

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
Aug 3, 2016**

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

**PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain**  
**ABSENT: Feldman, Salmon, Garza**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

-Historic Homeowner Fair - August 27, 2016 - 9:30 AM - 3 PM - Pearl Stable, 307 Pearl Pkwy  
- STAR in the Mission District - Application Deadline - August 31

- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                               |                                   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-299 | 232 Sherman St                    |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2015-298 | 432 Burleson St/ 1026 N Hackberry |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2016-202   | 800 E Guenther St                 |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-290 | 127 Crofton                       |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-232 | 1407 S St Marys                   |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-294 | 626 Avenue E                      |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-288 | 3506 N St Marys                   |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-291 | 507 E Locust                      |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-293 | 1403 N St Marys                   |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2016-287 | 1120 Burnet St                    |
| • Item #11 Case No. 2016-286  | 2330-2344 S Presa St              |
| • Item #12 Case No. 2016-289  | 126 North Dr                      |
| • Item #13 Case No. 2016-302  | 269 North Dr                      |
| • Item #14 Case No. 2016-309  | 3436 Roosevelt                    |
| • Item #15 Case No. 2016-224  | 306 Willow Dr                     |
| • Item #16 Case No. 2016-301  | 227 W Lullwood Ave                |

Items #4 & #16 were pulled for a citizen to be heard.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**4. HDRC NO. 2016-290**

Applicant: Nate Manfred/French & Michigan

Address: 127 CROFTON

**REQUEST:**

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

August 3, 2016

1. Install a new front sidewalk and paving from the sidewalk at the public right of way to the front of the primary historic structure.
2. Install a side yard walkway from the northern parking location to the side addition of the primary historic structure.
3. Modify the previously approved parking surface material from decomposed granite to midnight path gravel.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to install a new front sidewalk and paving from the sidewalk at the public right of way to the front of the primary historic structure, modify a previously approved landscaping material and construct a walkway from the northern parking are to the primary historic structure's side addition. The applicant and the King William Association met to review this request on July 5, 2016, where it was found to be acceptable.
- b. The original front sidewalk was removed to facilitate front yard landscaping through the course of the rehabilitation of the primary historic structure. The original front sidewalk was approximately three (3) feet in width and straight. The applicant has proposed a new walkway that features a width of five (5) feet at the public right of way and a width of seven (7) feet at the front porch of the primary historic structure. Materials include midnight path gravel and concrete pavers that are 24" x 48". Typically, from yard sidewalks in the King William Historic District are straight; however, there are examples of varying widths, designs and materials that are found, particularly on Crofton. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate and reversible.
- c. The applicant has proposed to install a side yard walkway on the north side of the lot northern parking location to the side addition of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the applicant's proposed materials, location and design appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.
- d. The applicant has proposed to modify the previously approved parking surfaces' materials from decomposed granite to midnight path gravel. Staff finds that both materials are similar in nature and that the applicant's proposed material is appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Cherise Bell- spoke in opposition

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval based on staff findings

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2016-301**

Applicant: Debi Hazlett

Address: 227 W LULLWOOD AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install artificial turf in the right-of-way planting strip in front of 227 W Lullwood.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The home at 227 W Lullwood is located in the Monte Vista Historic District. The home is Spanish eclectic, with a cross-gabled roof, clay tile shingles, and a front stoop. The front landscaping includes a front lawn, a large tree, and gravel beds with native plants along the base of the house.
- b. The proposed turf has been installed without prior approvals. The applicant has submitted the documentation required.
- c. The applicant submitted a request to alter the landscaping in the right-of-way planting strip that was heard by the

August 3, 2016

HDRC on May 21, 2014. The request was to remove the existing grass and install flagstone pavers and central planters containing knockout roses. The HDRC denied the request.

d. The applicant has proposed to install artificial turf in the right of way on either side of the sidewalk. As noted in finding b, grass was removed and the artificial turf has been installed. The proposal affects less than 50% of the existing lawn area. Staff made a site visit on July 22, 2016 and observed that the turf in place is similar to grass in color and texture. In addition to this, the artificial material will require less water to maintain. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 4.A., the removal of traditional lawn areas and the installation of impervious materials should be limited. The guidelines also support measures to conserve water. Staff finds the request to be consistent with the guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through d.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

Work was done without approval and the applicant has submitted all required items.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone for denial of the applicants request.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2016-296**

**Applicant:** Penner Brothers LLC/San Antonio River Authority, Kerry Averyt

**Address:** 323 W COMMERCE ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Demolish the structure at 323 W Commerce.
2. Construct a public plaza as part of the San Pedro Creek Improvement Project

**FINDINGS:**

**Findings related to request item #1:**

a. This property was designated as a historic landmark by Ordinance 68210 on October 27, 1988. The property is listed in the ordinance as 327 W Commerce, Commercial Building. The current address for the property is 323 W Commerce. Likewise, staff has a survey record from 1981 which also identifies the property as 323 W Commerce. At the time of the 1988 ordinance, the building would have been approximately 38 years old. The 1988 ordinance was the result of several years of surveys with oversight by a task force. The criteria for evaluation at that time allowed properties of 25 years of age or older to be considered eligible if they represented a part of the City's cultural heritage and were significant cultural resources. However, most buildings were only considered eligible if they were at least 50 years of age or older. The survey record for 323 W Commerce states that the building is an "intrusion" in the historic area which is located near the Main & Military Plaza Historic District.

b. The adjacent building to the west is identified in the survey as 327-331 W Commerce and a significant historic building. In the ordinance, both 327 and 331 W Commerce are listed separately as two distinct properties for a single building adjacent to 323. Because of the discrepancy between the address listed in the survey (323 W Commerce) and the address listed in both the ordinance and inventory (327 W Commerce), staff finds that the zoning map was likely updated in error to include a historic zoning overlay for the property at 323 W Commerce. The ordinance does not include a detailed map or photograph which would clarify the intended designation. With consideration for the span of time in which the property has been legally noticed as a historic landmark, the property should nevertheless be reviewed for demolition in accordance with the criteria established by the UDC for demolition of a landmark.

August 3, 2016

c. The structure at 323 W Commerce was built c. 1953 and designed by local architectural firm Peery & Tuggle. Allison B. Peery was well-known for his modern design work in San Antonio, and he would go on to work with O'Neil Ford as site plan coordinator for HemisFair '68. The building was initially occupied by F.W. Woolworth Co. Its mid-century mercantile design is expressed through the stark brick façade interrupted by a single horizontal band of windows at the second story, its blade sign, and recessed entryway at the street level framed by large display cases.

d. The structure is considered potentially eligible for listing on the National Register (Tomka, Nichols & Murray 2015). The UTSA Center for Archaeological Research surveyed the building and determined it maintained medium integrity of location, design, materials and setting. The survey also noted it was significant for its design and construction, representing a rare example of mid-century mercantile design in the downtown core.

e. The east side of the structure's foundation is cantilevered over San Pedro Creek. Below the brick wall, a stone and brick retaining wall lines the creek. This wall was deemed ineligible for the National Register (Tomka, Nichols & Murray 2015).

f. The demolition is being proposed to increase the public right of way for the San Pedro Creek Improvement Project. The loss of a contributing or eligible building constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing or eligible buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

*A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*

[Applicant has noted that the current property owner has offered to sell this property to the River Authority in order to expand the right-of-way available for use on the project. The proposed use of this site is incompatible with the current structure which precludes pedestrian access to the future park.]

*B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*

[The applicant states that the purpose of the San Pedro Creek Improvements Project is to efficiently control flood risk by producing a linear urban park. The channel at this juncture represents the most restricted section of the project, requiring widening and deepening in order to accommodate the flow of both water and people.]

*C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.*

[The structure is currently occupied by Dollar General.]

g. If the HDRC finds that the claim for an economic hardship has been thoroughly substantiated in the application and at the public hearing and that the conditions of UDC 35-614 which would warrant demolition apply, a recommendation for approval of the request for demolition will not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A permit will not be issued until replacement plans for the new construction are approved and all applicable fees are collected. The UDC states that permits for demolition and new construction shall be issued simultaneously if the requirements for new construction are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

h. If demolition is approved, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-614 in regards to building documentation prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Any documentation required by the Texas Historical Commission for the project may also be provided to OHP staff in order to fulfill this requirement.

Findings related to request item #2:

i. The proposed replacement plan for this space is a public plaza with access to the street level via staircase at the Commerce Street Bridge. A pedestrian walkway will cross the creek upstream from the property and direct people along the eastern wall of the Alameda Theater. The east wall on the creek and the parking lot west of Penner's appear to remain intact. The proposed plaza creates another opportunity for activation along this corridor. Its location on the opposite bank from the upstream amphitheater provides better design balance and livens up this previously barren stretch. Planting areas along the northern wall will mask the starkness of the Alameda Theater addition. The vista will also generate visual interest at an important juncture of the pedestrian experience, pulling

August 3, 2016

the eye from the street level retail downward to the park through a more organic transition. Materials and fixture details were not provided by the applicant.

j. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- Archaeological investigations have occurred for the San Pedro Creek Improvements Project and have received approval from the Texas Historical Commission (THC). However, due to the extremely sensitive nature of the project area, the San Antonio River Authority and the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), in consultation with the THC, have agreed to execute archaeological monitoring of excavations from the San Pedro Creek tunnel inlet to the general vicinity of Cesar Chavez Boulevard. The property located at 323 West Commerce is associated with the San Pedro Creek Improvements Project and is, therefore, subject to the aforementioned archaeology requirements. Moreover, the project area is nearby/adjacent to the Main and Military Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, San Pedro Creek, and the location of the 1722 Presidio de Bexar. Furthermore, the project area is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX1598, 41BX179, and 41BX2088. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the OHP for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. **DEMOLITION:** Staff recommends approval. There is a documented discrepancy in the ordinance which resulted in an erroneous update to the zoning map to include a historic zoning overlay for this property. Given the error, the building at 323 W Commerce may be considered for demolition provided that all requirements of the UDC section 35-614 are fulfilled. In accordance with the UDC, the HDRC shall be guided in its decision by balancing the historic value of the building against the special merit of the proposed replacement project.
2. **CONSTRUCTION OF A PUBLIC PLAZA:** Staff recommends conceptual approval with the stipulation that elevations, materials, and fixtures should be provided to OHP staff for review at the time of a request for approval. At this time, the applicant has not provided information sufficient for final approval which includes eighty (80) percent development of construction documents. The following archaeological stipulation applies:
  - i. Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for conceptual approval of the applicants request

**AYES:** Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain  
**NAYS:** None  
**RECUSALS:** Guarino

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**19. HDRC NO. 2016-297**

**Applicant:** Lawrence Fischer, CFO/Bricsoe Western Art Museum  
**Address:** 210 W MARKET ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of the following:

1. Add new permanent signage on the W Market façade consisting of one (1) glass panel to be installed above the primary entrance.
2. Add two (2) small directional signs near the pedestrian pathway in front of the primary façade.
3. Add six (6) art panels below existing windows on the W Market Street façade.
4. Modify one (1) existing directional sign on the Riverwalk side.
5. Add three (3) temporary banners on the W Market (north) elevation.
6. Add permanent art panels on the Riverwalk façade of an existing addition.
7. Add two (2) temporary banners on the Riverwalk elevation.

**FINDINGS:**

August 3, 2016

- a. The applicant has proposed various permanent and temporary signs at the Briscoe Western Art Museum, primarily on the W Market (north) and Riverwalk (south) facades of the structure.
- b. The applicant has proposed to add new permanent signage on the W Market façade consisting of one (1) glass panel to be installed above the primary entrance. This sign is to feature aluminum letters with a powder coat finish that are to be fixed to the glass panel. The glass panel will be placed in front of an original façade element that is a decorative grill. The applicant has proposed for this signage to span the width of the double entry door, approximately seven (7) feet and feature approximately 2.5 feet in height. Staff finds the design and placement of this sign appropriate.
- c. There is currently one directional and information sign near the public right of way in front of the historic structure. The applicant has proposed to install a second sign of the same size, approximately five (5) feet in height and 1.5 feet in width. Staff finds that the proposed signs are appropriate at this location given that they do not obscure or detract from architectural features. The applicant should ensure that these signs do not impede the public right of way.
- d. The north façade of the historic structure features six lower level windows that feature reliefs below each window. At this location, the applicant has proposed to install six art panels. While the installation of these panels may not obscure architectural features, staff finds that they may present visual clutter on the historic façade. Staff recommends the applicant continue to study the installation of art panels at this location and provide additional information on the panels' installation, materials and design.
- e. On the Riverwalk side of the property, above the Riverwalk level, there is currently one directional and information sign that the applicant has proposed to modify to match the proposed sign on the west and north side of the property. This sign is removed from the Riverwalk level and is approximately four (4) square feet in size. Staff recommends the applicant maintain the size of this sign. This sign is in addition to a sign at the Riverwalk level that features approximately four (4) square feet. According to the UDC Section 35-678(3), the maximum square footage for signage on the Riverwalk side of properties is eight (8) square feet.
- f. On the north façade on both sides of the primary entrance and on the northwestern corner of the building near the intersection of Presa and W Market, the applicant has proposed to locate three temporary banners for special exhibits. Staff finds each of these locations appropriate for temporary banners. Temporary banners are eligible for administrative approval by Office of Historic Preservation Staff for periods of up to ninety (90) days. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information on banner materials and mounting methods that will not damage this historic structure's façade. If the HDRC finds the placement and size of these banners appropriate, administrative approvals may be issued by staff for each banner installation.
- g. On the Riverwalk elevation, the applicant has proposed to locate two (2) temporary banners for special exhibits. As previously noted, the maximum square footage for signage on the Riverwalk side of properties is eight (8) square feet. Additionally, temporary signage facing the river shall not exceed more than eight (8) square feet at any given time in RIO-3. Temporary signage on the river side of buildings can be approved for up to thirty (30) days at a time.
- h. Along the southwest façade of an addition, the applicant has proposed to install permanent art panels. These panels are to span the width of the column bays of an open air patio and are to feature approximately 1 to 2 feet in height. Staff finds this installation to be appropriate given that there is neither text nor advertising present.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through f and h. Staff does not recommend approval of item #7 based on finding g.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve all items including item #7 of both banners with staff stipulations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 3, 2016

**20. HDRC NO. 2016-295**

Applicant: Robert Alvarado/Alvarado Builder

Address: 722 S ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace the existing corrugated plexiglass entrance covering with a new rough cedar branch covering.
2. Install cedar window awnings above each window on the S St Mary's façade.
3. Install stacked tile at the entrance areas.
4. Install a 42" tall "coyote fence" to match those existing on the site. A stone wall was previously approved at this location.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed modifications to the structure at 722 S St Mary's, commonly known as El Mirador, that do not involve any direct modifications to the primary structure. At the July 15, 2015, HDRC hearing, a large scope of work was approved which primarily consisted of site work.
- b. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing corrugated plexiglass entrance covering with a new rough cedar panel covering. The existing entrance canopy structure will remain with only the plexiglass covering being removed. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate.
- c. Above each window opening (5) on the S St Mary's façade, the applicant has proposed to install new window awnings. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B., new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building. The applicant has provided an elevation drawing that notes an appropriate proportion for each canopy; however, staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed drawing of the proposed canopies prior to approval that note specific dimensions and texture.
- d. The existing entrance area currently features two existing window openings where the applicant has proposed to install stacked barrel tile. Staff finds the retention of the existing openings appropriate as well as the installation of the stacked tile. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detail of this installation prior to approval noting overall size of the tile and the ratio of tile to void areas that will be included in each opening.
- e. Currently, a wrought iron fence exists in the front yard of the King William Garden House. At the July 15, 2015, HDRC hearing, a new stone wall was approved to replace the existing wrought iron fence. At this time, the applicant has proposed to modify the previous approval to install a 42" tall "coyote fence". According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B., New fences and walls should appear to be similar to those used historically within the district, should be no taller than 4 feet in the front where seen from the public right of way and should be constructed of appropriate materials. Staff finds that there is no precedent for the proposed coyote fence to be installed as the primary front yard fence for a historic structure of the Folk Victorian style. Staff recommends the applicant either retain the existing wrought iron fence or construct the previously approved stone wall.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1 as submitted based on finding b.

Staff recommends approval of items #2 and #3 based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide a detailed drawing of the proposed canopies prior to approval.
- ii. That the applicant provide a detailed drawing of the proposed stacked tile prior to approval.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4 based on finding e.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Cherise Bell- spoke in opposition

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Cone approval of item #3

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain

**NAYS:** None

August 3, 2016

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to remain item's #1, #2 & #4 to the DRC

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2016-266**

**Applicant:** Gustavo Mendoza/Smartworld Energy Inc

**Address:** 201 DELAWARE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 20 solar panels on the west and east slopes of the hipped roof.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The Lavaca Historic District was designated June 10th, 2004.
- b. The applicant submitted a request for solar panels at 201 Delaware, heard by the HDRC on April 20, 2016. The commission denied the request for 20 solar panels to be installed on the slope facing Staffel Street and four to be installed on the pitch facing the interior of the lot.
- c. The applicant submitted a request for solar panels at 201 Delaware, heard by the HDRC on June 15, 2016. The commission denied the request for 11 panels on the interior slope and 13 panels on the slope facing Staffel Street.
- d. The applicant is proposing to install 20 total solar panels on the standing seam metal roof of the primary structure. 11 panels will be installed on the slope facing the interior of the lot and 9 panels will be installed on the slope facing Staffel Street. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.
- e. Staff visited the site on July 22, 2016, and found that house is on a corner lot interior to the historic district and that the panels will be highly visible from the public right-of-way on the front and side. Staff also found that since the panels are mounted on a hipped roof, the solar panels are more visible than they might be on a different roof form. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. The current request has seven less panels facing the street than the first request, and four less panels than the second request. While the current proposal is more consistent with the Guidelines, the Guidelines are clear that panels should not negatively impact the right-of-way.
- g. The applicant is proposing to mount the panels flush with the pitched roof. This is consistent with Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii, which states solar collectors should be flush with the roof surface.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial based on findings a through f.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube for denial of applicant's request.

**Motion Withdrawn by Commissioner Connor**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve panels only on the east facing fascia.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain**

**NAYS: None**

August 3, 2016

## THE MOTION CARRIED

### 23. HDRC NO. 2016-283

Applicant: Kyle Zochert

Address: 110 GLORIETTA

#### REQUEST:

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

1. Receive Tax Certification for the property at 110 Glorietta
2. Replace standing steam metal roof with laminate dimensional shingles
3. Remove 3 existing aluminum windows and replace with vinyl windows
4. Remove existing aluminum sliding glass door and replace with steel French door
5. Remove existing rear door and install single steel French door

#### FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting Tax Certification for the property located at 110 Glorietta. The scope of work consists of various items that have been administratively approved or are work to the interior, including repairs to the foundation, electrical, plumbing, air conditioning, paint, and flooring.

b. The requirements for Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

c. The home at 110 Glorietta is located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, which was designated December 8, 1983. The home is bungalow style with a front gable, wood siding, standing seam metal roof, metal windows and a front wrought iron fence.

d. The applicant is requesting to remove the existing standing seam metal roof and install laminate dimensional shingles on the existing gable roof. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., roofs should be replaced when more than 25-30 percent of the roof area is damaged and be replaced with in-kind roofing materials or roof materials that historically were appropriate for the style. Staff made a site visit July 22, 2016, and found that bungalow style homes in the district and historically have dimensional shingled roofs. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The applicant is proposing to remove 3 existing metal windows on the left façade and replace with white singlehung vinyl windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., non-historic windows and doors should be replaced with elements that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the proposed vinyl windows not consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the applicant install wood double-hung windows.

f. The applicant is proposing to remove one metal sliding glass door on the left façade and replace with white steel French doors. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., non-historic windows and doors should be replaced with elements that are typical of the architectural style of the building. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff finds the proposed steel door not consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the applicant install wooden French doors.

g. There is an existing non-historic wooden door and iron screen door on the rear entrance. The applicant is proposing to remove both doors and install a single steel French door. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., non-historic windows and doors should be replaced with elements that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the proposed steel door not consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the applicant install a wooden French door.

h. Staff visited the site July 22, 2016.

August 3, 2016

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #5 based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:

1. That the windows be made of wood, be double hung, feature clear glass and be inset two inches within the frame.
2. That the side and rear French doors be made of wood.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone for approval with staff stipulations & can be single hung but all wood windows must remain wood, and doors should be also be wooden.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain**

**NAYS: Lazarine**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2016-308**

Applicant: Torres & Co Roofing and Remodeling

Address: 2215 W MISTLETOE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove 24 one over one wood windows and install 24 insulated aluminum windows.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The home at 2215 W Mistletoe is located in the Monticello Park Historic District, and was designated January 27, 2008. The home is a folk Victorian, cross-gabled, with composition shingles, and with a front porch with wrought iron posts.

b. The existing windows are double hung wooden one over one windows. The applicant is proposing to remove 24 windows and install single hung aluminum one over one windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond 50% deteriorated, 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 July 22, 2016, and found the windows in need of repair but repairable. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines. Windows are an important character defining feature, therefore, staff recommends that they are retained and repaired.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial based on findings a and b. Staff recommends the existing windows be repaired.

**APPLICANT WITHDREW REQUEST:** Staff will work with applicant on temporary options for windows that need to be immediately fixed.

**25. HDRC NO. 2016-269**

Applicant: Dulce Rivera

Address: 2044 W HUISACHE AVE

**REQUEST:**

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

August 3, 2016

1. Construct an approximately 73 square foot rear addition with wood siding
2. Replace solid non-original wood rear door with white steel door with large window light, and remove existing metal screen doors
3. Relocate side square window to façade of the addition

**FINDINGS:**

a. The home at 2044 W Huisache Avenue is in the Monticello Park Historic District, which was designated in May 16, 2010.

b. **EXISTING** – The home at 2044 W Huisache is a Tudor with wood siding and a cross gabled roof with two front gables, one steeped pitched sloped gable and an arch over the front porch. The rear has a hipped roof.

c. **MASSING/SCALE** – Existing at the rear of the structure is a hipped roof, double window and a stoop. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant is proposing to construct an addition of 73 square feet with wood siding and a hipped 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 hipped roof, which matches the roof form of the existing structure, will not be seen from the public right-of-way.

d. **ROOF FORM** – Existing at the rear of the structure is a hipped roof, double window and a stoop. The applicant is proposing to add addition and enlarge that hipped roof. Guidelines for Additions recommend additions feature a roof form comparable to that of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines because the hipped roof of the rear addition matches the existing roof form.

e. **MATERIALS** – The home has wood siding and a composition roof. The applicant is proposing to use wood siding and composition shingle roof on the addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., which states the materials should complement existing.

f. **TRANSITION** – The existing rear foot print has an inset. The applicant is proposing to fill in that inset with the addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions, 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 features two 4" vertical trim pieces, indicating the start of the addition. Staff finds this consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the applicant recess the addition from the edges of the historic structure.

g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant is proposing to remove a square window from the right elevation of the existing structure and install it on the right elevation of the addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions, additions should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Using the salvaged window proposed is consistent with the Guidelines, however, staff finds it would be more appropriate if the applicant incorporated the existing rear double window where the proposed addition is to be located to be salvaged and used in the addition.

h. The existing rear door is a non-original solid wood door. The applicant is proposing to replace it with a steel door with a full window light and insulated core blinds between the glass. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., non-historic windows should be replaced with those that are typical for the architectural style. Staff finds the steel door proposed is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the door be made of wood.

i. The applicant is proposing to remove a square window from the right elevation of the existing structure and install it on the right elevation of the addition. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window openings should be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the windows where the addition to be located appropriate, but finds the removal of square window openings not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing window opening be preserved and the applicant used the salvaged double window in the addition.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through h with the stipulation that the rear door be made of wood.

Staff recommends denial of item #3 based on finding i. Staff recommends that the existing side window be retained and the applicant salvage and reuse the existing rear double window in the proposed addition.

August 3, 2016

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube approval of items #1 & #2 with staff stipulations & denial of item #3

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2016-300**

**Applicant:** Elizabeth Fuller

**Address:** 227 HERMINE BLVD

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a 271 square foot concrete rear patio
2. Regrade the front lawn and remove existing timber retaining wall and replace with a concrete retaining wall
3. Widen sidewalk at the curb to 10' wide
4. Remove the existing front walkway and replace with same material and width, and with an enlarged squared landing where it meets the front porch
5. Install a 4' wide concrete sidewalk around the base of the existing home

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The home at 227 Hermine is in the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District that was designated October 14, 2007. The main structure is minimal traditional style home with stone façade, two porthole openings, and a side porch.
- b. In the rear, there is an existing lawn with concrete steps to the northwest rear door and no other landscape or hardscape elements. The applicant is installing a 10' x 17' concrete patio with five other smaller concrete pads ranging from 16 square feet to 25 square feet, retaining at least 50% of the rear lawn. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 4.A., historic lawn areas should not be reduced by more than 50%. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. The existing front lawn has two pecans, a low sago palm and a concrete fountain. The lawn is divided by a front concrete walkway, with steps at the curb and a retaining wall at the curb made of stacked landscape timber. The applicant is proposing to regrade the front lawn, remove the existing timber retaining wall and install a concrete retaining wall to be inset 2'-6". The proposed retaining wall will be 12" high and 6" deep. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A., historic lawns should be maintained. Staff finds the proposal to alter the existing retaining wall appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The existing front walkway has steps at the curb with landscape timber lining both sides. The applicant is proposing to widen the steps in between the proposed retaining wall and widen the sidewalk to 10' at the curb. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii., historic configuration and alignment of sidewalks should be followed. Staff made a site visit on July 22, 2016, and found that homes in this district did not historically have sidewalk flares. Staff finds the proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the width of the stairs at the curb match the width of the front walkway and that the sidewalk not be widened at the curb.
- e. The existing front walkway is made of concrete, 4' wide, straight from the curb to the front door where it curves outward. The applicant is requesting to remove the existing walkway and replace with the same material and width. Where the front walkway meets the front porch, the applicant is proposing to install a 10' wide, 6' deep squared landing in front of the front porch. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii., historic alignment of sidewalks should be retained. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the curve at the front porch be retained.
- f. The existing lawn abuts the bottom edge of the existing home. The applicant is requesting to install a 4' wide sidewalk around the base of the existing home. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii., historic alignment of sidewalks should be retained. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the applicant explore alternative drainage solutions.

August 3, 2016

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

1. That the stairs between the proposed retaining wall be 4' wide.
2. That the sidewalk width be retained and any increase in width be made with pervious material.
3. That when the front walkway is replaced, that the curve at the front porch be retained.

Staff recommends denial of item #5 based on finding f. Staff recommends the applicant explore alternative drainage solutions.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve items #1-#4 with staff stipulations & the denial of item #5.

\*Commissioner Brittain left at 5:01 pm

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2016-307**

Applicant: Guadalupe De La Cruz

Address: 1029 DAWSON ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove 16 double hung one over one wood windows and replace with 16 double hung vinyl windows.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The home at 1029 Dawson is located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, which was designated December 8, 1983. The home is a folk Victorian, cross-gabled, with a standing seam metal roof, and with a front porch with wrought iron posts.

b. There are 16 existing wood double hung one over one windows. The applicant is proposing to remove all 16 windows and install single hung vinyl one over one windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond 50% deteriorated, 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 July 22, 2016, and found the windows in need of repair but repairable. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines. Windows are an important character defining feature, therefore, staff recommends that they are retained and repaired.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial based on findings a and b.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT:** Staff will work with applicant on site visit & window schedule.

**28. HDRC NO. 2016-311**

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: San Antonio River Walk and surrounding blocks, roughly bounded by Camaron,

August 3, 2016

Augusta, Sixth, Bonham, Losoya, and Tolle Pl

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting review and concurrence of the nomination of the Downtown San Antonio and River Walk Historic District to the National Register of Historic Places.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. As a participant in the CLG program, the City of San Antonio's chief elected official, the mayor, and the local historic preservation review commission, board or committee must comment on properties nominated to the National Register of Historic Districts within their jurisdictions.
- b. OHP staff prepared the nomination in consultation with the Texas Historical Commission which lists 197 contributing buildings, structures, and objects including the River Walk.
- c. The proposed Downtown San Antonio and River Walk Historic District is eligible for its contribution to the commercial and financial growth of the city which surpassed all other Texas cities in the early twentieth century; for its city planning programs, including flood control and infrastructure improvements that resulted in the River Walk; and for its dense urban concentration of high style, large-scale buildings designed by prominent architects and the unparalleled River Walk.
- d. Designation provides the owner of income-producing property the opportunity to receive state and federal tax credits for rehabilitation.
- e. This application will be considered by the State Board of Review on September 17, 2016.
- f. The nomination is provided in the exhibits for this request.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends concurrence with the nomination of the Downtown San Antonio and River Walk Historic District to the National Register of Historic Places.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to support the designation.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**29. 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

August 3, 2016

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Approval of Meeting Minutes – July 20, 2016**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve July 20, 2016 minutes.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Cone to adjourn.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair

