. 2017-633

Applicant: Rick Archer

Address: 413 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the addition constructed on northwest corner (rear) of the historic structure and replace the walls and roof of a previously enclosed porch with a new addition.
2. Replace the existing front porch roof structure with a new roof.
3. Replace the existing, stucco finish with a historically-appropriate plaster.
4. Construct a side (south) addition that includes covered parking and a rooftop terrace.
5. Amend the location of previously approved solar panels.
6. Amend the previously approved window repair to include possible window replacement.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 413 N Pine was constructed circa 1890 and first appears on the 1904 Sanborn map. The structure feature strong traditional elements and an original limestone façade which is currently covered by non-original stucco. Per the 1904 Sanborn maps, this structure featured both a front and a side (southern) porch. A side addition has been constructed on the southern façade at the location of the side porch. This addition does not appear on the 1951 Sanborn map and was probably constructed between 1955 and 1960 based on the addition's building materials.
- b. At the January 18, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for repair of the stone façade, the installation of a standing seam metal roof, the installation of a French drain, repair to all existing wood windows and replacing non-original windows with wood windows, the construction of a rear retaining wall, the demolition of a side addition on the southern facade, the construction of a small, shed-roofed addition to replace the existing side (southern) addition, the installation of solar panels the received Historic Tax Certification.
- c. At this time, the applicant has proposed to modify items in the previously approved design as well as to demolish and reconstruct a rear addition, replace the existing front porch and apply plaster to the limestone façade. There have been no design modifications or proposed amendments to the installation of a french drain, installation of new roofing, removal of existing stucco, the construction of a rear retaining wall and Historic Tax Certification.
- d. **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. Conceptual approval of any element provided for review does not guarantee additional approvals or final approval.
- e. **DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to demolish the walls and roof of a rear (west façade) addition and to reconstruct the addition to feature a modified roof and cladding materials. The applicant has provided an engineer's report that notes that this portion of the structure is not original due to construction materials and methods that differ from

those the historic structure. The engineer's report also notes that the structural integrity of the addition has been compromised. This rear addition does not appear until the 1951 Sanborn Map and appears to have originally been an open air porch. Staff finds the removal and reconstruction of the non-original walls to be appropriate.

- f. **RECONSTRUCTION OF REAR ADDITION** – The applicant, per conceptual construction documents has proposed to reconstruct the rear walls of the addition as they currently exist; however, the applicant has proposed a flat roof to replace the existing shed roof. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii. notes that similar roof forms, including pitches, form, overhangs and orientation should be used when constructing an addition to a historic structure. Staff finds the flat roof to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **SIDE ADDITION AMENDMENT** – While a non-contributing addition has previously been constructed to the side of the historic house, any replacement addition should continue to seek conformance with the historic design guidelines and should be designed as to not distract from the original construction. The previously-approved replacement addition consisted of a modest, shed-roof form that met the Guidelines and was subordinate to the historic, stone house. The current application proposes to dramatically increase the footprint, massing, and height of the side addition.
- h. **SIDE ADDITION DESIGN** – According to the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should be sited at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. Additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass, and should feature similar roof forms and compatible materials. The proposed addition features a flat roof with a terrace and railing, wood siding, limited fenestration on the front façade, and a cantilevered portion on the south end that extends over a subgrade parking area. While the overall form of the proposed addition aids to provide a clear visual transition between the old and new construction, the siting and scale in relation to the front façade distracts from the historic house. The proposed side addition is in the same plane as the front façade and should be set back substantially or repositioned to the rear of the house consistent with the Guidelines. The addition should also seek to incorporate more compatible materials, roof form, and fenestration patterns that are complimentary of the historic house. The proposed side addition is a significant departure from the historic design guidelines in terms of siting and overall design and is not appropriate. Given the age and significance of the historic house, a more respectful addition should be considered.
- i. **MATERIALS** – regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, steel or aluminum windows, plaster and steel railing. The Guidelines for Additions 3.A. notes that materials that match in type, color and texture to those found on the historic structure should be used on additions. Staff finds the use of wood siding to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature steel or aluminum windows. Aluminum clad wood windows may be appropriate; however, these windows should feature profiles that relate to the historic wood windows of the historic structure, not contemporary, industrial profiles as suggested by precedents provided by the applicant. Additionally, 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. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.
- k. **FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has provided a structural report noting that approximately 70 percent of the roof structure's material is no longer structurally sound or has experienced significant deterioration. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front porch

roof structure; however, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct this structure by using an exposed steel structure and flat roof. Staff finds the reconstruction of the existing porch roof to be appropriate to repair and replace damaged elements; however, materials that match the existing should be used. The porch should be reconstructed to match the existing, original profile.

1. **STUCCO REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to remove the non-original stucco and apply an alternative plaster finish. When appropriate materials such as a lime-based plaster are specified, this type of work is eligible for administrative approval. However, no materials specifications have been provided to staff at this time.
- m. **SOLAR PANEL AMENDMENT** – Previously, two locations for solar panels were proposed; on the shed roof of the previously proposed addition and on the southern roof slope of the primary historic structure’s roof. Mounting on the previously proposed addition’s slope was recommended by staff and approved by the HDRC. At this time, the applicant has proposed to locate solar panels on the southern roof slope of the historic structure, visible from the public right of way. Staff supports the installation of solar panels at this property’ however, suggests that the applicant propose an alternative location that would limit the solar panels’ visibility from the public right of way.
- n. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has noted the potential replacement of existing windows. Staff finds the proposed replacement of non-original windows with a more architecturally appropriate window to be appropriate; however, the applicant should repair all existing wood windows.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #1, the demolition of the addition constructed on northwest corner of the historic structure and replace the walls and roof of a previously enclosed porch with a new addition with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the addition feature a cladding material more appropriate for a plaster and masonry façade and not wood siding.
 - ii. That the addition feature a sloped roof structure.
2. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #2, the reconstruction of the front porch with the stipulation that the profile of the porch, including height, massing, materials and roof slope remain as is.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of stucco replacement at this time. Staff recommends that appropriate specifications are submitted to staff for administrative approval. Cementitious stucco is not recommended.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed side (south) addition. This proposed addition is not appropriate and should be redesigned to be subordinate to the historic house consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
5. Staff does not recommend approval of item #5 at this time. Staff recommends the applicant continue to explore mounting location that would not result in the solar panels being located on a primary roof slope of the historic structure where visible from the public right of way.
6. Staff recommends that any non-original windows be replaced with architecturally appropriate windows that match the profile of the historic wood windows found in the structure. Additionally, staff recommends that all historic wood windows be repaired.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois and Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve as presented.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: **None.**

THE MOTION CARRIED

38. HDRC NO. 2017-630

Applicant: Richard & Susan Theis

Address: 429 DEVINE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 429 Devine Street to feature a footprint of approximately 2,500 square feet.
2. Construct a detached accessory structure to feature a footprint of approximately 600 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a one story, single family residential structure to feature a footprint of approximately 2,500 square feet.
- b. **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 examples found on the block. The applicant has noted per application documents that the proposed new construction will align with the front porch of the house to the west and the front façade of the house to the east. Staff finds that the proposed new construction should feature an overall setback that is greater than those of the primary historic structures.
- c. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Devine Street. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **PORCH MASSING** – Historic structures throughout the Lavaca Historic District feature front façade massing with recessed front porches. The applicant has proposed a front façade which is flat and features no porch element. Staff does not find this to be appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant introduce porch massing that is complementary of the historic porches found along this block and throughout the district.
- e. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The proposed massing is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- f. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has not provided specifics for foundation heights at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines.
- g. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms to include a street facing gabled roof and a flat roof. The street facing gabled roof is a form found historically throughout the Lavaca Historic District; however, flat roofs are not found historically throughout the district.
- h. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic

facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window and door openings that feature sizes that are contemporary in nature. Staff finds that window and door openings that closer relate to those found historically throughout the district should be installed. Fixed windows are not appropriate. All windows should feature an operable sash. The overall fenestration pattern should also follow the established ratio of solids to voids. As proposed, the large areas of blank wall space are a significant departure from this Guideline.

- i. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant’s proposed new construction is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, a standing seam metal roof and aluminum windows. Staff finds that the proposed siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure to relate to historic siding profiles found throughout the district. 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 standard galvalume finish.
- k. MATERIALS – Regarding windows, the applicant has proposed aluminum windows. Generally, staff finds the proposed aluminum windows to be appropriate given the contemporary architectural detailing of the proposed new construction. 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. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.
- l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural massing and details to be appropriate; however, the staff finds that the applicant should address the current lack of porch massing, current lack of window openings that relate to those found on historic structures throughout the district and address the currently proposed flat roof on the street facing façade.
- m. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT –Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment.
- n. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a single vehicle parking location utilizing the existing curb cut and a proposed shallow driveway. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.ii., off street parking areas should not be added within the front yard setback as to not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape. Staff finds the installation of a driveway to be appropriate; however, the driveway should follow the historic example found on the block and extend along the side of the proposed new construction rather than stop at the front of the proposed new construction.
- o. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to feature a total size of approximately 600 square feet. Generally, staff finds the location, massing and proposed materials appropriate; however, the accessory structure should feature materials specifications consistent with those noted in findings j and k.
- p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted the installation of Bermuda grass and a tree in the front yard with a rear orchard. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping plan to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- q. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed a front yard sidewalk to lead from the sidewalk at the public right of way to the front door. The proposed sidewalk should align with the front door and

should feature a width consistent with those found historically in the district; typically three to four feet in width.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to receiving conceptual approval:

- i. That the proposed new construction features an overall setback that is greater than those of the primary historic structures as noted in finding b.
- ii. That the introduce a porch configuration that is compatible with the historic porches found along this block and throughout the district as noted in finding d.
- iii. That a foundation height that is within one foot of the neighboring structure’s foundation heights be installed as noted in finding f.
- iv. That the proposed wood siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure to relate to historic siding profiles found throughout the district. 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 standard galvalume finish.
- v. That window specifications as noted in finding k are met. A detailed wall section should be submitted to staff for review.
- vi. That window openings that are complementary of those found historically in the district in regarding of size, head and sill height are installed as noted in findings h and l.
- vii. That the overall fenestration pattern be substantially revised to eliminate blank walls, in particular on the front façade. The fenestration pattern must follow the established ratio of solids to voids as demonstrated on nearby historic homes.
- viii. That the proposed flat roof portion of the primary façade be modified to become more consistent with historic, street facing facades found on the block as noted in findings g and l
- ix. That the proposed driveway be modified as to not present front yard parking as noted in finding n.
- x. That all mechanical equipment is screened from view at the public right of way as noted in finding m.
- xi. That the proposed accessory structure features material detailing consistent with that of the primary structure as noted in finding o.
- xii. That the proposed sidewalk align with the front door and should feature a width consistent with those found historically in the district; typically three to four feet in width as noted in finding q.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

