

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
November 2, 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, Brittain, Lazarine, Grube, Cone**

**ABSENT: Salmon, Feldman, Laffoon**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

- STAR in Dignowity Hill - November 12 and 13  
- November 16, 2016, HDRC Hearing - Modified start time of 8AM  
- National Trust for Historic Preservation - Preservation Leadership Forum - November 15-18 Houston  
- Rehabber Club Window Restoration Workshop - December 2 and 3 - Richter House - HemisFair

• **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                               |                      |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-421 | 327/331 Riverside Dr |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2016-419 | 615 Soledad St       |
| • Item # 3 Case No. 2015-426  | 131 City St          |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-423 | 133 E Mistletoe      |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-424 | 143 E Lullwood Ave   |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-420 | 435 Cedar St         |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-429 | 2123 W Huisache Ave  |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-430 | 163 Schriener Place  |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-418 | 600 Lone Star Blvd   |

Items #3 was pulled for a citizen to be heard. Item #9 was pulled for a recusal.

**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, Grube, Cone**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. HDRC NO. 2016-426**

Applicant: Kimberlee Lorenz/ReVamp Design Build

Address: 131 CITY ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Deconstruct the existing, non-contributing addition located at the southwest corner of the primary historic structure.
2. Reconstruct the addition using salvaged materials at the northwest corner of the primary historic structure.
3. Construct a wood porch at the rear of the primary historic structure at the location of the removed addition.

October 19, 2016

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 131 City was constructed circa 1900 and is located within the King William Historic District. Two small rear additions and a detached accessory structure have been constructed and are not contributing. The applicant has received administrative approval to perform modifications to the detached accessory structure, demolish the water heater closet addition, perform foundation and porch repair and other rehabilitative scopes of work to the primary historic structure.
- b. Currently, the structure features an addition at the southwest corner that features a low shed roof, aluminum windows and wood siding. The applicant has proposed to deconstruct this addition and reconstruct it on the northern side of the lot, at the northwest corner of the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed to reuse the existing roofing materials, dimensional framing lumber, wood siding and existing pine flooring.
- c. ADDITION – According to the Guidelines for Additions, residential additions should be sites at the side or rear of the primary historic structure to minimize visibility from the public right of way. Additionally, additions should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition from the old to the new. The applicant has proposed to for the addition to be at the interior of the site, feature a gable and shed roof and feature a setback from the north wall plane of the historic structure by two (2) feet to provide a transition from the old to the new. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- d. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed for the massing and scale of the proposed addition to be less than that of the primary historic structure and has proposed both and height and footprint that are appropriate for that of the primary historic structure and lot and are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.
- e. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed for the reconstructed addition to feature the salvaged materials of the deconstructed addition. These materials include a standing seam metal roof and wood siding. Additionally, the applicant has noted double hung wood windows and wood doors will be installed. The proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.
- f. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed architectural details that are complementary of this primary historic structure. These details include a gabled roof, similarly proportioned siding and window openings that are similar to those used throughout the historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.
- g. PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a wood porch to the south of the proposed addition. The applicant has noted that the porch will be primarily flat with no railings or overhangs. Staff finds the proposed porch appropriate.
- h. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 25-618 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.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to remained this case to the DRC

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

October 19, 2016

**9. HDRC NO. 2016- 418**

Applicant: Adam Schneider/Aqualand Development

Address: 600 LONE STAR BLVD

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the redevelopment of the Lone Star Brewery located at 600 Lone Star Boulevard. At this time, the applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish portions of the Cannery Building including non-historic warehouse space and office space.
2. Demolish portions of the Brewery Building including truck storage, the garage and loading dock area, noted as Buildings 7, 31 and 32 in the demolition exhibits.
3. Demolish six smaller accessory structures.
4. Rehabilitate and redevelop the Brewery Building.
5. Rehabilitate and redevelop the Cannery Building.
6. Perform modifications to the existing lake, pool and bleacher building.
7. Reconstruct the truck storage building.
8. Construct five parking structures.
9. Construct a cinema, three multi-family residential structures, a hotel and restaurant space.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to redevelop the Lone Star Brewery through the rehabilitation and reuse of both the Brewery and Cannery Buildings. Within the proposed redevelopment, the applicant has proposed partial demolition, reconstruction, new construction and the rehabilitation of many of the structures on site. At this time, the applicant is requesting conceptual approval of the listed scope of work.

b. In an October 2011, recommendation, Office of Historic Preservation staff found that buildings 1,3,4,5,6,17,18,20,21,32,35,38, the entrance drive tree canopy and the railspur should be retained or incorporated into a proposed redevelopment in some way. This recommendation and related exhibits are included in this recommendation.

c. The current proposed redevelopment was originally heard by the Design Review Committee on August 11, 2015. At that meeting, committee members asked questions regarding the preservation of the existing lake/pool and provided recommendations regarding materials and the overall design and branding of the proposed new structures.

d. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on July 12, 2016, where committee members asked questions regarding the proposed use for each existing structure, how parking would be organized, screening of the parking garages and the existing collection tanks. Committee members also commented on the creation of new window openings being appropriate and that the juxtaposition of the historic and proposed new construction was appropriate.

e. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION** – At this time, the applicant has proposed to partially demolish portions of the Cannery Building, located west of the Brewery Building. Along the west property line, the applicant has proposed to demolish a portion of the warehouse constructed circa 1970 to facilitate vehicular access to the rear of the site. Along Lone Star Boulevard, the applicant has proposed to demolish the one story office structure that is located between the surface parking lot adjacent to Lone Star Boulevard and the two story portion of the Cannery Building. Both of these structures were constructed in the 1970's and do not hold historic significance that relates to the Brewery. Staff finds the proposed demolition of both of these structures appropriate.

f. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION** – In addition to partial demolition at the Cannery Building, the applicant has also proposed to partially demolish portions of the Brewery Building including truck storage, an existing garage and loading docks. These structures are located at the rear of the Brewery Building with the exception of building 7, which is located along Lone Star Boulevard. Building 31 was constructed circa 1965, exhibits low architectural integrity and is eligible for demolition. Staff finds the applicant's request to demolish buildings 7 and 31 appropriate.

g. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION** – Regarding the demolition of structure 32, elements of significance include an interior mural which depicts many architectural and cultural icons of San Antonio in the form of a timeline. The addition itself was constructed circa 1950. Modifications to this structure have occurred in the past including the removal of the west wall and modification to the mural including the majority of it being painted over. Staff finds the demolition of this structure appropriate.

h. **BREWERY BUILDING** – The applicant has proposed many rehabilitative scopes of work to the existing

October 19, 2016

**Brewery Building.** The proposed work includes the replacement of existing metal windows with new metal windows, the installation of roll down doors on the west façade, the restoration of the existing, historic signage, the addition shade canopies on the west façade, the creation of new façade openings and the installation of new storefront systems on the north façade, the creation of new window openings on the east and west facades, the installation of metal screening, the repair of existing façade materials, painting, the installation of reclaimed brick for new exterior walls, the repair of the existing pedestrian bridge. Staff finds that the proposed scope of work is complementary to the industrial architecture that is original to the historic structure. Additionally, the creation of new façade openings is in keeping with the architectural character of the structures and does not present a negative design element. The applicant has proposed to retain and rehabilitate the existing silos.

i. **CANNERY BUILDING** – Similar to the Brewery Building, the applicant has proposed to perform rehabilitative efforts to the Cannery Building. Within this scope of work, the applicant has proposed to maintain and restore the existing conveyor bridge for pedestrian traffic, maintain the existing loading dock canopy, repair the existing sidewalk and repair the existing façade materials. The applicant has proposed to create new façade openings for windows and storefront systems, install painted building signage, install steel canopies with mesh panels and install a grand entry stair. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed modifications are in keeping with the industrial character of the Cannery Building and are appropriate.

j. **LAKE** – To the east of the Brewery Building, the applicant has proposed to repurpose the existing lake. The general shape of the lake will be maintained; however, the applicant will modify the area of the lake which holds water as well as modify the lake's depth. The applicant has proposed to incorporate plantings that are native to San Antonio. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate; however, staff recommends the applicant install a design feature which clearly shows the lake's original shape.

k. **POOL** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing swimming pool to the east of the lake and repurpose this location as a grand lawn that will serve as seating for an amphitheater. The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing shape and dimensions of the pool. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

l. **BLEACHER BUILDING** – The applicant has proposed to restore the existing bleacher building to serve as an entrance point into the brewery from the Mission Reach of the San Antonio River Walk.

m. **PARKING STRUCTURES** – The applicant has proposed to located five parking structures throughout the development. The applicant has noted that each parking structure will be wrapped with residential or retail space to some extent. At this time the applicant has not provided detailed elevations of the parking structures; however, staff recommends the applicant incorporate appropriate architectural screening methods for any portions of the proposed parking structures that will not be wrapped by retail or residential space. Each structure will need to be reviewed by Office of Historic Preservation staff and approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission prior to the issuance of a foundation or building permit. The proposed new construction is to comply with all Unified Development Code design standards.

n. **SURFACE PARKING** – The applicant has noted that to the south of the location of the proposed future hotel, a surface parking lot will be constructed to accommodate 136 vehicles. While the final design for this parking lot nor associated landscaping elements has not been provided, staff recommends the applicant buffer the proposed parking lot with landscaping appropriate landscaping elements.

o. **NEW CONSTRUCTION** – The applicant has noted the locations of various new structures including a cinema, three multi-family residential structures, a hotel and a restaurant. Staff finds the proposed locations of each structure appropriate. Each structure will need to be reviewed by Office of Historic Preservation staff and approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission prior to the issuance of a foundation or building permit. The proposed new construction is to comply with all Unified Development Code design standards.

p. **SIGNAGE MASTER PLAN** – Given the amount of retail and residential space proposed, the applicant should develop a master signage plan to be reviewed by the Office of Historic Preservation and approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission prior to the installation of signage.

q. **SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY COORDINATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-673 (c)(8), this proposed development and associated new construction shall coordinate with the San Antonio River Authority regarding landscaping and maintenance boundaries and storm water control measures as required in sections 35-672, 35-673, and 35-678.

r. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the local Mission Historic District, and the Mission Parkway National Register of Historic Places District. In addition, the property is traversed by the Principal or San Pedro Acequia. Furthermore, previously recorded archaeological 41BX1665 and 41BX278 are in close proximity to the property, as well. Therefore, 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.

October 19, 2016

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant incorporate a design feature into the proposed new lake design which clearly shows the lake's original shape.
- ii. That the applicant coordinate with the San Antonio River Authority regarding landscaping and maintenance boundaries and storm water control measures.
- iii. Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists 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 Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Grube

**NAYS:**

**RECUSAL:** Cone

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2016-431**

**Applicant:** Paulette Clay

**Address:** 611 BURNET ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a door on an existing, rear addition.
2. Construct a wraparound porch to include the existing porch, the side facade of the primary historic structure and the front facade of an addition.
3. Enclose an original, side facing front door.
4. Enclose two existing window openings on the east facade and create new facade openings.
5. Modify an existing opening on the west facade.
6. Modify the existing non-original dormer's roof pitch to match the existing roof pitches.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 611 Burnet was constructed circa 1920 and has since been modified heavily from its original architectural form. Modifications to this historic structure include the construction of a large dormer onto the front roof slope, the removal of historic columns and porch elements and the removal of historic materials and facade elements. Many non-historic facade elements have been added including shutters, awnings and non-original siding.

b. The applicant has received Administrative Approval for siding repair, wood window repair, to construct a rear deck and roofing repair.

c. The applicant has proposed to install a new door on the existing, rear addition. Staff finds that the installation of a door in the rear addition appropriate given that the applicant install an architecturally appropriate door. The applicant should have the specific door approved by Office of Historic Preservation staff prior to installation.

d. The applicant has proposed to construct a wraparound porch which would include the existing porch, the side facade of the primary historic structure and the front facade of an addition. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B., elements that create a false sense of historic should not be added. The addition of a porch to a primary facade both creates a false sense of history and alters historic architectural form and massing. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant restore the existing, original porch by installing columns that feature appropriate materials.

e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., historic window and door openings should be preserved. The applicant has enclosed an original, side facing front door, has modified existing side window openings. Many of the existing window openings that the applicant has modified feature sizes that appear

October 19, 2016

to be non-historic. Additionally, the applicant has introduced window openings that feature proportions that are consistent with historic window openings. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed window opening modifications are appropriate; however, wood windows should be installed. Staff finds that the applicant should reopen the side facing front door and install an architecturally appropriate door to be approved by staff prior to installation.

f. The applicant has proposed to modify the non-original dormer's roof pitch to be consistent with each other roof found on the structure. Staff finds this modification appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding b with the stipulation that the applicant have the specific door approved by Office of Historic Preservation staff prior to installation.

Staff recommends approval of items #4, #5 and #6 based on findings d through f with the stipulations that the applicant install wood windows and that the new side facing front door be approved by staff prior to installation.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 and #3 based on finding d and e.

**CASE COMMENT:**

Work began on the enclosure of original window and door openings prior to approval.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Walter Bowman spoke in support of the applicants request. Monica Savino spoke in opposition of the request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to remand this case to the DRC

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**11. HDRC NO. 2016-377**

Applicant: Andrew Douglas/Douglas Architects

Address: 135 E COMMERCE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to amend a previously approved design for the rehabilitation of the historic structure at 135 E Commerce, commonly known as the Witte Building. Within this amendment, the applicant has proposed:

1. Modify the exterior staircase to directly connect to the River Walk. Direct access to the River Level Terrace of the Witte Building from E Commerce will no longer be provided.
2. Construct a vegetation screen to be attached to the public/private elevator to provide screening as well as incorporate a sliding access gate.
3. Remove the proposed metal balconies at the street level, second level and third floor balconies at all locations other than the proposed stair's landings. The rear balconies will remain.
4. Reduce the number and size of window openings.

**FINDINGS:**

a. On October 16, 2013, the applicant received conceptual approval to rehabilitate the existing structure at 135 E Commerce, known as the Witte Building. Included in this conceptual approval was the restoration of the front (south) façade, the reconstruction of the historic decorative parapet wall, the removal of several rear additions, the construction of metal balconies on the north façade, the construction of a small, projecting balcony and a flat canopy at street level on the south façade and to remove an existing Hugman retaining wall and cantilevered walkway along the west side of the structure currently connecting E Commerce to an existing pedestrian bridge across the main river channel and construct a new pedestrian stair from E Commerce to the River Walk below.

October 19, 2016

Stipulations for this approval included more detail be presented for final approval regarding the materials and installation method for the proposed balconies and the proposed street facing canopy.

b. On December 3, 2014, the applicant received conceptual approval install a public/private elevator located in the southwest corner of the property. The applicant stated at that time that the proposed elevator would serve visitors to the San Antonio River Walk as well patrons of the Witte Building and that the owner was pursuing continual public access to the elevator. Stipulations for this approval included that the owner and operator of the proposed elevator offer continual elevator access to the public in order to facilitate pedestrian traffic from E Commerce to the River Walk level below, that the applicant address and provide more information regarding potential queuing at the elevator entrance on the River Walk level and that the applicant explore alternatives regarding the overall design and materials to mitigate the blocked view from the Witte Building's third story window, the use of complementary materials and the inclusion of a canopy (this canopy is not to be confused with the proposed and conceptually approved canopy attached to the existing structure's E Commerce façade).

c. At the July 15, 2016, HDRC hearing, the HDRC approved the design with the stipulations that the applicant coordinate with the City of San Antonio Center City Development & Operations Department regarding public access to the proposed elevator and that an archaeological investigation is required.

d. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 14, 2016, where committee members asked questions regarding the proposed stair circulation at the river level, the distance between the stair and elevator for a pedestrian path, proposed materials for both the stair and elevator tower and proposed landscaping materials for the green screen. Committee members expressed concern regarding the success of a proposed green screen, the materials used for the proposed elevator and stair tower and the queuing of pedestrians at the elevator entrance on the River Walk level.

e. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on October 12, 2016. At that meeting, committee members discussed the updated proposals to the green screen, questioned the elevator's door orientation, noted that the stair seemed to be an intrusion on the River Walk and asked questions regarding the existing circulation at the River Walk level.

f. **STAIR MODIFICATION** – The applicant received final approval to construct a stair that would feature a River Walk level landing that did not impede on the public right of way, nor pose a threat to the facilitation of pedestrian traffic passing by the Witte Building. At this time, the applicant has proposed the River Walk level landing to the west of the pedestrian walkway with the stair case extending over the pedestrian walkway. This design would utilize an existing planting strip and funnel pedestrian traffic between the proposed stair case and the proposed elevator tower. Staff finds that the newly proposed location of the stair landing could potentially impede the flow of pedestrian traffic in the public right of way.

g. **STAIR MODIFICATION** – The applicant has proposed modifications to the proposed detailing of the stair, primarily at the River Walk level to street connection. The applicant has proposed a stair that features materials that include polished concrete and perforated metal. While these materials may be similar to those found in original Hugman elements, their application is drastically different in design, scale and context.

h. **ELEVATOR MODIFICATION** – At the time of final approval, the applicant had proposed for the elevator and stair tower to feature an overall height of approximately thirty-three (33) feet. The applicant had previously proposed for the elevator to have a reduced height as to not obscure historic window openings on the west façade of the Witte Building. At this time, the applicant has increased the height of the proposed elevator; however, the overall height of the proposed elevator tower is less than that of the primary historic structure. given the distance between the elevator structure and the historic window, the window will not be obscured. Additionally, the proposed elevator materials which include perforated metal, steel members and clear and fritted glass will reduce the overall mass of the proposed tower.

i. **ELEVATOR MODIFICATION** – Previously, staff noted that an elevator which featured an entrance facing the pedestrian right of way at the Riverwalk level would promote queuing in the public right of way, which is prohibited by the UDC Section 35-672(a)(5). Additionally per UDC Section 35-672(p) a landing that is at minimum six (6) feet in depth shall be provided between an elevator or building access point or doorway and the River Walk pathway. The width of the landing shall further comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) and/or TAS (Texas Accessibility Standards) requirements. Per the site plan provided by the applicant, this requirement has not been met. Staff recommends the applicant revise the proposed design to comply with UDC Section 35-672(p). The elevator as proposed would require a variance given that it does not meet the minimum requirement for queuing.

j. **ELEVATOR MODIFICATION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a vegetation screen to screen the proposed elevator and stair from view. Staff finds that a screen at this location would only add to the massing of the proposed elevator. Additionally, staff has concern regarding the success of a western facing vegetation screen which is attached to glass and steel. Staff recommends the applicant remove the proposed green screen from the

October 19, 2016

scope of work.

k. WINDOW MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to reduce the size of the proposed window openings to match existing window openings as well as to reduce the overall amount of proposed window openings. Staff finds this modification to the previously approved design appropriate given that no historic elements will be negatively impacted.

l. BALCONY MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to remove all balconies from the west façade with the exception of balconies used in coordination with the proposed stair. Staff finds that the removal of the proposed balconies is appropriate given that no historic elements will be negatively impacted.

m. ARCHAEOLOGY- The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the Spanish Colonial Potrero. In addition, it is adjacent to the San Antonio River and the Main and Military Plazas National Register of Historic Places District. The project area is also in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX25 and 41BX984. Thus, the property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area. Excavations within public property shall adhere to the requirements of the Texas Antiquities Code. 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings f through j with the following stipulation:

i. Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists 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.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4 based on findings k and l.

**COMMISSION ACTION:** The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for conceptual approval with the stipulation that the archaeological study be completed.

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Grube, Cone

**NAYS:** Lazarine

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**12. HDRC NO. 2016-422**

Applicant: Sue Ann Pemberton/Mainstreet Architects Inc.

Address: 418 VILLITA ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install primary entrance steps on the existing porch at building #2.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to construct primary entrance steps and a landing on the porch of Building #2 at La Villita. The applicant has proposed for the new steps and landing to be a total of 9' – 4 ¼' in length and a total of 3' – 9 ½" in width. The total width of the historic porch is 4' – 4 ½". The total height of the proposed steps and landing is 1' 1 ½" with a total guardrail height of 4' – 2" above grade. The applicant has proposed 2x6 inch porch decking and 2x2 guardrail posts.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv., new elements such as stairs should be designed to be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The applicant has proposed that the landing, steps and guard rail to be oriented in a manner that is parallel with the front façade of the historic structure. Staff finds that the front entry landing, steps and guardrail are currently proposed in a manner that is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed orientation distracts from the design of the original porch.

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

October 19, 2016

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends the applicant redesign the front porch in a manner that does not include the construction of steps and a landing that span approximately 9 feet of the historic façade. Staff finds that the front entry landing, steps and guardrail are currently proposed in a manner that is not consistent with the Guidelines.

**CASE COMMENT:**

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 Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve as submitted.

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2016-427**

Applicant: Kamal Elhabr/SAISD

Address: 723 DONALDSON AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the existing fountain located in the Student Council Courtyard at Thomas Jefferson High School. Renovations would include the following:

1. Replace existing historic tiles with new tiles recreated by ceramic artist to match in-kind
2. Remove existing non-original clay wall cap on outer tier and install architectural precast concrete cap
3. Remove existing non-original blue pool tiles in the outer ring and re-install green pool tiles on the pool floor and sides of the outer tier
4. Raise the bottom of the pool of the outer tier from 3' deep to 4" deep
5. Reconstruct 3 water spouts and install frog fountain heads
6. Install a new water infiltration and recirculation system.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The Thomas Jefferson High School is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a Registered Texas Historic Landmark.

b. The existing fountain is located in the Student Council Courtyard at Thomas Jefferson High School. The fountain consists of two tiers, an outer pool and an inner pool. Originally, the inner tier had 3 fountain heads, but those have been removed.

c. The applicant is proposing to remove all of the existing historic tiles with new tiles recreated by ceramic artist to match in-kind. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. Staff finds the tiles should be repaired if possible. Staff made a site visit on October 21, 2016, and found that some tile is chipped and damaged, but that some are intact. Staff finds this proposal to replace all tiles no consistent with these standards and recommends a salvaging plan be made and submitted to staff.

d. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing non-original clay wall cap on outer tier and install architectural precast concrete cap. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved or missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. Staff finds the clay cap is not seen in the historic photographs submitted. Staff finds the replacement of the cap with a precast concrete cap appropriate.

e. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing non-original blue pool tiles in the outer ring and re-install green pool tiles on the pool floor and sides of the outer tier. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for

October 19, 2016

Rehabilitation, changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved or missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. Staff finds the pool tiles do not match the tiles that are seen in the historic photographs and are not original to the fountain. Staff finds the new tiles to be installed will not be seen as they will be under water. Staff finds the replacement of the pool tiles and installation of new green tiles on the pool floor and sides appropriate.

f. The applicant is proposing to raise the bottom of the pool of the outer tier from 3' deep to 4' deep in order to comply with building codes. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, exterior alterations shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. Staff finds that raising the pool bottom does not change the character of the fountain and is appropriate.

g. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct 3 water spouts and install frog fountain heads in the original locations of the water spouts. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The historic photographs submitted are not clear about the fountain heads on the water spouts. The applicant informed staff that Thomas Jefferson High School alumni have said the spray heads used to be an animal, a fish or a frog. Staff finds the reconstruction of the water spouts appropriate.

h. The applicant is proposing to install a new water infiltration and recirculation system. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, exterior alterations shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. Staff finds that installation of new mechanical equipment appropriate and would not destroy the historic material or character of the fountain.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through h with the stipulations that the applicant submit a salvaging plan for repairable historic tiles to staff.

**CASE COMMENT:**

This property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and a Registered Texas Historic Landmark and may require review by the Texas Historical Commission. The applicant should coordinate with THC directly.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**14. HDRC NO. 2016-425**

Applicant: Steven Salas

Address: 3127 MISSION RD

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install wrought iron fencing at the property at 3127 Mission Road that is to span approximately 130' along Mission Road and approximately 155' along E Huff Avenue. The applicant has proposed for the fence to feature heights that include both four (4) and six (6) feet.
2. Install signage on the gate of the proposed fence.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a wrought iron fence on the property at 3127 Mission Road. The applicant has proposed to construct the fence to span approximately 130' along Mission Road and approximately 155' along E Huff Avenue. The applicant has proposed for the fence to feature heights that include both four (4) and six (6) feet. There is existing fencing on the east and north property lines.

b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences and walls should appear similar to those used

October 19, 2016

historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. Front yard fences are commonly found on nearby historic properties; typically featuring materials that include wood, wrought iron and chain link. Additionally, the design of a new fence should respond to the design and materials on the main structure.

c. The applicant has proposed to construct a wrought iron fence to surround a commercial structure. Staff finds this material appropriate for both the property and district; however, staff does not find the proposed fence design appropriate. The applicant has proposed a wrought iron fence that features multiple angled pickets creating a fanlike design. Staff finds that this design is inconsistent with the character of fences found throughout the Mission Historic District.

d. In regards to height, the applicant has proposed for a height of four (4) feet along Mission Road and a portion of E Huff. Toward the rear of the primary structure, the applicant has proposed a height of six (6) feet to extend to the property line. This six (6) foot tall portion of fencing would front E Huff Avenue. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., the height of fences in the front yard should not exceed four (4) feet in height. Additionally, per UDC Section 35-614(a)(2)(a), no fence exceeding three (3) feet in height within the city or ETJ shall be erected, constructed, or built on a corner lot within the area formed by measuring twenty-five (25) feet in each direction from the street curb. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the overall height of the fence to comply with both the UDC and Historic Design Guidelines.

e. The applicant has proposed to install signage on the gate of the proposed fence that is to read "Hacienda Salas Artplex, Gallery and Studios" that is to be mounted on the proposed gate. The applicant has proposed for the gate to feature six (6) feet in height, inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds the proposed signage and the gate to which it is to be attached is inconsistent with fencing and gate design found in the Mission Historic District. Staff recommends the applicant revise the proposed signage and gate to be more appropriate for the district.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings c through e. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the overall height of the fence to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and Unified Development Code as well as simplify the fence's design to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines as well as fences found throughout the Mission Historic District.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to remand this case to the DRC

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

**NAYS:**

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **15. HDRC NO. 2016-406**

Applicant: Tracy Sloan

Address: 2219 W MISTLETOE

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove lawn and install granite, rocks, drought tolerant plants.

#### **FINDINGS:**

a. The property at 2219 W Mistletoe is located in Monticello Park and was designated in 2008.

b. Work was done to the front yard prior to receiving approval. The applicant has submitted the required documentation to staff.

c. The existing front yard lawn area consists of grass flagstones along the left of the driveway and right bed, seating area with flagstones, dry stone retaining wall along front sidewalk, and shrubs along the front façade. The applicant is proposing to install decomposed granite in the lawn areas, create five beds with hickory creek rocks, install drought tolerant plants in those beds, place boulders around the lawn, and border the left lawn with a strip of river rocks. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A and 3.B, traditional lawn areas should not be fully removed and replaced, and new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible

October 19, 2016

and should not be used as a wholesale replacement. Staff replacing the entire traditional lawn is not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. The existing planting strip consists of grass and two crepe myrtles. The applicant is proposing to remove all of the grass and install decomposed granite and place river rocks around the crepe myrtles. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 4.A.ii., maintain the use of traditional lawn in planting strips where a consistent pattern has been retained along the block frontage. Staff made a site visit on October 21, 2016, and found that the planting strips along this particular block solely consisted of lawn. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends denial based on findings a through d. Staff recommends the applicant retain at least 50% lawn in the front yard.

**CASE COMMENT:**

Work was done prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant has submitted the required documentation to staff.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for denial

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2016-428**

Applicant: Christopher Flores

Address: 726 DAWSON ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install new 18" fiber cement board skirting where no skirting exists
2. Paint the body, trim, shutters, columns, dormer, gable, door, and windows.
3. Remove two wrought iron porch railing along the front porch steps, repair front porch steps, and install siding on the sides of front porch stairway
4. Install a 6' wood rear privacy fence along the left property fence behind the front façade
5. Install a 4' wrought iron fence along the front property line and left property line until the front façade.
6. Remove 5 existing wrought iron columns and front porch railing and install 7 new 4' x 4' square columns with trim and a pediment base

**FINDINGS:**

a. The home at 726 Dawson is a Folk Victorian style home with Queen Anne features; it is one-story with a curved wrap around porch, wood siding, composition shingles on the hip with a side gable room, and a front dormer.

b. The applicant completed work prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

c. There is no existing skirting. The applicant is proposing to install 18" fiber cement board skirting. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.i., replacement skirting should consist of durable, proven materials, and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. Staff finds the proposed skirting consistent with the Guidelines.

d. The home is white in color. The applicant is proposing to paint the body Downing slate, the shutters and columns Antique White, the trim Downing Straw, the dormer and gables Rookwood Antique Gold, and the dormer window and front door Rockwood Red. Staff finds the color changes appropriate.

e. There are wrought iron railings along the sides of the front porch stairs. The applicant is proposing to remove the two wrought iron railings, repair the wood front porch steps, and install fiber cement siding on the sides of front porch stairway. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., reconstruct and

October 19, 2016

design porches based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff finds the addition of skirting to the sides of the steps compatible to the Folk Victorian style. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

f. There is not fencing along the left property line. The applicant is proposing to install a 6' wood rear privacy fence along the left property fence terminating behind the front façade. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2., privacy fences should be back from the front façade and per the UDC, rear fences should be no more than 6' in height. Staff finds the proposed rear privacy fence consistent with the Guidelines and the UDC.

g. There is a metal chain link fence along the right property line but no fencing along the front property line. The applicant is proposing to install 4' wrought iron fence along the front property line and left property line until the front façade. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., the appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Staff finds that 4' front yard transparent fences were present with the district was established. Staff finds the proposed front yard fence consistent with the Guidelines.

h. There are 5 existing wrought iron columns and one iron railing along the front of the porch. The applicant is proposing to remove the wrought iron columns and railing and install 7 new 4' x 4' square columns with trim and a pediment base. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., reconstruct and design porches based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff finds that the square columns are not compatible with the Folk Victorian style of the home. Staff finds that Folk Victorian homes with the curved wrap around porch have round Doric or Corinthian columns. Staff also finds that columns on porches are seen in even numbers. Staff recommends the applicant install columns that are more appropriate for the architectural style of the home.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

Staff does not recommend approval of item #6 based on finding h. Staff recommends the replacement of the wrought iron columns with a wood column appropriate, but recommends the applicant install columns that in keeping with the architectural style of the home.

**CASE COMMENT:**

The applicant completed work without approval. The applicant is working with staff to make payments towards the postwork application fee.

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514

**APPLICANT WITHDREW ITEM #6**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for approval of items 1-5.

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Approval of Meeting Minutes – October 19, 2016**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve October 19, 2016 minutes.

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

October 19, 2016

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Brittain, Lazarine, Grube, 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 5:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair