

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
6 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:** Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**ABSENT:** Guarino, Connor, Brittain.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Monica Savino spoke in support of items #10, 11, 12, 15, and 16.

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

- |                               |                                   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • Item #1, Case No. 2017-583  | 210 DEVINE                        |
| • Item #2                     | 115 DEVINE (DUPLICATE—INDIV. #35) |
| • Item #3, Case No. 2017-497  | 622 CEDAR                         |
| • Item #4, Case No. 2017-584  | 525 MADISON                       |
| • Item #5, Case No. 2017-605  | 1118 S ALAMO                      |
| • Item #7, Case No. 2017-596  | 710 S ST MARYS/511 S PRESA        |
| • Item #9, Case No. 2017-544  | 313 E LOCUST                      |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-586 | 430 BURLESON                      |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-598 | 514 SHERMAN                       |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2017-599 | 518 SHERMAN                       |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-585 | 2111 W MULBERRY (FISH RECUSED)    |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2017-540 | 723 BROOKLYN                      |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-589 | 815 N HACKBERRY                   |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-618 | 930 LAMAR                         |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-434 | 407 MISSION                       |
| • Item #18                    | 271 W WILDWOOD (WITHDRAWN)        |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2017-610 | 402 E EVERGREEN                   |
| • Item #20, Case No. 2017-612 | 517 E HOUSTON                     |
| • Item #21, Case No. 2017-603 | 230 LYNWOOD                       |
| • Item #22, Case No. 2017-573 | 110 E MULBERRY                    |
| • Item #23, Case No. 2017-602 | 318 MCCULLOUGH                    |

Items #6 and #8 were pulled for citizens to be heard; item #17 was moved to individual by staff.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**           None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Note: Commissioner Lazarine arrived at 3:14 PM.

**6.       HDRC NO. 2017-590**

**Applicant:**     Dale Carse/HEB Grocery Company

**Address:**      415 DWYER AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a six level parking structure to accommodate parking for 750 automobiles. The parking structure will feature façade screening, a roof-top shading trellis, LED lighting, landscaping elements and fencing. In addition to the parking structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a pedestrian bridge to span across Cesar E Chavez Boulevard.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a six level parking structure to accommodate parking for 750 automobiles. The parking structure will feature façade screening, a roof-top shading trellis, LED lighting, landscaping elements and fencing. In addition to the parking structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a pedestrian bridge to span across Cesar E Chaves Boulevard. The lot is bound by Cesar E Chavez Boulevard to the south, S Main Avenue to the west, Old Guilbeau Street to the north and Dwyer Avenue to the east.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The request to construct a parking structure at this location was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 10, 2017. At that meeting, committee members asked questions regarding the color of the proposed metal fins, noted that the fencing proposal was nicely designed and noted that the proposed horizontal elements separated the façade.
- c. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a), pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. Additionally, the various functions and spaces on a site must be linked with sidewalks in a coordinated system. The applicant has proposed improvements to the existing pedestrian sidewalks on the property and has proposed to incorporate various pedestrian pathways and sidewalks that will lead from the parking structure to the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.
- d. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS – Per the UDC Section 35-672(5), parking structure shall provide clearly defined pedestrian access points. The applicant has proposed approximately 10 pedestrian access point from the public right of way into the parking structure. This is consistent with the UDC.
- e. CURB CUTS – To facilitate automobile access into the parking structure, the applicant has proposed a curb cut to be located on Dwyer Avenue. The width of this proposed curb cut exceeds that recommended by the UDC (twenty-five feet); however, the UDC also permits two curb cuts per site. The applicant has proposed two curb cuts total.
- f. BUFFERING – The applicant has proposed landscaping buffers to separate the street from the sidewalk at the public right of way and to separate the proposed parking structure from the sidewalk at the public right of way. The applicant has noted that these buffers will include planting strips, trees and shrubbery. Staff finds the proposed buffers separating the proposed

structure from the public right of way to be consistent with the UDC and an appropriate measure to reduce potential automobile interference in the pedestrian experience.

- g. **PARKING STRUCTURE** – The UDC Section 35-672(b)(4) notes that parking structures shall be compatible with building in the surround area. Additionally, parking garages should have retail on the ground floor. Parking garages will be considered compatible with the UDC if they do not vary in height by more than thirty percent from another building on the same block face and if materials that are found on other buildings within the block face of in the block face across the street are used.
- h. **PARKING STRUCTURE** – While the proposed parking structure does not feature ground level retail, staff finds that the applicant has incorporated design elements such as the proposed landscaping and pedestrian pathway improvements that address the pedestrian experience. There is currently no other structure in the block face of the proposed new construction; however, the proposed materials, metal screening, D’Hanis brick and metal panels. D’Hanis brick if found commonly throughout the vicinity of the proposed structure.
- i. **PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a pedestrian bridge to span across Cesar E Chavez Boulevard to provide a safe crossing point for pedestrians. The applicant has proposed the bridge to feature materials that are consistent with those found throughout the cladding scheme of the proposed parking structure. As proposed, the bridge will not impact the public right of way at Cesar E Chavez Boulevard. The bridge will span across the public right of way and structural members located adjacent to the proposed parking structure and behind an existing wall on the west side of the street. Staff finds this to be consistent with the UDC.
- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials which include a steel and concrete structural elements, metal screening, metal fencing, D’Hanis brick and other masonry elements. These materials are consistent with the UDC.
- k. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed wrought iron fencing to surround the parking structure as well as a coated chain link fencing material to be located adjacent the parking structure to provide security. Staff finds that no fence is to exceed six (6) feet in height to be consistent with the UDC. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed coated chain link fencing is appropriate given the additional design specifications for its installation.
- l. **LIGHTING** – At this time the applicant has not provided specifics regarding lighting of the garage or the bridge. Both should be submitted to staff for review. Pole lights and other appurtenances protruding from the roof of the garage should be avoided. All lighting should also meet UDC requirements for temperature and color.
- m. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project area, including properties to the north and south of East Cesar Chavez Boulevard, is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the Arsenal Local Historic District, and encompasses a designated Local Historic Landmark. The property is also adjacent to the United States San Antonio Arsenal National Register of Historic Places District and is near to the San Antonio River. In addition, the project area is in close proximity to the San Pedro or Principal Acequia. Furthermore, a review of historic archival documents shows an acequia desague likely traversing the property. This archival review also identifies structures within or directly adjacent to the property as early as 1873, including the likely 19th century Callaghan residence. The reported Guilbeau Slave Quarters structure, no longer extant, is likely outside of this project footprint. Extensive archival research of the development area is recommended to verify the location of this aforementioned structure before excavations can begin. Therefore, the project area may contain archaeological sites, some of which may be significant. Thus, archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant provide details for the proposed fencing and lighting as noted in findings j and k.
- ii. **ARCHAEOLOGY-** Archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

A motion was made and seconded to approve with staff stipulations.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**8. HDRC NO. 2017-595**

**Applicant:** Tobias Stapleton

**Address:** 205 OSTRAM

**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. **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.
- d. **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.

- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. 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.
- j. 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.
- k. 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:** Mimi Quintanilla (Sylvia Guzman yielded her time), Larry DeMartino, Raleigh Wood (Kim Wood yielded her time), Christopher Green, and George Nash spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Garza to postpone.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2017-434**

**Applicant:** Mike Rod/Iron Clad Roofing & Renovations

**Address:** 407 MISSION ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install low rise batten cap system as an alternative to previously approved double munch ridge cap. The applicant is requesting this alternative in response to the previously denied Historic Tax Verification for the property at 407 Mission St.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 407 Mission St is a 1-story single family home constructed in the Queen Anne style. The home features several elements of the style, including a hipped roof with front gable, scalloped gable shingles, and decorative bracketing. The home is a contributing structure in the King William Historic District. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification.
- b. The scope of work for the project is complete, and consisted of various items and upgrades, including the removal of a non-original front door opening and installation of a new window; replacement of rotted exterior wood elements; removal of a non-original rear porch and construction of a new rear addition and porch; and several interior upgrades, including plumbing and electric fixtures, countertops, cabinets, appliances, and finish hardware. The previous applicant received Historic Tax Certification in 2015.
- c. Staff conducted a site visit on September 14, 2017, to examine the conditions of the property. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on June 15, 2017 for the installation of a standing seam metal roof with the stipulations that the roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. The approval also stipulated that a large profile ridge cap should not be used. As installed, the roof features an unapproved, raised ridge vent with modern capped ends that is not in compliance with the approval on record. The ridge detail must be corrected or receive

approval from the HDRC in order for the property owner to participate in the tax incentive program.

- d. ALTERNATIVE – The applicant has proposed to install a “low rise batten cap system with pop rivets” as an alternative to the crimped ridge seam. Staff finds the proposed alternative closer in dimension to the crimped ridge seam than the existing wide ridge cap. However, staff remains concerned with the installation and visibility of the pop rivets.
- e. HISTORIC TAX VERIFICATION - With approval of the proposed alternative replacing the previously non-compliant work (ridge cap), the property is now eligible to receive Historic Tax Verification.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the low rise batten cap system as an alternative to the crimped ridge seam based on finding d with the stipulation that the applicant address the visibility of the pop rivets.

If the HDRC recommends approval of the proposed ridge cap, then staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Verification based on findings b through e.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2017-533**

**Applicant:** Vincent Michael/San Antonio Conservation Society

**Address:** 905 NOGALITOS ST (parcel includes 901, 903, 903, and 911 Nogalitos and 118, 120, and 122 Ralph)

**REQUEST:**

A request for review by the HDRC regarding eligibility of 905 Nogalitos for landmark designation.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. A demolition application was submitted on October 3, 2017, to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner for the gas station structure located at 905 Nogalitos (currently addressed 901 and 903 Nogalitos) which is located in the Collins Garden Neighborhood. OHP Staff conducted research, met with the owner and contacted the Collins Gardens Neighborhood Association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. A Request for Review of Historic Significance for the gas station structure located at 905 Nogalitos was submitted to OHP by the San Antonio Conservation Society on October 13, 2017.
- c. This property was identified through a comprehensive survey of historic gas stations undertaken in 1983 by the San Antonio Conservation Society that was updated and expanded beginning in 2012. HDRC approved a finding of historic significance on August 17, 2016, as the property was

included in the 2016 Office of Historic Preservation Gas Station initiative. Although the UDC does allow for designation without owner support, the property was removed from the list due to the property owner's objection to designation prior to the City Council resolution on January 19, 2017, to move the Gas Station initiative forward.

- d. In accordance with UDC Section 35-453, an official notice of eligibility was sent to the property owner on October 20, 2017. The property is subject to interim design controls as defined in the UDC for the lesser of 180 days of notification or action by City Council on the recommendation for designation. During this period, written approval from the Office of Historic Preservation, known as a Certificate of Appropriateness, is required for work on the exterior of this property.
- e. If the HDRC agrees with the request and recommends approval, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP shall forward the recommendation to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- f. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.
- g. **SITE CONTEXT** – The parcel is located at the southwest corner of Nogalitos and Ralph Streets, a prominent corner on the Nogalitos corridor along San Pedro Creek. Prior to the construction of the gas station, the property was owned by the companies operating the slaughterhouses near the stockyards on the opposite side of San Pedro Creek. Nogalitos Street is part of the historic Meridian Highway which connected San Antonio to Laredo and Saltillo. The site would have been a prime location for roadside establishments capitalizing on auto travel. The corner of Nogalitos and Ralph is located at a bend in the road which makes the gas station structure a highly visible resource in the community, contributing to the overall character of the streetscape of Nogalitos Street. Outside of the site context, the gas station is a unique example of roadside architecture and is contributing to the historic use and period. There are 4 principal non-residential structures on the parcel including the gas station with the dates of construction ranging from 1935 through 2000. These are noted in the exhibits as buildings 1 through 4.
  - The first structures built on the parcel were several small residences facing Ralph, which were built in the early 1930s. The westernmost house was demolished in 2012 and the remaining two residences were approved for demolition in 2017.
  - After the filling station (**building 1**) was built in 1935, a restaurant, barber shop and package store were constructed c. 1940 to the south on Nogalitos Street. The package store appears to have been demolished between 1955 and 1960.
  - The restaurant and barber shop have been connected and are in use as a sports bar (**building 2**). Modifications to these two structures include a change in building footprint and façade arrangement.
  - A tourist court was built c. 1946 in the center of the parcel. It remained in operation through the 1960s and was demolished between 1986 and 1995.
  - An auto repair and welding shop (**building 3**) was also built c. 1946 addressed as 114 Ralph and has been modified by several additions made over the years. This structure is simple in form and material and does not reflect the character or architectural style of the gas station.

- Existing today and in use is a Quonset hut (**building 4**) housing an auto repair garage that was built c. 1948. It is addressed as 110 Ralph and appears to be of original building form, material and footprint. There are no additional character elements on the structure that demonstrate a relationship with the gas station, and it is not a unique or rare example of this building type.
  - Two small utility buildings were constructed between 1995 and 2002 on the western side of the property near San Pedro Creek and are determined to be non-contributing structures.
  - Accessory to the gas station (building 1) and these two small utility buildings, three other structures (buildings 2-4) remain on the parcel. While these structures are representative of the development of the property over time, they are determined to be non-contributing to the historic significance of the property.
- h. **ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT** – Based on the historic significance of the site, the gas station structure is the most significant of the existing buildings and staff finds it to be the only contributing structure on the parcel. The gas station structure was built circa 1936 for the Pure Oil Company. It is designed in the Tudor architectural style with a steeply pitched cross-gabled composition shingle roof on the office structure, faux half-timbering on the front gable of the canopy, and two brick chimneys flanking the north and south elevations with simple chimney pots. The main office features one large storefront window topped with a projecting hipped metal roof and one pedestrian door. A two-car service bay is attached to the south elevation of the main office and features a side-gabled composition shingle roof that is lower than the roofline of the office structure. Both the office and the service bay feature a painted brick exterior finish. The canopy roof is supported by two sets of square posts atop concrete pillars. The original office and canopy form is prominent and intact.
- i. **EVALUATION** –The applicant proposed a list of five (5) criteria for eligibility. These include (b)(6) Its historical, architectural or cultural character as a particularly fine or unique example of a utilitarian structure, including, but not limited to, bridges, acequias, gas stations, transportation shelters, or other commercial structures; (b)(8) Its historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship; (b)(11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States; (b)(12) It is an important example of a particular architectural type or specimen; (b)(15) It represents a resource, whether natural or man-made, which greatly contributes to the character or image of a defined neighborhood or community area. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607:

**35-607(b)(1) Its value as a visible or archeological reminder of the cultural heritage of the community, or national event;** this property is a reminder of the cultural heritage of San Antonio as a crossroads for many historic routes such as the Meridian Highway. Its site along the historic San Pedro Creek also connects the property to the city’s cultural heritage.

**35-607 (b)(6) Its historical, architectural or cultural character as a particularly fine or unique example of a utilitarian structure, including, but not limited to, bridges, acequias, gas stations, transportation shelters, or other commercial structures;** this utilitarian structure maintains its historic, architectural, and cultural character as the only example of a Tudor Style Gas Station and the only extant Pure Oil Station remaining in San Antonio.

**35-607 (b)(8) Its historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship;** the property maintains a high level of historical, architectural and cultural integrity in location, design, materials and workmanship. The structure is largely intact with few intrusions or modifications, reflecting the original design of Pure Oil Company brand.

**35-607 (b)(11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States;** this gas station exemplifies the economic heritage of the oil industry that played an important role in the economic growth of the state and the city in the early twentieth century. It also represents a societal shift from older transportation methods to a reliance on personal automobiles.

**35-607 (b)(12) It is an important example of a particular architectural type or specimen;** as an important example of a Tudor Style Gas Station featuring a residential appearance with typical Tudor stylistic characteristics including steeply pitched, side gable roof and half timbering on the gabled ends of the building and canopy with few intrusions or modifications.

**35-607 (b)(15) It represents a resource, whether natural or man-made, which greatly contributes to the character or image of a defined neighborhood or community area;** located at a prominent corner, where the street bends at the approach to the historic San Pedro Creek, the structure commands a highly visible location in the Collins Gardens Neighborhood near the edge of the Lone Star Neighborhood, and plays a part in defining the Nogalitos Corridor's historic evolution as a connection to local and transnational automotive travel.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the request and has identified the gas station structure to be the only contributing building on site. Staff finds that 905 Nogalitos meets six (6) of the 16 criteria for evaluation and is eligible for landmark designation based on findings f and g. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) approves the request, the HDRC will become the applicant and will request a resolution from the City Council to initiate the designation process.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Ashley Farrimond (property owner) spoke in opposition; Frederica Kushner spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2017-541**

**Applicant:** Patrick Christensen

**Address:** 819 AUGUSTA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate the historic structure located at 819 Augusta to the vacant lot located at 810 Augusta.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure located at 819 Augusta was originally a 1-story single family home. The home was constructed in 1880 by noted architect Alfred Giles. The structure was built by English-born physician C.E.R. King (1839-1919), who came to America in 1851 and was a Confederate Army surgeon during the Civil War. Decedents of King resided at the home until 1929, when the Junior League of San Antonio purchased it for use as a tea room and meeting place. According to the San Antonio Historic Resources Survey of 1982, the structure features a modified L-plan with front and side projecting bays, a cross gable standing seam metal roof, and random ashlar masonry with cut quoins on the front corners. The rest of the front façade is symmetrical with three bays, 4 over 4 floor-length windows, and an off-center double door comprised of three panels. The home also features a front bay window with a dentil frieze and corbelled chimneys. The structure was noted as having exceptional significance at the time of the survey. The structure features a non-contributing modern addition to the rear. The home was listed as a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark in 1973. That same year, a decision was made to undertake a significant restoration and expansion of the property for the Junior League. The project was completed in 1976. The property was locally designated on October 27, 1988. Despite this addition, the home retains a high degree of architectural integrity of design and workmanship, and is one of the oldest surviving residences identified in the area.
- b. **HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE** – According to a December 1987 assessment provided by a member of the City Council Historic Sites and Structure Task Force, the home’s significance was noted by the following: properties that are part of a group; contributing property in a district or cluster; notable example of architecture; archaeological site important to local social and ethnic groups; related structure representing standards and tastes of a specific segment of the community; contributes to the historic character of scene, reinforcing the value of more resources in the area; and establishes neighborhood identity.
- c. **RELOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to relocate the structure to a vacant lot across the street addressed 810 Augusta. The applicant has noted in their application that the decision to relocate the structure stems from its inability to be incorporated into a future development of the site, which will negatively affect the context of the structure. Proposed development plans have not been provided at this time.
- d. According to UDC Sec. 35-613, five considerations should guide the recommendation to relocate the building:
  1. **The historic character and aesthetic interest the building, structure or object contributes to its present setting;** the original context of the structure was a residential neighborhood. This context has largely been lost over the years, especially on the immediate block. However, the structure is one of the few remaining examples of late 1800s residential architecture that retains a high degree of integrity. The home is also an archetypal example of Victorian limestone residential architecture in San Antonio.
  2. **Whether there are definite plans for the area to be vacated and what the effect of those plans on the character of the surrounding area will be;** the applicant has stated that there are future plans to develop the property and its surrounding lots, four of five which contain surface parking. The proposed development is to be a large four- to five-story multifamily project. However, there have been no plans provided to staff. Additionally, even with the 1976 non-contributing addition and modern context within surface parking, the structure

retained a high degree of significance when surveyed in 1987. There are also many examples, several within the city, of projects that have incorporated an existing structure into a large-scale development.

3. **Whether the building, structure, or object can be moved without significant damage to its physical integrity;** the proposed structure has occupied the same site since its original construction in 1888. The materiality and construction method of the structure make it a significant burden to move.
4. **Whether the proposed relocation area is compatible with the historical and archaeological character of the building, object, or structure;** the proposed relocation area is in the direct vicinity of the existing location. The proposed lot is currently surface parking, surrounded to the east by additional surface parking, to the south by large footprint commercial structures, and to the west by two historic structures. The proposed location is nearby and would place it next to two historic structures of a similar era of significance. However, it removes the structure from its original location dating to 1880. Its placement also will not increase the likelihood of its continued preservation, and the structure may face a similar request as the area continues to change.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The historic context of the structure has generally been lost and the house may be a good candidate for relocation within an appropriate context in accordance with the UDC. However, staff does not recommend approval of relocation at this time based on the information provided. There is general concern regarding the proposal given the significance of the house and lack of a proposal for its prolonged use. If the HDRC recommends approval based on the evidence presented, then staff recommends the stipulation that the applicant provide a detailed site plan and landscaping proposal to better illustrate the proposed permanent treatment of the relocated structure.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** Lazarine, Kamal, Laffoon.

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

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

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

**Address:** 633 S ST MARYS

#### **REQUEST:**

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

1. Apply a graphic to the new wall at the River Walk level to feature a total of 229.8 square feet. The graphic will be 28' – 5" in length and 8' – 1" in height.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 633 S St Mary's was constructed in 2015 and is located within the River Improvement Overlay. Previously-approved signage includes a monument sign near the public right of way on S St Mary's, wall signage at the River Walk level and a parking identification sign at the entrance to the parking structure. Each of these signs were approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the October 21, 2015, hearing. These three signs total approximately 100 square feet in size. The wall sign at the River Walk level has not been installed.
- b. At the November 15, 2017, HDRC hearing, the request to install a wall sign on the southern facing façade to feature a total of 47.2 square feet was denied.
- c. RIVER WALK WALL SIGN – Per the UDC Section 35-681(c)(2), the maximum square footage for any sign on the riverside of property abutting the publicly owned River Walk and visible from the River Walk shall be eight (8) square feet. Staff finds that the overall size, scale and design of the proposed signage is inconsistent with those found along the River Walk. Signage at the River Walk level should be simple in design as to not distract from the character of the River Walk.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**27. HDRC NO. 2017-601**

**Applicant:** Jonathan Nee/Robins and Morton

**Address:** 111 DALLAS ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace and extend a vestibule at the Dallas St entrance.
2. Modify the existing staircase and install a new accessible ramp at the Dallas St entrance.
3. Modify the existing staircase and install a new accessible ramp at the Seymour St entrance.
4. Install new canopy structures at the Seymour St entrance.
5. Modify the existing hardscaping and landscaping at the Seymour St entrance to accommodate entry modifications and new wheelchair ramps.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 111 Dallas St is a 6-story brick and cast stone commercial building constructed in phases from 1950 - 1986. The property is part of the Baptist Memorial Hospital complex, which is a local landmark, designated on October 27, 1988. The applicant is requesting approval to modify existing entrances at Dallas St and Seymour St

- b. **SIGNIFICANCE** – This property the location of the original site of the Physicians’ and Surgeons’ Hospital, which housed one of the first nursing schools in the city, established in 1914. The hospital merged with an adjacent hospital and nursing school in the 1940s. The oldest remaining portion of the complex is at the southeast wing, which fronts Dallas St, constructed in 1950. This structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map in its current configuration. The complex was expanded several times in the 1960s and 1970s, and by 1986, all four existing wings were in place. This complex represents the growth and expansion of healthcare and education in San Antonio.
- c. **DALLAS ST ALTERATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing vestibule at the Dallas St entrance. The proposal will extend the vestibule canopy footprint to the northwest to accommodate a new accessible ramp. The canopy height will remain the same. Brick veneer columns to match the existing columns supporting the garage walkway will be installed near the entrance, along with new metal panel columns, new painted metal handrails, and a new aluminum curtain wall system. The primary pedestrian stair entrance will be relocated for access from the southeast versus directly off Dallas St. Aluminum storefront windows will infill the existing location of the stairway. In addition to the removal of the metal canopy and brick staircase, the existing cast stone columns and base will be removed to make these modifications. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing historic canopies should be preserved. This wing of the complex is the oldest remaining as noted in finding b. A newspaper article from 1952 shows the front façade of the structure with the existing canopy in its current configuration, which matches the footprint in the 1951 Sanborn Map. This canopy is a character defining feature of the historic structure. Staff does not find its removal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **SEYMOUR ST ALTERATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify an ancillary entrance on Seymour St, located on the far northwest of the façade. The entrance currently features a staircase and handrail leading up to a metal double door with transom. The applicant has proposed to remove the stairs and install a new staircase and landing that extends towards Seymour St. The proposal also includes a new rubbed concrete accessible ramp to the southwest, new painted metal handrail, a prefabricated aluminum canopy, new composite metal columns, and a new composite metal canopy. A new aluminum curtain wall system will be installed on the existing façade to the southwest of the existing double doors. Part of an existing sidewalk will be removed to accommodate the new stairway location. Additional sidewalk modifications will be made to the south to integrate wheelchair ramps. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new façade elements should not alter or destroy the historic building character. This entrance is secondary and the proposal does not affect character defining features of the façade. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Items 1 and 2, Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on findings a through c. Staff finds that adding an accessible ramp and entrance vestibule is appropriate, but finds that the existing canopy structure is a character defining feature of the oldest portion of the complex and should be preserved. Staff recommends that the applicant propose a solution that retains this element.

Items 3, 4, and 5, Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding d.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve items #3-5 with staff stipulations. Items #1 and 2 were withdrawn by the applicant.

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

**NAYS:**           None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**28.     HDRC NO. 2017-588**

**Applicant:**     Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

**Address:**      814 BURNET ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct four, two story residential structures on the vacant lot at 814 Burnet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct four, two story residential structures on the four vacant lots at 814 Burnet, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This lot is located mid-block between N Olive and N Pine Streets. The applicant has proposed for each residential structure to be located on each of the four lots with a designated parking location or carport. The two lots at adjacent to Burnet are to house units 1 and 2. The two rear lots are to house units 3 and 4.
- 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. This request was last heard at the October 18, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where it was denied. Since that time, the applicant has adjusted the design to address comments that were received at that hearing.
- d. **LOT COVERAGE** – Many lots in the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature a primary residential structure that fronts a primary street with one or more accessory structures toward the rear of the site. The applicant has proposed to locate two of the two story units on the lots at the rear of the lots adjacent to Burnet Street with a composition similar to that of a primary historic structure with a rear accessory structure.
- e. **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. Per the applicant’s proposed site plan, two of the residential structures are to address Burnet with setbacks of 15 and 16 feet from the property lines. These two structures would be the only two on Burnet with an orientation toward Burnet. The proposed orientations of units 1 and 2 are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The locations of units 3 and 4 are consistent with those of historic, rear accessory structures. The applicant has noted a setback of 25’ – 8” and 26’ – 2” for units 1 and 2 from the street. The other three historic structures that front Burleson on this block feature setbacks of 23’ – 5”, 27’ – 6” and a minimal setback of approximately 2 feet.
- f. **ENTRANCES** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrances toward Burnet. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. 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. These two lots are located across Burnet from a two story historic structure and to the immediate west of a two story historic structure. Staff finds heights of two stories for units 1 and 2, that address Burnet is appropriate. At the rear of units 1 and 2, the applicant has proposed units three and four, which are also to feature two stories, but feature an overall height and mass that is subordinate to those of units 1 and 2. Staff finds this modified massing to be more appropriate than the previous proposal of four structures that each shared equal massing.

- h. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has noted overall widths for units 1 and 2 are 36' – 0" and 39' – 0"; this measurement not only includes footprints, but also roof measurements. The applicant has noted that adjacent historic structures that front Burleson feature width of 40' – 11", 31' – 4" and 44' – 10". Staff finds the width of the proposed new construction to be more appropriate than the 43' – 0" that was previously proposed.
- i. **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. Neighboring historic structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. The applicant has proposed foundation heights of two feet for each unit. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for unit 1 to feature a side gabled roof, unit 2 to feature both a front and side gabled roof, unit 3 to feature a side gabled roof with front facing shed roofs and unit 4 to feature a roof form that matches that of unit 3, but with an opposite orientation. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The reduced width from 43' – 0" contributes to roof massing and forms that are more consistent with historic examples found throughout the district.
- k. **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. Staff finds that window locations and groupings should be revised to include proportionate locations such as distances from building corners and proportionate mullion spacing between grouped windows.
- l. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance, and feature traditional trim and sill details. The applicant has proposed block framed vinyl windows. Staff does not find the use of block frame vinyl windows to be appropriate. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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.
- m. **MATERIALS** – At this time, the applicant has proposed materials that include Hardi Artisan siding, Hardi lap siding, Hardi board and batten siding, cedar columns and a standing seam metal roof. 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. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- n. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed for each structure to have covered porches which are currently designed as stoops with shed roofs. Staff recommends the applicant incorporate additional porch massing and work to include the design of the porches into the overall building's mass.

- o. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** –Folk Victorian structures rely heavily on the relationship between front protruding window bays, side gables and inset porches. The front facing gable should extend to the top of the cross ridge line to present equal heights for both portions of the L plan. This has not been accomplished in unit 1. Additionally, porches on Folk Victorian structures are recessed behind the massing of protruding bays. As proposed, the applicant has proposed a porch that extends forward from the massing of the new construction. This is not architecturally appropriate.
- p. **COLUMN DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed cedar front porch columns; however, at this time has not included a column detail determining trim and dimensions. Staff finds that a column not to exceed six (6) inches in width should be used.
- q. **SIDEWALK** – The applicant has noted the installation of a front yard sidewalk for units 1 and 2; however, has not included these on the site plan. The proposed sidewalks should relate to those found historically in the district in terms of location, width and material and should be centered on the front porch of units 1 and 2.
- r. **DRIVEWAY** – On both the east and west sides of the lots, the applicant has proposed to install driveways to feature nine (9) feet in width. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that driveways should relate to historic driveways in the district and should not exceed (10) feet in width. The proposed driveways are consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds the installation of two separate driveways located consistently with the pattern within the district is appropriate.
- s. **PARKING** – The applicant has noted that each structure is to have designated parking, either in the form of a covered carport or in the form of open air parking. Staff finds the proposed parking locations to be appropriate.
- t. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has noted the location of trees and driveways on the site plan; however, a detailed landscaping plan should be submitted to staff prior to submitting for final approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of units 1, 3 and 4 based on findings d through t with the following stipulations:

- i. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 proposed Hardi siding feature a smooth finish along with an exposure of four inches for the. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- iii. That column details be submitted at the time of final approval. Columns should be exceed six inches square.
- iv. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.
- v. That all concrete sidewalks found on site be consistent with those found historically in the district.
- vi. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted prior to submitting for final approval.
- vii. That window locations and groupings should be revised to include proportionate locations such as distances from building corners and proportionate mullion spacing between grouped windows.

Staff does not recommend approval of unit #2. Staff recommends That additional architectural detailing be added that is consistent with Folk Victorian detailing including window proportions that feature additional height, transom windows above each entrance, equal spacing between windows, and consistent relationships between solids and voids. The proposed short windows in bathrooms on the front façade should be eliminated and full height windows should be installed. The front facing gable should extend to the top of the cross ridge line to present equal heights for both portions of the L plan. Additionally, a true L plan should be designed which includes a protruding bay and recessed porch massing.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Monica Savino, Cullen Jones, and Liz Franklin spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**29. HDRC NO. 2017-567**

**Applicant:** Aaron Morosini

**Address:** 729 N PINE ST

**REQUEST:**

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

**FINDINGS:**

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

## **WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

### **30. HDRC NO. 2017-619**

**Applicant:** Fernando Aguilar/Slay Architecture

**Address:** 204 NOLAN

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to removal an original, integral porch gutter and replace with a surface mounted gutter and downspouts. This modification includes the removal of the existing, decorative fascia and replacement with a flat profiled fascia.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 204 Nolan was constructed circa 1895 and is commonly known as the Dullnig/Schneider House. The structure features Folk Victorian architectural elements as well as a plaster coated limestone façade.
- b. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to removal an original, integral porch gutter and replace with a surface mounted gutter and downspouts. This modification includes the removal of the existing, decorative fascia and replacement with a flat profiled fascia. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7. notes that porches and porch elements are to be repaired to match the existing. The removal of the integral gutter and decorative fascia would result in the removal of a character defining feature and is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing, integral gutter as well as decorative parapet remain as original constructed. Repairs are eligible for administrative approval.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. If the HDRC finds that circumstances such as maintenance issues warrant approval to remove the integral gutter, then staff finds the simple, half-round gutter to be an acceptable alternative solution.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Monica Savino spoke in support.

## **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.

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**32. HDRC NO. 2017-609**

**Applicant:** Galvez Works LLC

**Address:** 130 W WOODLAWN

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify the existing front porch.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 130 W Woodlawn is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1915 with Queen Anne and Folk Victorian influences. The home features a hipped roof with lower cross gables, decorative semicircular front gable ornament, and an asymmetrical front porch flanked on the east by a bay window. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. The applicant is requesting approval to modify the existing front porch configuration. Based on Sanborn Maps and the typical porch configurations of Queen Anne homes of this construction period, the current configuration is not original. The 1911-1955 Sanborn Map indicates a metal roof with a separate front porch that wraps from the front bay window to the side bay on the west. This porch appears to have been removed, and the hipped roof was extended on the front façade to be flush with the front gable to cover the current porch entry. The existing roof is also shingle. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing porch roof with a new roof at a 3/12 pitch that extends the width of the porch base. The new roof will feature the same shingles as the existing structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, porches should be replaced in-kind when necessary. However, the existing condition is not original and incompatible with the style of the home. Any new porches should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff does not find the replacement porch roof form consistent with the Guidelines as proposed.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant proposes a front porch roofline that is more compatible with the style of the structure and is based on historical evidence as seen in the Sanborn Maps.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**33. HDRC NO. 2017-522**

**Applicant:** Varco Builder of Texas LLC

**Address:** 401 E LOCUST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install front yard fence of wood or wrought iron material.
2. Construct new carport featuring wood posts and metal roof, unattached from historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 401 E Locust is a two-story single family structure and features Neoclassical architectural elements including full-height Corinthian columns in the front porch.
- b. NEW FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install wrought iron or wood picket fencing along the north and east facing property lines as well as the front façade. This block of E Locust currently features 12 parcels, 2 of which feature non-historic fences. Staff finds that the installation of fencing at this location is not consistent with the Guidelines 2.B.ii.
- c. CARPORT – The applicant has proposed to construct a new carport adjacent to the historic structure for entry from cross street Paschal. The proposed carport features 11’5” in width, 39’ in depth, and 9’ to 12’ in height. The proposed carport features cedar wrapped metal columns and a low sloping metal roof to match the historic structure. While staff finds the proposed carport’s construction materials and setback from the Paschal Street right-of-way appropriate, the proposed overall footprint and location of the carport is not consistent with Guidelines 5.A.i (“subordinate to the historic structure”).

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff does not recommend approval of fence installation based on findings b.
2. Staff recommends approval of the construction of a new carport with the stipulation that it is setback farther away from the primary historic structure based on findings c.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Frederica Kushner spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve items #1-2 with staff stipulations and the additional stipulation of setting back the carport.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**34. HDRC NO. 2017-600**

**Applicant:** Amanda Holmes

**Address:** 301 W HOLLYWOOD AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace an existing six foot tall rear wooden privacy fence with an eight foot tall wooden privacy fence to step down in half foot increments to six feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 301 W. Hollywood Ave is a two-story single-family home constructed in 1924 by builder Bock Construction Company. The house was designed by architect Harvey P. Smith in the Colonial Revival style. The applicant has proposed to replace an existing six foot tall wood plank privacy fence with a new privacy fence measuring eight feet in height along the rear alley and Belknap Pl to step down in half foot increments to a height of six feet.
- b. LOCATION – The property is located on a corner lot at the intersection of W. Hollywood Ave. and Belknap Pl. The existing privacy fence is approximately six feet tall and located along the rear of the property on Belknap Pl. The existing fence also wraps behind the lot and fronts a rear alley. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, privacy fences should not be located in the front yard. The Guidelines also stipulate that fences should not be installed where they were not historically used. Privacy fences and walls are characteristic of the Monte Vista Historic District, especially along Belknap Pl. Staff finds the location consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. HEIGHT – The proposed fence is to be approximately eight feet in height along the rear alley, turn the the corner of the alley and Belknap, and then step down in half foot increments until it reaches a height of six feet on the east façade of the home. The existing fence is six feet in height. 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 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 plank fences taller than six feet are not common in the district. Staff does not find an eight foot fence consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. MATERIALITY – According to the guidelines, fences should be constructed of materials similar to fencing used historically in the district. In the Monte Vista Historic District, privacy fences and walls are commonly a reflection of the particular design style of the primary structure, and fences and screens made of unstained wood, stained wood, stucco, brick, stone, and other materials are common considering the eclectic styles found within the district. The existing privacy fence is made of wood boards, and the replacement proposes treated cedar planks to be stained to closely match the existing color. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the fence replacement based on findings a through d with the following stipulation:

- i. That the fence complies with Historic Design Guidelines standards 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.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded to approve.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**35. HDRC NO. 2017-587**

**Applicant:** Hilary Scruggs

**Address:** 115 DEVINE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a residential structure to feature a total of 2,950 square feet with a detached, rear accessory structure to feature a footprint of 693 square feet. The proposed primary residential structure will feature two stories in height.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two story, single family residential structure to feature a total of 2,950 square feet with a detached, rear accessory structure to feature a footprint of 693 square feet. The proposed primary residential structure will feature two stories in height.
- 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. **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 a setback of approximately twenty (20) feet. Per the applicant’s site plan, the setback of the proposed new construction is less than that of the neighboring historic structure. Staff finds that the proposed new construction should feature a setback that is greater than that of the neighboring historic structures.
- 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 Devine Street. 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 exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Each of the historic, residential structures on this block of Devine feature one story in height. To match the historic pattern, the applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a single story of height for the first half of the structure, which roughly matches the height and massing of the neighboring historic structures. Finds this appropriate.
- 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 hipped roof and a rear facing gabled roof. Both roof forms are found historically throughout the Lavaca Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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 street facing door openings that are consistent with those found historically in the district; however, many of the structures windows feature contemporarily sized and placed openings. Staff finds that additional fenestration should be added near the street on both the east and west elevation and that window sizes that are consistent with those found throughout the district should be used. Fixed windows are not appropriate. All windows should feature an operable sash.
- 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 existing lot is relatively small; however, staff finds the proposed footprints to be appropriate.
- j. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that consist of James Hardi Artisan VGroove siding, a standing seam metal roof, wood and aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds the use of Hardi siding appropriate; however, the proposed siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure. The 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 to install wood and aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds the installation of both appropriate; however, 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. 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. FENCING – The applicant has noted the construction of a fence toward the rear of the proposed new construction. The proposed location of the fence is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements; however, the applicant should submit details including height and materials to staff when returning for final approval.
- o. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to feature a total size of 693 square feet. The proposed structure will feature a side gabled roof, materials to match those proposed on the primary structure and a location that is consistent with the historic location of accessory structures in the district. Staff finds the proposed accessory structure to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- p. 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 based on findings a through p with the following stipulations:

- i. That a foundation height that is within one foot of those found historically on the block be installed as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the proposed new construction feature a setback that is greater than those of the historic structures on the block as noted in finding c.
- iii. That additional fenestration should be added near the street on both the east and west elevation and that window sizes that are consistent with those found throughout the district should be used. Fixed windows are not appropriate. All windows should feature an operable sash.
- iv. That column details be submitted when returning for final approval as noted in finding l.
- v. That the proposed wood and aluminum clad wood windows adhere to the specifications noted in finding k.
- vi. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view and that fencing and landscaping details be submitted to staff when submitting for final approval.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**36. HDRC NO. 2017-306**

**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 of 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 proposes an addition that has a roofline that is subordinate to the rear accessory structure.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED**

**37. HDRC NO. 2017-594**

**Applicant:** Bob King/Alamo Construction Company

**Address:** 917 HAYS ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a rear addition to the primary historic structure to feature approximately 720 square feet.
2. Perform exterior modifications to the historic structure including the relocation and removal of original window openings.
3. Construct a detached garage in the rear of the lot to feature an overall footprint of 960 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 917 Hays was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features both front and side gabled roofs, two brick chimneys and traditional folk architectural elements. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition and a detached, rear accessory structure.
- b. **CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS** – The construction documents do not accurately represent the structure as it currently exists. No modifications are to occur to forms, openings or architectural detailing of the historic structure.
- c. **REAR ADDITION** – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure, feature gabled roofs, and feature setbacks from the wall planes of the historic structure. Generally, the applicant's proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- d. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. The footprint of the existing, historic structure is 1,421. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a footprint of 771 square feet, which doubles the size of the existing structure.
- e. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood windows, wood siding and a roof to match that of the primary historic structure, asphalt shingle. Generally, the proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines. Regarding the proposed wood windows, 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. **EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS – HISTORIC STRUCTURE** – The applicant has noted in the construction documents exterior modifications which include the relocation of existing window openings and the removal of existing window openings. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. which notes that existing, original window and door openings should be preserved. Staff finds that all existing window openings should remain as they exist.
  - g. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new accessory structures should feature designs that are visually subordinate to the primary historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form, should not be larger in plan than forty percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint, should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic structure through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details and should feature windows and doors that are similar to those found on the primary historic structure.
  - h. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed for the accessory structure to feature an overall footprint of approximately 1,000 square feet. This is inconsistent with the Guidelines. The historic pattern for the district is small, rear accessory structure. Staff finds that an accessory structure that is larger than the primary historic structure as it currently exists and seventy percent of the proposed footprint (historic structure and addition) is not appropriate. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the proposed rear accessory structure’s footprint to be consistent with the Guidelines noted in finding g.
  - i. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The proposed structure is to feature a side gabled roof and an overhead rolling garage door. Staff finds that single width wood garage doors should be installed and that the soffit boxed be eliminated.
  - j. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B., new accessory structures should match the predominant orientation found along the block and should follow historic setback patterns found throughout the district. Generally, the proposed location is consistent with the Guidelines.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the construction of a rear addition. Staff finds that the applicant should address inconsistencies with the Historic Design Guidelines, such as the proposed square footage of the addition. Additionally, the applicant should address inaccuracies in the construction documents. The following items should also be addressed prior to receiving a recommendation for approval.

- i. That the applicant adhere to the wood window specifications noted in finding e.
- ii. That all materials – siding, roofing, skirting and trim match those found on the historic structure.
- iii. That a vertical trim piece be installed on the left elevation to differentiate the addition from the primary historic structure.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, modifications to existing, original window openings in the primary historic structure. No modifications are to occur to forms, openings or architectural detailing of the historic structure.

While staff generally finds the concept of a proposed detached garage to be appropriate at this location, staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #3, the rear accessory structure with the following stipulations:

- i. That the structure be reduced in size to not feature more than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint.
- ii. That the proposed soffit boxes be eliminated.

iii. That single width, wood garage doors be installed.

Updated construction documents demonstrating these stipulations should be resubmitted for consideration by the HDRC.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Monica Savino spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve items #1 and 3 with staff stipulations. Applicant was instructed to come back for item #2.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**38. HDRC NO. 2017-592**

**Applicant:** Michael Sohocki/Restaurant Gwendolyn

**Address:** 152 E PECAN ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install three fabric awnings on the N St Mary's façade.
2. Install potted plants, chairs and tables and benches near each entrance on the N St Mary's façade.
3. Install railings to extend the length of the N St Mary's façade's storefront. The enclosure will extend seven (7) feet into the public right of way. Six (6) feet of sidewalk space will remain.
4. Install string lights to be located at each awnings, on the proposed tailing and to extend over the public right of way to the existing traffic signal pole.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 152 E Pecan, commonly known as the Exchange Building was constructed circa 1925 and features an overall height of 116 feet. The requests in the current application for the Certificate of Appropriateness are in relationship to the retail space at the street level. All modifications are proposed to the N St Mary's façade.
- b. **AWNINGS** – The applicant has proposed to install three black awnings to cover the three transom openings above the storefront system on the N St Mary's façade. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new canopies and awnings should be based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design of new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached. Based on evidence of the building design and an existing metal canopy on the Pecan facade of the building, staff does not find that a fabric awning would have likely existed historically. Staff finds a flat canopy is historically accurate and would be more appropriate.
- c. **FURNISHINGS** – The applicant has proposed install two potted plants, wood benches and tables and chairs for outdoor dining. Staff finds the installation of each to be appropriate; however, all tables and chairs are to be made of high quality materials. The applicant is to submit table and chair selections to staff for review and approval prior to purchase and installation.

- d. **RAILINGS** – To enclose the outdoor seating area proposed on the N St Mary’s sidewalk, the applicant has proposed to install metal railings to feature 41 inches in height. Railings for outdoor seating are not common on N St Mary’s; however, they are found commonly on other streets throughout downtown San Antonio. Staff finds this installation as well as the profile, which matches that found on the river façade of this structure to be appropriate. Six feet of sidewalk clearance will remain.
- e. **LIGHTING** – The applicant has proposed to install string lighting to be attached to the proposed awnings, railings and to extend from the façade of the structure to the existing traffic signal pole. Staff finds the installation of lighting on the proposed railings to be appropriate; however, staff does not find the proposed installation of awning lighting or lighting to extend to traffic infrastructure to be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the installation of awnings based on finding b.

Staff recommends approval of items #2 and #3, the installation of street furnishings and railings based on finding c and d.

Staff recommends approval of item #4, the installation of lighting only on the railings noted in request item #3. Staff does not recommend approval of lighting on proposed awnings or to extend to traffic infrastructure.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded to approve.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**39. HDRC NO. 2017-611**

**Applicant:** Mike Sepeda/ADA Consulting Group Inc.

**Address:** 244 W CEVALLOS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a surface parking lot at 244 W Cevallos, including the installation 8 foot tall wrought iron fence around the perimeter of the property.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a surface parking lot at 244 W Cevallos. The lot featured a natural grass lawn until circa December 2016, which it was then converted into a gravel lot. At an unspecified date in 2017, it was then converted to a paved parking lot with a wrought iron fence prior to receiving a Certificate of

Appropriateness. A post-work application fee was paid on October 30, 2017. The lot is located within RIO-7E district and is zoned R-6 CD.

- b. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS – The UDC Section 35-672(a) notes that pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The existing sidewalks are consistent with the UDC.
- c. PAVING MATERIALS – The UDC Section 35-672(a)(3) notes that paving materials for pedestrian pathways shall use visually and texturally different materials than those used for parking spaces and automobile traffic. The existing paving and sidewalks are consistent with the UDC.
- d. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – The applicant has noted a primary use on the lots to be automobile parking. This is permitted in RIO-7 at this location due to its distance from the river right of way. Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(2), there is no maximum percentage of lot line coverage by surface parking in RIO-7. The applicant’s proposed parking location and site design is consistent with the UDC.
- e. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed two curb cuts with gated entry to facilitate automobile entry into the parking lot. These curb cuts and corresponding entry is to be located on Marty and W Cevallos , at the interior of the site, removed from major automobile and pedestrian thoroughfares. The UDC notes that a width of twenty-five (25) should not be exceeded for curb cuts. Staff finds the proposed curb cut locations to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- f. FENCE – The applicant has proposed a black wrought iron fence that is to be eight (8) feet in height. Per the UDC 35-673(h)(1) noting the use of 2 to 4 feet low scale walls to divide space between properties and right-of-ways and the use of solid walls up to 6 feet walls screen equipment or unsightly areas -- staff finds a fence height of six (6) feet appropriate at this location.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the overall height of the fence be reduced to 6 feet based on the findings.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**40. HDRC NO. 2017-608**

**Applicant:** Timothy Proctor/Laney Development Group

**Address:** 421 S PRESA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a twelve story, residential tower with ground floor retail at 421 S Presa. The property is bound by S Presa on the east, Cesar E Chavez on the south and

S S Mary's on the west. The structure will feature structured parking as the 2nd and 3rd levels. Material selections and final architectural detailing have not been provided at this time.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a twelve story, mixed use tower at 421 S Presa. The property is bound by S Presa on the east, Cesar E Chavez on the south and S S Mary's on the west. The structure will feature structured parking, retail and residential space.
- 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 November 7, 2017. At that meeting, committee members asked questions regarding the proposed locations of the live/work spaces, suggested that the townhome units should be located closer to the existing, historic structures on the adjacent lots and asked questions regarding an architectural cap for the tower.
- d. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a), pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. Additionally, the various functions and spaces on a site must be linked with sidewalks in a coordinated system. The applicant has proposed a footprint that covers the entire site; however, the applicant has noted proposed connections including connections to existing sidewalks and sidewalk improvements. This is consistent with the UDC.
- e. **AUTOMOBILE PARKING** – The applicant has proposed structured parking for 100 automobiles to occupy levels two and three. To facilitate automobile access into the site, the applicant has proposed one large curb cut along S Presa. Staff finds the location of this curb cut to be appropriate. While the proposed curb cut is larger than recommended by the UDC (twenty-five feet), the applicant has only proposed one curb cut total for the site. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- f. **ENTRANCE ORIENTATION** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has proposed to orient entrances on S St Mary's, Cesar E Chavez and S Presa. Additionally, the applicant has incorporated architectural elements such as canopies, storefront systems and other architectural elements to distinguish entrances. This is consistent with the UDC.
- g. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Regarding landscape design, the current site is used primarily for parking and is relatively void of landscaping materials. The applicant has proposed to install landscaping elements such as planting beds, trees, a green roof and a green wall to screen the proposed parking levels. When returning for final approval, the applicant is to provide staff with a detailed landscaping plan.
- h. **OUTDOOR FURNITURE** – The applicant has proposed outdoor seating areas adjacent to the public right of way. High quality street furnishings are required per UDC Section 35-673(i). The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- i. **HUMAN SCALE** – Per the UDC Section 35-674(b), all building should appear to have a human scale. In general, this scale can be accomplished by using familiar forms and elements interpreted in human dimensions. Facades shall contain a discernible pattern of mass to void, or windows and doors to solid mass. Opening shall appear in a regular pattern or be clustered to form a cohesive design. The applicant has proposed multiple architectural elements at the street level to provide a human scale including individual unit porches, pedestrian scaled entrances and pedestrian seating locations. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **LIGHTING** – Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk.

At this time, the applicant has not provided a lighting plan. When returning for final approval, the applicant is to provide staff with both a site and architectural lighting plan.

- k. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment as noted in UDC Section 35-673(n). The applicant has noted this equipment to be located on the roof.
- l. **BICYCLE PARKING** – On site bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO districts. Bicycle parking shall be placed in a well-lit and accessible area. UDC bicycle parking requirements in UDC 35-526 can be met through indoor bicycle storage facilities in lieu of outdoor bike rack fixtures. The applicant is responsible for complying with the requirement for on-site bicycle parking.
- m. **FAÇADE SEPARATION** – The UDC Section 35-674 (b)(4) notes that a façade in RIO-3 that features more than thirty (30) feet in length should be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions. At the street level, the applicant has accomplished this through the introduction of glazing systems, entrances, storefront systems and alternating materials. Façade separation should be included during the development of the design of the upper levels.
- n. **ALLOWABLE HEIGHT** – There is no height restriction for new construction in RIO 3, consistent with the Downtown District. The applicant has proposed a height of approximately 135 feet. Cesar E Chavez Boulevard is a dividing boundary between the Downtown District and the neighborhoods to the south. While the proposed tower is dramatically taller than the residential and small commercial structures located to the south, the proposed height is appropriate within the context of the Downtown District.
- o. **HEIGHT COMPATIBILITY** - UDC Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. The majority of neighboring structures are well below the allowable building height. The proposed podium at 3 stories is compatible with these lower buildings, and the overall tower height is of similar height as other towers in the near vicinity. The proposed tower is also located on the southwestern most corner of the La Villita Historic District, and there is an immediate contrast between the proposed height of the tower and the height of the neighboring historic buildings to the north. Staff finds that this impact can be mitigated by aligning ground floor elements with the established heights of the neighboring buildings.
- p. **MATERIALS** – At this time, the applicant has not determined material specifications. The UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- q. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(e) in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. The applicant has noted an architectural cap that features flared ends. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to develop this detail and provide additional information when returning for final approval.
- r. **FAÇADE ALIGNMENT** – The proposed new construction should be aligned in a manner that is not dominant of the setback of the neighboring historic structure. The applicant is to provide site plans and elevations to note that relationship between the proposed new construction and the existing structure.

- s. TOWER MASSING – While the RIO standards are generally silent in regards to tower design, the Downtown Design Guide provides guidance for tower massing and form. Buildings more than 10 stories tall should be tapered and should be designed to reduce overall bulk. Tower siting and massing should also maintain key views. A building’s top should be delineated with a change of detail and meet the sky with a thinner form, or tapered point. Unarticulated, flat-topped buildings are discouraged. In terms of proportion, a tower should generally appear taller than it is wide. Staff finds that, although the presented tower massing is preliminary, there are inconsistencies with these guidelines that should be addressed. For instance, the currently proposed tower is proportionally wider than it is tall when viewed from the north or south. This massing obstructs views toward downtown including view of the Tower Life Building from S. St. Mary’s. Staff finds that the massing should be rearranged to yield a more slender design that tapers as it ascends higher.
- t. SIGNAGE – At this time the applicant has provided conceptual information regarding building signage. All signage will need to be reviewed in full by the HDRC prior to installation.
- u. ARCHAEOLOGY- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the La Villita Local Historic District, and the La Villita National Register of Historic Places District. The property is also in close proximity to previously recorded site 41BX303. A review of historic archival documents shows structures within the property as early as 1873. This archival review also identifies the Pajalache or Concepcion Acequia, a designated Local Historic Landmark and National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark, likely traversing the project area. Therefore, the property may contain archaeological sites, some of which may be significant. Thus, archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of podium levels one through three at this time.

Staff recommends that the applicant continue to develop the tower massing and the overall proposal with the following considerations:

- i. That the applicant provide a diagram that illustrate how ground floor elements align with the neighboring historic buildings to the north based on finding o.
- ii. That the applicant provide additional renderings that illustrate the impact of views to and from downtown from various points.
- iii. That the applicant explore alternative tower massing that yields a more slender design that tapers as it ascends higher and a roof line that is articulated with an architectural element based on finding s.
- iv. That the mechanical penthouse be considered and incorporated into the massing of the tower.
- v. That the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan when returning for final approval as noted in finding g.
- vi. That the applicant continue to work with staff and the HDRC regarding material selection and window details.
- vii. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **41. HDRC NO. 2017-D05**

**Applicant:** James McKnight—Brown & Ortiz, PC;  
Ignacio Aliaga—A+B Architecture

**Address:** 803 North Cherry Street

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a new multi-family/retail mixed use development with 149 residential units and two retail spaces. The proposed development is four stories, the first being parking, leasing office, and retail spaces. Signage is not included in this request and will be submitted separately when the development name has been chosen.

This case was originally heard by the HDRC on September 6, 2017, at which time the Commissioners requested a site visit. The site visit was held on September 27th and resulted in the Commissioners requesting a follow-up Design Review Committee meeting with the applicant to discuss potential revisions to the proposed lot and building design. On October 11th, the applicant presented a number of revisions to the DRC, and has since amended the original proposal as follows.

- The original vehicle egress on Cherry Street has been removed; vehicle ingress/egress is now limited to one location on Lamar Street. Removal of the Cherry Street driveway allowed for a small increase in the number of on-site parking spaces.
- The retail component located at the northeast corner of the property has been shifted to have increased frontage along Cherry Street.
- An outdoor seating area has been added to the retail component located at the southwest corner of the property.

#### **FINDINGS:**

The proposed development and design meet the purpose and intent of the **Downtown Design Guide** required standards and encouraged guidelines.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted, as shown in the attached Exhibit Package (**Exhibits A-P**).

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Natasha Bakunda, Barbara Garcia, Nancy Alfred, Juan A Garcia, Aaron Retersdorf, Aimee Holland, and Arvis Holland spoke in support. Monica Savino (Lauren Bartholomew yielded her time), Nettie Hinton (Marcie Ince and Shelbie Gutierrez yielded their time), Brian Gordon (Brianna Berrera and Carol Fisher yielded their time), Gary Houston (Kendall Fox yielded their time), Graciela Sanchez (Bernard Sanchez and Enrique Sanchez yielded their time), Liz Franklin (Alicia Arredondo yielded her time), Keith Toney (Tremon McGrath yielded his time), H. Douglas

Steadman (Rosey R Abuabara and Kristina Moen yielded their time), Kristel Puente (Eliza Perez and Jurene Steadman yielded their time), Virginia S. Nicholas, Kimberly Feathers, Cullen Jones, Evelyn Brown, Patti Zaiontz, Alex Birnel, Dylan Verdi, Michael (no last name written), Diana Saenz, Ruben Martinez, Pastor Miguel A. Padilla, Celeste Orta, Erika Hizez, Marlon Davis, Yaneth Flores, David Kruse, Susana Segura, Natalie Rodriguez, and Gloria A. Ramirez spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**42. HDRC NO. 2017-566**

**Applicant:** Ricardo Turrubiates

**Address:** 402 CENTER ST, 406 CENTER ST, 1639 N SWISS, 126 N CHERRY, 122 N CHERRY, 120 N CHERRY, 134 N SWISS, 130 N SWISS, 126 N SWISS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for a twenty-four unit townhome development to be partially bound by N Cherry, Center and N Swiss. 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. **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.
- c. **MASSING, HEIGHT & FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT** – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding massing, height or façade arrangement. Staff finds that this information should be provided prior to the issuance of conceptual approval of site or building design.
- d. **SITE PLAN** – The applicant has provided a site plan that notes that construction of twenty-four residential structures in row house form. The ground level of each structure features an automobile garage. The applicant has proposed for thirteen of the proposed units to front N Cherry Street or N Swiss.

- e. **SETBACKS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new construction should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Where a variety of setbacks exist, the median setback of buildings should be used. The surrounding structures, many of which are not historic, feature varying setbacks. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a diagram noting the relationship of proposed setbacks with those found historically in the adjacent blocks. On N Swiss, the proposed new construction should feature a greater setback than the adjacent single family historic structure.
- f. **ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed an orientation that results in thirteen of the proposed twenty four units to front either N Cherry or N Swiss Streets. Eleven of the proposed units will feature an inward orientation. Generally, staff finds the units that have been proposed to front N Swiss and N Cherry to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. There are currently four units that are adjacent to Center Street but do not feature an orientation toward Center. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate porch and other architectural elements to reorient these units toward Center Street.
- g. **SITE DESIGN** – The applicant has noted the installation of natural lawn areas that are to include planting beds at the front of each structure. Additionally, the applicant has provided information regarding site design including the location of driveways, walkways and sidewalks and trees. Generally, the proposed locations of grass and plants are appropriate.
- h. **WALKWAYS** – The applicant has proposed sidewalks to extend between row structures as well as sidewalks to extend from front porches to the connecting sidewalks. Staff finds this appropriate; however, sidewalks that extend to Center Street should feature a width that is consistent with that found historically in the district.
- i. **DRIVEWAYS** – The applicant has noted driveway entrances that are to be located on N Cherry, Center and N Swiss Streets. Each of the 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:**

The proposed building footprints and scale are appropriate in the given context. However, staff cannot make a positive recommendation at this time due to a lack of information. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to develop the proposal with the following considerations:

- i. That the applicant provide a diagram noting the relationship of proposed setbacks with those found historically in the adjacent blocks.
- ii. That the proposed new construction which fronts N Swiss feature a similar setback as that of the neighboring historic structure.
- iii. That units which feature a side elevation toward Center Street be reoriented to feature a primary orientation toward Center or be designed to provide architectural interest along Center.
- iv. 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.
- v. That the applicant explore alternative configurations that reduce the number of curb cuts / private driveways.
- vi. That the applicant provide information regarding the width, profile and materials of each driveway, apron and curb cut.
- vii. 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

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

Michael Guarino  
Chair