

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
September 7, 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, Garza, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone
ABSENT: Salmon, Feldman

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - Historic Homeowner Fair Recap
 - Restored by Light - September 9 - 6:30 PM - Mission San Jose - 6701 San Jose Dr
 - Mission 5K Walk/Run Tour - 10 AM - Mission Park Pavilion - 6030 Padre Dr
 - Archaeology Month - October 2016
- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-299 | 232 Sherman |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2016-298 | 430/432 Burleson, 1026 N Hackberry |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2015-056 | 112 E Pecan |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-295 | 722 S St Mary's |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-D07 | 211 S Flores |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-347 | 233 Florida |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-338 | 1522/1524/1526 Grayson, 1943/1945/1947 N New Braunfels |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-325 | 724 N Cherry |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-336 | 536 Adams |
| • Item #10, Case No.2016-343 | 1119 N Olive |
| • Item #11 Case No. 2016-341 | 801 E Quincy |
| • Item #12 Case No. 2016-477 | 1507 W Rosewood |
| • Item #13 Case No. 2016-346 | 2354 W Gramercy |
| • Item #14 Case No. 2016-348 | 6322 US Hwy 87 |
| • Item #15 Case No. 2016-318 | 815 S St Marys |
| • Item #16 Case No. 2016-335 | 416 8 th St |
| • Item #17 Case No. 2016-350 | 311 E Houston |
| • Item #18 Case No. 2016-227 | 319 Barrera |
| • Item #19 Case No. 2016-337 | 423 Mission St |
| • Item #20 Case No. 2016-349 | 401 E Houston |

Items #9 & #20 were pulled for a citizen to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

September 7, 2016

9. HDRC NO. 2016-336

Applicant: Henry & Mary Newsom

Address: 536 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing composition shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 536 Adams was constructed circa 1920 and features many Craftsman style elements. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds that a standing seam metal roof is architecturally appropriate for this historic structure.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should be used on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Standing seam metal roofs are architecturally appropriate many architectural styles in San Antonio, Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, the applicant should ensure that panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. The applicant's proposed roof is consistent with the Guidelines

RECOMMENDATION:

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

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell spoke in opposition to the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Brittain for approval with staff stipulations and that the ridge vent not be allowed.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2015-349

Applicant: Mike McGlone/Alamo Architects

Address: 401 E HOUSTON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the existing, non-original fifth level addition.
2. Rehabilitate and restore the historic façade.
3. Construct an addition four stories.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 401 E Houston, commonly known as the Burns Building and Washer Brothers Building was constructed in 1912 originally featuring four levels. During the 1950's, a fifth level addition was constructed by J.C. Penney's.

b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

September 7, 2016

c. **DEMOLITION** – As noted, a fifth level addition was constructed in the 1950's which the applicant has proposed to demolish. According to the UDC Section 35-611, the demolition of a non-historic addition that consists of nonhistoric materials may be approved administratively by the Historic Preservation Officer. Staff finds the existing fifth level addition to be non-historic and non-contributing to the primary historic structure and eligible for demolition to be approved administratively by staff.

d. **REHABILITATION** – The primary historic structure features façade materials which include brick, cast stone, terra cotta detailing, an existing canopy and wood windows. The applicant has proposed to clean the existing masonry, repoint as needed and repair and replace any damaged cast stone and terracotta at the original parapet cap as the addition is removed. The applicant has also proposed to clean and repaint the canopy's suspension rods, brackets and anchors and repaint the existing wood windows. The applicant's proposals are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

e. **ADDITION** – At the rooftop of the original structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature four floors; each featuring floor to ceiling height of ten (10) feet. According to the Guidelines for Additions 2.A. new additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should be sited to minimize the visual impact on the original structure, should utilize a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the principle façade and should feature a transition between the old and new. The applicant has proposed to set back the proposed addition approximately twelve (12) feet from the south façade and twelve (12) feet from the southeast corner and west parapet wall, tapering to an eight (8) foot setback at the southwest corner of the building. Staff finds that this will limit new massing at the corner of E Houston and Jefferson and work to preserve historic street views along both streets. Additionally, the applicant has proposed floor to ceiling height that are subordinate to that of the original structure and has proposed materials that are will distinguish between the original structure and the proposed addition. Staff finds this consistent with the Guidelines.

f. **SCALE, MASSING & FORM** – According to the Guidelines for Additions, 2.B., the height of rooftop additions should be limited to no more than forty (40) percent of the height of the original structure. Full floor rooftop additions that obscure the form of the original structure are not appropriate. The height of the original structure is approximately sixty (60) feet. The applicant has proposed the addition to feature approximately forty-two (42) feet in height; approximately seventy-five (75) percent of the original structure's height. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.B.i.; however, staff finds that the proposed addition's massing and height will not obscure the form of the original structure and is consistent with height found on this block of E Houston.

g. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials which could possibly include vertical and horizontal metal panels and rain screens with shallow perforated shading devices. Materials that match in type, color and texture to the materials of the original structure should be used. Staff finds that the use of metal panels and rain screens may be appropriate given that the applicant include appropriate proportions for each panel which relate to façade proportions of the original structure such as the proportions of the existing vertical and horizontal rows and columns between the front façade's fenestration. Additionally, the use of metal panels could potentially reduce the overall impact of the proposed massing.

h. **WINDOWS** – According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i., the shapes of window openings

i. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Additions are to be designed to reflect their own time while respecting the historic context. Architectural details should be simple in design and complement the character of the original structure. Additionally, contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details should be incorporated into the addition. As previously mentioned, staff finds the incorporation of proportions based on those of the original structure's façade should be included into the design of the addition. Currently, the proposed addition does not feature a distinct building cap or cornice line; staff recommends the applicant study a contemporary solution to the lack of a building cap which could potentially include the use of an overhang similar to the proposed rain screens.

j. **SIGNAGE** – The applicant has noted in the application documents that the existing blade sign at the corner of the original building will be modified; however, at this time the applicant has not noted modifications. Additionally, small, pedestrian scaled signage will be added beneath the canopy. Staff recommends the applicant propose a signage package to be reviewed that is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage as well as appropriate for E Houston Street.

k. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – At this time the applicant has not noted the location of mechanical equipment. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment from view at the public right of way.

l. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – At this time, the applicant has not submitted an application for Historic Tax Certification. Staff recommends that the applicant submit for Historic Tax Certification as well as consider pursuing the state historic tax credit (totaling 25% of qualified expenses) or state and federal historic tax credits (totaling 45% of qualified expenses) for commercial projects.

September 7, 2016

m. **ARCHAEOLOGY**-The property is within the general battlefield area of the Battle of the Alamo and is in close proximity to the San Antonio River, the Spanish Colonial Potrero, the Alamo Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, the Navarro Acequia, and the Alamo Plaza Local Historic District. Furthermore, previously recorded archaeological 41BX436 is in close proximity to the property, as well. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for all excavations. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That the applicant include appropriate proportions for each proposed metal panel which relate to façade proportions of the original structure such as the proportions of the existing vertical and horizontal rows and columns between the front façade's fenestration.
- ii. That the applicant explore alternative massing options that relate more to the massing of adjacent additions. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant should consider reducing the overall height of the proposed addition by one floor to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- iii. That the applicant introduce a contemporary solution to the lack of a building cap for the proposed addition.
- iv. **ARCHAEOLOGY**-Archaeological investigations are required for all excavations. 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.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Susan Beavin, - spoke about concerns with the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval with staff stipulations with an additional stipulation that the applicant work with the DRC subsequent to returning for final approval.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2016-340

Applicant: Robert McGoldrick

Address: 342 W ELSMERE PLACE

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace front driveway with two concrete ribbon strips and fill in with decomposed granite
2. Remove existing tiles and install Saltillo tiles on the concrete front porch
3. Remove existing front door and install new wood door
4. Remove existing side lights install new side lights
5. Remove existing front walkway and install flagstone walkways
6. Receive Historic Tax Certification for the property at 342 W Elsmere.

FINDINGS:

a. The home at 342 W Elsmere was identified as contributing in the Monte Vista National Register Nomination in 1990. The home is a Spanish eclectic style, built in 1923.

b. The existing driveway is concrete and 8' wide from the sidewalk to the rear of the porte cochere; beyond the port

September 7, 2016

cochere the drive increases in width, is made of asphalt and extends to the rear garage. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing driveway and install two concrete ribbon strips with 24" wide ribbons and fill in the center with decomposed granite, from the sidewalk to the rear of the porte cochere. Beyond the porte cochere, the applicant is requesting to install decomposed granite where the current asphalt driveway exists. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., new driveways should incorporate a similar driveway configuration that is historically found and be no wider than 10 feet; also, pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration. Staff finds the proposed ribbon configuration, concrete and decomposed granite materials consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The existing porch is covered with ceramic tiles. The applicant is proposing to remove existing tiles and install Saltillo tiles on the front porch. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Modification and Alterations 7.A.iii., only cover porches with tile when historically used. Staff found examples of historic Spanish eclectic style homes with tile porches. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. The existing front door is a non-original wood door with spindles in the window light, and two matching side lights filled with wood inset and spindle detail. The applicant is proposing to remove and replace with a solid wood door with 6 divided lights and a craftsman style dental molding, and remove the two side lights and install clear glass. Staff finds the replacement of the non-original front door appropriate. Staff finds that the front door's location is not visible from the public right of way; however, staff finds that a door lacking craftsman elements would be more appropriate.

e. There is an existing square brick walkway connecting the front porch with the driveway. The applicant is proposing to remove the bricks and install a curved walk with made of flag stones and decomposed granite. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii., walkways and sidewalks should follow the historic alignment, configuration, and width of those in the district. Staff finds the proposed flagstone walkway not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the existing walkway configuration be retained.

f. There is not a front walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch, separate from the driveway. The applicant is proposing to install an angled walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch made of flagstone and decomposed granite. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii., walkways and sidewalks should follow the historic alignment, configuration, and width of those in the district. Staff finds that historically homes in Monte Vista have no front walkway or straight, concrete walkways from the sidewalk to the front porch. Staff finds the proposed flagstone material and configuration not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant propose a straight front walkway made of concrete.

g. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property located at 342 W Elsmere. The scope of work consists of various items including repairs approved administratively, such as repairs to the windows, as well as interior work including refinishing hardwood, insulation, exterior repair and repairs to plumbing and electrical.

h. The requirements for Historic 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.

i. Staff visited the site August 30, 2016.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through f with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant propose a front door that complements the style of the historic structure and submit the new door details to staff before receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. That the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan with each material labeled prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to remand this case to the next HDRC meeting due to the applicant not being present.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

September 7, 2016

22. HDRC NO. 2016-327

Applicant: Mary Valenzuela

Address: 1935 W WOODLAWN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 380 square foot addition in the rear.

FINDINGS:

- a. The existing home is in the Monticello Park Historic District, designated on 5/16/2016. The home is a minimal traditional home with a cross-gabled roof with composition shingles, a front porch with wrought iron posts and a rear carport and detached garage.
- b. The applicant received conceptual approval on August 18, 2016, from the HDRC with the stipulations that the applicant show details of a transition between the old and the new, that the ridge height of the addition be below the existing ridge, that the applicant submit photos and details of the hardiboard to be installed, that the existing rear windows be salvaged and used in the addition and that the additional windows to be installed have a traditional dimension and profile, be recessed in the window frame and not have false divided lights. The proposed addition features a transition, has a ridge height below the ridge of the original structure, has horizontal hardiboard to match profile of existing wood siding, and is using all new one over one windows. The proposed addition satisfies all stipulations except for salvaging the rear windows as they are in poor condition.
- c. **TRANSITION** – The existing structure is has a front gable on a side gable roof, and wood siding and composition shingles. The applicant is proposing to construct an addition at the rear of the original structure. The applicant is proposing to have the addition inset 3 inches on the left and right facade. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., additions should feature a transition between the old and the new. Staff finds the inset indicates a transition, which is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **SCALE, MASSING, FORM** – On the rear, there is a side gabled roof and there is an existing detached garage. The proposed addition has a rear facing gable and appears to be below the existing ridge line in the provided renderings. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A., additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, utilize a similar roof form, and have a height consistent with the primary structure. Staff finds the proposed addition will not negatively impact the public right-of-way, and the proposed height, scale and form are consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **MATERIALS** – The main structure has composition shingles and asbestos siding. The applicant is proposing to use hardiboard siding and composition shingles. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., materials should be compatible with the materials of the original structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The existing structure has minimal architectural details. The porch has wrought iron columns, steel casement windows, wood screens and simple trim around the windows. The proposed addition will have roof overhangs, trim, and siding details that match the existing structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii., details should be in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure but simple in design. Staff finds the proposed details consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **WINDOWS** – The existing structure has steel casement windows. The applicant has noted the installation of two one over one vinyl windows and one vinyl horizontal one by one window. According to Guidelines for Additions 4.A., window details should correspond with the architectural style of the original structure. Staff finds the proposed windows match the proportions of the existing, which is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends install block frame windows with traditional dimension and profiles and be recessed two inches within the window frame.
- h. Staff finds that at this time the applicant has not provided construction documents that contain a sufficient amount of detail for final approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the applicant produce construction documents that provide sufficient detail prior to receiving final approval. Staff also finds that the applicant should address the following prior to returning to the HDRC.

1. That the ridge height of the addition be below the existing ridge of the original structure.

September 7, 2016

2. That the applicant install block frame windows with traditional dimension and profiles and be recessed two inches within the window frame.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT: Applicant will submit more detailed drawings at a later date.

Approval of Meeting Minutes – August 17, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve August 3, 2016 minutes.

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

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, Garza, Grube, Laffoon, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone

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 4:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