39. HDRC NO. 2017-498

Applicant: Christopher & Lauren Mongeon

Address: 1115 NOLAN

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a two story rear accessory structure at 1115 Nolan.
2. Perform site modifications including the removal of existing hardscaping and the installation of rear yard automobile parking locations.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 1115 Nolan was constructed circa 1915 and features two stories in height with double height front porch columns, a wraparound front porch and front and side gabled roofs. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story rear accessory structure to contain a garage and dwelling unit on the first floor and dwelling units on the second floor. The proposed footprint is 1,005 square feet.
- b. This request received conceptual approval as submitted at the October 4, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing. Since that time, the applicant has modified the request to include aluminum clad wood windows, additional landscaping area and has screened mechanical equipment.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 30, 2017. At that meeting, committee members commented that the massing of the proposed accessory structure is appropriate, asked questions regarding the locations of parking and recommended that the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan and additional information regarding the proposed exterior staircase.
- d. MASSING & FORM – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i., new garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure on the lot in terms of their height, massing and form. The applicant has noted an overall height of twenty-seven (27) feet. The primary historic structure features an overall height of thirty-seven (37) feet. Double height accessory structures are not common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the construction of a two story rear accessory structure may be appropriate provided that the applicant explore ways of minimizing massing and height to the greatest extent possible. The proposed accessory structure should not be dissimilar to those found historically in the district.
- e. BUILDING SIZE – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii. notes that new accessory structures should be no larger in plan than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint. Per the applicant’s provided site plan, the proposed structure’s footprint will exceed that which is recommended by the Guidelines. The applicant has proposed a footprint of approximately 1,000 square feet. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the footprint of the proposed structure to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- f. SITE MATERIALS – The majority of the rear of the lot is currently covered in concrete paving. The applicant has proposed to reduce the existing amount of concrete paving by adding natural lawn areas between the primary historic structure and the proposed accessory structure. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has incorporated additional landscaping areas and buffers including a perimeter rain garden.
- g. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials which include Hardi board siding, aluminum clad wood windows, a standing seam metal roof and wood stairs and porches. 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 standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap should not be used. All Hardi siding should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four (4) inches. Staff finds the proposed wood stairs and porches appropriate.
- h. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum clad wood windows. Regarding window installation, 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. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

- i. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed garage doors that are single in width and feature top row window lights. Staff finds that the proposed garage doors are generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. ORIENTATION & SETBACKS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.i. the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Additionally, accessory structure should feature a setback that is consistent with the historic examples found in the neighborhood. Staff finds the proposed orientation, placement and setbacks to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.
- k. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the screening of all mechanical equipment through the installation of fencing and a privacy enclosure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- l. SITE WORK – The property currently features a rear yard that is predominantly concrete. The applicant has proposed to remove portions of the existing concrete and install natural turf and landscaping areas. Staff finds the appropriate.
- m. REAR YARD PARKING – The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i. notes that the preferred location for on-site parking is at the rear of the site, behind the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed to locate parking for five (5) automobiles to the rear of both the primary structure and the proposed accessory structure. Staff finds this location appropriate. Per application documents, the applicant has noted additional parking locations along the driveway. The applicant has noted that the existing driveway and curbcuts will not be altered.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings d and e. Staff recommends the applicant address the following concerns prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- i. That the applicant explore ways of minimizing massing and height to the greatest extent possible to result in a rear accessory structure that is consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district as noted in finding d.
- ii. That the applicant reduce the footprint of the proposed structure to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding e.
- iii. That all window specifications be adhered to as noted in finding h.
- iv. That the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- v. That all Hardi siding feature an exposure of four (4) inches and a smooth finish.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois and Liz Franklin spoke in opposition. Arvis Holland and Aimee Holland spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve items #3-5 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

40. HDRC NO. 2017-655

Applicant: Christopher Shannon O'Malley

Address: 1910 E HOUSTON, 430 N MONUMENTAL, 129 FLORENCE ALLEY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for approval of a proposed site plan for nine, single family residential structures.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the construction of nine, two story, single family residential structures on the vacant lots at 1910 E Houston, 430 N Monumental and 129 Florence Alley. The lots are currently zoned commercial and are located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- 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. **LOT COVERAGE** – The applicant has proposed a number of houses and lot coverage that is generally consistent with the historic development pattern found in the district. Staff finds this appropriate.
- 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 examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature a similar setback. Staff finds that the structures on the corners of N Monumental, Florence Alley and E Houston
- e. **ENTRANCES** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Based on the historic lot configurations, all proposed structures should face either N Monumental or Florence Alley. The two northernmost homes should be reoriented so that the primary entrances face these streets instead of Houston. This is the most appropriate solution provided that homes feature a corner element that addresses both streets, such as a wraparound porch.
- f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed lots feature one story in height. Each of the proposed structures features two stories in height; however, staff finds that the applicant has incorporated architectural elements to act as transitions from the proposed height to the height of neighboring historic structures.
- g. **BUILDING WIDTHS** – The applicant has proposed narrow façade widths for structures fronting N Monumental and Florence Alley. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate façade elements on the two corner units to minimize the overall visual width of both.
- h. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the Guidelines.

- i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include gabled and hipped roofs, both of which are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the proposed soffit boxes should be eliminated.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – At this time, the applicant has provided general information regarding window and door openings, including proportions and locations. Staff finds the general number and location of openings to be appropriate; however, staff finds that proportions should more closely relate to those of historic structures found in the district.
- k. MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided specifics regarding materials. Per the Guidelines, the use of wood or Hardi siding, shingle or metal roofing and wood and aluminum clad wood windows are appropriate.
- l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural massing and details to be appropriate. Design specifics including column design are to be submitted to staff when submitting for final approval.
- m. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT– Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment.
- n. DRIVEWAY LOCATION – The applicant has proposed for the driveway to have access to E Houston street. Staff finds that this proposed configuration reduces the number of curb cuts for the development and allows for parking areas to be located completed to the rear of the properties. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- o. LANDSCAPING – At this time the applicant has not provided as landscaping plan. The applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan when submitting for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed site plan and general massing based on findings a through o with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant should provide information regarding how the proposed setbacks will relate to those of historic structures on N Monumental.
- ii. That foundation and floor height be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights.
- iii. That the proposed soffit boxes should be eliminated.
- iv. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view at the public right of way.
- v. That all proposed window proportions and placement relate to the historic pattern found throughout the district. This is to include sill and head heights as well as mullion widths. Window proportions should directly relate to those found on neighboring historic structures.
- vi. Regarding window materials, 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. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.
- vii. That the two northernmost homes be reoriented so that the primary entrances face these streets instead of Houston and feature a corner element that addresses both streets, such as a wraparound porch.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois and Liz Franklin spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

41. HDRC NO. 2017-653

Applicant: Peggy Brimhall/Figurd

Address: 808 E CARSON

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, two story, multi-family residential structures on the vacant lot at 808 E Carson.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, two story, multi-family residential structures on the vacant lot at 808 E Carson. This lot is located within the Government Hill Historic District.
- 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. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the design review committee on December 14, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted that the proposed massing, architectural form, parking locations and lot design were generally appropriate.
- 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 examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed setbacks as well as orientations that are consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district and the Guidelines.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed architectural for both structures that signal entrances; however, formal entrance massing and doors have not been proposed to front either E Carson, for the northern structure or Colita Street, for the southern structure.
- f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This structure of E Carson features seven residential structures, three of which feature two stories in height. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing of the northern unit appropriate; however, staff finds that the massing of structures on Colita Street is subordinate to that of those on E Carson. Staff finds that the rear (southern) unit should be reduced in overall massing to present itself subordinate to the structure

that fronts E Carson. This would follow the pattern of large massing for primary structures and subordinate massing for accessory structures.

- g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has not provided specifics for foundation heights at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines.
- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include gabled and hipped roofs. Generally, these proposed roof form are appropriate and are found historically throughout the Government Hill Historic District; however, the applicant has proposed a series of roof voids to accommodate rooftop decks and viewing areas. Staff finds this inappropriate and inconsistent with overall roof massing and form of the district.
- i. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Generally, the applicant has proposed fenestration that features an overall size consistent with that found on historic structures throughout the district; however, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to ground level facades, particularly those visible from the public right of way at E Carson and Colita.
- j. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- k. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include both vertical and horizontal Hardi siding and standing seam metal roofs. Staff finds that the proposed standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A smooth finished should be used along with an exposure of four inches for the proposed lap siding. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed structures that generally feature massing that is appropriate for this block; however, various architectural details should be addressed prior to receiving conceptual approval, such as recessed porch massing, ground level fenestration and façade depth. The applicant has proposed an architectural form features forms and profiles found commonly in the historic, Folk Victorian style; specifically, porches on Folk Victorian structures are recessed behind the massing of protruding bays. This should be addressed by the applicant prior to receiving conceptual approval.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS / PARKING LOCATIONS – The applicant has proposed for the driveways to pass through each structure and for parking to be located on the ground level of both structures. Staff suggests that the applicant study interior courtyard parking which could potentially lead to a reduction in massing and the incorporation of additional ground level fenestration.
- n. LANDSCAPING – At this time, the applicant has not submitted a landscaping plan. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements when producing landscaping documents.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to receiving conceptual approval:

- i. That the rear structure feature a massing that is subordinate to that of the structure that is proposed to front E Carson to follow the historic pattern of rear structures appearing subordinate to primary, street fronting structures as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant locate parking areas within the interior of the site to reduce building massing and to incorporate ground level fenestration as noted in finding l.

- iii. That the applicant introduce additional window fenestration comparable to that found on neighboring historic structures as noted in finding h.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate appropriate architectural details including recessed porch massing, ground level fenestration, façade depth that is consistent with that found historically throughout the district as noted in finding k.
- v. That the overall massing, including proposed voids in the roof form be simplified to follow historic building forms. Roofs should feature hipped or gabled forms with appropriate eave depth and windows should feature proportions that are consistent with those of historic structures.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Denise Homer spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Garza to refer the request to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Grube, Garcia.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

42. HDRC NO. 2017-566

Applicant: Ricardo Turrubiates

Address: 402 CENTER ST, 406 CENTER ST, 139 N CHERRY, 126 N CHERRY, 122 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. This request is for conceptual approval of the placement of proposed units only. Massing, materials and architectural details have not been provided for review and are not considered at this time

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. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 12, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted concerns regarding with primary entrances internal to the site, noted concern regarding units facing Center Street featuring no stoop, noted that a wall or solid mass should be incorporated to create more of a block face along Center Street and recommended that the applicant provide additional context regarding massing and architectural detailing in the vicinity.
- c. 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.

Conceptual approval of any element provided for review does not guarantee additional approvals or final approval.

- d. **MASSING, HEIGHT & FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT** – At this time, the applicant has provided general information regarding massing, including widths and heights. In order to follow the established precedent for historic row houses, staff finds that the overall width of each unit should be reduced to be no more than 3 window bays. The massing should also be revised to include vertical articulation between the units, such as a protruding entrance bay or bay windows, to add visual interest and detail along the street wall.
- e. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILING** – As noted in finding d, the applicant has proposed massing that is inconsistent with typical row house massing. While there is not sufficient information to review architectural details at this time, staff has concerns regarding the application of historic architectural detailing to massing that is inconsistent with historic row house precedents.
- f. **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.
- g. **SETBACKS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction I.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. Generally, staff finds the proposed setbacks to be appropriate.
- h. **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. Staff also finds that a special treatment is needed in the space between units that fronts Center Street in order to screen views of the shared driveway. A masonry wall would blend in architecturally with the homes while providing a more permanent and comfortable condition along the sidewalk.
- i. **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.
- j. **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.
- k. **DRIVEWAYS** – The applicant has noted driveway entrances that are to be located on N Cherry, Center and N Swiss Streets. Each of the propose 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:

At this time, staff finds the proposed setbacks and general placement of buildings to be appropriate. However, staff does not recommend conceptual approval at this time due to concerns regarding the

massing and architectural treatment of the units. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to develop the design with the following considerations in mind:

- i. That the proposed new construction which fronts N Swiss feature a more similar setback as that of the neighboring historic structure.
- ii. That units which feature a façade along Center be revised to feature architectural elements to provide interest such as a secondary entrance or porch element.
- iii. That the fenestration pattern be developed to feature traditional solids to voids ratios and avoid the placement of blank walls with exposure to the street.
- iv. That the overall width of each unit should be reduced to be no more than 3 window bays. The massing should also be revised to include vertical articulation between the units, such as a protruding entrance bay or bay windows, to add visual interest and detail along the street wall.
- v. That all sidewalks which intersect the sidewalk at Center feature a width and profile that is consistent with those found historically in the district.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

Move to adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made to adjourn.

AYES: Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair