

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
November 16, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 8:17AM, 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, Laffoon, Garza, Cone, Grube

ABSENT: Salmon, Feldman, Brittain, Lazarine

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

- STAR in Dignowity Hill - Recap
- National Trust for Historic Preservation - Preservation Leadership Forum - November 15-18 - Houston, TX
- SAPreservation 5K Series - Downtown Holiday Lights - December 6 - Travis Park - 6PM
- STAR in the Mission District - January 21 - 22 and January 28 - 29
- Rehabber Club Window Restoration Workshop - February 3 and 4 - Richter House - HemisFair
- New Office of Historic Preservation Phone Number - (210) 207-0035

• **CITIZENS TO BE HEARD**

- John Whitsett, spoke regarding a certificate of appropriateness.
- Cherise Bell, spoke regarding the KWA Home Tour.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-445 | 504 Mason St |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2016-455 | 817 Nolan |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2015-386 | 932 Burnet St |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-435 | 101 Bowie St |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-446 | 1833 E Houston St |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-434 | 217 Robinson Place |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-448 | 226 N Hackberry St |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-451 | 530 McCullough Ave |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-444 | 114 Princess Pass |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2016-368 | 226 W Rosewood Ave |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2016-436 | 126 E Lullwood Ave |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-439 | 201 Delaware |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2016-484 | 315 Club Dr. |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2015-379 | 2127 W Summit |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2016-458 | 206 Quentin |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2016-438 | 502 E Dewey Place |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2016-442 | 2222 N Alamo St |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2016-447 | 501 N Alamo St |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2016-437 | 7131 Symphony Lane |

Items #3, #5, #6, #10, #11, & #16 were pulled for citizens to be heard. Items #7& #17 were pulled for recusals.

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, Laffoon, Garza, Cone, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

November 16, 2016

3. HDRC NO. 2016-386

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio, PLLC

Address: 932 BURNET ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Repair existing wood siding, trim, windows and Folk Victorian elements.
2. Construct a rear, two level addition.
3. Construct a side yard deck with a trellis cover.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 932 Burnet was constructed circa 1905 and features strong Folk Victorian architectural elements including a circular wrap-around porch, a front window bay and side roof gables. This structure appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps.

b. At the October 5, 2016, HDRC hearing, the applicant received final approval to perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the historic structure, construct a rear, two level addition and construct a side yard deck. At this time, the applicant has proposed to modify the previously approved design by proposing two additional dormers as well as a trellis covering over the previously approved side yard deck.

c. The previous dormer was approved with the stipulation that the applicant reduce the proposed height and roof pitch. Staff found the previous dormer design appropriate given its design which is distinguishable from the historic dormers of the primary historic structure.

d. REPAIR & MAINTENANCE – The applicant has previously received approval of rehabilitative efforts to the historic structure at 932 Burnet Street, including the repair of existing wood Dutch siding to match the existing, the repair of existing wood trim, the installation of a new standing seam metal roof, wood window repair and repair of folk Victorian architectural elements. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

e. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition featuring a footprint of approximately 380 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, 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 between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a rear gable roof, setbacks from the wall planes of the primary historic structure and Dutch lap siding that differs in detail than that of the original historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

f. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure, a width that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure and a footprint that is appropriate for the lot. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.

g. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal roof, wood windows and doors and Dutch wood siding. The applicant should ensure that the proposed standing seam metal roof includes panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.

h. DORMERS – The original dormer reviewed at the October 5, 2016, hearing features an overall height and roof pitch that was greater than those that are currently proposed. At this time, the applicant has proposed two additional dormers, both to be located on the proposed addition. Staff finds the proposed dormer design appropriate in massing and distinguishable from the original dormers, which is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions which states that additions should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context of the primary historic structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through h with the following stipulation:

- i. That the proposed standing seam metal roof includes panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches

November 16, 2016

in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.

