

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
October 19, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:50 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, Brittain, Lazarine, Laffoon

ABSENT: Salmon, Grube, Feldman, Cone

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

- Archaeology Month in Texas - October 2016
- Currents in Texas Archaeology Symposium - October 21 - 6:30 PM - 3801 Broadway
- Power of Preservation PROM - October 27, 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
- STAR in Dignowity Hill - November 12 and 13
- November 16, 2016, HDRC Hearing - 8AM
- National Trust for Historic Preservation - Preservation Leadership Forum - November 15-18 in Houston, TX

- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-415 | 502 Burnet St |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2016-416 | Hays St Bridge |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2015-417 | Nolan St Under Pass of Union Pacific Railroad |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-069 | Azalan Creek |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-405 | 516 Pierce |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-404 | 101 Alder |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-407 | 211 Devine St |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-408 | 203 St Marys |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-409 | 318 Huisache Ave |
| • Item #10, Case No.2016-410 | 702 Donaldson Ave |
| • Item #11 Case No. 2016-411 | 815 S St Marys |
| • Item #12 Case No. 2016-412 | 715 Grant Ave |
| • Item #13 Case No. 2016-413 | 1123 Nolan |
| • Item #14 Case No. 2016-349 | 401 E Houston St |
| • Item #15 Case No. 2016-402 | 3325 Adams St |
| • Item #16 Case No. 2016-403 | 631 Mission St |

Items #12 & #14 were pulled for a citizen to be heard. Item #16 was pulled by Vice- Chairman Connor.

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, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

October 19, 2016

12. HDRC NO. 2016-412

Applicant: Michael Perez/MP2 Home Restoration, LLC

Address: 715 GRANT AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is seeking a Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation to remove historic designation from the property at 715 Grant Avenue, also known as 1002 W Magnolia.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 715 Grant Avenue, previously known as 1002 W Magnolia, was designated as a historic landmark by Ordinance 2009-01-15-0048 on January 15, 2009.
- b. The property owner submitted a request for removal of historic designation. Consistent with the UDC Sec 35-606(g), the applicant must present new and compelling evidence that the property no longer meets the criteria for landmark designation. The applicant submitted photos of the lot showing that there are no buildings on the site.
 - The structure that existed on the site in 2009 no longer exists. The structure was a Neoclassical-style residence constructed circa 1910. The two-and-a-half-story frame house featured a hipped roof with two-story front, side, and rear-gabled projections, a standing-seam metal roof, two-story porch wraps around the façade and east side elevation, and the porch features fluted Ionic columns and a wooden balustrade at the second floor.
 - The structure caught fire in early 2011.
 - On February 28, 2011, the Dangerous Structure Determination Board issued a demolition order asking that structure be demolished within 30 days.
 - On June 2, 2011, the demolition permit was obtained and issued.
 - On July 26, 2016, the applicant requested a determination of non-contributing status for the two remaining accessory structures on the site. Staff determined that due to the loss of context, and extensive modifications that both the garage and accessory structure to be of non-contributing status.
- c. In accordance with the UDC Sec. 35-607, Criteria for designation, staff should evaluate the property based on the criteria for designation. At the time of designation in 2009, the main structure met the designation criteria: UDC sec. 35-607(b)(5), the structure embodies characters of a valuable architectural style; UDC sec. 35-607(b)(7), the structure exhibits singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature; UDC sec. 35-607(b)(8), the property has maintained a high level of integrity. If the structure was to be evaluated today, according to the UDC, it would not be eligible as the structure no longer exists and does not meet the criteria.
- d. The property is located in the Beacon Hill NCD-5 (Neighborhood Conservation District), which went into effect on December 15, 2005. NCDs are established to protect and preserve physical features of neighborhoods. Should the historic designation be removed, the NCD requirements would still apply requiring any new construction to be in compliance with the architectural standards which are character defining features of the Neighborhood conservation District.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that there is new and compelling evidence and that the property no longer remains eligible for designation based on finding c. Staff supports the removal of the designation considering the review process mandated by the UDC Section 35-335 as noted in finding d.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: John Merson, Mark Spielman, Martin Kushener, Paula Bondurant, William Lambert, Jack M. Finger, all spoke in opposition to the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for denial of the applicant's request.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2016- 349

October 19, 2016

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.

c. This request was originally heard at the September 7, 2016, HDRC hearing where it was approved with staff's stipulations which included the inclusion of appropriate proportions for the proposed addition's metal panels, the exploration of alternative massing options that relate to the massing of adjacent additions, the consideration of a reduction in height by one floor to become consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, the introduction of a building cap, archaeological investigations for all excavation and that the applicant attend a meeting with the Design Review Committee prior to returning for final approval.

d. This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on September 28, 2016, where committee members recommended that the applicant provide a diagram noting the current and proposed additions in comparison of each other, asked questions regarding the updated setback, noted that the proposed cap appeared too heavy and recommended a tapering or trimming of the proposed cap.

e. **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.

f. **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.

g. **ADDITION** – At the rooftop of the original structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature four floors; each featuring a floor to floor 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 nine (9) feet from the south façade and approximately 9' – 6" from the west façade which tapers to a setback of 3' – 4" at the northwest corner of the addition given the irregular footprint of the historic structure. 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.

h. **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-two (62) feet in height. The applicant has proposed the addition to feature approximately forty-one (41) feet in height; approximately sixty-six (66) percent of the historic structure's height. When including the existing addition, the existing overall height is approximately seventy-five (75) feet in height. A total new net height proposed at this location is approximately twenty-eight (28) feet in height, approximately

October 19, 2016

thirty-seven (37) percent of the existing height. Staff finds that the proposed addition's massing and height will not obscure the form of the original structure and is consistent with the height found on this block of E Houston.

i. **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.

j. **WINDOWS** – According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i., the shapes of window openings should reflect their own time while respecting the historic context of the primary historic structure. The applicant has provided elevations which note the locations and sizes of the addition's windows. Staff finds the proposed windows appropriate for the proposed addition as well as generally appropriate in size in regards to the historic structure. Staff finds that the use of one over one windows may further relate the addition's windows to the historic structure. Additionally, the applicant should inset each window at least two inches within walls to create façade depth.

k. **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. Historic structures commonly feature distinctive parapets and cornices that often serve as an architectural capital. The applicant has proposed an architectural cap for the proposed addition that features an overhang that is to match the proposed metal façade panels. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

l. **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.

m. **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.

n. **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.

o. **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 approval based on findings a through o with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide information regarding materials and material detailing prior to returning for final approval.
- ii. That the applicant provide information regarding window materials and profile and inset each window at least two inches within walls.
- iii. **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

COMMISSION ACTION:

October 19, 2016

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to move for approval with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2016-403

Applicant: Tyron Johnson/IES Texas Solar.

Address: 631 MISSION ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a solar panel system on the roof of the historic structure at 631 Mission. The proposed system is to include fourteen panels.

FINDINGS:

a. The request to install solar panels on the roof of the historic structure at 631 Mission was originally heard by the HDRC on June 15, 2016. At that time, the applicant had proposed to locate solar panels in front of the existing side gable where they would be visible from the public right of way. Staff's recommendation was for the applicant to relocate the panels to the rear of the structure, behind the side gable. The applicant withdrew the request at the hearing in order to revise the request. The applicant has made progress toward a less visible solution.

b. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install fourteen solar panels on three separate roof slopes to the rear of the side gable. Two panels will be at the extreme rear of the structure located on an addition, six panels will be located on the west facing rear roof slope and six panels will be located on the south facing roof slope of the front gable to the rear of the existing side gable.

c. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i, solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Staff finds that the majority of the proposed panels will not be seen from the public right of way and their placement is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions. Additionally, staff finds that the upper two panels to the immediate rear of the side gable will be seen from the public right of way and recommends that the applicant reposition both panels to minimize any visibility.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant present additional information regarding a revised placement of the two panels that will be visible from Mission Street to staff prior to permitting.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve the applicants request with staff stipulations

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of Meeting Minutes – October 5, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to approve October 5, 2016 minutes.

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

October 19, 2016

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

At 4:35 the commission met in executive session until 5:25. At any time during the meeting, the HDRC may meet in executive session for consultation with the City Attorney's Office concerning attorney-client matters related to the powers and duties of the Commission in enforcing and interpreting the City Code and Design Guidelines, in accordance with Section 551.071 of the Texas Government Code.

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, 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 5:27 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair