

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
October 5, 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, Feldman, Brittain, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon
ABSENT: Salmon

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

- Archaeology Month in Texas - October 2016
- Power of Preservation PROM - October 21, Kress Building - 315 E Houston
- SAPreservation 5K Series - October 29 - 9AM, Fairchild Park, 1214 E Crockett
- Association for Preservation Technology Conference - Oct 30 - Nov 2 - San Antonio, TX
- 2016 Amended HDRC Schedule - Proposed November 16, 2016, time change to 8AM
- 2017 HDRC Schedule
- National Trust for Historic Preservation - Preservation Leadership Forum - November 15-18 - Houston, TX

- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-D08 | 100 W Cesar Chavez Blvd |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2016-351 | 314 E Carolina St |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2015-355 | 615 Soledad St |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-398 | 221 E Carolina St |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-400 | 100 Auditorium Circle |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-354 | 702 Mason St |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-388 | VIA Metropolitan Transit- Next Gen Plus |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-367 | 220 Hermine Blvd |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-390 | 227 Adams St |
| • Item #10, Case No.2016-399 | 903 W Martin St |
| • Item #11 Case No. 2016-386 | 932 Burnet St |
| • Item #12 Case No. 2016-393 | 524 N Pine St |
| • Item #13 Case No. 2016-396 | 1602 N Zarzamora |
| • Item #14 Case No. 2016-383 | 317 Lexington |
| • Item #15 Case No. 2016-320 | 100 N Main |
| • Item #16 Case No. 2016-384 | 10 10 th St |
| • Item #17 Case No. 2016-401 | 523/525 N Colorado |

Items #7 was pulled due to a recusal from Chair Guarino. Item#15 was pulled by Commissioner Lazarine.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

October 5, 2016

7. HDRC NO. 2016-388

Applicant: John Seymore/VIA Metropolitan Transit

Address: VIA Metropolitan Transit - Next Gen Plus

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to place 'Next Gen Plus' bus shelters, a new prototype, at 46 various locations along Zarzamora and Military Drive, and future locations.

FINDINGS:

a. This proposal was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 13, 2016. The members present had no major concerns about the design, but had concerns about maintenance. The members also supported the absence of advertisement space on the structure.

b. The applicant is proposing approval of the "Next Gen Plus" shelter. The proposed prototype is minimal and light in terms of design and construction. Therefore, their installation will not significantly impact views of existing historic buildings. The proposed prototype design is also flexible, in that there are several variations to accommodate to narrow right-of-ways. The installation of these shelters will create more uniformity among VIA stops, helping to reduce the amount of visual clutter, consistent with the UDC Section 35-646(a).

c. The applicant at this time is proposing to install 46 "Next Gen Plus" shelters at existing stops along Zarzamora and Military Drive. These are not located in any Historic Districts and do not impact any historic structures. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and consistent with the UDC Section 35-646.

d. **ARCHAEOLOGY-** The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

1. **ARCHAEOLOGY-** The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

2. The applicant is responsible for submitting future requests for installations at specific locations to staff for review and issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve the applicants request with staff stipulations based on the findings.

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

NAYS: None

RECUSAL: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

October 5, 2016

15. HDRC NO. 2015-320

Applicant: Randy Kelly/JRK Design

Address: 100 N MAIN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an 18 story mixed use tower on the vacant lot at 100 N Main. The structure will feature a commercial component and an overall height of 236 feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct an 18 story mixed use tower on the vacant lot at 100 N Main. The structure will feature a commercial component and an overall height of 236 feet. This property formerly featured the landmark structure commonly known as the Wolfson Building, which was destroyed by fire in 2011.

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. At the July 5, 2016, HDRC hearing, commissioners noted that more context and detail was needed in the presentation documents and this application was withdrawn at the hearing. At the August 17, 2016, HDRC hearing, this request was approved on the consent agenda with staff's stipulations.

d. 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.

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 has noted that both proposed curb cuts are twenty (20) feet in width. This is consistent with 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. The applicant has noted that the street level seating area will be buffered from the public right of way by landscaping elements. Per the site plan, the applicant has noted the use of concrete; however, a specific landscaping plan has not been submitted.

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. Per the construction document set, the applicant has proposed site lighting at the street and patio levels. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

k. 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

October 5, 2016

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 has noted that all mechanical equipment will be located on the roof and will be screened by a parapet wall. This is consistent with 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. The applicant has provided documents that show the proposed tower's scale in context with various structure's in its immediate vicinity. 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, glazing, stucco wall panels, metal wall panels, glass railings and limestone cladding. These materials are consistent with the UDC.

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 an elevation that is adjacent to Riverview Tower that does not feature window fenestration on sections of the façade that are in immediate proximity to Riverview Tower. As the tower separates itself from Riverview Tower, fenestration is added to the façade. Staff finds this appropriate. The north (project west) elevation currently features no fenestration. The Riverview Tower parking structure is immediately adjacent to this façade; however above the roof of the parking structure, staff finds that addition façade separation elements should be added.

q. **PUBLIC ART COMPONENT** – The applicant has proposed to locate a public art component to the north façade above the parking garage roof of Riverview Tower. At this time, the applicant has not specified the specifics of the public art component; however, the applicant has provided a graphic for its overall size. Staff finds that the installation of a public art component is appropriate; however, the applicant must follow Division 5 of the UDC in regards to Public Art.

r. **WINDOWS** – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. The applicant has provided detailed walls sections noting that all windows will be inset three (3) inches within walls. This is consistent with the UDC.

s. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – If a previously unidentified archaeological site is encountered during construction work, activities should be immediately stopped in the vicinity and the OHP should be notified.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

October 5, 2016

- i. That the applicant coordinate with Public Art San Antonio and comply with UDC Division 5 in regards to the installation of public art on the north façade of the proposed new construction. A Certificate of Appropriateness will not be issued until the proposed public art component has been approved by the HDRC.
- ii. That the applicant provide staff with information regarding the patio paving materials and landscaping materials at the street level.
- iii. If a previously unidentified archaeological site is encountered during construction work, activities should be immediately stopped in the vicinity and the OHP should be notified.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff stipulations and the stipulation that the applicant come back to with landscape plans, signage plans & signage master plan, which will include signage for tenants, retail & restaurant portions of the building & that they return with detail on how they plan to secure the exterior stairwell & lastly, that the sidewalk remain at an accessible and constant level and not drop at the automobile entrance.

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

18. HDRC NO. 2016-387

Applicant: Andrew Douglas/Douglas Architects

Address: 211 N ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to perform rehabilitative efforts at 211 N Alamo. Included in this restoration, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Repoint and restore the historic, masonry facades.
2. Paint and repair the existing fire escape.
3. Repair the existing Third Street canopy install a new street level canopy on N Alamo.
4. Install new carriage garage doors to the Third Street entrance.
5. Install a new storefront system to the N Alamo and Third Street facades.
6. Install signage on the N Alamo façade and at the building corner.
7. Replacement of the existing windows, non-original arched windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 211 N Alamo/223 Third Street was constructed in 1907 and served as San Antonio's first YMCA location. The historic structure originally featured four levels, a brick and stone façade and one over one wood windows. In 1925, the YMCA relocated to a structure on Broadway and this structure became known as the North Alamo Office Building. Circa 1935, exterior modifications had taken place which included modifications to the street level façade, removing its original heavy masonry façade and installing a commercial storefront system as well as a street level entrance canopy. Currently, the structure features wood windows, many of which are not original, an existing exterior fire escape, a non-original wood storefront system, non-original storefront openings on the Third Street façade and remains of the existing canopy system that was installed circa 1935.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 27, 2016, where committee members noted that the applicant should provide details of proposed replacement elements and provided comments on the proposed rehabilitation.

c. **MASONRY FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed to repoint and restore the historic masonry facades of the structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A. and B. The applicant should ensure that new mortar joints match the profile of the original. Abrasive, strong chemicals, sandblasting and high-pressure cleaning methods should be avoided when cleaning masonry elements.

d. **MASONRY FAÇADE** – In addition to the restoration of the existing masonry, the applicant has proposed to

October 5, 2016

install a new brick sill on the N Alamo façade, a new roof parapet cap and a new cornice line. Based on historic photographs, each of these elements previously existed and have been removed. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is responsible for providing a detail of the profile of each element to staff prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

e. FIRE ESCAPE – The applicant has proposed to repair and paint the existing fire escape. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.i.

f. STREET LEVEL CANOPIES – The applicant has proposed to repair the existing Third Street canopy and install a new street level canopy on the N Alamo façade. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii., canopies should be added based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. Historic photographs from both the 1930's and 1950's show canopies on both N Alamo and Third Street. The applicant's proposal to install a new canopy as well as to restore the existing canopy and canopy hardware is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is responsible for providing a detail of the canopy profile to staff prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

g. THIRD STREET GARAGE DOORS – The current Third Street has been heavily modified at the street level since the building's construction; primarily through the modification of original window and door openings. Originally, the street level façade featured human scaled openings; however, currently there are four larger storefront entrances. Three of the current storefront systems feature a similar profile with two featuring single width doors. One storefront system features a recessed double width entrance. The applicant has proposed to install garage carriage doors in the northern two openings. Staff finds the installation of carriage style garage doors at this location appropriate given that the existing storefront system is not original. Staff finds that a design and materials that are appropriate for the date of construction of this historic structure should be used.

h. NEW STOREFRONT SYSTEMS – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, non-original storefront systems and install a new storefront system on both the N Alamo and Third Street facades. At this time, the applicant has not specified a material; however, per the preliminary perspectives note a profile that is consistent with the current profile. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information in regards to materials; however, staff finds that the installation of a wood storefront system would be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i.

i. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – Many of the existing windows are not original and were installed during previous renovations. Many windows are currently inoperable; however, the majority hold structural integrity. The applicant has proposed to replace the arched, non-original windows as well as the non-original windows that feature non-original elements. The applicant has proposed to restore all original one over one windows.

j. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install signage across the N Alamo façade reading "The Arevalo Alamo Building". Historic photos note that this location has been used for signage for approximately 90 years. Staff finds the applicant's proposed signage location appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Regarding the naming of the historic structure, this structure has been formally, or commonly known as the YMCA, the North Alamo Building, the North Alamo Office Building, the Oppenheimer Building, and Hotel Alden. Staff finds that the proposed new signage reflects on the proposed adaptive reuse of the historic structure and further enforces that historic structures can have multiple uses for decades. The applicant should provide staff with additional details regarding this signage including size and materials prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

k. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install a blade sign at the corner of the historic structure. The applicant has referenced a historic photo from 1955 that notes signage at this location. Staff finds the installation of signage here appropriate; however, the applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Signage in regards to its design.

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.

m. ARCHAEOLOGY – The property is a designated local historic landmark and is within the general battlefield area of the Battle of the Alamo. In addition, the project area is in close proximity to the Alamo Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, the Alamo Plaza Local Historic District, and previously recorded archaeological site 41BX1894. Thus, the property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, if excavations are planned or necessary in the basement, archaeological investigations shall be required. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation.

RECOMMENDATION:

October 5, 2016

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

- i. That the applicant provide a detail of the profile of the proposed new parapet cap, new cornice and new brick sill prior to returning to the HDRC as noted in finding c.
- ii. That the applicant provide a detail of the canopy profile to staff prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval as noted in finding e.
- iii. That the applicant provide a detail of the proposed carriage style garage doors that feature a profile and materials that are appropriate for a historic structure prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval as noted in finding f.
- iv. That the applicant install wood storefront systems as noted in finding g.
- v. That the applicant provide signage details as noted in findings i and j.
- vi. That the applicant provide a window survey noting each non-original window that will be replaced as well as details on the proposed replacement windows.
- vii. Archaeological investigations shall be required if excavations are planned or necessary in the basement. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff stipulations and with the stipulation that the Architect returns to the DRC before returning to the HDRC.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2016-389

Applicant: Michael Duffey

Address: 201 DELAWARE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 24 solar panels on the left slope of the hipped roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The Lavaca Historic District was designated June 10, 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 submitted a request for 20 solar panels at 201 Delaware, heard by the HDRC on August 3, 2016. 11 panels were proposed on the slope facing the interior of the lot and 9 panels were proposed on the slope facing Staffel Street. The commission approved the 11 interior panels and denied the 9 panels facing Staffel Street.
- e. The applicant is proposing to install 24 total solar panels on the standing seam metal roof of the primary structure. All panels will be installed on the slope facing Staffel Street. The applicant noted that the panels cannot be installed on the right slope due to tree coverage. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations

October 5, 2016

should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.

f. Staff visited the site on September 26, 2016, and found that house is on a corner lot interior to the historic district and that the proposed panels would 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.

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 g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube for denial

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2016-378

Applicant: Kyle Zochert

Address: 110 GLORIETTA

REQUEST:

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

1. Create 3 new openings
2. Alter 5 existing window openings
3. Install 2 shutters to front of right windows
4. Encase two front porch posts with wood detail

FINDINGS:

a. 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.

b. Work was done on the windows prior to approval. The applicant has submitted the required documentation and the fees have been paid.

c. **NEW OPENINGS** - There are 4 existing openings on the left elevation: three windows and one sliding glass door. The rear elevation includes a non-historic back door opening. The right elevation includes 3 window openings. The applicant is proposing at this time to create 3 new window openings: a one over one wood window on the left elevation, a double one over one wood window on the rear elevation, and a horizontal 42" x 18" wood window on the right elevation. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.ii., new entrances are compatible in size, scale, shape proportion, material and massing with historic entrances. Staff finds the proposed openings on the left and rear consistent with the Guidelines, but finds the horizontal window not appropriate for the architectural style.

d. **ALTER WINDOW OPENING** - There is an existing aluminum sliding glass door on the left elevation. The applicant is proposing to remove the door and install a wood single French door in its place. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **ALTER WINDOW OPENING** - There is an existing aluminum horizontal 24" x 12" window on the left elevation

October 5, 2016

to the left of the existing sliding aluminum door. The applicant is proposing to remove the window and install a wood one over one window in its place. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

f. ALTER WINDOW OPENING - There is an existing aluminum one over one window on the left elevation toward the rear. The applicant is proposing to remove the window and install a horizontal 42" x 18" wood window. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style, and that window openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal to remove the aluminum window and replace with wood appropriate, but finds the proposal to alter the window opening and the proposed proportion not appropriate for the bungalow style home. Staff finds an appropriate window proportion would be vertical one over one.

g. ALTER WINDOW OPENING - There is an existing aluminum one over one window on the right elevation toward the rear. The applicant is proposing to remove the window and fill in the opening. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., original window openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal to infill the window not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the window opening be retained.

h. ALTER WINDOW OPENING - There is an existing aluminum one over one window on the right elevation. The applicant is proposing to shift the opening to the right of the existing, historic opening. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., original window openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal to alter the original opening not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the opening be retained.

i. SHUTTERS - There is a front double one over one window on the right. The applicant is proposing to install shutters on either side of this window. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.x., shutters should be installed only where they existed historically and where appropriate to the architectural style of the house. Staff finds that shutters are not appropriate for bungalow style homes, thus the proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

j. FRONT PORCH POSTS - There are two existing 4"x4" wood posts under the front porch gable. The applicant is requesting to wrap the bottom of the existing original posts with wood to create a column base painted white. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations &.B.iv., new elements should be compatible with the architecture or style of the structure and not distract from the character of the building. Staff finds the proposal distracts from the simplicity of the architecture, thus not compatible with the home and not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and 2 based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

1. That the new opening installed on the right elevation be a one over one window as noted in finding c.
2. That the window to be installed on the left toward the rear be a one over one window as noted in finding f.
3. That the window opening on the right toward the rear be retained as noted in finding g.
4. That the window opening be retained as noted in finding h.

Staff recommends denial of item #3 and 4 based on finding i and j.

CASE COMMENTS:

Work was done prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant has submitted the required documentation and the fees have been paid.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve the request with the following stipulations: That the design of the shutters & front porch be reexamined, that the stairs leading to the front porch be detailed and that an alternate to the door be investigated & that columns must line up. Applicant must return to HDRC for those items.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

October 5, 2016

21. HDRC NO. 2016-395

Applicant: Jeff Herman

Address: 538 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to create an extended patio on the left of existing rear accessory structure, with a front gable roof, and to repair the existing wood porch flooring.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 538 Adams is in the King William Historic District. The main structure is a one-story structure with a side gable roof, a browed covered entry, wood lap siding, and a standing seam metal roof. There is a rear accessory structure that does not appear on the 1919 Sanborn map.

b. EXISTING - The rear accessory structure has carriage doors facing the street, French doors facing the interior, a gabled roof opened toward the street, board and batten siding, standing seam metal roof, and a covered porch across the left side with four 6"x6" wooden posts.

c. ROOF FORM – The existing structure has a gable roof open towards the street. The applicant is proposing to add a gable roof off the left pitch to create a cross-gabled roof and to create an additional covered area. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., use a similar roof form and orientation as the structure, particularly if visible from the street. Staff finds the proposed gable overwhelms the structure. Staff recommends the added roof be a hip roof to minimize the visual impact. Staff spoke with the applicant to correct the existing elevation drawing with an accurate depiction of the exiting roof pitch. Staff has not received the updated drawing at the time of posting.

d. TRANSITION – The applicant is proposing to construct the addition so there is a transition at the roof line and that the area under the addition is concrete slab. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., there should be a small change at the seam in order to provide a visual distinction between old and new. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. SCALE & MASS – The applicant is proposing of adding approximately 200 square feet of covered, open space to the left of the existing rear accessory structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 2A. and .B.ii., new additions should be subordinate to the principle façade and not double the existing square footage. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

f. MATERIALS – The rear structure has a standing seam metal roof, board and batten siding, wood posts and a wood deck and stairs. The applicant is proposing a covered area with a standing seam metal roof, board and batten siding, wooden posts and a concrete patio. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., materials that match in type, color and texture and include an offset to distinguish from the historic structure should be used. Staff finds the proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines.

g. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant is proposing a closed gable roof addition with two supporting posts. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii., details should be simple in design and not overwhelm the original structure. Staff finds the gable roof overwhelms the structure, thus is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the roof be a hipped roof.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. That the ridge height of the additional roof be below that of the original structure's ridge.
2. That the roof to be added be a hipped roof.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell spoke in opposition .

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval with the gable design.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

October 5, 2016

22. HDRC NO. 2016-391

Applicant: Lauren Diliberto/Don McDonald

Address: 315 W LYNWOOD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to fill in three existing garage door bays, create 3 loggia door openings on the front façade, and alter two existing window openings on the left and front facades.

FINDINGS:

a. The existing main structure is a large two-story Spanish Eclectic home with a detached two story garage and driveway in the rear, in the Monte Vista Historic District.

b. The request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 28, 2016. The member present had questions regarding the landscaping, fence height and screening, and commented on the symmetry and the proposal's relation to the architecture found on the main structure.

c. There is an existing garage that is Spanish eclectic style, two-stories with a flat roof and flared corners. On the existing front façade there are 3 car bays. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing garage doors, fill in the openings with stucco, install 3 arched loggia style openings on the same façade, and install doors to match those enclosing the loggia on the main structure. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, openings should be preserved. The Carriage House is identified in the 1998 survey as contributing. Staff finds the existing garage contributing and recommends that original garage bays are retained. Staff finds the proposal to alter the garage bays is not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. The applicant is proposing to install three arched loggia openings with loggia style doors. Staff finds the proposed arched doors alter the character of the garage.

e. There are many successful examples of incorporating pedestrian doors into an existing garage door opening. The applicant should pursue a solution that is more consistent with the character and original use of the accessory structure.

f. On front façade of the existing garage there are 3 car bays, two 6 over 6 windows and one 3 over 3 window. On the left façade there is another 6 over 6 wood window. The applicant is proposing to remove the middle 3 over 3 window on the front façade and exchange it with the side 6 over 6 window. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window openings should be preserved. Staff visited the site September 26, 2016, and found that the stucco had been patched below center window and is not original to the structure. Also, staff finds the left window is not seen from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal to enlarge the front middle opening, using an existing historic window from the structure, to match the existing flanking windows appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of altering the windows based on finding f with the stipulation that the windows be reinstalled to match the existing profile.

Staff recommends denial of the proposed modification to the garage doors based on findings c through e. Staff recommends the applicant retain the existing garage bay openings and develop a solution that incorporates pedestrian access into the existing bays but continues to read as a garage door opening.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Rebecca Simmons

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for approval with cool cabana option A with the proposal to extend the center window on the east elevation.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

October 5, 2016

23. HDRC NO. 2016-382

Applicant: Frederica Kushner/Tobin Hill Community Association

Address: 430 E FRENCH PLACE

REQUEST:

A citizen request for the HDRC to make a recommendation regarding the significance of the property and its eligibility for designation as a historic landmark

FINDINGS:

- a. A request for review of historic significance for 430 E French Place was submitted to OHP by the Tobin Hill Community Association.
- b. Consistent with the RID 2014-003, OHP processed the request and scheduled on the HDRC agenda. If the HDRC does not take action to nominate the property for historic designation, the process will end.
- c. The HDRC may concur that the property is eligible for landmark designation without the consent of the property owner. According to the UDC Section 35-607(a) & (b)(1), initiation of landmark designation cannot begin without owner consent, unless a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation has been approved. If 430 E French Place is found to be eligible for historic landmark designation and the property owner does not consent, the HDRC shall direct the Historic Preservation Officer to request a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation.
- d. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(5) Criteria for Evaluation, the property is a one-story, side-gabled Craftsman bungalow, with a small centered front-gabled porch. All gables, including the porch, are clipped, which is a unique feature. The gabled porch roof supported by two columns with pediments, exposed rafter tails, and triangular knee braces are characteristic of the Craftsman style.
- e. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(7) Criteria for Evaluation, the property features clipped gables, consistent with other homes along this block located between N St. Mary's and I-281. There are 34 residential structures along this block. Thirteen of the 34 feature clipped front gables, and the remaining others feature front gables. Along the block, homes have linear front walkways and driveways placed to the east. These homes share other important details that produce "tout ensemble" of this micro-neighborhood, distinguishing this block from the other commercial corridor as well from the homes on the blocks to the north and south.
- f. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(8) Criteria for Evaluation, the property exhibits the original floor plan and retains a high level of integrity. The home features several craftsman bungalow elements such as wood lap siding, detailed wood window screens, triple windows, side lights on the front door, clipped front gable, clipped side gable, covered front porch, exposed rafter tails, and composition shingle roof.
- g. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(11) Criteria for Evaluation, the property is distinctive in character and exemplifies the social and economic heritage of San Antonio because of its relationship with developer H.C. Thorman. Thorman constructed hundreds of homes across San Antonio, often working with local manufacturing supplier and contracting firm Hillyer-Deutsch-Jarrett and pulling from a distinct plan book. The New Encyclopedia of Texas proclaimed Thorman was the "leading home builder of this city," best known for the San Antonio Country Club Addition and Olmos Park Estates. Additionally, property owners represent the economic heritage of San Antonio for their contributions toward the development of the manufacturing industry in San Antonio. For example, during the 1930s the home was owned by the Alpert family. Max Alpert was president and his wife Belle was secretary/treasurer at the Bell Manufacturing Company, which was originally located at 535 Broad (now E Mistletoe) in 1918, and later moved downtown. Later residents worked for Wolff & Marx, the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad, and the US Army.
- h. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(13) Criteria for Evaluation, the structure is one of several similar small structures that make up the planned development. The house was built circa 1922, as part of the development platted in February 1922 by H.C. Thoman. Remarkably, here are no vacant lots or intrusions.
- i. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(15) Criteria for Evaluation, the property contributes to the character of a well-defined neighborhood as part of a previously-identified potential historic district. In 2004, OHP staff

October 5, 2016

surveyed E French Place on the east side of N St. Mary's and noted its eligibility as a local historic district. Notably, the consistent architectural statement of the homes, their shared history of development through Thorman's plat and construction, and the high overall integrity of the area provide cohesion and support a potential district.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff concurs that the property is eligible for designation based on findings d through i. If the HDRC chooses to approve the request, the HDRC will become the applicant for the designation application before City Council. OHP shall process the application on behalf of the HDRC.

CASE COMMENTS:

The property owner submitted a demolition application for 430 E French Place on August 16, 2016. A request for a change in zoning from "R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District to "IDZ AHOD" Infill Development Zone Airport Hazard Overlay District with two (2) dwelling units.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Susan Beavin, Sam Aguire, Jordan Landes, Joshua Biffle, Betty Franklin, Paula Bondurant, Cynthia Speilman, Cosima Colvin, Martin Kushner- all spoke in support

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to approve applicants request for designation.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2016-363

Applicant: 7-Eleven, Inc.

Address: 115 S ZARZAMORA, Malt House

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the structure at 115 S Zarzamora, including a commercial building and canopies.
2. Construct a commercial structure and canopy.
3. Install signage on the commercial structure and canopy.

FINDINGS:

General Findings

a. This property was designated as a historic landmark by Ordinance 2013-03-21-0199, on March 21, 2013. The property is listed in the ordinance as 115 S Zarzamora, the Malt House Restaurant. The property was identified through the Westside Cultural Resources Survey initiative and was designated without owner opposition by City Council.

b. The Malt House was designated for its cultural significance as a place and institution where community gathered, socialized and celebrated for more than 50 years. The architecture by itself is not the basis for landmark status, instead the basis is found in spatial (tangible) and social (intangible) characteristics that provide a unique and authentic sense of place. Tangible elements which reflect a sense of place and create human interaction include: canopied in-car dining within close proximity to the dining hall, street setback, corner vehicular access, a lack of boundary between parked cars and pedestrian space, and distinctive signage. Intangible elements, communicated through community comments at the time of designation, reflect affection for The Malt House business as a place where the community formed a collective cultural identity over the period of its existence.

c. The structure at 115 S Zarzamora was built in 1954. It sits on the western side of Zarzamora and faces Buena Vista. It is a one-story box form, commercial post-war structure with auto-centric canopies. Its vernacular construction and auto-oriented design, street presence along Zarzamora, existing signage, including the use of hand-painted signage, pedestrian flow orientations, and parapets with banding are visible reminders of San

October 5, 2016

Antonio's economic history and social heritage. The exterior has been modified with the addition of brick veneer wainscot.

d. The request for the proposed demolition was reviewed by the Demolition and Designation Committee on August 23, 2016. The committee met on site and discussed certain characteristics of the Malt House that should be retained, such as signage and canopies. The members present also discussed orientation of the existing and proposed structures toward the street, complementary materials to the existing building, and community engagement.

e. The request for the proposed new construction was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 14, 2016. At the meeting, the committee voiced concerns regarding the fenestration pattern on the elevations facing the street. The committee stated that it would be important to reuse the Malt House signage and to create a gathering space similar to the existing canopies.

Findings Related to Request #1

f. Per the UDC Sec 35-614 (b)(1) regarding demolition of a landmark, the Historic and Design Review Commission shall be guided in its decision by balancing the historic, architectural, cultural and/or archaeological value of the particular landmark or eligible landmark against the special merit of the proposed replacement project. Unreasonable hardship is meant to assess the feasibility of reuse of architectural resources. The UDC directs staff to consider economic hardship for all demolition requests. Demolition of any landmark building 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).

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;

[The applicant has provided an estimate for renovation of the existing structure (\$1.8 million) but no additional information demonstrating the inability to produce a reasonable rate of return through the retention and reuse of the existing structure. While financial information for the business that operated in the structure was not submitted, the applicant has stated that it was no longer financial feasible to keep the restaurant open.]

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 has provided an Asbestos Inspection Report, a survey of issues to remodeling the existing structure as a convenience store, and the cost estimate for the work required to remodel and build out the existing building. The information is geared toward a specific proposed use. It's not clear whether other uses were considered but some of the costs outlined would apply regardless of the type of use. Others are specific to the convenience store and may be eliminated if another use were proposed. Regardless of the proposed use, the cost estimates indicate the existence of a hardship. While the \$1.8 million dollar estimate is a very high estimate, it's clear that the cost to rehabilitate the structure would be significant.]

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 property owner has found a potential buyer who is the applicant in this case. The potential buyer is requesting demolition and has stated in the narrative submitted with the application that the offer to purchase is contingent upon demolition of the existing structure. It is not clear whether other attempts to sell the property have been made.]

g. In accordance with the UDC Sec 35-614(b)(3), the applicant has provided information that supports the claim of economic hardship.

h. The property was designated for its cultural significance to the community as a commercial enterprise which contributed to the social heritage of the Westside. The Malt House, as a restaurant, is no longer an operating business which signifies loss of its historical use. Staff finds however, that the property continues to serve as a visible reminder of cultural heritage. Memories, affection for place and a location associated with cultural identity are characteristics which should have continuity. New construction, if approved, should retain elements of the existing structure and spatial configuration in order to retain a sense of place and intangible heritage. This includes:

- spatial relationships and location of the original footprint;
- street presence along Zarzamora;
- setbacks;

October 5, 2016

- existing signage;
- pedestrian flow;
- areas for gathering and socializing.

Modifications to the property, including demolition, would not necessarily compromise the significance of the site. Retention of the street facing walls (east and south) would contribute to the spatial relationship as would canopied gathering areas, hand-painted signage, street orientation and setback of the eastern wall and its alignment with the adjacent landmark building, design supporting pedestrian activity, and salvaging of marquee signage.

i. If the HDRC approves the request for demolition, this action does not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A demolition 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.\

j. In regards to the documentation of the demolition of any historic landmark, per the UDC Sec 35-614 (d), the applicant is required to provide documentation and salvage strategy of demolition prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Documentation may be used for interpretation at a later date.

Findings related to request item #2:

k. 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.

l. The Design Review Committee recommended that the building be oriented to the street corner at Zarzamora and Buena Vista and that all street elevations include windows. They also discussed the importance of reusing the Malt House signage and incorporating canopies as a gathering space.

m. **FAÇADE ORIENTATION** - The existing Malt House is oriented toward Buena Vista and sits along Zarzamora. The applicant is requesting to construct a convenience store at the corner of Zarzamora and Buena Vista, with the primary entrance facing the west interior. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.ii., the front façade of the new building should be oriented to be consistent with other historic structures along the street. As noted in finding b, the spatial configurations and presence along the street should be retained. While the DRC was open to the proposed orientation, staff finds the orientation and footprint should reflect the existing building.

n. **SETBACKS** – The existing Malt House sits along Zarzamora with a zero line setback. The applicant is requesting to construct a convenience store at the corner of Zarzamora and Buena Vista. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., front facades of new buildings should align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. The property immediately adjacent on the north is a historic landmark building with a zero lot line setback. Staff finds the zero lot line setback is appropriate and consistent with the adjacent historic landmark structure.

o. **SCALE & MASS & FORM** – The applicant is proposing to construct a one-story 3,062 square foot building with a flat roof. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2. A. and B., new construction height and scale should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and roof forms should be similar with those found on the block. Staff finds the proposed square footage and roof form are appropriate for the site.

p. **FAÇADE CONFIGURATION** – The applicant is proposing to have windows on the west, south and east elevations. On the north façade, they are wall mounting one of the existing “Malt House” signs. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.ii., the primary façade of the new commercial building should be in keeping with established patterns. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines as there are windows that face both Zarzamora and Buena Vista.

q. **MATERIALS** – The existing structure is stucco, with wood board and batten, and a brick veneer base. The applicant is proposing to use two types of stucco with a brick base. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A., materials that complement the type, color and texture of material found in the district. Staff finds the proposed materials appropriate.

r. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The existing structure has metal awnings on the facades facing the street. The applicant is proposing to install standing seam roofing on awnings on all four facades. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A., architectural details that are in keeping with the predominate architectural style should be incorporated. Staff finds the proposed awnings appropriate.

s. **CANOPY** – The applicant is proposing to install a canopy for fuel pumps with four pumps underneath, made of brick and light sandstone. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B., service areas should be

October 5, 2016

screened from the public right of way. Staff finds the proposed landscaping helps buffer the pumps from the residential property to the west, but recommends that further screening is needed. Staff also recommends the materials on the canopy match those proposed on the main structure.

t. **SITE ELEMENTS** – The existing site is paved with asphalt except for two planting strips with grass. The applicant is proposing a paved site with landscaping consisting of Bermuda grass, and various trees and shrubs along the west property line, north property line, and street frontages. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3, a varied plant palette with varied heights and native plant materials should be used; impervious surfaces should not be introduced where not historically located. Staff finds the proposed paving and landscaping consistent with the Guidelines.

u. **SITE ELEMENTS** – The applicant is proposing to construct a dumpster enclosure and locate on the northwest corner of the lot. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B., service areas should be screened from the public right of way. Staff finds the proposed screening consistent with the Guidelines, however finds that if any other mechanical equipment is needed, that the applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines and receiving approval for their placement.

v. **MALT HOUSE ELEMENTS** – There is an existing attached canopy. The applicant is proposing a seating and gathering area on the southwest corner of the new structure under a detached canopy. Staff supports the concept of canopy use to denote gathering spaces as it reflects a signature design element that contributes to the shared experience and cultural significance of the site.

Findings related to request item #3:

w. There are two existing roof-mounted “Malt House” signs. The applicant is proposing to salvage one of the two roof mounted sign to install on the north elevation. This proposal speaks to the comments from the Design Review Committee and is an appropriate treatment for historic signs. However, Staff recommends that both roof-mounted signs be salvaged and reused. Also, the plans submitted show additional signage, but there is not enough information for staff to review and determine compliance with Chapter 28 or the design guidelines. The applicant should return at a later date with a complete sign request and packet.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition based on findings a through j. Staff does not recommend approval of replacement plans at this time. Replacement plans should incorporate significant design elements noted in finding h. The elements are as follows:

1. The proposed new construction is constructed at the same setbacks and orientation of the existing structure to maintain spatial relationships as noted in finding m.
2. The applicant salvage both of the existing roof mounted “Malt House” signs as noted in finding w.
3. In accordance with the UDC, if demolition is approved, documentation and salvage strategy must be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

If the HDRC approves demolition and conceptual approval for the proposed new construction, staff recommends that the design elements noted in findings k through v are addressed before returning to the HDRC for final approval.

1. That the applicant explore adding further screening and buffer between adjacent properties.
2. That the applicant return for review and approval and provide details of proposed signage.
3. That the applicant meet with the Design Review Committee prior to submitting the final proposal.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Susan Beavin, John David A. Griffin, Alex Briseno, Alicia Arredondo, Tomas Ybara Fausto, Rachel Delgado, Mr. Vidales, Gianna Rendon, Jess Benavides, Gloria Ramirez, Robert Rendon, Cynthia Spielman, Josie Merla, Mr. Dudley, Susana Segura, Bernard Sanchez, Isabella Sanchez, Enrique Sanchez, Charles P. Jones, Sarah Gould, Ramiro Arriaga- All spoke in opposition to the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to move for approval of demolition and conceptual approval of proposed new construction with the stipulations that the design elements noted in findings K-V are addressed before returning to HDRC for final approval, further that the applicant explore adding further screening and buffering between the adjacent properties further that the applicant return for review and approval and provide details of proposed signage and further that the applicant meet with the DRC prior to submitting the final proposal and also that the applicant be encouraged to include the neighborhood and neighborhood representation in the design.

October 5, 2016

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Feldman, Lazarine, Cone, Grube, Laffoon
NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of Meeting Minutes – September 21, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve September 21, 2016 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Feldman, Lazarine, Cone, Laffoon, Grube
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, Feldman, Lazarine, Cone, Laffoon, Grube
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 7:45 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