ii. That the applicant repair all Folk Victorian Elements including wood siding and trim, wood skirting, wood windows and other ornamental elements.

iii. That the applicant install wood windows into the proposed addition.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Liz Franklin & Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

5. HDRC NO. 2016- 446

Applicant: Scott Hill

Address: 1833 E HOUSTON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 1833 E Houston.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property located at 1833 E Houston.

b. The scope of work consists of the HDRC approved rehabilitation of the historic structure, which was constructed circa 1920. The rehabilitation of this structure was approved by the HDRC on November 18, 2015. At that time, staff recommended that the applicant submit for Historic Tax Certification for the proposed rehabilitation.

c. 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 c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

6. HDRC NO. 2016-434

Applicant: Joaquin Escamilla/Studio E Design

Address: 217 ROBINSON PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install covered walkways in the existing

November 16, 2016

courtyard of the IDEA Carver charter school, formerly known as The Carver Academy. The covered walkways will consist of new concrete sidewalks with free-standing steel framed canopies that will match the existing canopies throughout the campus.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 217 Robinson Place, commonly known as both IDEA Carver and The Carver Academy is located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and was constructed in 2000. The structure features facades primarily consisting of tan brick, aluminum windows and aluminum storefront systems. The applicant has proposed to install covered walkways in the existing courtyards to provide shelter from the elements for students.

b. The applicant has proposed covered walkways to consist of new concrete sidewalks with free-standing steel framed canopies that will match the existing canopies throughout the campus. The applicant has specified that all materials will match those existing one the site including the size and finish of both steel and concrete columns, tongue and groove cedar wood decking, standing seam metal roofs, galvanized fascias, gutters and scuppers and sconce lighting. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in support

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

10. HDRC NO. 2016-368

Applicant: Ecolectrics, LLC

Address: 226 W ROSEWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 25 solar panels on rear slopes of roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The home is in the Monte Vista Historic District, which was designated in 1975.

b. The structure at 226 W Rosewood has a front gable on hip roof. The front gable is steep and the side hip is lower. The applicant is proposing to install 26 total solar panels on composition shingles roof of the primary structure and on the rear accessory structure. 18 panels are proposed on the right slope of the shed roof behind the hipped roof form. 7 panels are proposed on the rear slope of the side facing gable of the rear accessory structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.

c. Staff visited the site on September 9, 2016. The home is located midblock two blocks into the historic district. The pitch of the front gable is steep and the proposed location of the panels would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

d. Staff finds the proposed locations consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is proposing to mount the 26 panels flush with the pitched roof. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii, solar collectors should be flush with the roof surface. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison- spoke in opposition.

November 16, 2016

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

11. HDRC NO. 2016-436

Applicant: Daniel Moyer/CAM Solar

Address: 126 E LULLWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 18 solar panels on four rear slopes of the roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The home is a Tudor style home in the Monte Vista Historic District, which was designated in 1975.
- b. The structure at 126 E Lullwood has a cross-gabled roof form with two front gables, with a rear hipped roof. The front and side gables are steep in pitch. The applicant is proposing to install 18 total solar panels on composition shingles roof of the primary structure. The applicant is proposing to install 2 panels on the rear slope of the side gable, 5 panels on the left shed roof behind the side gable, 9 panels on the left slope of the rear hipped roof and 2 panels on the right slope of the rear hipped roof. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.
- c. Staff visited the site on November 9, 2016. The home is located midblock and in the interior of the historic district. The pitch of the side gable is steep and the proposed location of the panels would not be visible from the public right-of-way.
- d. The applicant is proposing to mount the 18 panels flush with the pitched roof. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii, solar collectors should be flush with the roof surface. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison, spoke in opposition to the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2016-438

Applicant: Jason Balderas

Address: 502 E DEWEY PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a wrought iron fence to be 4' tall in the front yard.

FINDINGS:

- a. The home at 502 E Dewey is a two-story brick craftsman style home, located in Tobin Hill Historic District,

November 16, 2016

designated in 2007.

b. There is not an existing front yard fence, but there is an existing rear 6' wrought iron fence enclosing the rear yard. The applicant is proposing to install a wrought iron fence to be 4' tall in the front yard. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B., front yard fences should only be installed if the district historically had them, should be a maximum of 4 feet in height, and should be consistent with the location, height and design found in the district. Staff found that in Tobin Hill Historic District, wrought iron fences would have been used when the neighborhood was established. Staff finds the proposed fence location, material, height and design appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CASE COMMENT:

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.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner, spoke in opposition of the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Garza, Grube

NAYS: Cone

THE MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Cone left the meeting at 8:44 AM, which caused a lack of quorum.

Commissioner Lazarine joined the meeting at 8:51, which gave the commission the minimum quorum to continue.

ITEMS #7 & #17 were remanded to the next HDRC agenda, due to a lack of quorum with recusals from these cases.

20. 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 deck at the rear of the primary historic structure at the location of the removed addition.

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. The rear accessory structure is addressed as 319 W Sheridan, but is located on the same parcel as the primary historic structure.

b. This request was originally heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on November 2, 2016. At that hearing, the request was referred to the Design Review Committee. At the November 8, 2016, DRC meeting, committee members asked questions regarding the scope of the proposed rehabilitation, noted that the construction documents appeared to be a "builder's set", noted that the proposed deck will be screened by existing shrubbery and noted that landscaping elements should be noted on the proposed site plan. Committee members also noted that the applicant should supplement the application with additional photos and additional information regarding materials that are to remain.

November 16, 2016

c. 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.

d. **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.

e. **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.

f. **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.

g. **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.

h. **DECK**– The applicant has proposed to construct a wood deck to the south of the proposed addition. The applicant has noted that the deck will be primarily flat with no railings or overhangs. Staff finds the proposed deck is reversible and consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through h.

CASE COMMENT:

The complete scope of work at 131 City includes administratively approved items including foundation repair, porch repair, wood window repair, mechanical installations, standing seam metal roof replacement and the items included in this current request, which includes the reconstruction and relocation of an existing rear addition and the construction of a rear deck. The removal of a small hot water heater closet addition occurred without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The complete scope of work at 319 W Sheridan, an accessory structure to 131 City, includes administratively approved items including aluminum window replacement, front door replacement and front porch repairs. The enlarging of the existing window openings and relocation of the existing door opening were done outside of the approved scope of work. The porch has been modified from its existing condition and will require review and approval by the HDRC.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell, spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. **HDRC NO. 2016-452**

Applicant: Randy Kelly/JRK Design

Address: 100 N Main

November 16, 2016

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for outstanding items specific to the new construction at 100 N Main. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for:

1. Approval of the exterior stair including a gate for after-hours security.
2. Approval of a site plan which notes a constant height of the sidewalk to accommodate pedestrian traffic.
3. Approval of a landscaping plan.
4. Approval of the size and placement of hotel and tenant signage.

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. The applicant received final approval for the construction of the proposed 18 story mixed use tower at the October 5, 2016, HDRC hearing with the stipulations that the applicant return to the HDRC with specific design details regarding the securing of the exterior stair after-hours, a constant sidewalk height to accommodate pedestrians, a landscaping plan and a master signage plan as well as staff's stipulations that the applicant coordinate with Public Art San Antonio and comply with the UDC Division 5 regarding the installation of public art on the north façade, that patio and landscaping information be provided and that is a previously unidentified archaeological site is encountered during construction that activities immediately stop and that OHP should be notified.

b. **STAIR DETAIL** – At the street level, the applicant has provided a detail which notes the installation of a lockable gate which is to measure 56 inches in width and 84 inches in height. Staff finds that a gate exceeding six (6) feet in height at this location is inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the height of the gate to not exceed six (6) feet in height. Additionally, the proposed gate should match the stair railings in materials, finishes and detailing.

c. **SIDEWALK DETAIL** – The applicant previously proposed to incorporate curb cuts along N Main which would require pedestrians to step down from sidewalks to cross the curb cuts, potentially disturbing the flow of pedestrian traffic. The applicant has provided a set of civil documents that note the sidewalk remaining at a constant level. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

d. **LANDSCAPING PLAN** – The applicant has provided staff with a landscaping plan that notes the installation of various plant materials within raised planters along the public right of way at E Commerce and N Main and the installation of bicycle racks along N Main. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672. Additionally, the applicant has provided a detailed list of landscaping materials including shrubbery, vines, blooming plants and ornamental grasses. Staff finds the applicant's proposed landscaping materials appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

e. **MASTER SIGNAGE PLAN** – The applicant has provided staff with elevation drawings that note the location of proposed hotel and tenant signage. The applicant has proposed hotel signage to read "Cambria" on both the west and south facing facades. The signage on the west façade will be located approximately 175' above street level and at street level. The signage on the south facing façade will be approximately forty (40) feet above street level.

f. The applicant has proposed for both signs on the N Main façade to measure 23' – 11" in width and 4' 2" in height and feature 100 square feet of signage. Staff finds that the square footage of the sign located approximately 175 feet above street level is appropriate; however, finds that the street level signage should not exceed thirty (30) square feet based on the size of similarly proportioned street level signs in the vicinity. Additionally, staff finds that this signage should feature aluminum reverse channel letters and be back lit by LED lighting.

g. **MASTER SIGNAGE PLAN** – The applicant has proposed signage on the south façade to measure 16' – 11" in width and 2' – 11" in height featuring fifty (50) square feet. Regarding the south facing signage, staff finds that given its location and proximity to Main Plaza, the applicant should reduce the overall square footage to no more than twenty-five square feet. Additionally, staff finds that this signage should feature reverse aluminum channel letters and be back lit by LED lighting.

h. **MASTER SIGNAGE PLAN** – At the street level, the applicant has proposed signage for two tenants to be located beneath the previously approved canopy. The applicant has proposed for the corner tenant space to feature two signs; one along N Main and one alone E Commerce and for the adjacent tenant space to feature one sign to face E Commerce. Staff finds that each sign should be mounted to the underside of each canopy and be constructed of aluminum, feature reverse channel letters and be internally illuminated. Staff recommends that each sign not exceed more than ten (10) square feet total.

i. **PUBLIC ART COMPONENT** – At this time, the applicant has not provided an update regarding the public art component. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued for this project until the public art component has been

November 16, 2016

reviewed and approved by the HDRC.

j. **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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant reduce the overall height of the proposed security gate to no more than six (6) feet in height and that it match the stair railings in materials, finishes and detailing.

ii. That the applicant reduce the west facing street level signage to no more than thirty (30) square feet and the south facing signage to no more than twenty-five (25) square feet.

iii. That each sign be constructed of aluminum, feature reverse channel letters and be internally illuminated.

iv. That each street level tenant sign not exceed more than ten (10) total square feet.

v. **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.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve items #2-#4 with staff stipulations and the approve vertically oriented building sign.

ITEM #1, Withdrawn by applicant.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2016-459

Applicant: Luis Gerlein

Address: 1008 BURNET ST

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

23 HDRC NO. 2016-457

Applicant: Christopher Gill/CGRE Ltd Co

Address: 721 BURLESON ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Rehabilitate the historic structure including the installation of a standing seam metal roof, foundation repair, siding repair and wood window repair.
2. Reconstruct the front porch.
3. Construct a rear addition.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 721 Burleson was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1912 Sanborn map. The structure features many traditional elements including a front gabled roof as well as a side gabled roof, a raised front porch and a standing seam metal roof.

b. Work began on the historic structure located at 721 Burleson prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. On Wednesday, September 21, a stop work order was issued for the demolition of the existing front porch. A second stop work order was issued on Saturday, October 1, for the construction of a rear addition without a Certificate of Appropriateness. All necessary post work application fees have been paid.

November 16, 2016

c. **REPAIR & MAINTENANCE** – The applicant has proposed a number of repair and maintenance scopes of work which includes the repair of the historic wood windows, the installation of a new standing seam metal roof, the repair of wood siding to match the existing and foundation repair. The applicant's proposed scope of work is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Regarding the proposed new roof, the applicant should ensure that panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.

d. **PORCH RECONSTRUCTION** – The existing porch at 721 Burleson featured a concrete foundation, round, nonoriginal replacement columns and a roof structure that was in disrepair. This existing porch was demolished without a Certificate of Appropriateness. At this time, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front porch. The applicant has proposed a front porch foundation height of 1' – 3" and a shed porch roof. Both of these items are architecturally appropriate.

e. **PORCH RECONSTRUCTION** – Per the applicant's architectural documents, the existing side front porch door is to be enclosed. Two front porch doors are vernacular to San Antonio and are often found in Folk Victorian style structures as a ventilation mechanism. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved. Staff recommends the applicant preserve the side front door opening. Additionally, staff recommends that the applicant install period appropriate doors. The applicant may present these to staff prior to installation.

f. **PORCH COLUMNS** – The applicant has provided information to staff regarding the installation of front porch columns; however, the applicant has not noted to staff a specific column design nor provided a detailed drawing. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed drawing of the proposed column design.

g. **ADDITION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition of approximately 480 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, 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 between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include a rear gable roof; however, has not provided a detail on the west elevation to separate the addition from the historic structure. Staff recommends the applicant incorporate a detail to separate the addition from the historic structure.

h. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that exceeds that of the historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. The applicant's proposed height is neither appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **ADDITION** – As noted in findings g and h, the applicant has not proposed a detail to differentiate the existing addition from the historic structure. Staff finds that through the lowering of the addition's overall height and through the incorporation of siding details, the addition can be visually distinguishable from the primary historic structure.

j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood siding, wood or metal windows, a standing seam metal roof and period appropriate doors. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows, and a standing seam metal roof that is consistent with the primary historic structure's roof. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant provide a door to be approved by staff prior to installation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3. Staff recommends the following prior to the applicant returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant install a standing seam metal roof throughout that features that panels are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
- ii. That the applicant preserve the side front porch door opening and provide staff with final door selections that are to be approved prior to installation.
- iii. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed drawing of the final column design.
- iv. That the applicant reduce the overall height of the rear addition to be subordinate to that of the primary historic structure.
- v. That the applicant incorporate a siding detail to separate the addition from the historic structure.

November 16, 2016

vi. That the applicant install wood skirting on both the primary historic structure and addition.

CASE COMMENT:

Work on the proposed scope of work began prior to approval. All necessary HDRC application fees have been paid.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in opposition to the request.

REQUEST WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

24. HDRC NO. 2016-456

Applicant: Christopher Gill/CGRE Ltd Co

Address: 312 BURLESON

REQUEST:

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

1. Repair the existing wood windows.
2. Repair the existing front porch.
3. Construct a rear addition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 312 Burleson was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1912 Sanborn map. The structure features many traditional elements including a front gabled roof as well as a side gabled roof and a raised front porch.
- b. The applicant has received administrative approval for various rehabilitative items including the removal of a non-original rear addition, the removal of metal siding, foundation repair, roofing repair and repair to existing wood siding. In addition to the previously noted administratively approved items, the applicant has proposed to repair the existing, wood windows. The applicant has noted that where non-repairable, windows will be replaced. Staff finds the repair of the wood windows appropriate.
- c. **PORCH RECONSTRUCTION** – The porch at 312 Burleson features a concrete foundation, wrought iron columns and shed porch roof. The applicant has proposed to install square porch columns, a wood porch floor and per the elevations, the applicant has proposed to enclose the side facing front door. Staff finds the replacement of the existing wrought iron columns appropriate as well as the installation of wood decking over the existing concrete porch; however, staff recommends the applicant maintain the original side facing front door. Two front porch doors are vernacular to San Antonio and are often found in Folk Victorian style structures as a ventilation mechanism.
- d. **PORCH COLUMNS** – The applicant has provided information to staff regarding the installation of front porch columns; however, the applicant has not noted to staff a specific column design nor provided a detailed drawing. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed drawing of the proposed column design.
- e. **ADDITION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, 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 between the old and the new. The applicant has properly located the proposed addition and has proposed a roof form that is similar to the historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions. The applicant should incorporate a siding detail to separate the addition from the historic structure.
- f. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature an overall roof height that matches that of the primary historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.B., additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the primary historic structure and should feature a height that is less than that of the historic structure. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the overall height of the addition to be less than that of the primary historic structure.
- g. **ADDITION** – As noted in findings e and f, the applicant has not proposed a detail to differentiate the existing addition from the historic structure. Staff finds that through the lowering of the addition's overall height and through the incorporation of siding details, the addition can be visually distinguishable from the primary historic structure.
- h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood siding, wood or metal

November 16, 2016

windows, a standing seam metal roof and period appropriate doors. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant provide a door to be approved by staff prior to installation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item #1, the repair of the existing wood windows.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 and #3. Staff recommends the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant preserve the side front porch door opening and provide staff with final door selections.
- ii. That the applicant provide staff with a final column design and a detailed drawing.
- iii. That the applicant reduce the overall height of the rear addition to be subordinate to that of the primary historic structure.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate a siding detail to separate the addition from the historic structure.
- v. That the applicant install wood skirting on both the primary historic structure and addition.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois, spoke in opposition of request.

APPLICANT WITHDREW REQUEST.

Commission took a break from session from 9:33 AM-9:38AM

25. HDRC NO. 2016-450

Applicant: Michael Heller

Address: 630 E CARSON

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing asphalt shingle roof.
2. Install architectural moldings beneath the second story window bays on the north facade as well as install windows with divided lights to match the original.
3. Install windows in the east facade to the north of the existing bay on the first floor.
4. Un-enclose the existing porch on the east facade and perform exterior modifications including window installation, the installation of ornamentation and door replacement.
5. Demolish a second story enclosed porch and a first story enclosed porch.
6. Modify the existing roof line from a hip to gable on the south facade.
7. Remove the enclosed porches on the west facade.
8. Demolish the rear accessory structure.
9. Construct a two-story addition to the south side of the primary historic structure.
10. Construct a two-story garage to the south of the proposed two-story addition.
11. Install a concrete driveway from the street to the proposed garage.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 630 E Carson was constructed circa 1900 and features many historic architectural elements with some Folk Victorian influence including spindle work and projecting window bays. Originally constructed as a single family home, the structure has been multiplied many times to incorporate multiple separate dwelling units. At this time, the applicant has proposed various exterior modifications to remove inappropriate additions, to demolish a rear accessory structure and to construct two rear additions.

b. Various administrative approvals have been issued for this structure for the repair of existing siding, the installation of fencing and foundation repair.

c. **ROOFING** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof. Historically, this structure would have featured a standing seam metal roof; however, staff finds the replacement of the existing roof in kind appropriate.

d. **ARCHITECTURAL MOLDINGS** – Beneath the second story window bays on the north facade, the applicant has proposed to install bracket molding. Folk Victorian houses historically feature brackets beneath window bays. Staff finds the proposed installation appropriate; however, the applicant should provide a detailed drawing of the

November 16, 2016

proposed bracket prior to installation.

e. **EAST FAÇADE WINDOW** – The applicant has proposed to install a window on the east façade near the front of the house beneath a second story window. Currently no window opening exists; however, architecturally staff finds that the installation of this window is appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install a wood window that matches the existing windows in profile and material.

f. **PORCH RESTORATION** – The east façade currently features a side porch that has been enclosed. The applicant has proposed to reopen the porch under its current configuration. The original porch wrapped from the east side of the structure to the rear. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate; however, staff finds that a full porch restoration would be more appropriate. The applicant should provide detailed architectural documents for the porch restoration that includes information regarding materials and architectural ornamentation.\

g. **PORCH RESTORATION** – In addition to the proposed porch restoration, the applicant has proposed to install windows beneath the porch into the original façade, to replace the existing porch door and to install spindle work on the porch. As noted in finding e, staff finds the proposed work appropriate; however, the applicant should provide staff with detailed architectural documents that note the specific location and detailing for each.

h. **PORCH RESTORATION** – On the west façade of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to remove existing enclosed porches. Per the 1904 Sanborn map, a porch does not appear on the west façade; staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate.

i. **ROOFING MODIFICATION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to modify an existing shed roof and to install a rear facing gabled roof. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 3.B.ii., original roof forms should be preserved. The roof in questions is not an original roof and staff finds the proposed modification appropriate.

j. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE DEMOLITION** – The applicant has proposed to demolish the rear accessory structure located to the immediate south of the primary historic structure. Office of Historic Preservation staff has found this structure to be contributing. This structure is found on the 1904 Sanborn map and persists in its original location through the present day. Expanded over time, it was likely used as a residence as early as the 1920's. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed demolition and recommends the applicant restore the rear accessory structure. The applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations for any repair work.

k. The applicant has proposed various scopes of work that are contingent on the rear accessory structure's demolition. These proposals are listed as items #8 through #10 and include the removal of the rear accessory structure and the construction of two, two story additions. Given that staff finds the demolition of the rear accessory structure inappropriate; the construction of the proposed rear additions can no longer be constructed as proposed.

l. **DRIVEWAY** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear driveway to facilitate vehicular access to the rear accessory structure. Per the site plan, the applicant has based the driveway width and configuration on the proposed width of the rear addition that would be located in the location of the existing accessory structure. Staff finds the installation of a driveway at this location appropriate; however, the applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for Site Elements when considering its design. Typically, driveways in historic districts feature a width that does not exceed ten feet.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #7 based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff with details of the proposed window bay brackets prior to installation.
- ii. That the applicant install a wood windows that matches the existing windows in profile and material.
- iii. That the applicant provide detailed architectural documents for the porch restoration that includes information regarding materials and architectural ornamentation.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #8 through #11 based on findings j through l.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

November 16, 2016

26. HDRC NO. 2016-453

Applicant: Russ Tillery/Paradise Decks

Address: 629 NOLAN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a side deck to the historic structure at 629 Nolan.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 629 Nolan was constructed circa 1900 in the Folk Victorian style and features a wraparound porch, multiple brick chimneys, front and side window bays and front and side roof gables. The applicant has proposed to construct a side deck addition to the rear of an original bay and in front of an existing addition. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new porches, balconies and porte-cocheres should not be added where not historically present. The applicant has proposed the porch to be sited near the rear of the primary historic structure where it will be screened by the historic structure when viewed from the front façade. Staff finds this placement appropriate.
- b. The applicant has noted that cedar decking will be used; which staff finds appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant paint the proposed deck to match this historic structure.
- c. In regards to a porch roof, the applicant has not provided a detail on the covering. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed elevation drawing of the proposed cover prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- d. Staff finds that the proposed porch will not negatively impact the historic structure and can be removed without damaging the historic structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the applicant provide a detailed elevation drawing of the proposed cover prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2016-443

Applicant: Lars Allen

Address: 1145 VIRGINIA BLVD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove two palm trees and to remove the concrete carriage step in front of the house.

FINDINGS:

- a. The home is located in the Knob Hill Historic District, which was designated on September 12, 2010. The existing home is on the corner of Virginia and St. Anthony. The home is large craftsman style two-story home with wood siding, a cross-gabled roof with composition shingles, a wraparound porch, a second story balcony, and two square wooden columns.
- b. There are seven mature palm trees along the front and side lawn of the property. The applicant is requesting to remove two palm trees that are planted adjacent to the front walkway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.i., mature trees should be preserved. The applicant was asked to provide an arborist report, but none has been provided at this time. Staff made a site visit on November 9, 2016, and found many mature palm trees along the block. Staff finds the palm trees are a character defining feature in Knob Hill. Staff recommends that the

November 16, 2016

trees be preserved.

c. The request was reviewed by the City Arborist who recommended that if the two palm trees were removed, then two native large species shade trees be planted in their place. The arborist recommended either pecan, Live oak, Texas Fall elm, Anaqua, or a Mexican sycamore.

d. There is a concrete carriage block at the end of the front walkway along the street. The applicant is requesting to remove the block. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 5., distinctive features that characterize a historic property shall be preserved. Carriage steps were common during the period of significance for the home and the district. Based on the placement of the step directly in front of the primary entrance it appears to be original. These steps were popular in the horse and buggy days at the turn of the 20th century and there are only a few remaining in the city. Staff finds the carriage block to be a distinctive feature and should be retained.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through d. Staff recommends the trees and carriage block be retained. If the commission recommends approval to remove the two palm trees, staff recommends that the removal be approved with the stipulation that two native large species shade trees be planted in their place.

APPLICANT WITHDREW REQUEST

28. HDRC NO. 2016-339

Applicant: Gilbert Gonzales/Dynamic Contracting Services

Address: 324 W MULBERRY AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove an existing front walkway and to install stamped concrete in the same location. The proposed walkway will be stained with a darker tan color.

FINDINGS:

a. The home located at 324 W Mulberry Ave is a two-story craftsman style home in Monte Vista Historic District, designated in 1975.

b. The applicant received administrative approval to remove the existing non-original tile on the front steps, refinish the concrete on the front steps with a clear grit finish, and to replace existing concrete sidewalks and walkways with the same material, color, and configuration and with a salt finish.

c. There is a concrete flat finish sidewalk existing. The proposed new front walkway is made of stamped concrete in the same location as existing front walkway configuration. The proposed walkway will be stained with a darker tan color. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.i, sidewalks should be replaced to match existing color and material. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

November 16, 2016

29. HDRC NO. 2016-440

Applicant: Hope Hausman

Address: 318 W MISTLETOE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove 7 original wood one over one windows on the left and right sides and install vinyl one over one windows with bottom screen, and to remove front lawn and install artificial turf

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 318 W Mistletoe is a two-story style home in the Monte Vista Historic District, designated in 1978.

b. Four of the windows were installed prior to receiving a certificate of appropriateness.

c. The home has wood one over one windows. The windows to be removed are 7 original wood one over one windows on the left and right sides, and the proposed replacement windows are 7 vinyl one over one windows with a bottom screen. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond 50% deteriorated, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff made a site visit November 9, 2016, and found that the wood windows are not deteriorated beyond 50%, though the glass is missing. Staff finds the vinyl windows are not an appropriate replacement and recommends that the windows should be repaired. Where the applicant can show to staff that windows are deteriorated beyond repair they should be replaced in-kind.

d. The proposed turf has been installed without prior approvals and is not appropriate as a substitute for the front lawn.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement or turf installation based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that the windows are repaired or replaced in-kind.

CASE COMMENT:

Work was done prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant has not paid the \$500 post-work application fee.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Paul Kinnison- opposition

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of Meeting Minutes – November 2, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve November 2, 2016 minutes.

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

NAYS:

November 16, 2016

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Garza, Laffoon, Lazarine, 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 10:32 A.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

