

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
July 6, 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, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube

ABSENT: Connor, Brittain, Salmon

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - Vincent Michael- Executive Director of the San Antonio Conservation Society
 - OHP Meet & Greet- Saturday, July 16, 2016 – 9AM- 11:00AM-1901 S Alamo
 - Historic Homeowner Fair- August 27, 2016- 9:30 AM – 3 PM Pearl Stable- 307 Pearl Pkwy
- Citizens to be heard
 - Liz Franklin spoke in support of OHP Staff

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-D04 | 211 S Flores |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2015-245 | 803 S St Marys |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2016-232 | 1407 S St Marys |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-200 | 350 Hoefgen Ave/Amtrak |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-207 | 414 Atlanta Ave |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-219 | 622 S Flores St |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-218 | 127 E Mulberry Ave |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-217 | 117 E French Place |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-214 | 200 W Jones Ave |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2016-210 | 317 Lamar St |
| • Item #11 Case No. 2016-204 | 136 E Grayson St |
| • Item #12 Case No. 2016-097 | 3700 N St Marys, Brackenridge Park |
| • Item #13 Case No. 2016-144 | 3100 Roosevelt Ave |
| • Item #14 Case No. 2016-201 | 722 S St Marys |
| • Item #15 Case No. 2016-211 | 529 Mason St |
| • Item #16 Case No. 2016-202 | 800 E Guenther St |
| • Item #17 Case No. 2016-235 | 3503 Martin Luther King Dr/MLK Park |
| • Item #18 Case No. 2016-238 | 315 W Lynwood |
| • Item #19 Case No. 2016-239 | 3903 N St Marys |
| • Item #20 Case No. 2016-251 | 9800 Airport Blvd |
| • Item #21 Case No 2016-154 | 211 Devine St |
| • Item #27 Case No 2016-242 | 425 Soledad St |
| • Item #37 Case No 2016-236 | San Pedro Creek |

Item #3, was pulled from consent by Commissioner Garza.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

July 6, 2016

3. HDRC NO. 2016-232

Applicant: Ryan Reed/French & Michigan

Address: 1407 S ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform exterior modifications to the structure at 1407 S St Mary's including the installation of a new storefront system, the addition of a steel canopy, landscaping and the introduction of a green wall. Neither signage nor a mural is part of this request.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 1407 S St Mary's is a 1960's commercial structure featuring a façade consisting of stone veneer with little minor penetrations. The applicant has proposed to modify the east facing façade by incorporating a storefront window system and a new green wall to feature climbing vegetation. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new façade elements that alter or destroy the historic character of a structure should not be introduced. Staff performed a site visit on June 22, 2016, and found that the applicant's proposed materials would not negatively impact the structure nor negatively impact the existing streetscape.

b. The applicant has proposed to install four 6' x 5' aluminum storefront windows, a trellis constructed of 3" round steel with a corrugated steel roof, four (4) corten planters will replace two parking spaces between the front (east) façade and the public right of way and 3" x 4" steel angles and hog wire mesh to provide a climbing surface for the proposed green wall ivy. Given the existing materials in use on this structure and its location on S St Mary's in close proximity with other structures with various metal materials featured on their façade, staff finds this request appropriate. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed green wall is an appropriate solution to improving the existing façade which lacks openings and depth providing features

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Cone refer this case to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine , Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2016-228

Applicant: Alex Schafer

Address: 924 DAWSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to restore the front porch of the historic structure at 924 Dawson.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 924 Dawson features a front gable roof, a front gable porch roof, simple craftsman style elements and appears on the 1951 San Born Maps. The current front façade features many modifications that are inappropriate including the enclosure of the original front porch as well as modifications to window and door openings. The applicant has proposed to restore the front porch to its original architectural form. A number of rehabilitative items have been approved administratively by staff including the installation of a new roof, the restoration of the original wood windows, the restoration or porch siding, painting and the construction of a rear addition of less than 200 square feet. Staff performed a site visit on June 22, 2016, and found that many of the structure's original elements have been removed or heavily modified.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 7.B.v., porches should be reconstructed

July 6, 2016

based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. A photograph of the structure from October 2007 shows the original front porch, original window openings and both original front doors.

c. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front porch to include its original height, width and depth, based on photographs and examples of neighboring historic structures which feature similar architectural elements. The applicant has proposed to retain the front porch extension past the front façade of approximately two (2) feet. Staff finds this extension to be architecturally appropriate.

d. In regards to architectural elements, the applicant has proposed front porch railings to space the width of the porch minus the width of the front porch steps. Historically, this porch would not have featured front porch railings, however, the applicant has proposed square railings that a minimal in size that lack ornamentation. Staff finds this request appropriate.

e. The applicant has proposed three front porch columns that are to feature bases of approximately 9 inches in width, mid sections of 6 inches in width and capitals of 6 inches in width featuring craftsman ornamentation. The applicant's proposal of three columns on the front façade is inappropriate; two columns are architecturally appropriate. The applicant's proposal of ornate craftsman capitals is also inappropriate. Staff finds that the applicant should install the proposed columns at the corners of the porch without the ornate capitals.

f. Historic houses in San Antonio often feature a vernacular entrance and ventilation system comprised of two front doors; one facing the street and one facing the side yard. The applicant has proposed to reintroduce the front porch door facing the side yard, but no the door facing the street. Staff finds this inappropriate and recommends the applicant install both doors. The door which faces the street should be reinstalled at its original location, centered on the front porch steps.

g. The applicant has proposed to install two windows beneath the front porch overhang. One window spaced evenly between the end of the porch and the street facing front door, which is to be centered on the front porch steps, is appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install the window in this manner. This window should be inset within the wall at least two (2) inches or at a depth that is consistent with all other windows.

h. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing concrete porch steps and install new front porch steps that are code compliant. Staff finds this request appropriate; however, the applicant is to maintain the existing width of the front porch steps.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That the applicant eliminate the craftsman ornamentation from the porch columns and eliminate the proposed middle column as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant reintroduce the street facing front door that is to be centered on the front porch steps as noted in finding f.
- iii. That the applicant reintroduce a front window that is appropriately spaced between the end of the porch and the reintroduced street facing front door as noted in finding g.
- iv. That the applicant pour new front porch steps that maintain the width of the original front porch steps as noted in finding h.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Lazarine, Laffoon, Garza, Cone, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2016-243

Applicant: David Merritt/Merritt Development Group

Address: 114 SOLEDAD

July 6, 2016

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to demolish the structure at 114 Soledad Street, commonly known as the Solo Serve Building, with the exception of the stone retaining wall and construct a new hotel to feature a total of nine levels, including the Riverwalk level. The stone retaining wall on the river side constructed circa 1914 is to be incorporated into the design of the new construction.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to demolish the structure at 114 Soledad Street, commonly known as the Solo Serve building and construct a hotel featuring nine total levels including street level retail space and Riverwalk level restaurant space.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 20, 2016, where committee members recommended reducing the number of penetrations in historic walls and recommended the use of brick on the Soledad street façade. Staff performed a site visit on June 22, 2016.

c. DEMOLITION – 114 Soledad, commonly known as the Solo Serve building was constructed circa 1920 and is a local historic landmark. Staff from the Office of Historic preservation as well as Design Review Committee Members have visited the site numerous times throughout the past 10 years and have found the structure to have lost significance and its demolition and replacement with a new structure to be appropriate.

d. DEMOLITION – A site visit was made by the Designation and Demolition Committee most recently in January 2015, with attendance by Office of Historic Preservation Staff.

e. DEMOLITION – A detailed demolition plan with a proposal for salvaging will be required before a Certificate of Appropriateness may be issued. While the applicant has indicated that the historic stone retaining wall along the River Walk will be retained, the extent of the demolition of the Solo Serve building and its adjoining stone wall remains unclear. Any historic construction materials, such as the stone foundation elements which are likely remnants of the original Bexar County Courthouse, should be salvaged and stored on site for future integration into the development.

f. DEMOLITION – In regards to the documentation of the demolition of any historic landmark, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-614 prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

g. DEMOLITION – The applicant has proposed to demolish the Solo Serve structure itself located at 114 Soledad, however at this time has not provided a specific use to the northern portion of the lot that will not feature new construction. The UDC Section 35-672(b)(2) prohibits the lot from having a primary use of parking. Staff encourages the applicant to submit additional details regarding the future treatment of this area and a projected timeline for development for consideration by the HDRC.

h. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan that notes public access ways across the site from Soledad Street to the Riverwalk. Additionally, the applicant has connected the various functions of the site in a coordinated system. This is consistent with the UDC.

i. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – The UDC Section 25-672(a)(5) addresses pedestrian access along the Riverwalk pathway and how it shall not be blocked by queuing, hostess stations and tables and chairs. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

j. VIEWS – The section of the Riverwalk currently features somewhat of a canyon effect given the location of multi-height structures along the river on both the east and west sides. The applicant has proposed to setback the structures massing and has incorporated setbacks and offsets within the structure's façade. Staff finds the applicant's proposed massing appropriate and sensitive to the historic Riverwalk features. Additionally, the applicant's proposed setbacks preserve existing views of the river north of the site from various vantage points south of the proposed new construction.

k. SOLAR ACCESS – The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study noting the proposed development's shadow on the San Antonio River for both the summer and winter solstices. The applicant's study has noted that the proposed development is consistent with the UDC in regards to solar access to the river.

l. SITE DESIGN – 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. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate and consistent with the UDC in regards to providing clearly

July 6, 2016

defined pedestrian access points, activity nodes that will not only activate the site, but also the public right of way.

m. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(e) regarding landscape design, a variety in landscape design must be provided with no more than seventy-five (75) percent of the landscape materials, including plants being the same as those on adjacent properties. Additionally, according to the UDC Section 35-674(f), indigenous, non-invasive plant species and tropical plant species are permitted. The applicant has noted all landscaping location and has noted that native plant materials will be used. This is consistent with the UDC. The applicant will need to provide a final, detailed landscaping plan when requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness.

n. **PAVING MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted a stone patio adjacent to the public right of way at the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(g), a separate paving materials that is clearly distinguishable from the adjacent patio paving materials is to be used. The applicant is responsible for complying with the requirement.

o. **STREET FURNISHINGS** – Street furnishings adjacent to the Riverwalk are to be constructed of high quality materials that are complementary to the tradition and craftsmanship of the Riverwalk. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673 (i) in regards to street furnishings. Any and all proposed changes to River Walk landscape adjacent to property must be coordinated with and approved by Center City Development & Operations Dept., and any proposed use of River Walk public property (including placement of tables & chairs) must be approved by Center City Development & Operations Department.

p. **LIGHTING DESIGN** – 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. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. This applicant is to provide a lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

q. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

r. **BUILDING SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a "human scale". To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed many human scaled elements at the river and street levels including materials with human scaled proportions, human scaled floor heights and human scaled façade penetrations. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to incorporate balconies and other façade elements that on an individual level maintains a human scale. This is consistent with the UDC.

s. **BUILDING MASSING** – As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed various setbacks in massing to prevent a dominating effect on the Riverwalk. The applicant has proposed tower massing on approximately half of the proposed Riverwalk frontage of the site. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and commends the applicant for reducing the overall impact of new construction on the Riverwalk.

t. **BUILDING HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. 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. This site is in close proximity with various structures of significant height including Riverview Towers, the Holiday Inn San Antonio Riverwalk and the Courtyard San Antonio Riverwalk. Staff finds the applicant's proposed height appropriate.

u. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, 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 has proposed materials to include hand trowelled stucco, brick, stone banding, Texas limestone, terra cotta rille roofing and aluminum windows.

v. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to

July 6, 2016

this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed modulating features throughout, however, staff finds the applicant should provide information addressing the lack of façade separation and fenestration on the western portions of the north and south façades.

w. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – The applicant has provided information regarding the façade composition of each façade, however, as mentioned in finding v, the applicant should introduce additional façade elements including fenestration to the western portion of the north and south facades.

x. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – The UDC Section 35-674(e) states that building should feature three distinctive segments: a base, midsection and cap. The applicant has consistently separated the proposed new construction's facades to include these three sections. To accomplish this, the applicant has incorporated both massing elements and changes in materials. This is consistent with the UDC. In regards to the proposed roof cap, staff recommends the applicant study additional forms and materials outside of the proposed terra cotta roof tile.

y. **WINDOWS** – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. The applicant has proposed fenestration patterns that promote the existence of a human scale as well as relate to the uses of spaces behind them. This is consistent with the UDC. The applicant should ensure that all windows are inset within walls at least two to three inches.

z. **STONE WALL** – There currently exists a stone retaining wall at the Riverwalk level which the applicant has proposed to incorporate into the new construction. The applicant has proposed to modify the existing wall to include both square and arched openings that are to serve as a buffer between public and private space. Staff finds the applicant's proposed use of the existing stone appropriate and a contemporary interpretation of a fundamental architectural elements which utilizes historic materials. The applicant has incorporated proportions and dimensions into the proposed wall that are consistent with WPA and Hugman features. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant should provide information regarding the reuse of existing masonry materials currently located within alley ways.

aa. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project area is within the Main and Military Plazas National Register of Historic Places District. In addition, the site is known to be along the route of Ben Milam's march from the Molina Blanco to Main Plaza in 1835 during the Siege of Bexar. Also, the property abuts the San Antonio River, an area known to contain archaeological evidence of over 12,000 years of prehistory and history. Therefore, an archaeological investigation is required prior to any ground disturbing construction activities

RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

i. That the applicant submit additional details regarding the future treatment of the portion of the site that will not feature this proposed new construction and a projected timeline for development for consideration by the HDRC.

ii. That the applicant provide an updated landscaping plan noting all proposed landscaping and plant materials as well as site lighting prior to returning to the HDRC.

iii. That the applicant provides information on the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.

iv. That the applicant address the lack of fenestration on the western portion of the north and south facades.

v. That the applicant ensure that each window is inset at least two to three inches within walls.

vi. An archaeological investigation is required.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Fidel Two Bears Castillo, Dan Arellano, Rhett "White Feather" Smith, Banks M. Smith, Rodney Kidd, all spoke in opposition of the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garza to Conceptual Approve with staff stipulations. Applicant must go back to DRC before final approval.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Garza, Cone, Grube

NAYS: None

July 6, 2016

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2016-229

Applicant: Hayes Hinkle/JRK Design, Inc

Address: 100 N Main

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a hotel tower with a commercial component to be approximately 225 feet in height on the vacant lot at 100 N Main.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a hotel tower with a commercial component to be approximately 225 feet in height on the vacant lot at 100 N Main at the corner of N Main and E Commerce, immediately north of Main Plaza. While this lot is vacant, it remains zoned as a landmark property.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 7, 2016, where comments from the committee focused on the use of materials, landscaping elements and façade fenestration. Staff performed a site visit on June 22, 2016.

c. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed to integrate the proposed new construction into the existing sidewalks at the public right of way on both N Main and E Commerce. This is consistent with the UDC.

d. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – The UDC Section 25-672(a)(5) addresses pedestrian access along the Riverwalk pathway and how it shall not be blocked by queuing, hostess stations and tables and chairs. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

e. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – The applicant has noted that there will be parking for approximately 10 vehicles on the street level for valet purposes. The UDC Section 35-673 (1) notes that curb cuts are not to exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

f. VIEWS – The UDC Section 35-673(c) notes that properties at the terminus of a street are to include an architectural focal point within the proposed design. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a series of overhangs and balconies on the southern façade facing Main Plaza. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

g. SITE DESIGN – 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. Staff finds the applicant's proposed locations of pedestrian access which are located on E Commerce and N Main appropriate. At the street level on E Commerce, the applicant has proposed to locate outdoor dining and patio space. This is consistent with the UDC.

h. LANDSCAPE DESIGN – The UDC Section 35-673(e) provides information regarding landscape design. While the applicant will not have much ground level square footage to landscape, staff finds that information regarding paving materials and any plant materials that will be visible from the public right of way should be submitted to staff prior to returning to the HDRC.

i. STREET FURNISHINGS – Street furnishings adjacent to the Riverwalk are to be constructed of high quality materials that are complementary to the tradition and craftsmanship of the Riverwalk. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673 (i) in regards to street furnishings.

j. LIGHTING DESIGN – 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. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. This applicant is to provide a lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

k. MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and

July 6, 2016

mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

l. **BUILDING SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed human scaled elements that include balconies, individually scaled curtain wall systems and sun shade systems on each level on the south and southwestern facades. Staff finds these proposals consistent with the UDC.

m. **BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. 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. This site is immediately adjacent to multiple structures that feature additional height including Riverview Towers and the Frost Bank Tower. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed massing and height appropriate.

n. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, 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 has noted that the proposed tower will include glass curtain wall systems and glazing, but has not noted other façade materials. The applicant should provide this information prior to returning to the HDRC.

o. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed a base primary consisting of a glass curtain wall system extending from floor to floor, a mid-section featuring window openings arranged for individual room uses and a cap of a curtain wall system with a small portion of added massing. This is consistent with the UDC.

p. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – The proposed new construction features a portion of its each façade that at its closest point in contact with Riverview Towers features no fenestration. As Riverview Towers steps back, the proposed new construction features fenestration. Staff finds this proposed façade arrangement appropriate given its proximity to another structure.

q. **WINDOWS** – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. For window openings that are not included within a curtain wall system, an inset of at least two to three inches within each wall is required. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Fidel Two Bears Castillo & Tom Thompson spoke in opposition of the applicants request.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide a complete landscaping plan noting all paving and plant materials.
- ii. That the applicant provide information regarding proposed façade materials.
- iii. That the applicant inset each window into walls at least two to three inches.
- iv. That the applicant provide information regarding the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT. Applicant will meet with the DRC.

July 6, 2016

28. HDRC NO. 2016-253

Applicant: Nick Ali/Texas Signs, Inc

Address: 2001 FREDERICKSBURG RD, SUITE 102

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 50 square foot LED illuminated channel letters on back plate at 2001 Fredericksburg Road, Suite 102.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is proposing signage on the building located at 2001 Fredericksburg Rd, which is a multi-tenant building. The building holds two tenants. At the time of this proposal, only one space will have signage. There is no master signage plan.
- b. The applicant is proposing to install one 50 square foot LED illuminated channel letters on back plate for Suite 102. The channel letters will have a 4" return, acrylic face, and aluminum back plate. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.A., each building is allowed one major sign, and two minor signs totaling 50 square feet. Staff finds the signage area not consistent with the Guidelines, as this is a sign for one of two tenants. Staff recommends the signage area be reduced.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.C., signs should be placed where historically located and oriented toward the pedestrian. Staff finds the proposed placement consistent with the Guidelines as signage is placed over the storefront.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.D., materials should be durable, and synthetic materials should not be used. Staff finds the proposed acrylic face channel letters not consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.D., letter styles and sizes should complement the building. Staff finds the font simple and does not distract from the building, therefore consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.E., internal illumination should not be used. Staff recommends that the applicant use reverse channel letters.
- g. Staff visited the site June 21, 2016, and found that small building is on a small lot, covered in parking.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial based on findings a through f. Staff recommends that the applicant use a non-synthetic material, the letters be reverse channel letters, and the size be reduced.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Cone to make the signage 45 square feet rather than 50 with the stipulation that the applicant will not put any extra signage up, along with staff stipulations of reverse channel letters.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2016-230

Applicant: Daniel Northcutt

Address: 1150 S ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 40 square feet of signage, including eight signs at 1150 S Alamo. This signage request includes:

July 6, 2016

1. One added 6' x 1.5' (9 square feet) graphic to existing front awning
2. One added 1.5' x 1.5' (2.25 square feet) graphic to existing side awning
3. Four added 2' x 6" (4 square feet) vinyl decals on four front windows
4. One wooden 5.5' x 4' (22 square feet) freestanding signage, 11 feet tall, in existing frame
5. One painted 4' x 9" (3 square feet) wood sign over the front door

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is proposing signage at 1150 S Alamo, known as the historic Alamo Methodist Church, converted to a commercial use. The building was built circa 1915.
- b. Currently, no permanent signage exists except for a 11' tall freestanding metal frame with external lighting. The applicant received approval to temporarily hang two banners.
- c. The applicant is proposing to install eight (8) signs, totaling approximately 40 square feet of signage. According to the Guidelines for Signage 1.A., each building is allowed one major sign, and two minor signs totaling 50 square feet. Staff finds the signage area consistent with the Guidelines, but finds the number of signs not consistent.
- d. The applicant is proposing to install a 9 square foot graphic to existing front awning and a 2.25 square foot graphic to existing side awning. Staff finds the added awning signage consistent with the Guidelines for Signage, as the signs relate to the pedestrian scale and the signage area is within the allowable square footage.
- e. The applicant is proposing four vinyl window decals to be 1 square foot each to be mounted in the four window fronts along S Alamo St. According to the Guidelines for Signage 5, window signs should be located on the first floor, in high traffic pedestrian areas, and do not cover more than 30% of the window area. Staff finds these additional minor signs consistent in coverage and location and would not be highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- f. The applicant is proposing to install a wooden sign, 5.5' x 4' signage area in an existing freestanding frame standing 11' tall on a 2.3' retaining wall. Including the retaining wall, the signage stands 13.3' tall. According to the Guidelines for Signage, signs should be proportionated to building scale, oriented toward the sidewalk to maintain pedestrian oriented nature of the historic district, made of an appropriate material, and use a dark background with light lettering to make signs more legible. Staff finds the material and location of this sign consistent with the Guidelines, but finds the color inappropriate. Staff recommends that the applicant consider a dark background with light letters instead of a white background.
- g. The applicant is proposing one painted 4' x 9" (3 square feet) wood sign over the front door. Staff finds this additional sign repetitive and not consistent with the Guidelines for Signage. Staff recommends that if the applicant would like signage in that location, that the applicant consider a window decal of similar design and size of the other decals to be placed.
- h. Staff visited the site June 21, 2016, and found that the retaining wall 2.3' tall and creates a distinct difference between the street level and the patio at 1150 S Alamo.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on finding a through f with the stipulation that the applicant alter the color scheme to include a dark background and light letters, and submit the details to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff recommends denial of item #5 based on finding g. Staff recommends that the applicant consider a window decal of similar design and size of the other window decals to be placed.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Cherise Bell- spoke in support

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve requests 1, 2, 3 as submitted & that applicant must return for approval of request 4.

*Applicant withdrew request 5 during his HDRC hearing

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

July 6, 2016

30. HDRC NO. 2016-192

Applicant: David Ericsson

Address: 625 BURLESON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story single family structure with a detached accessory structure at 625 Burleson.

FINDINGS:

a. This case was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 1, 2016, where the applicant received conceptual approval with the following stipulations: that the applicant provide staff an updated site plan noting setbacks that are consistent with the predominant historic example on N Pine, that the applicant provide staff an updated front porch design that includes additional depth and massing as noted in finding d as well as address the arrangement of the porch in relationship to the second level windows, that the applicant provide staff with a sample of the proposed metal siding, that the applicant provide specifications and a wall section noting the proposed framing for the proposed windows, that the applicant provide specifications for the proposed garage door, that the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan noting the width of the proposed sidewalk, driveway and all landscaping materials and that the applicant provide additional information in regards to the proposed fence including an appropriate height.

b. Staff performed a site visit on June 21, 2016, and found that the proposed structure's massing will be appropriate and consistent with other structures in the vicinity.

c. **SETBACKS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new buildings should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. If no consistent setback has been established, the median setback of all buildings should be used. The applicant has proposed to align the setback of the proposed porch with the setbacks of other historic structures on N Pine. Staff finds this setback appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines and historic example on N Pine.

d. **ORIENTATION** – The front façade of new construction should be oriented in a manner that is consistent with the historic example of the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the front façade of the structure toward N Pine. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.ii.

e. **FRONT PORCH** -Many historic structures feature a front porch that is recessed within the plan producing a front façade that features depth. The applicant has proposed a front porch with little depth that features only a porch overhang and a stoop. Since conceptual review, the applicant has increased the depth of the front porch which has promoted a consistent setback, however, staff has concerns about the overall lack of emphasis placed on the front porch.

f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The block predominantly features single story historic structures, however, there are examples of structures featuring either two stories or roof designs that present height not typical of a one story structure. Staff finds the applicant's proposed height of two stories at approximately thirty (30) feet appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **TRANSITIONS** – Step downs in building height should be utilized to transition from the height of the proposed new construction to the single story height of the neighboring structure. The applicant has proposed a smaller massing between the highest massing of the house and the neighboring structures. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a modified roof plane to facilitate this transition. This is Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii.

h. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a front gable similar to the historic structures on the site. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a shed roof on the north elevation. Staff finds both of these proposed roof forms appropriate.

j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that complementary

July 6, 2016

of the openings found on historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i.

k. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

l. MATERIALS – In regards to materials, the applicant has proposed board and batten siding, composite siding, aluminum windows, cedar rafters, a standing seam metal roof, stucco skirting, cedar fencing, galvalume corrugated metal siding and an exposed metal flue. Generally, the applicant's materials are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A., however, staff recommends the applicant provide a sample of the proposed galvalume siding to staff as this material is not typical for historic districts. Staff finds this material may be appropriate if properly dimensioned to relate to traditional wood siding.

m. WINDOWS – As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed aluminum windows. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed section noting the framing of the proposed windows as well as information on the proposed windows. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within the walls. The applicant has noted window depths of two (2) inches. Staff finds this installation appropriate.

n. 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. Staff finds that in general the applicant's proposed design is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.

o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed a horizontal element to separate the wall planes between the first and second floor. The trim piece as currently proposed is located at the bottom of the second floor windows. Staff finds the placement of this trim piece inappropriate. Additionally, staff finds the applicant's proposed front porch covering's height inappropriately placed in relationship to the second level windows. The applicant should modify these elements.

p. GARAGE – At the rear (west) of the primary structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a single story accessory structure. In regards to massing and form, building size and character, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. The applicant has proposed a garage door to facilitate vehicular access to and from Burleson.

q. GARAGE – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v., garage doors that are similar in proportions and materials as those found historically in the district should be used. The applicant has proposed a cedar clad garage door. Staff finds this is an appropriate proposal.

r. GARAGE – The Dignowity Hill Historic District features properties with accessory structures in various locations at the rear of the primary historic structure. Many structures are located along both the side and rear property lines. In regards to the proposed accessory structure's orientation and setbacks, the applicant has proposed to locate the proposed accessory structure parallel with the side (north) and rear (west) property lines to include a five (5) foot setback. Staff finds the location appropriate.

s. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted that mechanical equipment will be located to the north of the proposed structure to be screened by a cedar privacy fence. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A.

t. FENCES – Around the perimeter of the property, the applicant has proposed to install a metal fence painted black. The applicant has proposed this fence to be four (4) feet in height in the front and side yard and six (6) foot tall fence in the rear yard. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

u. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has noted on the provided landscaping plan that the driveway width is to be approximately seventeen (17) to twenty (20) feet in width. An appropriate driveway width in a historic district is ten (10) feet in width. Staff recommends the applicant modify the width of the proposed driveway.

v. SIDEWALK – Leading from the public right of way to the front porch, the applicant has proposed a staggered concrete paver sidewalk. Staff finds that a sidewalk that is even on each side and three (3) to three and a half (3.5) feet in width is appropriate. Staff finds that the use of concrete pavers may also be appropriate given their installation is in keeping with the previously mentioned standards

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends final approval based on finding a through u with the following stipulations:

July 6, 2016

- i. That the applicant add additional architectural features to increase the massing of the proposed front porch.
- ii. That the applicant reduce the proposed driveway width to no more than ten (10) feet in width.
- iii. That the applicant propose a sidewalk that is even on each side and three (3) to three and a half (3.5) feet in width.
- iv. That the applicant modify the proposed front porch covering's height in relationship to the second level windows as noted in finding o.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for approval as submitted with stipulation that the drive be broken into two ribbon drives.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2016-248

Applicant: Milton Porterfield

Address: 227 WICKES

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform various landscaping to include the following:

1. Install crushed granite along planting strip and to the right of walkway
2. Regrade and cover with lattice pavers
3. Remove curb along driveway
4. Pour concrete along rear wall

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 227 Wickes is a one-story Folk Victorian. Currently, in the front of the house there is a small lawn, a front concrete walkway and an asphalt driveway on the left side of the lot.
- b. Currently, there is lawn in the area to the right of the front walkway and in the planting strip. The applicant is proposing to install crushed granite in the planting strip and to the right of walkway with no other plantings. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.ii, historic lawns should not be fully removed. Guidelines for Site Elements 3.ii, states that new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible and if used, small plantings should be incorporated. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant plant native xeric plant materials within the crushed granite areas and limit the crushed granite areas to smaller areas.
- c. Currently, there is lawn in the area between the driveway, sidewalk, and front walkway. The applicant is proposing to cover this entire area with lattice pavers and allow grass to grow in between. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3 historic lawns should not be fully removed and new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible. Staff finds the proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines as the pavers are inappropriate and are highly visible.
- d. Along the driveway is a minimal curb. The applicant is proposing to remove the curb and re-grade the lawn to the right. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5, historic curbing should be retained if possible. Staff made a site visit on June 21, 2016, and found that the curbing is not historically found along the block. Staff finds the proposal to remove it consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. Currently, the area in front of the house, to the left of the existing porch, is covered in river rocks. There is an existing small tree in this area that is to be removed. OHP Staff and the City Arborist reviewed the request, and it is not a significant tree that would require a Certificate of Appropriateness to be removed according to the UDC. The City Arborist did note the tree is a 4.5" Desert Willow tree and recommends that they plant a new tree anywhere on the property; per the City Arborist, the new tree shall be a 1.5" caliper native medium to large shade tree from Appendix E of the UDC.

July 6, 2016

f. In this area the applicant is proposing to pour concrete along house to re-grade and allow water to flow away from the structure. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.A.iii., soil should be sloped away from the foundation to avoid moisture collection. Staff requested the applicant submit dimensions of the area to be re-graded with concrete, but has not received them as of June 22, 2016. The applicant also did not indicate that he was withdrawing his application.

g. Staff visited the site June 21, 2016, and found the curbing along the driveway not consistent on the block.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of items #1 and 2 based on findings a through c, and recommends the applicant submit a request to install granite beds, and leave 50% green lawn.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4 based on findings d through g with the stipulation that:

1. The applicant submit dimensions of the area to be re-graded with concrete to staff.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Cone for Approval of items #2 and #3 with stipulations that the hardscaping only include a 3' walkway of pervious material along the existing driveway and the rest remain lawn area.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2016-167

Applicant: Jason Feuge/MDN Architects, Inc

Address: 1441 SE MILITARY DR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval to construct a new commercial structure at 1441 SE Military Drive that will include drive through teller lanes, landscaping, surface parking and exterior lighting.

FINDINGS:

a. Conceptual approval of the proposed massing, materials, setbacks and façade arrangement was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the May 18, 2016, hearing. At that time, staff recommended the applicant address a number of items before returning to the HDRC. These items included: coordination with the World Heritage Director, reduction of proposed curb cuts from five to three, coordination with Transportation and Capital Improvements, the location and screening of mechanical equipment, bicycle parking, information on window installation and materials, information on landscaping, site and architectural lighting, the removal of the eastern ATM and the redesign of the western ATM shelter and to perform an archaeological investigation. The applicant has satisfied the previously mentioned stipulations with the exception of the elimination of the eastern ATM and the reduction of curb cuts from five to three.

b. This case was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 22, 2016, where committee members noted that a total of five curb cuts was excessive. Staff performed a site visit on June 21, 2016.

c. This address falls within the buffer zone of the San Antonio Missions World Heritage sites. The applicant is responsible for complying with all regulations and meeting any design standards associated with the inscription.

d. The applicant has proposed to construct a commercial structure on the vacant lot at 1441 SE Military Drive. The lot is currently bounded by SE Military to the south, Mission Road to the west and Padre Drive to the East and will contain parking for approximately fifty automobiles, drive through teller lanes and vehicular access to and from SE Military, Mission Road and Padre Drive.

e. DESIGN OBJECTIVES – According to the UDC Section 35-670(B)(4)(f), the design objectives for RIO-5 are to maintain the residential character of the area while encouraging the development of mixed use nodes that offer neighborhood shopping and services and to respect established neighborhoods in new top-of-bank riverscape designs, particularly recreational opportunities that require parking or transport of recreational equipment.

f. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall

July 6, 2016

provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan that has noted a way of pedestrian access across the property connecting SE Military Drive to Padre Drive. Additionally, the applicant has proposed sidewalks along SE Military Drive, Mission Road and Padre Drive as well as sidewalks within to site connecting various functions of the site. This is consistent with the UDC.

g. CURB CUTS – The applicant has noted five curb cuts on the provided site plan; three are to serve Padre Drive, one is to serve SE Military Drive and one is to serve Mission Road. Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(B), curb cuts may be no larger than twenty-five (25) feet. Staff noted at conceptual approval that the use of five curb cuts, with three serving Padre Drive was excessive and inconsistent with the UDC and included the stipulation that these curb cuts be removed at the time of approval by the HDRC. The HDRC issued conceptual approval with staff's stipulations. Staff maintains the recommendation that the applicant reduce the amount of proposed curb cuts to three, discarding two of the three proposed curb cuts on Padre Drive.

h. TRAFFIC STUDY – At the time of conceptual approval, staff recommended the applicant coordinate with transportation and capital improvements regarding the proposed new construction's impact on pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular traffic on Padre Drive and Mission Rd. The applicant has noted that the traffic study is incomplete, but is anticipated to be complete by the July 6, HDRC Hearing.

i. PARKING – Regarding onsite parking, surface parking areas are to be located toward the interior of the site or the side or rear of a buildings and shall be screened or buffered from view of public streets and the San Antonio River if they are located within a fifty foot setback from the edge of the river ROW use and within a twenty foot setback from a property line adjacent to street use. The applicant has proposed surface parking adjacent to a street use and has noted a landscape buffer to separate the public right of way and pedestrian paths from surface parking. This is consistent with the UDC.

j. BUILDING ORIENTATION – The UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(A) both state that a building's orientation as well as primary entrance should be toward the street. The site features frontage to SE Military, Mission Road and Padre Drive, however, SE Military is the only of these streets that features a commercial setting. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward SE Military. Staff finds this orientation appropriate.

k. BUFFERING & SCREENING – Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. The applicant has provided building sections noting the location of mechanical equipment on the roof and its screening from the public right of way by parapet walls. This is consistent with the UDC.

l. BICYCLE PARKING – Bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO Districts. The applicant has noted the placement of bicycle racks. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(o) and 35-526.

m. FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT – According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a "human scale" which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed a base of stone veneer, a mid-section featuring a textured stucco façade and a cap featuring parapet walls and cornice lines. This is consistent with the UDC.

n. FAÇADE ARRANGMENT – In RIO-5, where a building façade facing the street or river exceeds that maximum façade length allowed (seventy-five feet), the building façade must be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed various façade elements that separate the proposed facade. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(b)(4)(A).

o. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials of stone veneer, textured stucco, cast stone and earth toned paints. These materials are consistent with the UDC.

p. WINDOWS – According to the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2), windows help provide a human scale and should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, windows should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them and that windows shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the facade and grouped to establish rhythms. The applicant has arranged window openings to establish a rhythm and has inset windows two (2) inches within the façade. The applicant has proposed anodized aluminum storefront windows. This is consistent with the UDC.

q. AWNINGS & CANOPIES – According to the UDC Section 35-674(g), awnings and canopies are to be used to accentuate the character defining features of the building. The applicant has applied the proposed awnings and an arcade to mark entrances to the building. This is consistent with the UDC.

r. ARCHITECTURAL & SITE LIGHTING – The applicant has provided a site plan noting the installation of site

July 6, 2016

lighting throughout the site as well as elevations noting the placement of architectural lighting on each façade. This is consistent with the UDC.

s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided a detailed site plan noting landscaping buffers between the public right of way and all parking locations, parking locations and the proposed new construction and landscaping of the various parking islands on the site. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed landscaping plan appropriate.

t. ATM SHELTERS – At conceptual approval, staff recommended the applicant remove the eastern ATM and shelter and incorporate the colors and materials of the new construction into the proposed western ATM. The applicant has incorporated the colors and materials of the proposed new construction in to the western ATM, however, the eastern ATM has not been eliminated from the proposed scope of work. Staff’s concerns at conceptual approval was that the introduction of the eastern ATM shelter interrupted the landscape buffer and increased the amount of impervious paving on the site. While the applicant has provided more landscaping elements around the eastern ATM, staff finds that the elimination of the additional ATM would facilitate the increase of naturally landscaped areas.

u. ARCHAEOLOGY – The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the Mission Parkway National Register of Historic Places District, the Missions Local Historic District, and is in close proximity to the San Antonio River. In Addition, the project area contains previously recorded archaeological site 41BX279 and is traversed by 41BX267, the San Jose Acequia. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The applicant should coordinate the archaeology scope of work with the OHP archaeology staff prior to the commencement of construction activities. Additionally, development within the River Improvement Overlay Districts contains stipulations regarding the incorporation of acequias into the design of the project. Division 6, Section 35-673, (c)(4) of the Unified Development Code states that “where archeological evidence indicates a site contains or has contained a Spanish colonial acequia, incorporate the original path of the acequia as a natural drainageway or a landscape feature of the site by including it as part of the open space plan, and a feature of the landscape design.”

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That the applicant reduce the amount of proposed curb cuts from five to three, one for each Padre Drive, Mission Road and SE Military Drive as noted in finding g.
- ii. That the applicant remove the eastern ATM from the scope of work.
- iii. Archeological investigations are required.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman for approval with staff stipulations along with a stipulation that the applicant reduce from the 5 curb cuts to 4 curb cuts shown on the plans today & that the ATM will removed from the eastern end of the property.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone , Garza, Feldman, Grube

NAYS: None

RECUSAL: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2016-223

Applicant: David Adelman/AREA Real Estate

Address: 623 Hemisfair Blvd

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 150-unit apartment structure and a 415 space parking garage at 623 Hemisfair Blvd

FINDINGS:

- a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific

July 6, 2016

design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 12, 2016, where comments focused on the proposed materials,

c. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan noting the proposed new construction's connection with the various other pedestrian paths throughout Hemisfair Park. This is consistent with the UDC.

d. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed two (2) curb cuts on Hemisfair Boulevard; one to facilitate automobile access to public parking and one to facilitate automobile access for residents. According to the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(B), curb cuts should not exceed more than twenty-five (25) feet in width. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

e. AUTOMOBILE ACCESS & PARKING – The applicant has proposed a parking structure to accommodate 415 automobiles. Per the UDC Section 36-672(b)(2)(A), parking areas should be located toward the interior of the site. The applicant has proposed to partially wrap the parking structure with residential and commercial units on the north, west and east facades at street level and on the north and west facades above street level. On the east and south facades above the street level, the applicant has proposed to clad the parking garage with screening that is to include vegetative elements. This is consistent with the UDC.

f. ARCHITECTURAL FOCAL POINT – Per the UDC Section 35-672(c), an architectural focal point shall be incorporated into the design of a structure located at a prominent intersection where the street appears to terminate. The applicant has incorporated a tower element based on that of the San Antonio Casino Club Building. This is consistent with the UDC.

g. BUILDING ORIENTATION – The applicant has oriented the structure in a manner that situated the primary pedestrian entrances to the north, oriented toward the great lawn. The applicant has oriented secondary entrances toward additional pedestrian access ways as well as Hemisfair Boulevard. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(b).

h. LANDSCAPE DESIGN – The applicant has noted various small green spaces as well as other unique landscaping elements that will be used as buffers between public access ways and ground level residential porches and stoops. Staff finds these buffer areas appropriate. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(e)(f)(g) in regards to Landscape Design, Plant Materials and Paving Materials.

i. SITE FURNISHINGS – The applicant has noted the inclusion of restaurant space on the ground level of the proposed new construction. The UDC Section 36-673(i) addresses street furnishings and the standards for proper placement and materials. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

j. LIGHTING – The applicant has not specified a distinct lighting scheme at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to Lighting.

k. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), buffering and screening should be used to screen mechanical and service equipment from view from the public right of way. At this time, the applicant has not specified the exact location of all mechanical and service equipment however the applicant should provide a method of buffering and screening any visually obtrusive equipment from the public right of way prior to returning for final approval.

l. BICYCLE PARKING – Bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO Districts. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(o) and 35-526 in regards to bicycle parking.

m. HUMAN SCALE – According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a “human scale” which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed multiple components that achieve this which include projecting balconies, ground level porches and stoops. This is consistent with the UDC.

n. FAÇADE SEPARATION – For proposed new construction in RIO-3 where a façade is longer than thirty (30) feet long, additional steps must be taken to separate the façade. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to be read as four (4) distinct buildings, a contemporary interpretation of historic structures found along the Riverwalk. On each distinctive façade, the applicant has proposed alternating materials and alternating setbacks. This is consistent with the UDC.

July 6, 2016

o. **FAÇADE SEPARATION** – For proposed new construction in the River Improvement Overlay, each façade must be organized into three distinct segments; a base, midsection and cap. The applicant has achieved this through the use of porches, stoops and loggias to create a base, balconies and fenestration to create a mid-section and a series of dormers, canopies, balconies and porches at the roof level to create a cap. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674 (e).

p. **HEIGHT** – The UDC Section 35-674 (c) addressed height issues in the River Improvement Overlay Districts. The applicant has noted the proposed west tower's height of ninety-six (96) feet in height, being the tallest portion of the proposed design. While not immediately adjacent in Hemisfair, there are other structures located in the vicinity of the proposed new construction with comparable height. The applicant's proposed height is consistent with the UDC in regards to allowable height.

q. **HEIGHT** – The proposed new construction is in close proximity to the following historic Hemisfair houses; the Espinoza House and the Koehler House, located to the immediate south of the proposed new construction and the Smith House, located to the immediate north of the proposed new construction. The distance between the Smith House and the proposed new construction is 11' – 7". Staff has concern over the proposed height of ninety-six (96) feet being located in close proximity of a single story historic structure. Staff finds that additional design consideration for the historic structure could potentially remove some of its dwarfing by the proposed new construction. Staff recommends the applicant propose the use complementary materials on the northwest corner of the proposed new construction adjacent to the Smith House and provide information on how the impact will be mitigated.

r. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted a variety of materials that are being studied to be used throughout the proposed new construction. These materials include brick, tile, stucco and decorative metal panels. These materials are appropriate and consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d).

s. **WINDOW FENESTRATION** – In regards to window fenestration, the UDC Section 35-674 (2) states that windows help provide a human scale to a façade and therefore should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, they should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them, they shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and grouped to establish rhythms and that curtain wall systems should be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

t. **SOLAR PANELS** – The applicant has proposed to mount PV panels to the roof of the parking structure which will also provide shading elements for automobiles. The applicant has proposed to screen the view of the PV panels from the south by the proposed metal screening and vegetative elements. Staff finds this appropriate and the screening of the PV panels consistent with the UDC Section 35-673 (m).

u. **ACEQUIA** – The applicant has noted the location of the Acequia Madre de Valero in the provided application documents, however, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding its inclusion into the overall design of the proposed new construction.

v. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The proposed project is occurring within lands owned by the City of San Antonio and is therefore subject to the Antiquities Code of Texas. In addition, the Acequia Madre de Valero (or Acequia del Alamo), a local historic landmark and a National Historic Engineering Landmark is located immediately adjacent to the footprint of the project and also has been determined contributing to a potential Hemisfair Park National Register of Historic Places District. In addition, the project area is within a local historic district. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required prior to any ground disturbing activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through t with the following stipulations which are to be addressed before returning to the HDRC for final approval:

- i. That the applicant provide an updated site plan noting the widths of each curb cut as noted in finding d and the location of bicycle parking as noted in finding l.
- ii. That the applicant provide updated information regarding proposed plant materials as noted in finding h.
- iii. That the applicant provide updated information regarding proposed site furnishings as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the applicant provide information on the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.
- v. That the applicant provide information in regards to site and architectural lighting as noted in finding j.
- vi. That the applicant provide information on how the impact of the new construction's dwarfing of the Smith House will be mitigated.

July 6, 2016

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Ronald Rocha, Maria Torres & Fidel Two Bears Castillo spoke in opposition of the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone ,Garza, Feldman, Grube

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

32. HDRC NO. 2016-227

Applicant: Ignacio Salas-Humara

Address: 319 BARRERA

REQUEST:

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

1. Apply a new mortar color to the existing, non-original stone.
2. Remove the existing wrought iron elements of the primary historic structure including the railing, columns and security bars.
3. Remove the existing vinyl siding and install cedar, board and batten and corrugated medal siding.
4. Install new 6x6 cedar columns.
5. Perform exterior modifications to the existing porch including the separation of the porch roof from the side gable roof and the removal of the existing, non-original porch tiles.
6. Install a new 23 gauge corrugated corten roof.
7. Construct a rear addition of approximately 100 square feet.
8. Perform exterior modification and construct a second level addition to the rear, non-original accessory structure.
9. Perform modifications to the existing carport structure.
10. Install a new, crushed granite driveway.
11. Install a new front yard fence to replace the existing chain link fence.
12. Xeriscape the front yard.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure located at 319 Barrera was constructed circa 1890 and features a side gable roof similar to many of the other historic structures in the 300 block of Barrera. The structure currently bears many modifications including a non-historic stone front façade, vinyl siding, a red standing seam metal roof, wrought iron porch railings and columns, non-original porch tile, aluminum windows and a series of small additions at the rear. The property also features a non-original accessory structure and a car porch which spans the entire width of the driveway from the front façade of the primary historic structure to the rear accessory structure.

b. Staff performed a site visit in February 2016, as well as on June 22, 2016, and found that the introduction of a an accessory structure featuring multiple floors is not in keeping the with historic context of Lavaca.

c. **FAÇADE MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing stone façade and apply a new mortar color over the existing stone. Staff finds that the existing stone façade provides a false sense of history. Staff recommends the applicant study remove the existing stone and installing an appropriate siding material.

d. **FAÇADE MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing vinyl siding that currently exists on the west, north and east facades and install painted board and batten siding, medal siding and stained cedar siding in various combinations on the primary historic structure. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.A.ii., in kind materials or materials similar in size, scale and character with the historic structure should be used as replacement items. Staff finds that horizontally oriented wood siding comparable to the wood siding found on historic structures throughout the district is appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install horizontally oriented wood siding on each façade that shares exposures comparable to neighboring historic structures.

July 6, 2016

e. **PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing wrought iron railings, security bars, floor tile and columns currently existing on the front façade. The applicant has proposed to install cedar 6x6 columns to replace the existing wrought iron columns. The removal of the existing wrought iron elements and floor tile are appropriate, however, the applicant's proposal of a simple square column is not appropriate for a Folk Victorian style house. Staff recommends the applicant propose a column design that is architecturally appropriate.

f. **PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to reconfigure the roof of the front porch roof to be complete separate from that of the side gable; this would result in a side gable with a front shed. The separation of those two roof forms is appropriate, however, the front facing roof form should feature a pyramidal or tapered hipped form, similar to the roof forms found at 315 Barrera, 305 Barrera and 301 Barrera. Staff recommends the applicant incorporate a similar, architecturally appropriate roof form into the proposed design at 315 Barrera.

g. **ROOF MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, red standing seam metal roof with a 24 gauge corten roof. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs should be used on houses that historically featured a metal roof. Additionally, metal roofs should follow the following standards; panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width should be used, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height should be used, that a crimped ridge seam that's historically appropriate be used, that a low profile ridge cap be used and that a galvalume finish be used; manufacturer's colors are not recommended. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **ADDITION – PRIMARY** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition of approximately 100 square feet to include a similar roof height and roof form as the primary historic structure. Staff finds the applicant's proposed footprint and location, at the rear of the primary historic structure appropriate.

i. **ADDITION – ACCESSORY** – At the rear of the primary historic structure on the east side of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct a second story addition to the existing accessory structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A., additions should be designed in keeping with the historic context of the block. Additionally, according to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B., additions should be subordinate to the principle facade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass. The applicant has proposed a two story metal clad accessory structure to the rear (east) of a single story historic structure. Staff finds the applicant's proposal inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.

j. **ADDITION – ACCESSORY** – In regards to height, additions should be consistent in height with the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed an overall height of 21' – 6" with an additional 10' of trellis structure for the accessory structure's addition. The overall height of the primary historic structure is approximately fifteen (15) feet in height. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

k. **ADDITION – ACCESSORY** – In regards to materials, the applicant has proposed materials which include solid, corrugated and perforated corten siding, a metal canopy and a metal trellis structure. Staff finds that these materials may be appropriate is properly dimensioned to complement the traditional siding dimensions found throughout the Lavaca Historic District. Staff finds that the applicant should include windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document.

l. **ADDITION – ACCESSORY** – Architecturally, the applicant has proposed an addition to the existing accessory structure that provides little façade separation and does not provide a clear contemporary interpretation to relate it to the primary historic structure on the lot or other structures located in the Lavaca Historic District. Staff finds that modified roof forms, such as a shed roof or partial hipped roof or a partial split level plan featuring a shed roof with a similar profile as the street facing slope of the historic structure's side gable roof may not only reduce the massing of the proposed structure, but also provide an appropriate contemporary interpretation.

m. **CARPORT** – Currently, a lean-to type carport structure existing on the property that spans from the front façade of the primary historic structure to the front façade of the rear accessory structure. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the carport in its current location with cedar posts, wood decking and a roof deck. Staff finds that if the current carport is to be modified, it should be reduced in size to be subordinate to the primary historic structure as noted in the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. Staff finds the applicant's current proposal inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.

n. **DRIVEWAY** - The applicant has proposed to remove the existing concrete driveway and install a crushed granite driveway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A., driveways in historic districts should be no wider than ten (10) feet in width. Staff finds that the replacement of the non-original concrete driveway may be appropriate given that the applicant proposes a driveway no wider than ten (10) feet in width.

o. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing side yard chain link fence with a new perforated corten fence and gate. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.v., new fences should be constructed of

July 6, 2016

materials found historically throughout the district. Staff finds that a corten fence is not appropriate, however, a contemporary interpretation of a wrought iron fence may be appropriate.

p. XERISCAPING – The applicant has proposed to remove all existing lawn area and replace with xeriscape elements. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.ii., no more than fifty (50) percent of the historic lawn area should be removed. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guideline

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the requested items. Staff recommends the applicant address the inconsistencies with the Historic Design Guidelines before returning to the HDRC.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Susan Beavin- spoke in opposition of the applicants request

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube to refer to the DRC with the request of a 3D rendering and a bird's eye view.

33. HDRC NO. 2016-199

Applicant: William Triplett/H.E.B.

Address: 327 W CRAIG PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to do the following work on the Carriage house located in the rear of 327 W Craig Place:

1. Replace 2 existing wood windows on exiting dormers with wood windows
2. Alter 4 existing window openings
3. Install a triple wood window on the east façade
4. Install a wood one over one window on the south facade
5. Replace existing non-historic door on south facade
6. Demolish existing addition
7. Install a concrete slope to be ADA compliant and concrete walkway
8. Replace existing siding with board and batten fiber cement board
9. Repair woodwork with wood composite or fiber cement board

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 327 W Craig Place is a one-story Folk Victorian built circa 1902 in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is proposing to work on the Carriage House at this address. No work is being requested on the main structure. The Carriage House is a one-story structure, with a hipped roof, a standing seam metal roof, two gables and board and batten siding. The structure appears on the August 1935 Sanborn map without the shed addition. The Carriage House is identified in the 1998 Survey as contributing, built circa 1920.

b. The applicant recently received administrative approval to remove existing privacy fence around accessory structure, paint carriage house, repair foundation of carriage house, replace existing standing seam metal with new standing seam metal, replace existing skirting and repair and replace the gutters.

c. Currently, there are 9 wood windows, 2 on the two existing dormers and 7 one over ones. Two of the seven are on the addition that the applicant is proposing to demolish. The applicant is proposing to replace 2 windows with the wood fixed windows on the dormers.

d. The applicant is also proposing to create and alter four openings, one on the south elevation, and infill all three windows on the west elevation. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window and door openings should be preserved. The proposal to alter window openings is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing window openings be preserved.

e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond repair, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff made a site visit June 22, 2016, and found that though the

July 6, 2016

windows are in poor shape, they are repairable. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood windows and salvage the windows from the addition to be demolished.

f. The applicant is proposing to install a triple wood window, consisting of three one over one windows on the new east elevation where the addition was removed. The applicant is also proposing to install one wood one over one window in the south elevation. The new windows match the proportions of the existing one over one windows.

g. Staff finds the new windows consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., which states to install new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, form and detail. However, staff recommends that the applicant attempt to salvage the wood windows from the addition that is proposed to be demolished.

h. The applicant is proposing to replace existing non-historic door on south façade with another door. The applicant is proposing to replicate the front door of the main structure and install it on the Carriage House. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., historic doors should be repaired, or replaced when necessary with a style of door that is historically appropriate. Staff finds the proposed door consistent with the Guidelines.

i. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing rectangular addition on the east side of the carriage house. The structure appears on the August 1935 Sanborn map without the shed addition. Staff finds the removal of the nonhistoric addition appropriate.

j. Currently, there is no walkway to the Carriage House. The applicant is proposing to install a concrete slope to be ADA compliant to access the front door of the Carriage house. The concrete walk way will not exceed a 1:12 slope up to the entrance. The entrance will have a landing the meets the 60" length minimum. Staff finds the proposal appropriate as the walkway is minimal, meets ADA standards, and will not be seen from the public right-of-way.

k. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing wood siding and repair woodwork with board and batten fiber cement board. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2, repair should be considered before replacement, hardiboard is not recommended and in-kind materials are preferred when exterior woodwork is beyond repair. Staff recommends the applicant repair the siding with in-kind materials and dimensions, and only repair when necessary. Repairs in-kind can be approved administratively.

l. Staff visited the site June 22, 2016, and found the windows in tact with broken glass, and the board and batten had various profiles

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of items #1, 2, 8 and #9 based on findings a through e and finding j. Staff recommends that the applicant repair those windows that are repairable and replace when necessary with wood windows of the same dimension and profile, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Staff recommends the applicant repair the existing siding, where repair is not possible replace with in-kind materials with the same dimensions.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 through #7 based on findings f through i with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant used salvaged windows from the addition when creating new window openings.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Bob & Linda Adkinson- spoke in support of the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman referred this case to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Lazarine, Cone , Garza, Feldman Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

34. HDRC NO. 2016-255

Applicant: Robert Murray, AIA

Address: 431 QUEENS CRESCENT

July 6, 2016

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a 259 square foot addition
2. Construct a 219 square foot wood deck
3. Modify front entry and porch to convert duplex into single family residence
4. Construct 40 square foot carport
5. Replace asphalt driveway with 8' concrete ribbon and crushed granite
6. Replace non-historic front door with new front door
7. Fill in window openings on rear and side elevations

FINDINGS:

a. **BACKGROUND** – This structure at 431 Queens Crescent is a craftsman style one-story home, with composition shingle roof. The front roof line at the entrance includes two brow arches each supported by two round columns. The home is located in Monte Vista Historic District.

b. The request was heard by the Design Review Committee on June 22, 2016. The commissioners present expressed comments and concerns regarding replacing windows, re-using windows, facades that could be modified, retaining the front façade, and the way the building addresses the side property lines.

c. **MASSING/SCALE** - At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant is proposing to construct an addition of 259 square feet with wood siding and a gable roof. Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way and be subordinate to the historic structure. Staff finds the construction of the addition to the rear and with a rear facing gable, which matches the roof form of the existing structure, will not impact the public right-of-way.

d. **ROOF FORM** – Guidelines for Additions recommend additions and feature a roof form comparable to that of the primary historic structure. The existing structure has a side and rear gable, and the proposed roof of the addition adds another rear gable. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **MATERIALS** – The proposed wood siding and composition shingle roof are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., which states the materials should complement existing.

f. **TRANSITION** - A transition between the primary historic structure and the addition is needed in order to differentiate the addition from the existing structure. The proposed addition is recessed from the corners, creating a distinction between the old and new. Staff finds this floor plan consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant is proposing to install a double window with two one over one wood windows and a French door with two flanking tall fixed wood windows in the addition and three fixed windows on the left elevation, some of which are relocated, salvaged windows. The windows proposed are of the same size or proportion as existing windows, which are both wood one over one. Staff finds the proposed windows on the addition consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, which state to incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure.

h. **DECK** – Currently, there is lawn to the rear of the existing structure. The applicant is proposing to construct a 12'-8" x 14'-4", including steps, along the rear of the existing house and proposed addition. Staff finds the deck will not be seen from the public right-of-way, subordinate to the historic structure, and will not impact or cause damage to the historic structure.

i. **FRONT PORCH** - Currently, there are two individual concrete front porches with two browed arches, each with two rounded column supports and two front doors. The applicant is proposing to remove the right front door and install a wood one over one window. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window and door openings should be preserved. The proposal to alter window openings is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing window opening be preserved.

j. **FRONT PORCH** – Additionally, the applicant is proposing to connect the two existing concrete porches and create one long porch with wood decking, steel and wood trellis connecting the arches, and installing 36" decorative wood railing around the porch. The four round columns will remain and connected with simple railing where needed. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alteration 7.B., design replacement elements to be simple and to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposed design of the trellis simple and appropriate for the architectural style of the building, therefore is consistent with the Guidelines.

k. **CARPORT** – Currently, the existing driveway terminates into the existing rear lawn. The applicant is proposing to construct a 20' x 20' x 16'-2" tall, with a hip on gable roof form, composition shingles, wood siding on front gable, and wood louvers at back wall of carport. The clearance height is 8'tall.

July 6, 2016

l. CARPORT MASS/FORM – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new outbuilding should be visually subordinate to the principal structure. Staff finds that the carport's location in the rear minimizes the visibility from the public right-of-way, therefore consistent with the Guidelines.

m. CARPORT MATERIALS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new outbuilding should incorporate materials that are traditionally found in the district. Staff finds the use of wood siding and supports, and composition shingle roof are consistent with the Guidelines.

n. CARPORT CHARACTER – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., new outbuilding should relate to the period of construction. Staff finds the proposed garage has craftsman style features and the proposed hip on gable roof relates to that of the main structure, thus is consistent with the Guidelines.

o. CARPORT ORIENTATION/SETBACK – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new outbuildings should match the setback and orientation found along the block. Staff made a site visit on June 21, 2016, and found that historically garages are set in the rear and face the primary street, therefore the proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

p. DRIVEWAY - Currently, there is a 8' to 9' deteriorated asphalt driveway and concrete apron that abuts the neighbor's concrete ribbon driveway. The asphalt driveway terminates at the rear of the house. The applicant is proposing to install a concrete ribbon driveway, 8' wide at the sidewalk up to the gate. The driveway beyond the gate would then be made of decomposed granite and be 21' wide at the carport. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet wide and to retain similar driveway configurations at those found on the site. Staff finds the replacement of the driveway consistent as the proposed driveway is below 8' wide along the house until it reaches the rear. Staff also finds the ribbon driveway configuration consistent with the Guidelines, as ribbon driveways are historically found in the district.

q. DRIVEWAY – Staff found that with the addition, the deck, the carport, and a driveway, that the lot coverage is significantly increased. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration. Staff finds the pervious driveway consistent with the Guidelines.

r. FRONT DOOR – Currently, there are two white solid paneled front doors with door screens. The applicant is proposing to replace both front doors with wooden craftsman styled doors both with three lights. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6, which states non-historic doors should be replaced with doors that would be typical for the architectural style of the building.

s. WINDOW OPENINGS - The applicant is proposing to remove two doors and two windows, and alter two windows on the rear elevation, remove one window on the south elevation, and alter 3 window openings on the north elevation. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window and door openings should be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the windows where the addition to be located appropriate, but finds the removal of the two door and altering of the window openings not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing window and door openings be preserved.

t. Staff visited the site June 21, 2016, and found that the home is set near the street and that other historic properties had garages facing the street, set in the rear of the property.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through r, and u with the following stipulations:

1. That the front door openings be retained.
 2. That the dimensions of the ribbon strips be submitted to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- Staff recommends denial of item #7 based on finding s.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for approval with stipulations on items 1 & 2 and approval of item number 7

AYES: Guarino, Lazarine, Cone , Garza, Feldman, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

July 6, 2016

35. HDRC NO. 2016-231

Applicant: Andres Garza

Address: 511 DAWSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a single family house featuring approximately 1,400 square feet on the vacant lot at 511 Dawson.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a single family structure on the vacant lot at 511 Dawson Street in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. **SETBACKS** - According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new buildings should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. If no consistent setback has been established, the median setback of all buildings should be used. The applicant has proposed a site plan which appears to be similar to the setbacks of the surrounding structures, however, staff finds that the applicant should provide a site plan noting dimensions to ensure that an appropriate setback is used.
- c. **ORIENTATION** - The front façade of new construction should be oriented in a manner that is consistent with the historic example of the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the new construction toward Dawson, consistent with the historic examples on this block. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **FRONT PORCH** - The applicant has proposed a front porch design that includes a stoop with an overhang featuring a front gabled roof. Staff finds the applicant's proposed front porch form and massing appropriate and a well displayed contemporary interpretation of traditional front porch massing.
- 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. The applicant has proposed to construct a structure that features a footprint that is slightly larger than those found on adjacent lots, however, with an overall width of approximately thirty (30) feet and an overall height of approximately nineteen (19) feet, the applicant's proposed scale and mass is appropriate for this setting and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i.
- f. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** - According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of those of neighboring structures. Foundation heights of historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District are approximately two (2) feet in height. The applicant has noted a foundation height of approximately one (1) foot in height. This is consistent with the Guidelines, however, staff finds that the applicant should provide a street elevation drawing for context noting the proposed structure's foundation height in relationship to neighboring structures.
- g. **ROOF FORM** - The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a front gabled roof. This is consistent with the historic example set forth throughout the district as well as the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i.
- h. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** - The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are not consistent with historic examples found in the district nor the Guidelines for New Construction. The applicant's proposed window and door openings feature both sizes and locations that are not consistent with those found historically on structures in the immediate vicinity of 511 Dawson. Staff recommends the applicant study the façade arrangements found in the district and incorporate appropriate window proportions.
- i. **LOT COVERAGE** - The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- j. **MATERIALS** - The applicant has proposed materials to include concrete walls, a galvanized metal roof and vinyl windows. Materials that complement those found on historic structures should be used on new construction in historic districts. Staff finds that the proposed concrete walls may be appropriate given the use of appropriate architectural details, however, the applicant should use a standing seam metal roof and adhere to the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document for information regarding appropriate window materials and

July 6, 2016

installation.

k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Overall, the applicant has proposed an architectural form that is in keeping with historic forms found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff recommends the applicant continue to propose elements that are complementary of historic elements such as window and door openings and materials.

l. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not provided information for the location and screening of mechanical equipment. The applicant is responsible for property locating and screening all mechanical equipment.

m. **SIDEWALKS** – Historically, sidewalks found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District are centered on the front door of each historic structure. Typically these sidewalks are three to three and a half feet in width. The applicant has proposed an L shaped driveway to connect the existing concrete driveway to the front porch. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

n. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided a written narrative noting the use of various landscaping materials including those of a driveway, however, has not provided a complete landscaping plan with dimensions and locations for site paving. Staff finds that this information should be provided prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed massing, scale and porch design appropriate, however, staff finds the applicant should address the following before receiving final approval:

- i. That the applicant should provide a site plan noting dimensions to ensure that an appropriate setback is used.
- ii. That the applicant provide a street elevation drawing for context noting the proposed structure's foundation height in relationship to neighboring structures.
- iii. That the applicant study the façade arrangements found in the district and incorporate appropriate window proportions and locations.
- iv. That the applicant adhere to the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document for information regarding appropriate window materials and installation.
- v. That the applicant provide a detailed site plan noting appropriate sidewalk and driveway locations and dimensions, all plant and landscaping materials and the appropriate location and screening of all mechanical equipment.

Withdrawn by applicant

36. HDRC NO. 2016-233

Applicant: Tyrone Holloway/Erus Energy

Address: 613 INDIANOLA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install solar panels at 613 Indianola.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 613 Indianola is located at the corner of Indianola and Garfield at the northern extent of the Lavaca Historic District. This structure was constructed circa 2005 and features many contemporary architectural elements. The applicant has proposed to mound a solar panel system on two southeastern roof slopes. Staff performed a site visit on June 22, 2016, and found that while existing trees provide some screening from the public right of way, the proposed panels will be viewable.

b. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i, solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Additionally, solar collectors may be located on garages or other accessory structures where access to the primary structure is limited. The structure is oriented to front Indianola which

July 6, 2016

would place both locations of solar panels on side roof slopes, visible from the public right of way. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant explore placing solar panels on the middle roof section of the structure which is sloped toward the interior of the property. Staff finds that this slope may screen solar panels from view at the public right of way.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b.

Staff recommends the applicant explore placing solar panels on the middle roof section of the structure which is sloped toward the interior of the property. Staff finds that this slope may screen solar panels from view at the public right of way.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman for approval with the stipulation that final approval for position of the panels can be approved by staff.

AYES: Guarino, Lazarine, Cone, Feldman, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

38. HDRC NO. 2016-258

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: SAN PEDRO CREEK

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting HDRC review and recommendation for proposed revisions to Article VI, Division 6, RIO, including design requirements for a new River Improvement Overlay District (RIO-7).

FINDINGS:

a. In alignment with the San Pedro Creek Public Improvements Project, the San Antonio River Authority has contracted with a consultant to develop design requirements for properties adjacent to the planned San Pedro Creek improvements. The objective of the new requirements is to ensure quality public and private development within the vicinity of the Creek Improvements and compatible

b. Two public informational meetings were held in March 2016, and the draft amendments have been publicly available since that time. Stakeholder groups, such as Bexar County, the San Pedro Creek Advisory Committee, the King William Association, the AIA, and a few private groups have all provided comments for the draft.

c. The design requirements, which include site development standards, creek connectivity, and building massing, will be applied to the Unified Development Code (UDC) as a new RIO district (RIO-7). Staff has developed the current draft based on comments received. Briefings have been held with the Design Review Committee of the HDRC and the Development Process Task Force.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed UDC Amendments.

Staff used this time to update commissioners on the case.

Approval of Meeting Minutes – June 15th, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve June 15th, 2016 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Lazarine, Feldman, Cone, Garza, Grube

NAYS: None

July 6, 2016

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 7:11 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair