

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
January 20, 2016**

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

PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

ABSENT: Lazarine, Salas, Rodriguez, Valenzuela

- Chairman’s Statement
- Citizens to be heard - Liz Franklin, Dignowity Hill, stated Dignowity Hill Assoc., is in support of OHP recommendations.
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-493 | 203 McDonald |
| 2. Case No. 2015-483 | 5503 S. Presa |
| 3. Case No. 2015-484 | 315 Club Dr. |
| 4. Case No. 2015-477 | 1507 W. Rosewood Ave. |
| 5. Case No. 2015-485 | 6102 San Pedro Ave. |
| 6. Case No. 2015-504 | 1011 S. Main Ave. |
| 7. Case No. 2015-478 | 122 Gorman St. |
| 8. Case No. 2015-479 | 1005 Hays St. |
| 9. Case No. 2015-481 | 902 N. Pine |
| 10. Case No. 2015-499 | 237 Palo Blanco |
| 11. Case No. 2015-496 | 833 E. Magnolia Ave. |
| 12. Case No. 2015-491 | 106 Alamo Plaza |
| 13. Case No. 2015-495 | 430 E. Commerce St. |
| 14. Case No. 2015-492 | 410 Florida St. |
| 15. Case No. 2015-490 | 307 E. Carolina |
| 16. Case No. 2015-489 | 118 Callaghan Ave. |
| 17. Case No. 2015-487 | 500 E. Cesar Chavez Blvd. |
| 18. Case No. 2015-486 | 302 Cedar St. |
| 19. Case No. 2015-503 | 602 E. Locust |
| 20. Case No. 2015-502 | 122 Heiman |

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

21. HDRC NO. 2015-423

Applicant: San Antonio River Authority

Proposed amendments to Chapter 35 of the City Code, called the “Unified Development Code”, being more particularly the proposed addition of Section 35-210, “Low Impact Development and Natural Channel Design Protocol (LID/NCDP)”, and associated amendments to Sections 35-201, 35-203, 35-506, 35-523, and 35-A101.

The San Antonio River Authority is proposing amendments to the Unified Development Code (UDC) as part of the 2015 Update Program to provide clarifications and editing amendments related to Low Impact Design as a voluntary site design option and the existing Conservation Subdivision regulations. The proposed amendments have developed with input from the Planning Commission Technical Advisory Committee and have been made publicly available.

Staff recommends approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. Approval of Office of Historic Preservation Window Design Guidelines Document pertaining to repair, replacement and new construction.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. **HDRC NO. 2015-497**

Applicant: Fernando Marin

Address: 1014 Burnet St.

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

1. Install a 13' x 13' front porch deck
2. Install a new craftsman style door.
3. Perform exterior medications to the primary historic structure, including repairing the original siding, trim and soffits.
4. Install vinyl windows into the primary historic structure.
5. Install wooden front porch columns.
6. Receive Historic Tax Verification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an addition at the rear of the primary historic structure at 1014 Burnet on November 5, 2014. Since that approval, the applicant has performed exterior modifications to the primary historic structure, constructed a front porch and constructed a rear deck without a Certificate of Appropriateness. While the requested work has been completed, Office of Historic Preservation staff reviews all requests as if they are new requests where work has not started.
- b. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on November 4, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request was scheduled to be reviewed by the DRC on November 17, 2015; however, the DRC did not meet that day due to a lack of quorum. This request was heard by the DRC on December 8, 2015, at that meeting committee members noted that the porch's proportions were not consistent with the Craftsman style, that the columns taper too much toward the top, that molding could potentially be added to the bases of each column that the wood window screens could potentially hide the installation of aluminum windows.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, in kind materials should be used when original wood siding and other wood elements are deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant has repaired the existing wood siding, trim and other wood elements in a manner that is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The applicant has installed a new, Craftsman style door to replace the existing, non contributing door. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. At the front of the primary historic structure, the applicant has constructed a front deck measuring 13' x 13' as well as constructed front porch columns. The applicant has constructed the front deck of wood and has installed Craftsman style columns. While the applicant's proposal of a craftsman style column is appropriate, the constructed dimensions, particularly the width is not appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant modify the constructed width of the front porch columns to be proportionally accurate and architecturally consistent with the Craftsman style.

f. The existing windows in the primary historic structure were aluminum casement windows. The applicant has removed these windows and installed vinyl windows, which are not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines.

g. A stipulation of the approval of the addition was to install wood window screens to cover the new, vinyl windows, which the applicant has not yet met. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood screens on the addition be adhere to the previously approved design and stipulations.

h. The applicant is also requesting Historic Tax Verification. The applicant’s request for Historic Tax Certification was heard by the HDRC on June 17, 2015, where it was approved with the stipulation that the applicant receive all necessary approvals and permits prior to returning for Historic Tax Verification. At this time, the applicant has not met this stipulation. Per the UDC Section 35-618 regarding Tax Exemption Qualifications, a property must be rehabilitated or restored as certified by the Historic and Design Review Commission prior to receiving Historic Tax Certification. Staff finds that work has been completed that is not in the scope of approval by the HDRC , nor has it been done consistently with the Historic Design Guidelines and that at this time, this property is not eligible for Historic Tax Verification.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 with the following stipulation:

i. That the applicant installs wood window screens on both the addition as originally stipulated. Staff does not recommend approval of items #4 and #5, the installation of the vinyl windows and the front porch columns. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows as well as modify the width of the proposed columns to include an architecturally and historically correct proportion. Staff does not recommend approval of item #6 based on findings a through h.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve items 1, 2, and 3 with staff recommendations. Denial of items 4, 5, and 6 based on findings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2015-482

Applicant: Daniel Diaz

Address: 928 N. Olive

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

- 1. Replace vinyl siding with wood siding on the existing porch.
- 2. Construct a new deck on the south elevation
- 3. Install six (6) vinyl windows on the south elevation
- 4. Install new skirting around the main structure

FINDINGS:

a. A stop work order was issued on October 1, 2015, for the construction of a side yard deck, the installation of six (6) vinyl windows, removing vinyl siding from the existing porch and installing new skirting without a Certificate of Appropriateness. At this time, all associated application fees have been paid.

b. Original wood siding should be exposed if it is currently covered with vinyl or aluminum siding, stucco or other materials that have not achieved historic significance. The applicant has removed vinyl siding from the south elevation porch wall and replaced it with 6-inch wood lap siding. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.

c. The applicant has built a new deck along the south elevation of the main structure. The dimensions of the deck are 27-feet by 8-feet with 2x2 pine banisters. The Guidelines for Additions 3.B states that residential additions, including porches and balconies, should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass. The new deck is consistent with the Guidelines.

d. The applicant has removed six (6) wood windows from the south elevation of the house, and installed six (6) vinyl windows. The applicant has noted that the original wood windows were deteriorated over 80%. No photographs of the original windows were submitted to staff. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv, new windows should match the historic or existing

windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The new vinyl windows are not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The applicant has installed new skirting around the base of the primary structure. It is white whereas the body of the structure is beige, causing a stark contrast. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B. replacement siding should consist of durable, proven materials, and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. The new siding is not consistent with the Guidelines because it does not match the existing siding nor does it have a minimal visual impact.

Staff recommends approval of item #1 and #2 based on findings b and c. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3 and #4 based on finding d and e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve items 1 and 2 based on findings b and c. Denial of items 3 and 4 based on findings de and e.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2015-494

Applicant: Alba DeLeon

Address: 1430 Napier Ave.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a single family residence at 1430 Napier.

FINDINGS:

a. 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.

b. The lot at 1430 Napier Avenue is currently a vacant lot located to the immediate southeast of Mission San Jose. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately forty-five (45) feet from Napier Avenue. Napier Street is mostly undeveloped with two structures surrounding adjacent to this property, both of which were constructed circa 2000 that feature setbacks of approximately seventy (70) feet. Staff finds that a setback of seventy (70) feet is appropriate.

c. The Guidelines for New Construction state that primary entrances, porches and landings should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the primary entrance of the house to be oriented toward Napier. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i.

d. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. This particular section of the Mission Historic District features a mix of modestly sized houses as well as larger houses featuring two stories. The applicant's proposal of a one story house is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

e. Foundation heights of new construction should be within one foot of floor to floor heights on adjacent structures. Both adjacent structures feature foundation heights that are less than one foot in height. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of approximately twelve (12) inches. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii.

f. New construction in historic districts should include a similar roof form to those found historically throughout the district. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to include a front gable roof as well as a hipped roof. Both of these forms are found throughout the district, however, typically not together. Generally, a front gable is accompanied by a side gable, not a hipped roof.

g. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. states that window and door openings of new construction should feature a similar proportion to those of historic structures found throughout the district. Staff finds that generally the applicant has presented window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines. Window materials should be comparable to those found historically throughout the district; featuring appropriate materials such as wood. The applicant's proposal of vinyl windows is not consistent with the Guidelines.

h. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of wood and Hardi Board siding and trim and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds that these materials are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.

i. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.D.i., new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The applicant’s proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. New construction in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the neighborhood. The applicant has provided information regarding materials that are complementary of the historic context throughout the neighborhood, however, staff has concerns regarding the proposed roof form as noted in findings f. Staff recommends that the applicant address this inconsistency in order to be fully consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

k. Mechanical equipment should be located at the rear of the property and be screened from the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for appropriately locating and screening mechanical and should provide this information to staff prior to returning to the HDRC.

l. The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan or a tree preservation plan at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements regarding landscaping and the UDC regarding tree preservation.

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

- i. That the applicant propose a setback that is consistent with the existing structures on Napier as noted in finding b.
- ii. That the applicant propose to install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted with the stipulation that the applicant place wood screens over the vinyl windows.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

Agenda case #23 was heard at this time.

23. HDRC NO. 2015-395

Applicant: Jenny de la Rosa
Address: 321 Burleson St.

Withdrawn at the request of the applicant. The applicant will return with further landscape detail.

27. HDRC NO. 2015-480

Applicant: Hannah & Justin Flores
Address: 101 Alder

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

1. Restore and repair existing wood siding
2. Change the paint color of the body and trim of the house.
3. Restore and repair existing wood windows and remove security bars.
4. Restore the existing front porch.
5. Install a new main entry on the east façade of the house with a wood awning.
6. Replace the existing chain link fence with a new wooden fence.
7. Replace the rear concrete patio slab and concrete steps.
8. Re-locate exposed utilities and plumbing to inside wall of house.
9. Replace existing light fixtures with new fixtures.
10. Remove existing concrete walkway.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 101 Alder Lane is located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, and built ca.1912.The house reflects characteristics of Folk Victorian, including a side and front gabled roof and covered front porch. This style is seen throughout the Dignowity Hill

Historic District.

- b. The applicant is proposing to restore and repair the existing wood siding, and replace any sections that are damaged beyond repair with comparable siding. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.A.v and 2.B.i-iii, any deteriorated areas or loose elements should be refastened if applicable with an exterior wood filler, epoxy, or glue. Existing wood siding should be replaced in-kind and matching in profile, dimensions, material, and finish, when beyond repair. The proposal to repair and replace (if severely damaged) existing wood siding with new wood siding is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. The applicant is proposing to apply new paint on the body of the structure, the trim and the existing rear door, and has submitted a color palette to staff for review. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.
- d. The applicant is proposing to remove existing security bars and repair existing wood windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii and 6.B.viii, historic windows should be preserved and security bars on windows should be limited to the interior of windows and doors. The proposal to remove the security bars and repair the wood windows is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. The applicant is proposing to restore the existing front porch by repairing the awning and the existing concrete porch slab. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A.i and iii states that existing porches, balconies, porte-cocheres and their original concrete or wood floors should be preserved.

The proposed repairs to the existing porch are consistent with the Guidelines.

- f. The applicant is proposing to wrap the existing metal porch pillars with wood in order to replicate Craftsman style square pillars. The structure at 101 Alder Lane reflects characteristics of the Folk Victorian style. Although the existing pillars are not necessarily reflective of Folk Victorian, staff finds that Craftsman style columns are not appropriate for this architecture style. Staff recommends the applicant propose and construct new front porch columns that are architecturally appropriate.
- g. The Guidelines for Site Elements 3.ii, new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible, and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. The proposal to install new paving stones on the right side of the home is consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. The applicant is proposing to construct a new main entry on the east side of the house. The entry will include a small awning. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 6, A, i. avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds that the creation of a new, side entrance door is appropriate given the fact that the applicant has proposed to retain both original front doors.
- i. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii, new awnings should be based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no evidence exists, the design of new 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. The proposed awning above the new entry door is consistent with the Guidelines in that it matches the style of the house and is proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the façade on which it will be constructed.
- j. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing chain link fence with a wooden fence. The proposed height of the front and east yard replacement fence is 3-feet, and the proposed height of the rear and west yard replacement fence is 6-feet. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2. B.iii, the height of a new fence within the front yard should be limited to four feet. The proposed front fence height of 3-feet and rear and side yard height of 6-feet is consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i, new fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. Fences should be designed to respond to the materials and design of the house or main structure. The proposal to replace the existing rear and side yard chain link fence with a new wooden privacy fence is consistent with the guidelines. The proposed wooden fence for the front yard is not consistent with the Guidelines because of the minimal transparency. A wrought iron or picket fence would be more appropriate.
- l. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing rear wooden deck and concrete steps, and replace it with new concrete steps. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.iii and iv, replace in-kind porches, balconies, porte-cocheres, and related elements, such as ceilings, floors, and columns, when such features are deteriorated beyond repair. The guidelines also say to design replacement elements, such as stairs, to be simple so as not to distract from the historic character of the building. Removing the wooden decking and stairs is appropriate because it is unoriginal to the structure. The applicant notes that the existing concrete steps are deteriorated, hence the request to replace them in-kind. This request is consistent with the Guidelines.

m. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii, new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible, and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing concrete patio slab in the rear yard and pour a new slab. This proposal is consistent with the guidelines.

n. According to the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.iv, and Guidelines for New Construction 6, A, i., new utility and mechanical connections should not be placed through the foundation along the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way; do not locate utility boxes, air conditioners, rooftop mechanical equipment, etc. on primary facades, front-facing roof slopes, in front yards, or in other locations that are clearly visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant is proposing to relocate existing exterior-mounted electrical cables/wires/outlets and plumbing pipes to inside the walls of the primary structure. The utilities in question are located at the south east corner of the structure, which in view of the public right-of-way. The proposal to relocate them so they are out of the public right-of-way is consistent with the Guidelines.

o. The applicant is proposing to remove existing light fixtures in the rear and front of the house, and replace them with new fixtures that would be more appropriate in design. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 5.B.ii and iii, replace missing or severely damaged historic light fixtures in kind or with fixtures that match the original in appearance and materials when in-kind replacement is not feasible. Fit replacement fixtures to the existing mounting location. New light fixtures and those not historically present should be placed in locations that do not distract from the façade of the building while directing light where needed. Two of the three proposed removals are located at the rear of the structure and appear to be non-historic in nature, and the third fixture is located on the front porch. Replacing the two rear fixtures is consistent with the Guidelines. The fixture on the front porch appears to be an appropriate style for the house. Staff finds that removing this fixture is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 5.A.i.

p. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii, historic alignment, configuration, and width of sidewalks and walkways should be followed. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing front yard concrete walkway and steps, both of which are not only contributing to this structure itself, but also are consistent with the pattern found throughout the district. The proposal to remove the front concrete walkway and steps is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of items #1-9 based on findings a-o with the following stipulations:

Item #4 – that the front metal columns of the porch remain unwrapped, and that the applicant consider alternative options more appropriate to the architectural style of the house. In this case, Folk Victorian.

Item #6 – that the material of the front yard fence be more transparent. Wrought iron or a picket fence is an appropriate choice.

Item #9 – that the front porch light fixture not be removed, as it appears to be of an older style.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #10 based on finding p.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve as submitted. Applicant has provided staff with alternative front fencing and front porch column choices in order to comply with staff's stipulations, and staff has reviewed these options. The applicant has approval to install a wooden picket fence in the front yard that may not exceed a maximum height of 4-feet. The applicant has approval to replace the existing metal front porch columns with white, round pillars with flat column caps.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2015-498

Applicant: Daniel Paley – A Frame Properties, LLC

Address: 1522 W. Lynwood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 15 existing wood windows with vinyl windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 1522 W Lynwood currently features the original wood windows. The applicant has proposed to replace each of these existing, fifteen, original wood windows with vinyl windows.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., historic windows should be preserved, non-historic, incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building and new windows should match the historic windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail when the original windows

December 16, 2015

8

are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff made a site visit on December 3, 2015, and found that the all of the existing wood windows are repairable.

c. Staff finds that the repair of the original wood windows is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations

Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of any existing windows based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant submit an application to repair all existing wood windows, which can be approved administratively.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to deny the applicants request for window replacement based on finding b.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2015-475

Applicant: Santiago Leija – Leija Roofing

Address: 306 Donaldson Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof on the structure located at 306 Donaldson Ave.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, shingle roof on the structure at 306 Donaldson with a new, standing seam metal roof. The structure at 306 Donaldson is a two story brick structure with Italianate characteristics constructed circa 1930 in the Monticello Park Historic District.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs are to be used on structures that historically had metal roofs or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a standing seam metal roof is not appropriate for a structure with Italianate architectural features. Staff recommends that the applicant match the existing roofing material.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant replace the existing roof with in kind materials.

Applicant was not present.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset to January 6, 2016 so that the applicant may be present.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2015-500

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 509 Madison St.

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Building Standards Board (BSB) for the demolition of the rear accessory structure at 509 Madison. The City's Code Enforcement Division has determined that the rear accessory structure at this address has deteriorated beyond repair and is recommending demolition of the structure per Chapter 6-156, subsections 1, 2, 12, 15, 17 and 18.

FINDINGS:

a. The rear accessory structure at 509 Madison is found on the 1951 Sanborn maps and was likely constructed between 1935 and 1951. The King William Historic District features many properties with accessory structure including carriage houses, servant quarters and small detached garages. Many of these accessory structures feature significant architectural features that are contributing to the district.

b. The rear accessory structure at 509 Madison does not feature significant architectural features and has significant structural damage to the roof and siding. Staff finds that this rear accessory structure is not contributing and recommends demolition. Staff recommends demolition of the rear accessory structure at 509 Madison.

Roy Pachecano stated he would be willing to assist the owner.

Alicia Valdez, Code Compliance Officer, presented her report to the board.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve demolition of the rear accessory structure at 509 Madison St.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of Meeting Minutes – December 16, 2015

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve December 4, 2015 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Brittain, Feldman, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:48 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

