

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
October 4, 2017**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 PM, in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Chairman Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal
Absent: Connor, Garza, Brittain

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - STAR in Saint Cecilia - October 7 and 8
 - SAPreservation 5k Series - Haunted Cemetery Tour - Saturday, October 21 - Fairchild Park - 9AM

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cosima Colvin & Cynthia Spielman both spoke in support of 715 Grant.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-510 | 401 E HOUSTON |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-495 | 711 BROADWAY |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-500 | 617 N FLORES |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-499 | 120 CEDAR |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-497 | 622 CEDAR |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-496 | 849 E COMMERCE |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-492 | 630 MISSION |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-508 | 2231 W MAGNOLIA |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-507 | 715 GRANT |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-505 | 531 E HUISACHE |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-477 | 104 FIR |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2017-494 | 107 W CRAIG |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-511 | 502 E LOCUST |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-486 | 310 TRAIL |

Items #3, #4, #11, #12, #14 were pulled for citizens to be heard. Item #1 was pulled by Commissioner Lazarine. Item #2 was pulled for recusal by Commissioner Lazarine. Item #14 was pulled by the applicant.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve the Consent Agenda with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2017-510

Applicant: Ann McGlone

Address: 401 E HOUSTON ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Modify the street level entrance on Jefferson Street and install a perforated metal access gate.

October 4, 2017

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 401 E Houston, commonly known as the Burns Building and Washer Brothers Building was constructed in 1912 originally featuring four levels. During the 1950's, a fifth level addition was constructed by J.C. Penney's.
- b. The applicant has proposed to modify the street level entrance on Jefferson Street by installing a perforated metal access gate. The proposed gate will be installed in a manner that will remove the existing vestibule from view. Within the vestibule, the existing, non-original door will be replaced and the opening will be modified by increasing the depth of the vestibule and installing an off-axis opening. The proposed new door entrance will be located to the rear of the storefront system.
- c. **ENTRANCE MODIFICATION** – The Guidelines for Exterior Modifications 10.B. notes to not introduce new facade elements that alter or destroy the historic building character, such as adding inappropriate materials; altering the size or shape of windows, doors, bulkheads, and transom openings; or altering the façade from commercial to residential. Alterations should not disrupt the rhythm of the commercial block. Staff finds that the proposed modifications are reversible, will be performed in a manner that will not remove historic elements and will not negatively impact the architectural character of the historic structure.
- d. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – At this time, the applicant has not applied to receive the local Historic Tax Incentive. Staff encourages the applicant to submit an application for Historic Tax Certification.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Larry Demartino spoke in opposition to the applicant's request (Hector Gonzalez & Christopher Green yielded their time to Mr. Demartino- He received a total of 9 mins to speak).

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve the relocated entry door conceptually- gate and final details must return to HDRC.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

2. HDRC NO. 2017-495

Applicant: John Beauchamp/Hixon Properties

Address: 711 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a six story office structure at 711 Broadway that is to feature subgrade parking and ground floor retail.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a six story office structure to feature approximately 81 feet in height. The proposed new construction is to feature subgrade parking and ground level retail.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval. Buildings identified for demolition or partial demolition have preliminarily been found to be ineligible for historic designation. A formal demolition application and review by staff is still required.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 15, 2017, where committee members asked questions regarding the proposed new construction's relationship with future Broadway improvements, noted that the building should address the street, questions the installation of additional canopies and noted that the building masses should read as two separate buildings. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on September 12, 2017, where committee members noted that the proposed scale was appropriate and asked questions regarding architectural elements that emphasize the entrance.
- d. **EXISTING SITE** – The existing site currently features a non-historic structure that lacks architectural detail and is eligible for demolition to be approved administratively.
- e. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed to incorporate pedestrian walkways and a pedestrian plaza adjacent to Broadway. This is consistent with

October 4, 2017

the Guidelines.

- f. **AUTOMOBILE PARKING** – The applicant has noted the construction of sub grade automobile parking to be accessed from Brooklyn Avenue. Staff finds the proposed location and access location to be appropriate. When returning to the HDRC for final approval, the applicant should include curb cut measurements on the site plan.
- g. **SITE DESIGN** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed locations of pedestrian access which are located on Broadway, within the ground level breezeway and at the rear of the structure to be appropriate.
- h. **LANDSCAPING** – The UDC Section 35-673(3) provides information regarding landscape design. The applicant has provided a site plan noting the general location of trees, patio furniture and other landscaping items such as planting beds. Staff finds the proposed locations of landscaping elements appropriate; however, the applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan at the time of final approval.
- i. **STREET FURNISHINGS** – Street furnishings throughout the RIO are to be constructed of high quality materials that complementary to the tradition and craftsmanship of the River Walk. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(i) in regards to street furnishings.
- j. **LIGHTING DESIGN** – Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project’s design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. This applicant is to provide a lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.
- k. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is to comply with this section of the UDC and provide information to staff regarding the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.
- l. **BUILDING SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed human scaled elements that include both horizontal and vertical bandings, human scaled openings, balconies and human scaled materials such as brick and metal panels. This is consistent with the UDC.
- m. **BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, the maximum height for new construction in RIO-2 is ten stories and 120 feet. The proposed new construction complies with the UDC in regards to height.
- n. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant has proposed materials that include glass, brick and metal panels. These materials are consistent with the UDC.
- o. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed for the structure to feature a distinctive base and a terminating cap, which consists of shed roofs and overhangs. This is consistent with the UDC.
- p. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District. A review of historic archival maps places structures within the property as early as 1886. In addition, historic plat and deed records identify a desague to the Acequia del Alamo likely traversing the subject property. Therefore, the property may contain archaeological sites, some of which may be significant. Thus, archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That any required demolition be formally reviewed and approved by staff.
- ii. That the proposed final site plan indicate all curb cut and sidewalk widths as noted in finding g.
- iii. That a detailed landscaping plan and lighting plan be submitted at the time of final approval as noted in findings h and j.
- iv. That all street furnishings be consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(i) as noted in finding i.
- v. That all mechanical and service equipment be screened from view of the public right of way as noted in finding k.
- vi. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- Archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction. 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.

October 4, 2017

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cullen Jones spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

3. HDRC NO. 2017-500

Applicant: Frank Juarez/Alamo 1

Address: 617 N FLORES ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for partially remove the structure while preserving the N Flores façade.

FINDINGS:

- a. **BUILDING HISTORY** – The applicant has proposed to partially remove the structure located at 617 N Flores, commonly known as Sunshine Laundry, with the exception of the storefront facade. The storefront along N Flores was constructed in 1922; it was designed by J.M. Marriot in the English Gothic style and is significant. The structure is not currently zoned historic but falls within a River Improvement Overlay District.
- b. **ALTERATIONS** – As proposed, the existing roof structure would be removed and the façade would be reinforced by pipe bracing. Staff finds the proposed alterations to be appropriate since the proposal preserves the significant storefront façade. The applicant has noted that side wall depth of between ten to fifteen feet will be retained. Staff also finds this appropriate as the retention of the side walls will indicate the structure's original massing which can be integrated into a future development.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval with the stipulations that the proposed ten to fifteen feet of sidewall depth be preserved and that the existing "Sunshine Laundry, Dry Cleaning" sign be salvaged and stored for reuse on site.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition to the applicant's request

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube move for approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

4. HDRC NO. 2017-499

Applicant: David Armendariz

Address: 120 CEDAR ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing, rear privacy fence with horizontal fence pickets.
2. Construct a rear accessory structure of approximately 252 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 120 Cedar Street was constructed circa 1890 and features two stories in height, a stuccoed brick façade, five brick chimneys and both single and double height porches. This structure is first found on the 1896

October 4, 2017

Sanborn Map. The rear of this lot is adjacent to Bonham Elementary School.

b. FENCING – The rear of the property currently features a cedar privacy fence with vertical pickets. The applicant has proposed to replace these vertical pickets with horizontal pickets. The proposed privacy fence will not extend to the front façade on either elevation. Staff finds the proposed location and design of the proposed fence to be appropriate. At no location should the fence exceed (6) feet in height.

c. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear accessory structure in the southeast corner of the property. Per the Guidelines for New Construction, 5.A and B., accessory structures should be designed to be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure, should not exceed forty percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint, should relate to the historic structure in terms of materials and architectural details, should feature similar window and door openings and should feature an orientation that is consistent with accessory structures found historically along the block. Staff finds the proposed the proposed accessory structure to be appropriately located, sized and scaled per the Guidelines.

d. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed wood siding, wood windows, a metal roof and paint colors to include Lighthearted Pink, Porch Ceiling (light blue) and Haute Pink. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through d.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

11. HDRC NO. 2017-477

Applicant: Jim Poteet/Poteet Architects

Address: 104 FIR

REQUEST:

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

1. Install a curb cut, driveway and rear parking area of decomposed granite on the east side of the historic structure.
2. Construct a rear wood privacy fence to feature six (6) feet in height.
3. Amend the size of a previously approved rear deck.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure at 104 Fir was constructed circa 1905 and is of the Folk Victorian style. The historic structure features a modified L-plan and a wraparound front porch which features Doric columns.

b. At the January 18, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received approval to repair various historic architectural elements, install foundation skirting, new wood windows, construct a rear addition of approximately 97 square feet, install a decomposed granite driveway and received Historic Tax Certification. At this time, the applicant has proposed to modify the location of the previously approved driveway, increase the size of the rear deck portion of the previously approved rear addition and to construct a rear privacy fence.

c. CURB CUT, DRIVEWAY & PARKING – On the east side of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to install a curb cut, driveway and rear parking location. Both the curb cut and driveway are to feature ten (10) feet in width. The proposed driveway and parking location, located toward the rear of the primary historic structure will feature decomposed granite. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B. notes that new driveways and curb cuts should not exceed ten (10) feet in width and should maintain the width and configuration found consistently in the district. Staff finds the proposed, amended location to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

d. REAR DECK – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant previously received a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear addition and an attached rear deck. At this time, the applicant has

October 4, 2017

proposed to increase the overall size of the rear deck to extend an additional ten (10) feet further than previously approved. Staff finds the proposed amendment to be appropriate.

e. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear privacy fence to enclose the rear portion of the lot. The proposed privacy fence is to feature six (6) feet in height, 1x4 and 1x2 smooth cedar, horizontal fence boards. Staff finds the proposed fence to be appropriate in regards to height and material.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

CITIZENS TO HEARD: Cherise Bell spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approval as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

12. HDRC NO. 2017-494

Applicant: Carlos de Luna

Address: 107 W CRAIG PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to widen an existing concrete drive and approach from 8.6' to 22' wide.

FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 107 W Craig Place is a 2-story residential structure constructed in 1906. The home was designed by prolific architect Atlee B. Ayers in the Neoclassical style with Craftsman and Tudor influences. Character-defining features include a hipped roof with two front gables, decorative half timbering, simplified Doric columns, and wood shingle siding. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District.

b. DRIVEWAY WIDENING – The applicant is requesting approval to widen an existing driveway approach from 8.6 feet in width to 22 feet in width. The approach is located off Main Ave and leads to a surface parking lot at the ITEM# 12

rear of the structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic driveway configurations should be preserved. However, the driveway is not the primary driveway for the property, which is accessed on Craig Place. Main Ave is also characterized by commercial structures and properties in the vicinity of the lot. The lot across the street, 2406 Main Ave, contains a wider driveway and apron. Staff finds that the proposed driveway should be consistent with the driveway across the street.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b with the stipulation that the driveway and apron are consistent in width with the driveway across the street. The applicant should provide staff with dimensions that verify the existing driveway conditions and submit an updated site plan that responds to these dimensions prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Cone move this item to the next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

October 4, 2017

14. HDRC NO. 2017-486

Applicant: Gaspar Rivera/Poma Properties

Address: 310 TRAIL

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing cement board siding with Hardieplank siding.
2. Replace the existing windows with new vinyl windows. All existing windows are aluminum except for one remaining original two over two window on the east façade.
3. Modify the existing entryway configuration, including the removal of one door and relocation of another.
4. Cover the existing concrete porch with wood.
5. Replace the existing composition shingle roof with a metal roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 310 Trail is a 1-story single family home constructed in the Craftsman style. The house appears on a 1912-1951 Sanborn Map and appears to have had multiple modifications over the years, including additions. The home features a cross-gable configuration, asymmetrical front porch, and overhanging porch eaves with exposed rafter tails. The home is a contributing structure in the River Road Historic District.

b. **SIDING REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing asbestos lap siding with Hardie Plank siding in a profile to match the existing reveal as closely as possible. The existing siding does not appear to be original to the property and is failing in several locations. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, when original siding is deteriorated beyond repair or has been removed, materials similar in size, scale, and character should be used. Siding should match the original pattern, including exposures. If there is not repairable wood siding beneath the non-original siding, then staff finds replacement with Hardiboard to be acceptable.

c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing windows with new one over one vinyl windows. All of the existing windows in the structure are one over one aluminum, with the exception of one original two over two wood window. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the proposal to replace the aluminum windows appropriate, but finds that the two over two window should be repaired in place. Staff does not find vinyl to be an appropriate material for replacement.

d. **ENTRY OPENING MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing front entryway configuration. Modifications include: the removal of the door on the east facing façade; shifting two windows slightly on the east facing façade; and swapping the location of a window and a door on the north facing façade. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic openings should be preserved. However, based on the home's previous configuration on Sanborn Maps, this house was likely converted to a duplex sometime after the 1950s. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

e. **PORCH DECKING** – The applicant has proposed to cover the existing concrete decking with wood decking. Currently, the doors are raised slightly from the finish grade of the existing concrete decking. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, original porch floors of wood or concrete should not be covered unless the proposed materials were used historically. Based on the current configuration of the openings, staff finds that wood decking street wall through the alignment of horizontal parts. Avoid blank walls, particularly on elevations visible from the street. No new façade should exceed 40 linear feet without being penetrated by windows, entryways, or other defined bays.

D. LOT COVERAGE

i. **Building to lot ratio**—New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. Limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio.

3. Materials and Textures

A. NEW MATERIALS

i. **Complementary materials**—Use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. For example, corrugated metal siding would not be appropriate for a new structure in a district comprised of homes with wood siding.

ii. **Alternative use of traditional materials**—Consider using traditional materials, such as wood siding, in a new way to provide visual interest in new construction while still ensuring compatibility.

iii. **Roof materials**—Select roof materials that are similar in terms of form, color, and texture to traditionally used in the district.

iv. **Metal roofs**—Construct new metal roofs in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. Refer to the Guidelines for Alterations and Maintenance section for additional specifications regarding metal roofs.

v. **Imitation or synthetic materials**—Do not use vinyl siding, plastic, or corrugated metal sheeting. Contemporary materials not traditionally used in the district, such as brick or simulated stone veneer and Hardie Board or other fiberboard siding, may be appropriate for new construction in some locations as long as new materials are visually similar to the traditional material in dimension, finish, and texture. EIFS is not recommended as a substitute for actual stucco.

B. REUSE OF HISTORIC MATERIALS

Salvaged materials—Incorporate salvaged historic materials where possible within the context of the overall design of the

October 4, 2017

new structure.

4. Architectural Details

A. GENERAL

- i. Historic context—Design new buildings to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district.
- ii. Architectural details—Incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found within the district are inappropriate.
- iii. Contemporary interpretations—Consider integrating contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for new construction. Use of contemporary window moldings and door surroundings, for example, can provide visual interest while helping to convey the fact that the structure is new. Modern materials should be implemented in a way that does not distract from the historic structure.

5. Garages and Outbuildings

A. DESIGN AND CHARACTER

- i. Massing and form—Design new garages and outbuildings to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form.
- ii. Building size – New outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40 percent of the principal historic structure footprint.
- iii. Character—Relate new garages and outbuildings to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details.
- iv. Windows and doors—Design window and door openings to be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principle historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions.
- v. Garage doors—Incorporate garage doors with similar proportions and materials as those traditionally found in the district.

B. SETBACKS AND ORIENTATION

- i. Orientation—Match the predominant garage orientation found along the block. Do not introduce front-loaded garages or garages attached to the primary structure on blocks where rear or alley-loaded garages were historically used.
- ii. Setbacks—Follow historic setback pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the principal building. In some instances, historic setbacks are not consistent with UDC requirements and a variance may be required.

6. Mechanical Equipment and Roof Appurtenances

A. LOCATION AND SITING

- i. Visibility—Do not locate utility boxes, air conditioners, rooftop mechanical equipment, skylights, satellite dishes, and other roof appurtenances on primary facades, front-facing roof slopes, in front yards, or in other locations that are clearly visible from the public right-of-way.
- ii. Service Areas—Locate service areas towards the rear of the site to minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.

B. SCREENING

- i. Building-mounted equipment—Paint devices mounted on secondary facades and other exposed hardware, frames, and piping to match the color scheme of the primary structure or screen them with landscaping.
- ii. Freestanding equipment—Screen service areas, air conditioning units, and other mechanical equipment from public view using a fence, hedge, or other enclosure.
- iii. Roof-mounted equipment—Screen and set back devices mounted on the roof to avoid view from public right-of-way.

7. Designing for Energy Efficiency

A. BUILDING DESIGN

- i. Energy efficiency—Design additions and new construction to maximize energy efficiency.
- ii. Materials—Utilize green building materials, such as recycled, locally-sourced, and low maintenance materials whenever possible.
- iii. Building elements—Incorporate building features that allow for natural environmental control – such as operable windows for cross ventilation.
- iv. Roof slopes—Orient roof slopes to maximize solar access for the installation of future solar collectors where compatible with typical roof slopes and orientations found in the surrounding historic district.

B. SITE DESIGN

- i. Building orientation—Orient new buildings and additions with consideration for solar and wind exposure in all seasons to the extent possible within the context of the surrounding district.
- ii. Solar access—Avoid or minimize the impact of new construction on solar access for adjoining properties.

C. SOLAR COLLECTORS

- i. Location—Locate solar collectors on side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right-of-way while maximizing solar access. Alternatively, locate solar collectors on a garage or outbuilding or consider a ground-mount system where solar access to the primary structure is limited.
- ii. Mounting (sloped roof surfaces)—Mount solar collectors flush with the surface of a sloped roof. Select collectors that are similar in color to the roof surface to reduce visibility.
- iii. Mounting (flat roof surfaces)—Mount solar collectors flush with the surface of a flat roof to the maximum extent feasible. Where solar access limitations preclude a flush mount, locate panels towards the rear of the roof where visibility

October 4, 2017

from the public right-of-way will be minimized.

Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 5, Guidelines for Site Elements

1. Topography

A. TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES

- i. *Historic topography*—Avoid significantly altering the topography of a property (i.e., extensive grading). Do not alter character-defining features such as berms or sloped front lawns that help define the character of the public right-of-way. Maintain the established lawn to help prevent erosion. If turf is replaced over time, new plant materials in these areas should be low-growing and suitable for the prevention of erosion.
- ii. *New construction*—Match the historic topography of adjacent lots prevalent along the block face for new construction. Do not excavate raised lots to accommodate additional building height or an additional story for new construction.
- iii. *New elements*—Minimize changes in topography resulting from new elements, like driveways and walkways, through appropriate siting and design. New site elements should work with, rather than change, character-defining topography when possible.

2. Fences and Walls.

A. HISTORIC FENCES AND WALLS

- i. *Preserve*—Retain historic fences and walls.
- ii. *Repair and replacement*—Replace only deteriorated sections that are beyond repair. Match replacement materials (including mortar) to the color, texture, size, profile, and finish of the original.
- iii. *Application of paint and cementitious coatings*—Do not paint historic masonry walls or cover them with stone facing or stucco or other cementitious coatings.

B. NEW FENCES AND WALLS

- i. *Design*—New fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure.
- ii. *Location*—Avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them.
- iii. *Height*—Limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. If a taller fence or wall existed historically, additional height may be considered. The height of a new retaining wall should not exceed the height of the slope it retains.
- iv. *Prohibited materials*—Do not use exposed concrete masonry units (CMU), Keystone or similar interlocking retaining wall systems, concrete block, vinyl fencing, or chain link fencing.
- v. *Appropriate materials*—Construct new fences or walls of materials similar to fence materials historically used in the district. Select materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district, and that are compatible with the main structure. Screening incompatible uses—Review alternative fence heights and materials for appropriateness where residential properties are adjacent to commercial or other potentially incompatible uses.

C. PRIVACY FENCES AND WALLS

- i. *Relationship to front facade*—Set privacy fences back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence.
- ii. *Location* – Do not use privacy fences in front yards.

3. Landscape Design

A. PLANTINGS

- i. *Historic Gardens*—Maintain front yard gardens when appropriate within a specific historic district.
- ii. *Historic Lawns*—Do not fully remove and replace traditional lawn areas with impervious hardscape. Limit the removal of lawn areas to mulched planting beds or pervious hardscapes in locations where they would historically be found, such as along fences, walkways, or drives. Low-growing plantings should be used in historic lawn areas; invasive or large-scale species should be avoided. Historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50%.
- iii. *Native xeric plant materials*—Select native and/or xeric plants that thrive in local conditions and reduce watering usage. See UDC Appendix E: San Antonio Recommended Plant List—All Suited to Xeriscape Planting Methods, for a list of appropriate materials and planting methods. Select plant materials with a similar character, growth habit, and light requirements as those being replaced.
- iv. *Plant palettes*—If a varied plant palette is used, incorporate species of taller heights, such informal elements should be restrained to small areas of the front yard or to the rear or side yard so as not to obstruct views of or otherwise distract from the historic structure.
- v. *Maintenance*—Maintain existing landscape features. Do not introduce landscape elements that will obscure the historic structure or are located as to retain moisture on walls or foundations (e.g., dense foundation plantings or vines) or as to cause damage.

B. ROCKS OR HARDSCAPE

- i. *Impervious surfaces*—Do not introduce large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces where they were not historically located.
- ii. *Pervious and semi-pervious surfaces*—New pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible, and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. If used, small plantings should be incorporated into the design.
- iii. *Rock mulch and gravel* - Do not use rock mulch or gravel as a wholesale replacement for lawn area. If used, plantings should be incorporated into the design.

October 4, 2017

C. MULCH

Organic mulch – Organic mulch should not be used as a wholesale replacement for plant material. Organic mulch with appropriate plantings should be incorporated in areas where appropriate such as beneath a tree canopy.

i. *Inorganic mulch* – Inorganic mulch should not be used in highly-visible areas and should never be used as a wholesale replacement for plant material. Inorganic mulch with appropriate plantings should be incorporated in areas where appropriate such as along a foundation wall where moisture retention is discouraged.

D. TREES

i. *Preservation*—Preserve and protect from damage existing mature trees and heritage trees. See UDC Section 35-523 (Tree Preservation) for specific requirements.

ii. *New Trees* – Select new trees based on site conditions. Avoid planting new trees in locations that could potentially cause damage to a historic structure or other historic elements. Species selection and planting procedure should be done in accordance with guidance from the City Arborist.

iii. *Maintenance* – Proper pruning encourages healthy growth and can extend the lifespan of trees. Avoid unnecessary or harmful pruning. A certified, licensed arborist is recommended for the pruning of mature trees and heritage trees.

4. Residential Streetscapes

A. PLANTING STRIPS

i. *Street trees*—Protect and encourage healthy street trees in planting strips. Replace damaged or dead trees with trees of a similar species, size, and growth habit as recommended by the City Arborist.

ii. *Lawns*—Maintain the use of traditional lawn in planting strips or low plantings where a consistent pattern has been retained along the block frontage. If mulch or gravel beds are used, low-growing plantings should be incorporated into the design.

iii. *Alternative materials*—Do not introduce impervious hardscape, raised planting beds, or other materials into planting strips where they were not historically found.

B. PARKWAYS AND PLANTED MEDIANS

i. *Historic plantings*—Maintain the park-like character of historic parkways and planted medians by preserving mature vegetation and retaining historic design elements. Replace damaged or dead plant materials with species of a like size, growth habit, and ornamental characteristics.

ii. *Hardscape*—Do not introduce new pavers, concrete, or other hardscape materials into parkways and planted medians where they were not historically found.

C. STREET ELEMENTS

i. *Site elements*—Preserve historic street lights, street markers, roundabouts, and other unique site elements found within the public right-of-way as street improvements and other public works projects are completed over time.

ii. *Historic paving materials*—Retain historic paving materials, such as brick pavers or colored paving, within the public right-of-way and repair in place with like materials.

5. Sidewalks, Walkways, Driveways, and Curbing

A. SIDEWALKS AND WALKWAYS

i. *Maintenance*—Repair minor cracking, settling, or jamming along sidewalks to prevent uneven surfaces. Retain and repair historic sidewalk and walkway paving materials—often brick or concrete—in place.

ii. *Replacement materials*—Replace those portions of sidewalks or walkways that are deteriorated beyond repair. Every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material.

iii. *Width and alignment*—Follow the historic alignment, configuration, and width of sidewalks and walkways. Alter the historic width or alignment only where absolutely necessary to accommodate the preservation of a significant tree.

iv. *Stamped concrete*—Preserve stamped street names, business insignias, or other historic elements of sidewalks and walkways when replacement is necessary.

v. *ADA compliance*—Limit removal of historic sidewalk materials to the immediate intersection when ramps are added to address ADA requirements.

B. DRIVEWAYS

i. *Driveway configuration*—Retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives. Incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration.

ii. *Curb cuts and ramps*—Maintain the width and configuration of original curb cuts when replacing historic driveways. Avoid introducing new curb cuts where not historically found.

C. CURBING

i. *Historic curbing*—Retain historic curbing wherever possible. Historic curbing in San Antonio is typically constructed of concrete with a curved or angular profile.

ii. *Replacement curbing*—Replace curbing in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Where in-kind replacement is not feasible, use a comparable substitute that duplicates the color, texture, durability, and profile of the original. Retaining walls and curbing should not be added to the sidewalk design unless absolutely necessary.

7. Off-Street Parking

A. LOCATION

i. *Preferred location*—Place parking areas for non-residential and mixed-use structures at the rear of the site, behind primary structures to hide them from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, place parking areas behind the primary structure and set them back as far as possible from the side streets. Parking areas to the side of the primary structure are acceptable when location behind the structure is not feasible. See UDC Section 35-310 for district-specific standards.

ii. *Front*—Do not add off-street parking areas within the front yard setback as to not disrupt the continuity of the

October 4, 2017

streetscape.

iii. *Access*—Design off-street parking areas to be accessed from alleys or secondary streets rather than from principal streets whenever possible.

B. DESIGN

i. *Screening*—Screen off-street parking areas with a landscape buffer, wall, or ornamental fence two to four feet high—or a combination of these methods. Landscape buffers are preferred due to their ability to absorb carbon dioxide. See UDC Section 35-510 for buffer requirements.

ii. *Materials*—Use permeable parking surfaces when possible to reduce run-off and flooding. See UDC Section 35-526(j) for specific standards.

OHP Window Policy Document

Windows used in new construction should:

- Maintain traditional dimensions and profiles;
- Be recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended;
- Feature traditional materials or appearance. Wood windows are most appropriate. Double-hung, block frame windows that feature alternative materials may be considered on a case-by-case basis;
- Feature traditional trim and sill details. Paired windows should be separated by a wood mullion. The use of low-e glass is appropriate in new construction provided that hue and reflectivity are not drastically different from regular glass.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family home on the vacant lot located at 309 Pierce. The lot is located within the boundary of the Government Hill Historic District and is flanked to the north by a 1-story historic single family home, to the west by a 1.5-story historic single family home, and to the east by a vacant lot and a cluster of contributing residential structures ranging from 1 to 2 stories in height. The lot is also adjacent to Interstate 35 Frontage Road to the south. This area of the Government Hill Historic District is characterized primarily by 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family homes, many with rear accessory structures. However, the configurations of the lots in the area vary in orientation, setback, lot coverage, and lot size.

b. The applicant received conceptual approval from the HDRC at the August 16, 2017, hearing. The applicant was heard for final approval on September 20, 2017, which was deferred to the Design Review Committee (DRC). Staff did not recommend approval at that time and recommended that the applicant address the following items.

The applicant provided an updated proposal to staff and the DRC on Tuesday, September 26, 2017. This recommendation is based on the new design proposal.

1. **That the applicant orients the primary entrance of the structure towards Interstate 35 Frontage Road to be more consistent with the development pattern of the block** – this stipulation has not been met in the current submission.

2. **That the applicant explores ways to incorporate a detached garage as noted in finding k to be more consistent with the overall development pattern of the Government Hill Historic District** – this stipulation has been met in the current submission.

3. **That the applicant simplifies the overall massing and configuration of the roof form to be more consistent with the historic roofs found in the district** – this stipulation appears to be partially met in the submission, but staff has not seen the final front, rear, or west-facing elevations.

4. **That the applicant installs wood or aluminum clad wood windows that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening** – the applicant agreed to this stipulation at the September 20, 2017, HDRC hearing.

5. **That the applicant complies with the OHP Checklist for Metal Roofs. The roof must feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a standard galvalume finish, and a crimped ridge seam. The applicant must contact staff 24 hours prior to installation in order to schedule an inspection to verify that metal roof specifications are met** – the applicant agreed to this stipulation at the September 20, 2017, HDRC hearing.

6. **That the board and batten siding features a smooth finish, an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide** – the applicant agreed to this stipulation at the September 20, 2017, HDRC hearing.

c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on July 11, 2017. The DRC noted that the attached garage is a departure from typical configurations in the district, but recognized the limitations of the lot size and the associated easements, stating that the solution is appropriate for the constraints. A key concept discussed was the massing of the building and its proposed roof forms. The DRC noted that the typical configuration of structures in the area is a projection of the front entryway towards the streetscape, which is the opposite condition indicated in the submission; the proposed structure's garage mass is the element that projects closest to Pierce. The DRC suggested simplifying the various roof forms and incorporating shed dormers to make ridgelines less complex, and to allow the central mass to read as one distinct element, which responds

October 4, 2017

more closely to the historic massing found in the surrounding vicinity. The applicant met again with the DRC on July 25, 2017. The DRC discussed the development pattern in the area and the configuration of the roof forms of the historic houses in the vicinity, suggesting that the applicant take inspiration from neighboring precedents. The DRC recommended that the applicant explore adding a front porch to remain consistent with the neighboring homes fronting IH 35 N. The DRC also recommended exploring raising the foundation height in response to historic precedents. Façade materials were discussed, including the lack of board and batten siding precedents in the historic district, and the DRC recommended incorporating horizontal lap siding or another façade element that responded to the neighborhood materials. The DRC recommended that rock veneer be avoided. The applicant also met with the DRC on September 26, 2017. The applicant provided an updated proposal that included a detached garage and a modified floor plan. The proposal was received favorably by the DRC, which gave comments on adding windows to blank wall planes, extending the front porch across the entrance, and selecting a garage door that is compatible with the historic district.

d. SETBACKS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. The orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. Additionally, established setbacks average to approximately 10 feet from the public right-of-way. The proposed structure will be set back from Pierce by 10 feet. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

e. ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed to orient the structure towards Pierce. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade should be oriented to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. The adjacent single family homes orient towards the Interstate 35 Frontage Road. Staff finds the primary orientation inconsistent with the Guidelines.

f. ENTRANCES AND MASSING – In the surrounding vicinity, historic structures are situated on narrow, deep lots, allowing for the front façade to be smaller in width than the side facades; however, the lot condition at 309 Pierce is wide and shallow. Therefore, the primary entrance will be located on the longest elevation, facing west towards Pierce. The applicant has included a porch element that partially wraps around the southwestern edge of the structure; however, the front door will be located on the elevation facing Pierce. This is a departure from standard entrance configurations in the district. Staff finds the entrance configuration inconsistent with typical patterns of the district.

g. SCALE – The applicant has proposed a 2-story single family structure. Per the submitted elevations, the ridgeline of the highest point appears to measure approximately 24 feet in height. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Staff finds the proposed scale acceptable for the surrounding context of the district.

h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Throughout this block, the foundation heights of historic structures are between two and three feet. The submitted elevations do not indicate the dimension of the foundation height, but it appears to be approximately 1 foot. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines based on the submitted documentation.

i. ROOF FORM – The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction state that new structures should incorporate roof forms, including pitch, overhangs, and orientation, that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. The applicant has proposed an overall hipped roof form that is reflective of historic homes in the area with smaller gable roofs. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines, but has not seen all updated elevations at this time.

j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window as compared to nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. Overall, the applicant has incorporated window sizes and proportions that are consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document and historic fenestration precedents in the district. The applicant has also stated that they will install aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

k. GARAGE – The applicant has proposed to construct a detached garage with a covered walkway. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new garages should follow the historic pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the principal building. Staff finds the proposed garage configuration generally consistent with the Guidelines.

l. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include vertical board and batten siding with trim, horizontal woodlap siding, a standing seam metal roof, and a wooden front door. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, materials should complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Additionally, materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. Contemporary interpretations of traditional materials are encouraged. Staff finds the proposed material palette appropriate for the context of the district.

m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations outlined in the recommendation.

October 4, 2017

n. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not noted the location and screening of mechanical equipment. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment from view of the public right of way.

o. **TREE REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove several trees from the property, including a tree located in approximately the center of the lot, and several trees along the property's lot line. The tree located in the center of the lot is not a heritage tree. The trees located along the lot line are smaller and are not heritage trees. The applicant has consulted with an arborist on their significance. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided a full landscaping plan to staff that includes decomposed granite, ample grass, and a variety of landscaping species, including crape myrtles, esperanza, and blue cypress, as well a variety of small shrubs. Staff finds the landscaping generally consistent with the Guidelines.

q. **HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing concrete apron near the center of the lot on Pierce and install a new concrete driveway measuring 10'-0" in width. The driveway will expand to a pad towards the interior of the lot. The applicant has also proposed to construct a concrete walkway measuring 13'-4" in length near the center of the property, slightly south of the concrete apron to be removed. Staff finds the proposed walkway width and material consistent with historic precedents in the district, but finds that its entrance should terminate at the façade facing IH-35 Frontage Road to be more consistent with entrance patterns along the block as noted in finding g. Regarding the driveway, concrete driveways are contextually appropriate and historically common in the Government Hill Historic District. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways should be limited to 10'-0" in width. Staff finds the proposed width consistent with the Guidelines.

r. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to install a six foot cedar plank privacy fence in the rear yard, and a 4 foot tall horizontal cedar plank fence in the front and side yards. The proposed front and side yard fencing is made of horizontal wooden fencing. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, front and side yard fences should be limited to a height of 4 feet. Wood plank fences are common in the Government Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the remaining stipulations be met:

1. That the applicant orients the primary entrance of the structure towards Interstate 35 Frontage Road to be more consistent with the development pattern of the block as noted in finding f.
2. That the applicant simplifies the overall massing and configuration of the roof form to be more consistent with the historic roofs found in the district as noted in finding i, and submits all final exterior elevations to demonstrate this modification.
3. That the applicant installs additional windows on the façade facing Pierce to comply with the Historic Design Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy Document, and window pattern precedents in the district.
4. That the applicant installs woodlap siding or a smooth composite siding. The applicant must submit final siding specifications to staff for review and approval.
5. That the applicant submits a final garage door specification to staff for review and approval. Staff recommends a carriage-style door with lites.
6. That the applicant submits all additional drawings, details, and material specifications to staff required for final review and approval. This includes the following items: complete landscaping and hardscaping plan with dimensions and fence location; final window specifications; and the location of all mechanical equipment and its associated screening methods..

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Cone to recommend approval of item #1 with 8inch reveal, #2, #4, #5 with staff stipulations, & approval of item #3

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2017-477

Applicant: David Armendariz

Address: 502-508 E GUENTHER

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing front yard grass and install gravel and plant materials to include Ajuga, Dahlbert Daisy, Frogfruit and Winecups.

October 4, 2017

FINDINGS:

- a. The structures addressed as 502-504 and 506-508 E Guenther are located on the same parcel immediately north of the E Guenther/Crofton split in the King William Historic District. The structure addressed as 502-504 E Guenther was constructed circa 1900 and first appears on a Sanborn map in 1904. This structure is located toward the rear (east) of the lot. The structure addressed as 506-508 E Guenther was constructed circa 1930 and is shown on the 1951 Sanborn map. This structure is located toward the public right of way at E Guenther.
- b. On April 6, 2016, the applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness to install gravel on a dirt area at the rear of the site. Since that time, the applicant has removed the existing turf from the planting strip at the public right of way, has removed turf from the front and side yards of the lot and has installed gravel. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.ii., traditional lawns should not be fully removed or replaced and that historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than fifty (50) percent. Additionally, the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.iii. notes that rock mulch and gravel should not act as a wholesale replacement for lawn area. The applicant has modified the historic lawn area on this parcel in a manner that is not consistent with the Guidelines. An official notice was left on site on October 26, 2016, and another delivered via mail on August 11, 2017.
- c. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install plant materials including Ajuga, Dahlbert Daisy, Frogfruit and Winecups in the planting strip between the street and sidewalk and immediately in front of the primary historic structure, noted as areas 2 and 3 on the site plan. The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing, unapproved gravel between the concrete driveway strips and on the west side of the property, areas 1 and 4 on the site plan.
- d. Staff finds the installation of the proposed plant materials in the front yard, areas 2 and 3 to be appropriate. Materials in the planting strips vary along E Guenther. Additionally, staff finds the installation of gravel between the ribbon strips of the driveway to be appropriate. Staff does not find the installation of the gravel in area 4 to be appropriate. Staff finds the applicant should return this location to grass or maintain vegetation to adhere to the fifty percent of front yard grass requirement noted in the Guidelines for Site Elements, 3.A.ii. The approval of gravel at this location would allow for automobile parking per code.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant return area 4, the western most portion of the site to natural grass or vegetation.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell- spoke in opposition to the applicant's request

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations and to include that AREA 1 be a 1' wide band of gravel along drive. Area 2 must return to turf, grass.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Connor arrived at 3:58 PM

17. HDRC NO. 2017-454

Applicant: Wade Lewis

Address: 529 DEVINE ST

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Replace existing, historic wood windows with vinyl windows.
- 2. Replace existing, aluminum windows with vinyl windows.
- 3. Repair siding to match the existing profile.
- 4. Paint the historic structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 529 Devine was constructed circa 1920 in the Craftsman style and feature a front gabled roof, asphalt shingle roof and double front porch columns. The historic structure features a number of its historic wood windows; however, many historic windows were previously replaced by aluminum windows, particularly at the rear of the structure.
- b. **WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT** - The applicant has proposed to replace wood windows with vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that historic windows should be preserved. Staff performed a site visit on August 14, 2017, and found the removed wood window sashes to be in

October 4, 2017

good condition. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood window sashes and reinstall in the house.

c. ALUMINUM WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace 3, non-original aluminum windows with new vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii. notes that non-original windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that while the proposed vinyl windows are not consistent with the Guidelines in regards to materials, their profile is more consistent with the profile of the historic windows than the existing aluminum windows.

d. SIDING REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to repair and install new siding where existing siding is damaged to match the siding of the historic structure. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. In addition to the proposed siding repair, the applicant has noted that the house will be sanded and painted. Sanding should occur in a gentle method. Paint colors are to be submitted to staff for approval prior to painting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the replacement of wood windows. Staff recommends that all existing wood windows be repaired and that the removed sashes be repaired and reinstalled in the house.

Staff recommends approval of item #2, the replacement of aluminum windows, with the stipulation that the profile of the proposed vinyl windows match that of the historic structure's original wood windows and feature a framing depth that is consistent with the historic windows.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4, the repair, sanding and painting of siding with the stipulation that sanding be done in a gentle manner and that paint colors be submitted to staff for approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move to the next agenda

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

COMMISSIONER CONE OUT AT 5:00

18. HDRC NO. 2017-465

Applicant: Jim Poteet

Address: 250 WASHINGTON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace rotten and mismatched wood columns on the lower level of the front porch.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 250 Washington is a 2-story single family home constructed circa 1910. The brick structure features a wraparound asymmetrical porch with turned balusters and Doric columns, a dentil course on the cornice levels, and segmental and jack arch windows. The home also features a rear addition. The house is a contributing structure to the King William Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the first story wood columns with fiberglass columns to match the historic configuration.

ITEM# 18

b. PORCH COLUMNS: EXISTING CONDITION – The applicant has noted that the existing, historic porch columns have been previously modified, which has caused irreparable damage. Some columns had their rotted bases removed and replaced with metal bases, which has caused erosion, separation, water infiltration, expansion, and separation of materials. Other historic columns have been previously replaced with mismatching or incompatible styles. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii. notes that columns should be replaced with columns that are compatible in scale, massing and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions and finish, when repair is not possible.

c. PORCH COLUMNS: REPLACEMENT – At this time, the applicant has proposed to install replicas of the columns that are made of fiberglass. While the proposed columns will feature fiberglass materials, the applicant has provided product specifications and examples of existing installations of the proposed fiberglass columns which note appropriate scale, massing and details. Staff does not find the installation of fiberglass columns to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant first attempt to locate original columns to install. If this is not possible, staff finds that the proposed composite columns may be appropriate.

October 4, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of fiberglass replacement columns. Staff recommends that the applicant first attempt to locate historic, wood replacement columns.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval as proposed, columns must be salvaged, and a detailed salvage plan must be submitted to staff, along with a drawing of historic column detail.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2017-451

Applicant: Thelma Pena

Address: 117 BUFORD

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 729 square feet.
2. Construct a water closet addition on the west elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 117 Buford was constructed circa 1920 in a vernacular style and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure features a gable roof and wood siding with a covered front porch to match. The structure features approximately 780 square feet.
- b. REAR ADDITION – The applicant proposed to construct a 27 feet wide by 27 feet long addition to the rear of the historic structure to match its width. The proposed addition would add 729 square feet to the current 780 square feet structure. The addition would maintain an 11 feet setback to the rear property line. The Guidelines for Additions 3.1.B.iv. notes that an appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within historic districts and that residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint regardless of size. Guidelines 3.1.A.iv. notes the use of setbacks or a recessed area and a small change in detail at the seam of the historic structure and the new addition to provide clear visual distinction between old and new forms. While the applicant has proposed to install vertical trim boards between the existing structure and the addition, staff finds that also including an inset condition would provide a smaller overall addition that is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. MATERIALS - The applicant proposed to install wood siding to feature a 6” exposure and vertical trim pieces between the existing structure and the addition. The applicant has also proposed to paint the exterior addition the same color as the existing structure. The Guidelines for Additions 3.3.A.i notes that using materials that match in type, color, and texture should include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Staff finds the proposed materials for the addition appropriate.
- d. ROOF FORM – The applicant proposed to construct a roof for the addition that matches the form (gable) and materials (shingle) of the existing roof. Staff finds the proposal for the roof of the addition appropriate and in compliance with the Guidelines for Additions 3.1.A.iii regarding a similar roof form and 3.3.A.i. regarding complementary materials.
- e. WINDOWS & DOORS – The applicant proposed to install two windows on each side façade and one door on the rear façade. The applicant has proposed to use 24” by 60” aluminum double hung windows with trim detail that matches the existing historic structure. While staff finds the window materials to be inconsistent with the Guidelines (typically wood), staff finds the proposed windows appropriate given the aluminum windows installed the existing structure. Staff finds that the dimensions of the proposed windows inappropriately large. A window dimension closer to the existing windows would be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed aluminum windows should feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Staff also finds the proposed color of white appropriate given the color of the existing windows in the historic structure.
- f. UTILITY CLOSET –The applicant proposed to construct a utility closet addition on the west elevation of the structure. Staff finds this location and construction to be appropriately placed and scaled, consistent with examples found throughout the district.

October 4, 2017

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings b through f with the following stipulations

- i. The addition includes an inset condition to distinguish between old and new forms and reduce the overall square footage of the addition.
- ii. The applicant must reduce the size of the proposed windows to match windows in the existing structure as noted in finding e. The proposed windows feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. An updated window schedule must be submitted to staff before final approval.

CASE COMMENT:

A stop work order was issued on 8/21/2017 for the construction of a rear addition prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or permits.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Liz Franklin, spoke about this case

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube conceptual approval with staff stipulations, applicant must come back with high quality drawings and more details.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2017-434

Applicant: Beth Rothwell

Address: 407 MISSION ST

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT BEFORE MEETING

22. HDRC NO. 2017-250

Applicant: Christopher Mongeon

Address: 1115 NOLAN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a two story rear accessory structure at 1115 Nolan.
2. Perform site modifications including the removal of existing hardscaping and the installation of rear yard automobile parking locations.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 1115 Nolan was constructed circa 1915 and features two stories in height with double height front porch columns, a wraparound front porch and front and side gabled roofs. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story rear accessory structure to contain a garage and dwelling unit on the first floor and dwelling units on the second floor. The proposed footprint is approximately 1,000 square feet.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 30, 2017. At that meeting, committee members commented that the massing of the proposed accessory structure is appropriate, asked questions regarding the locations of parking and recommended that the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan and additional information regarding the proposed exterior staircase.
- c. MASSING & FORM – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i., new garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure on the lot in terms of their height, massing and form. The applicant has noted an overall height of twenty-seven (27) feet. The primary historic structure features an overall height of thirty-seven (37) feet. Double height accessory structures are not common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the construction of a two story rear accessory structure may be appropriate provided that

October 4, 2017

the applicant explore ways of minimizing massing and height to the greatest extent possible. The proposed accessory structure should not be dissimilar to those found historically in the district.

d. **BUILDING SIZE** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii. notes that new accessory structures should be no larger in plan than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint. Per the applicant’s provided site plan, the proposed structure’s footprint will exceed that which is recommended by the Guidelines. The applicant has proposed a footprint of approximately 1,000 square feet. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the footprint of the proposed structure to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

e. **SITE MATERIALS** – The majority of the rear of the lot is currently covered in concrete paving. The applicant has proposed to reduce the existing amount of concrete paving by adding natural lawn areas between the primary historic structure and the proposed accessory structure. It would also be appropriate to create additional areas of landscaping to reduce the overall amount of proposed paving and mitigate storm water runoff onto the neighboring properties.

f. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials which include Hardi board siding, vinyl windows, a standing seam metal roof and two single width garage doors. The applicant has noted that the proposed Hardi siding will feature a smooth finish. Staff finds that the Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches. Additionally, the proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Staff does not find the installation of vinyl windows appropriate. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

g. **GARAGE DOORS** – The applicant has proposed garage doors that are single in width and feature top row window lights. Staff finds that the proposed garage doors are generally consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **ORIENTATION & SETBACKS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.i. the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Additionally, accessory structure should feature a setback that is consistent with the historic examples found in the neighborhood. Staff finds the proposed orientation, placement and setbacks to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.

i. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not noted the location of proposed mechanical equipment. All mechanical equipment is to be screened from view from the public right of way.

j. **SITE WORK** – The property currently features a rear yard that is predominantly concrete. The applicant has proposed to remove portions of the existing concrete and install natural turf. Staff finds the appropriate.

k. **REAR YARD PARKING** – The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i. notes that the preferred location for on-site parking is at the rear of the site, behind the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed to locate parking for five (5) automobiles to the rear of both the primary and proposed accessory structure. Staff finds this location appropriate. The applicant has noted that the existing driveway and curbcuts will not be altered.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval at this time based on findings c and d. Staff recommends the applicant address the following concerns prior to receiving conceptual approval:

i. That the applicant explore ways of minimizing massing and height to the greatest extent possible to result in a rear accessory structure that is consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district.

ii. That the applicant reduce the footprint of the proposed structure to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

iii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for

iv. That the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.

v. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.

vi. That additional landscaped areas be added to reduce storm water runoff onto the neighboring properties and public right of way.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Felix Ziga, Arvis Holland, Aimee Holland, Nancy Alford, Drew Witt- spoke in support of the applicant’s request. Liz Franklin spoke in opposition to the applicant’s request.

October 4, 2017

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for conceptual approval with staff stipulations #3, #4, #5, #6, applicant must return with details about the security fence and to reduce run off issues for final approval.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-490

Applicant: Alanzo Alston/Sol Studio Architects

Address: 820 HAYS ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a single family house featuring approximately 2,015 square feet on the vacant lot at 820 Hays street in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
2. To construct a rear accessory structure.
3. To construct fencing on the lot.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a single family house to feature approximately 2,015 square feet on the vacant lot at 820 Hays Street, located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – This request received conceptual approval at the April 19, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, where the request was approved as submitted. At that time, staff's concerns regarded setbacks from the street, front porch massing, window opening proportions, the front porch corten planter, bronze colored roof, cement plaster finish, window profiles and exposed rafter tails.
- c. FINAL APPROVAL – The request for a Certificate of Appropriateness was heard by the HDRC on September 6, 2017, where it was denied. Since that time, the applicant has provided a document to respond to staff's findings and recommendations; however, has not modified a majority of the design elements to be consistent with staff's recommendation.
- d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 26, 2017, where committee members noted that an increase to the proposed porch roof was needed, that the proposed materials were generally appropriate and that the proposed massing and scale was appropriate.
- e. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of 33' – 0". The applicant has noted that adjacent historic structures on this block feature setbacks of 42' – 0", 24' – 6" and 27' – 6". Staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards Hays Street. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. ENTRANCES – The applicant has proposed a protruding enclosure front porch with cut openings to represent two windows and a front door. Beneath this enclosure, the applicant has proposed a recessed primary entrance. Folk Victorian structures, feature primary entrances on recessed front porches at the side of projecting front bays. As the applicant has proposed the enclosed porch, the primary entrance area extrudes past the front projecting bay. This is architecturally inappropriate and removes façade depth that is naturally created by a recessed front porch.
- h. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a front porch overhang that features a roof with a slope of ½ /12 roof slope. Historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature porch roofs that feature numerous widths, depths and roof styles. The applicant's proposed porch roof design is not appropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Where a porch roof features shed and hipped elements, the slope is greater than that proposed by the applicant. The applicant should also incorporate porch columns that feature historic characteristics in regards to spacing and detailing.
- i. ENTRANCE RAMP – The applicant has proposed an entrance ADA ramp at the front of the proposed new construction. Staff finds the ramp to be an integral part of the new construction and appropriate.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window openings that generally feature widths that are similar

October 4, 2017

to those found on historic structures.

k. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed windows that feature contemporary sizes on the side elevations. Staff finds that these windows may be appropriate in addition to or coupled with windows that are similarly sized to historic windows.

i. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum clad one over one windows. The door and window schedule note these windows. Staff finds that a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used based on finding m. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

l. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant’s proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

m. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include cypress siding, Hardi siding with a four inch exposure, Portland cement plaster, galvalume roof decking, a standing seam metal roof and a corten steel planter. The applicant should ensure that the proposed Hardi siding features a smooth exposure. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Regarding the proposed cement plaster finish and corten steel planter at the front porch, there is no historic example or precedent of these proposed materials. Staff does not find this appropriate.

n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILES – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in natural and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the proposed structure is consistent with the Guidelines; however, the proposed porch massing should not extend past the front bay as noted in finding h.

o. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – At the rear of the proposed new construction, the applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to accommodate parking for three vehicles. Staff finds this location appropriate.

p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this.

q. DRIVEWAY – The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.i. notes that historic driveways should be repaired and retained in place. There is currently a ribbon strip driveway located on the west side of the property. The applicant has proposed to remove this driveway and install a new, decomposed granite driveway on the east side of the property. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

r. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed front yard landscaping that includes the installation of xeric plant materials. At least fifty (50) percent of front yard grass is to be retained.

s. PLANTER BOX – The applicant has proposed to locate a corten planter box on the front façade of the proposed new construction. This material and the location of a planter box on the front façade of a structure to be located in a historic district is not appropriate.

t. RAFTER TAILS/LOOKOUTS – The applicant has noted that the proposed rafter tails serve a structural purpose. Folk Victorian structures, from which the applicant has modeled the massing, do not feature exposed structural roofing elements. Staff finds these should be eliminated.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to receiving final approval.

i. That the applicant propose a front porch and front massing that are consistent with the Guidelines and complementary of historic structures’ front porches found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District as noted in findings g and h.

ii. That the applicant eliminate the proposed front porch corten planter, bronze colored roof and cement plaster finish from the proposed materials as noted in finding m and s.

iii. That the proposed aluminum clad windows feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

iv. That the applicant install a standing seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish as noted in finding m. A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to installation.

v. That the applicant eliminate the proposed exposed rafter tails/lookouts that are inappropriately placed on the front gable as noted in finding t.

October 4, 2017

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2017-479

Applicant: Jordan Restoration

Address: 2024 W HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 7 existing wood windows on the right façade of the home with new vinyl windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 2024 W Huisache Ave is a 1-story single family home designed in the Tudor style. The home features several quintessential elements of the Tudor style, including a prominent chimney with a decorative brick pattern, half-timbering in the gables, and arched windows and doors. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace 7 existing wood one over one windows with new vinyl windows on the west façade of the property.
- b. The applicant indicated on their application that the existing wood windows to be replaced are damaged due to the effects of the neighboring house burning down. Staff conducted a site visit on September 21, 2017, to assess the condition of the windows. Staff concurs with the applicant that the windows have suffered damage and are need of replacement.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in-kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Replacement of original wood windows with vinyl is not consistent in historic districts. Staff does not find the proposed replacement material consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the window replacement based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant install double-hung, one-over-one wood windows to match the existing configuration as closely as possible. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. ITEM# 24

The final specification should be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2017-491

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

Address: 1121 E CROCKETT ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install fencing along the eastern property line

October 4, 2017

at a height of six (6) feet to extend past the front façade of the historic structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a side yard privacy fence that extends along the eastern property line beyond the front façade of the primary historic structure at a height of six (6) feet. The Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.i. notes that privacy fences should be set back from the front façade of the historic structure rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence. Additionally, the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.ii. notes that privacy fences should not be installed in front yard.
- b. As installed, the applicant's fence is not consistent with the Guidelines in regards to location. In regards to height, the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i. notes that fences within the front yard should not exceed four (4) feet in height. The proposed fence is not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the fence not exceed (4) four feet in height past the front wall plane of the historic structure.

CASE COMMENT:

The installation of the current privacy fence was completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The existing fence, which featured the same location as the current privacy fence was in compliance with the Historic Design Guidelines.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Earl Wright spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor approve as submitted

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2017-506

Applicant: T.Y. Thomas/Arc Design & Associates

Address: 527 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition to measure approximately 1580 square feet and to include a 10 foot rear covered patio.
2. Remove two existing front doors and install a new central front door.
3. Construct a new front porch with a wheel chair access ramp.
4. Modify the existing fenestration.
5. Remove the existing ribbon driveway and install a new 13 foot wide circle concrete driveway with retaining wall.
6. Construct a new rear accessory structure to measure approximately 290 square feet.
7. Install a 3 car parking pad in the rear of the lot with access from the alley.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 527 E Huisache is a 1-story duplex constructed in the 1950s. The structure does not appear on a 1951 Sanborn Map. The home features some simplified Craftsman influences, including a low-sloped gable roof with overhanging eaves and window screens with geometric detailing. The home is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic District.

Findings for the primary structure, items #1-4:

b. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The proposed addition measures 1580 square feet with a rear covered porch. This approximately doubles the size of the primary structure, which measures a total of 1593 square feet. Given the relatively small footprint of the existing structure and the depth of the lot, the additional square footage is appropriate.

c. **ROOF** – The existing rear elevation of the historic primary structure features a gable roof. The proposed addition features a single gable, is 1-story in height, and is slightly shorter than the existing structure's roofline. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and

October 4, 2017

orientation as the principal structure. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. ROOF MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install a new composition shingle roof on the addition to match the existing composition shingle roof on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. REAR WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL – The proposed addition will require the removal of two existing casement windows and two aluminum sliding glass doors. Guideline 3.C.i in the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions encourages the salvage and reuse of historic materials, where possible, that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with the stipulations included in the recommendations.

f. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS – The applicant has proposed door and window proportions on the rear addition that are generally consistent with proportions on the primary structure and those found within the district. However, the size, configuration, and material are not definitively indicated in the application.

g. MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The existing structure features vinyl lap siding with a wide exposed profile of approximately 12 inches. The applicant has proposed to utilize HardiePlank Primed Cedarmill lap fiber cement siding on the addition. The submitted drawings indicate that the profile of the lap siding will match that of the existing structure; however, HardiePlank siding is generally installed with an 8 inch profile. Staff finds that the elevations are not consistent with the proposed products.

h. TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW – The proposed addition will be inset on the east façade from the historic structure by approximately 5'-1 ½". On the east façade, a vertical trim piece will cover the joint between the existing structure and addition. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The proposal meets this Guideline.

i. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has not indicated the location of new mechanical equipment. The applicant is responsible for providing this information for final approval.

j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition keeps with the Craftsman style of the historic home without detracting from its significance. Staff finds the proposed addition's architectural details generally consistent with the Guidelines.

k. EXISTING WINDOW MODIFICATIONS – Based on the submitted photos and drawings, the side fenestration of the existing structure will be modified, requiring the removal of existing doors and/or windows. The applicant should provide an existing floor plan or demolition floor plan that indicates which openings are to be modified.

l. FRONT DOOR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing front entrance configuration. Two existing front doors on either side of the façade will be removed and a new door installed on the central axis. The existing windows will remain. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic openings should be preserved.

m. FRONT PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch. The front façade currently contains two small shed awnings above each door. The property has not historically had a porch mass that extends the length of the façade. The proposed porch features a low-sloped gable, simple column posts, and a railing. The gable also contains a circular vent. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements, including stairs and related elements, should be simple and not distract from the historic character of the building and should be architecturally appropriate for the home. While staff finds that a new porch may be appropriate, the proposed porch gable has no precedent in its configuration and proportion. Typically, as found on the block and in the district, porches on Craftsman-style structures do not extend the full width of the façade. Historic examples that do contain wide or full-width porches incorporate alternate roof forms, such as a simple shed or hip, or exhibit roof proportions that mimic the primary gable. Staff does not find the porch consistent as submitted. Findings for the rear accessory structure, item #5:

n. MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the rear of the lot to measure approximately 290 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

o. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – Guidelines 5.B.i and 5.B.ii for new construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation and setbacks common in the district. Staff finds the proposal for orientation consistent with the Guidelines, but has not seen a site plan indicating how the new footprint will affect the setback from the rear or adjacent lots in terms of definitive dimensions. The applicant will likely be required to obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

p. WINDOWS AND DOORS – According to the OHP Window Policy Document, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. Based on the submitted exhibits, the proposed structure will feature an alley-facing garage door and one door on the west façade. Staff finds the included openings conceptually consistent in terms of proportion and configuration, but finds the lack of windows to be inconsistent.

q. MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. The applicant has proposed to use Hardie Plank siding to match the siding used on the new addition. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines

r. ROOF – The applicant has proposed a simple shed gable structure for the rear accessory structure roof. Staff finds

October 4, 2017

the proposal appropriate and consistent.

s. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed to incorporate simplified architectural features that respond those of the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

Findings for site elements, items #6 and #7:

t. **RIBBON DRIVEWAY REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing ribbon driveway on the east side of the property. This driveway will be partially replaced by a new circular drive. The ribbon driveway configuration is likely original to the lot and is a common driveway pattern along E Huisache. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, historic driveways should be preserved. Staff does not find the wholesale removal of the existing ribbon driveway consistent with the Guidelines.

u. **NEW DRIVEWAY AND RETAINING WALL** – The applicant has proposed to install a new circular driveway in the front yard of the property. The driveway is intended to provide greater ease of access to a new ADA accessible entrance. The driveway measures 13'-0" in width and will require a retaining wall and grading.

According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, the preferred location of new ramps or accessible entrances is at the side or rear of the building. New entrances should be as visually unobtrusive as possible, especially if visible from the public right-of-way. Additionally, grade changes should be minor if required. If a new driveway is required, a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site should be incorporated. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Additionally, existing curb cuts should be maintained, while new curb cuts should follow historic patterns and dimensions. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines due to its modification of an existing ribbon driveway and deviation from historic driveway configurations and widths. Based on the submitted renderings, the grading required to achieve this driveway also appears significant. Staff has not seen a section or similar information that demonstrates how much the height will be modified, nor how the proposed grading will affect the streetscape or drainage of neighboring properties.

v. **REAR PARKING PAD** – The applicant has proposed to install a rear concrete parking pad to accommodate three cars. The parking pad will be directly adjacent to the existing alley. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, off street parking should be located at the side or rear of a structure whenever possible. There is also evidence of existing parking pads along the alley. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines; however, the applicant should make every effort to install the least amount of concrete cover allowable due to the additional changes proposed to the lot.

w. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. The applicant is required to provide this information for final approval, to include grading information, specific hardscaping locations and dimensions, and the location and species of all plants.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval at this time. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant provides contextual drawings, including a neighborhood site plan and elevations, renderings, and/or sections that indicate the proposal's relationship and effect on surrounding structures. These drawings should, at a minimum, demonstrate the following: how any proposed landscaping and hardscaping will affect the existing condition of the grade and how said modifications will relate to the existing grade of neighboring properties; and how the proposed addition and site modifications relate to the development context of the neighborhood, as noted in findings t, u, and w.
2. That the applicant confirms the dimensions of the existing siding and the proposed addition siding and indicates this information on the elevations as noted in finding g.
3. That the applicant explores ways to utilize the existing ribbon driveway to lead to an accessible entrance on the side of the home as indicated in findings t and u.
4. That the applicant provides addition information on the material, configuration, and condition of the existing windows. The applicant should seek to retain the existing fenestration as noted in finding k. The applicant should explore ways to salvage and integrate the two rear windows to be removed in the new addition as noted in finding e.
5. That the applicant proposes a porch design that is rooted in historic precedents in terms of proportions and configuration as noted in finding m.
6. That the applicant incorporates windows in the rear accessory structure as noted in finding p.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison (Frank Garcia yielded time- received 6 mins), Tony Garcia (Angie Sandoval yielded time- received 6 mins), Felipe Sandoval, James Thurwalker, Ester Contreras, Josie Delon, Kathleen Thompson, Rosemarie Courchesne, Andrew Holbrook, Robert Desimone, Cee Winkler, Sean Fruge, Will Arnsman- all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to denial of the applicant's request

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

October 4, 2017

27. HDRC NO. 2017-487

Applicant: Matthew Thomson

Address: 523 MISSION ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to widen the existing driveway apron.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 523 Mission was constructed in circa 1944 with a Spanish Colonial configuration and is a contributing structure to the King William Historic District. The structure is a duplex that features a wide parking pad in front of the residence.
- b. LOT - The structure at 523 Mission resides on the same lot as another residential duplex structure at 517/519 Mission. The two structures are divided by a driveway that runs through the center of the property.
- c. DRIVEWAY - The structure at 523 Mission features its own two-car parking pad on its street facing façade. The parking pad features approximately 18 feet in width with 7'6" wide apron on its left side. The applicant has proposed to widen the apron, 18 feet wide to where it meets the parking pad and 22 feet wide flaring to the curb. The applicant cites the existing 7'6" wide apron as "inadequate." Staff has also noticed that vehicles entering and exiting the driveway traverse beyond the concrete of the apron resulting in dead grass, signifying how wide the apron needs to be for those vehicles. The Guidelines for Site Elements: Sidewalks, Walkways, Driveways, and Curbing 5.5.B.i. notes that historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet and requires the incorporation of similar materials, width, and design that is historically found on the site. Staff finds that the proposed widening of the apron to meet the 18 feet wide curb inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- d. CONTEXT - A double-width driveway is not common in the King William Historic District and the historic pattern on this block does not support a variation.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the driveway as proposed. Staff recommends that the driveway apron be limited to 10 feet in width with a 12-foot flare at the street based on the findings. A final plan must be submitted to staff before approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cullen Jones- spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2017-503

Applicant: Karla Alvarado/Alvarado Properties Ltd

Address: 630 SHERMAN ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Install new front porch columns.
2. Remove the existing composition shingle roof and install a new standing seam metal roof.
3. Construct a rear addition.
4. Install a front and side fence constructed of horizontal wooden slats in the location of an existing chain link fence.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 630 Sherman is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure first appears on a 1912 Sanborn Map. The home is a contributing

October 4, 2017

structure in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

b. FRONT PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing non-original metal porch columns and replace them with simple square posts. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements should be simple in design and not distract from the historic structure nor falsify a historic appearance. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent based on the submitted exhibits, but requires dimensioned elevations and plans to confirm their appropriateness.

c. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The structure currently features an asphalt shingled roof which the applicant has proposed to replace with a standing seam metal roof. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi notes that metal roofs should be used on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds the installation of a standing seam metal roof on this Folk Victorian structure to be appropriate. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam.

d. REAR ADDITION: PREVIOUS ADDITION – The structure previously featured an element at the southwest corner of the property that was subordinate to the primary roofline. The structure had a low-sloped sawtooth roofline and featured woodlap siding concealed by cement shingle tiles. Based on Sanborn Maps from 1912 and 1951, a portion of the removed structure was likely original, with a majority of the structure originally functioning as an open porch.

e. REAR ADDITION: FORM – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature one story and approximately 419 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 both a rear facing gabled roof and a shed roof. While the gabled roof is appropriate for the architecture of the historic structure, staff finds the large shed roof to be inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant replace the proposed shed roof with a gabled roof, a roof similar to the one on the previous structure, or a roof form that is complementary of the architecture of the historic structure.

f. REAR ADDITION: SCALE – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature an overall height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

g. REAR ADDITION: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to use woodlap siding to match the original structure on the addition. The addition will also be delineated from the primary structure with a vertical trim piece at the joint of the new and old structures. Staff finds the materials appropriate.

h. FENCING: LOCATION – The property currently contains a chain link fence. The applicant has proposed to remove this fence and construct a wood slat fence in its place. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

i. FENCING: HEIGHT – Based on the submitted renderings, the proposed fence will measure 4 feet in height along Willow Street and be raised to approximately 5 to 6 feet at the approximate location of the proposed addition. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, front and side yard fences should be limited to 4 feet in height. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines, but requires final measured drawings for review and approval.

j. FENCING: MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed to construct the fence out of horizontal wood slats. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences and walls should relate to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, Staff recommends conceptual approval of the front porch column installation with the stipulation that porch columns be no wider than 6x6 inches and chamfered corners. The applicant must provide final dimensioned plans and elevations to staff for final approval.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the installation of a standing seam metal roof with the following stipulation:

i. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam. The applicant must schedule an inspection with OHP Staff prior to installation.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the construction of a rear addition based on findings e through g. Staff recommends the following prior to a recommendation for approval:

i. That the applicant replaces the proposed shed roof with a gabled roof or a roof form that is complementary of the architecture of the historic structure as noted in finding e.

ii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed within the addition that adhere to the following standards: White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the fence installation based on findings h through j with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant provides staff with final measured drawings including a site plan that indicates where the fence will be located relative to the property line and the structure, and elevations indicating the height of the fence.

October 4, 2017

ii. That the applicant provides staff with a final material specification for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to move for approval with staff stipulations except stipulation on the roof form.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2017-502

Applicant: Ricardo McCullough

Address: 1021 N PALMETTO

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new 2-story single family home with rooftop terrace on the vacant lot located at 1021 N Palmetto.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family home to feature approximately 2,015 square feet on the vacant lot at 1021 N Palmetto, located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located at the intersection of N Palmetto and Burleson and is flanked to the west and the south by 1-story historic single-family homes. The blocks in the vicinity are predominantly defined by 1-story historic homes with a few 2-story historic homes, including one across the street from the vacant lot.

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

c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 27, 2017. The DRC commented on the combination of stucco and lap siding, which is not common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, nor generally in historic districts in the city. The DRC suggested a more consistent window pattern, sizes, and placement that were more representative of those found in the district and more consistent with the Guidelines. The DRC suggested to utilize the curb cut off Burleson instead of introduce a new curb cut with pavers as a driveway on N Palmetto. The DRC emphasized the importance of studying the surrounding context and responding to the neighborhood conditions, including providing exhibits or drawings that convey reasoning for design choices.

d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the structure to face N Palmetto Street, which is consistent with the development pattern found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback that per the application documents is to be within five feet of the adjacent setbacks. The applicant is to provide field measurements to confirm setbacks of adjacent structures and proposed a setback that is consistent. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines.

e. ENTRANCES: ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards N Palmetto. This is consistent with the Guidelines and the pattern of neighboring homes.

f. ENTRANCES: PORCH – The applicant has proposed a front entrance that projects slightly from the primary setback of the front façade. Historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature distinct porches that engage the pedestrian streetscape and feature numerous widths, depths and roof styles. The applicant's absence of a definitive porch is not appropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.

g. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with a rooftop terrace. The highest point of the structure is indicated to be 29'-4 without considering the foundation height. The height is generally consistent with the two-story structures nearby; however, the block is predominantly single-family homes with a maximum height of 20 feet at the roof ridge line. Additionally, the massing of the structure, primarily the right façade that will face Burleson, is not similar to historic structures and is not appropriate for the site, nor consistent with the Guidelines.

h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Historic structures found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature foundation heights of two to three feet in height.

October 4, 2017

The applicant has provided information that notes a foundation height of approximately 1 to 2 feet. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.

- i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a gable roof form and a habitable flat rooftop terrace. While the gable pitch is commonly found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, the treatment of the rear façade with the rooftop terrace, as well as the proportions and height, are deviations from common patterns. Guideline 3.A.iv states that new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof forms inconsistent with the Guidelines as proposed.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS: PROPORTIONS AND PLACEMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window openings that are not consistent with those found on historic structures in the neighborhood, either in width, height, or configuration. Additionally, the left elevation is completely void of fenestration. Guideline 2.C.ii states that blank walls should be avoided. The openings are inconsistent with those found on historic structures in the area, specifically the Craftsman structures found in the immediate vicinity. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines and incompatible for the district.
- k. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant’s proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- l. MATERIALS – In regards to material, the applicant has proposed materials to include horizontal siding and stucco for the walls, along with a standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the use of siding appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District; however, a material specification is required to make a final determination. Additionally, a mixture of stucco and siding is not a common pattern in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the installation of a standing seam metal roof appropriate; the roof should feature 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. The applicant has also indicated the use of metal brackets underneath the roof eaves, as well as a railing with balusters on the second floor. While roof eave detailing is common on nearby structures, metal brackets are not characteristic of the district. A material specification would need to be submitted for consideration of the railing for approval.
- m. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has not specified window materials; however, per the provided application documents, the applicant has proposed window that lack profiles that are consistent with those found on historic structures. The applicant should refer to the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy document to ensure that appropriate window materials and an appropriate framing depth is used. Staff finds the installation of wood windows to be appropriate.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The architectural details of the proposal are not consistent with context of the neighborhood, which features Craftsman bungalows, Queen Anne cottages, and Folk Victorian homes in the direct vicinity. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- o. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for accommodating mechanical elements when proposing a design for final approval.
- p. DRIVEWAY: LOCATION – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways that are similar to the historic configuration found on site or in the district should be incorporated. Currently, a curb cut exists off Burleson. The proposed new driveway placement, in conjunction with its materiality and parking strategy, is not consistent with the historic development pattern of the district. Staff finds the proposed location and configuration inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- q. DRIVEWAY: MATERIAL - According to Guideline 5.B.i, driveways similar in material found in the district should be used. Pavers are not characteristic of the Dignowity Hill Historic District, where concrete driveways are common. Staff finds the material inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- r. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install three individual paver walkways leading from N Palmetto St to the front of the house. One leads to the front door and the other two terminate at the front façade with no entrance. Staff finds the proposed walkway leading to the front door consistent with the guidelines, but finds no precedent in the district for walkways leading to facades with no openings. Additionally, pavers are not consistent with the materials used in front approaches in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, where poured concrete is common.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval based on findings a through q. The applicant should address the following items if they wish to return with a new design proposal:

- i. That the applicant submits a street elevation noting the proposed new construction in comparison with neighboring historic structures to determine the new construction’s impact and proposed a consistent setback.
- ii. That the applicant proposes a front porch and front massing that are consistent with the Guidelines and complementary of historic front porches found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District as noted in finding e.
- iii. That the applicant explores overall massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity as noted in finding f.
- iv. That the applicant proposes a fenestration pattern and window opening proportions that are more consistent with the Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy document, and the historic examples found in the Dignowity Hill

October 4, 2017

Historic District as noted in finding i.

v. That the applicant install windows that include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details as noted in finding l.

vi. That the applicant explores ways to incorporate architectural details and materials that are representative of the historic context of the district as noted in findings k and m.

vii. That the applicant implements a concrete driveway at the rear of the property in lieu of pavers to be more consistent with the development pattern of the district as noted in findings o and p.

viii. That the applicant reconfigures the front walkway to be more consistent with those found within the Dignowity Hill Historic District as noted in finding q. The applicant should incorporate concrete in lieu of pavers.

APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to postponed to the next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2017-501

Applicant: Heidi Haese Jenifer Earnshaw/Castle Lanterra

Address: 633 S ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a halo illuminated, channel letter wall sign on the southern façade to feature an overall size of 13.05 feet in length and 3.61 inches in height at its tallest. At its shortest point, the sign will feature an overall height of 2.45 feet. The total square footage of the sign as proposed is 47.2 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 633 S St Mary's was constructed in 2015 and is located within the River Improvement Overlay. The structure currently features a monument sign near the public right of way on S St Mary's, wall signage at the Riverwalk level and a parking identification sign at the entrance to the parking structure. Each of these signs were approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the October 21, 2015, hearing. These three signs total approximately 100 square feet in size.

b. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install a halo illuminated, channel letter wall sign on the southern façade to feature an overall size of 13.05 feet in length and 3.61 inches in height at its tallest. At its shortest point, the sign will feature an overall height of 2.45 feet. The total square footage of the sign as proposed is 47.2 square feet. The proposed signage will face south toward the King William Historic District.

c. The UDC Section 35-678 (e)(1) notes that each structure is permitted a total of three signs, one major and two minor for a total square footage of fifty (50) square feet. Staff finds the proposed new signage to be inconsistent with the UDC in regards to square footage when combined with the existing signage. Staff does not find that there is sufficient evidence that would warrant the additional signage at the proposed location.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b and c.

APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to postpone to the next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

October 4, 2017

31. HDRC NO. 2017-493

Applicant: Gary Boyd/Hemisfair Park Area Redevelopment Co

Address: 600 HEMISFAIR PLAZA WAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a pole sign at the Perieda House at Hemisfair Park.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install a pole sign at the Perieda House at Hemisfair Park to feature an overall height of 12' – 6". The proposed sign will be located 8' – 6" above grade and will feature a height of four (4) feet. At the July 5, 2017, HDRC hearing, the applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of two round blade signs and one hanging sign to be located on the front porch.
- b. The proposed signage will be fabricated of metal and will feature internal illumination. White, push through acrylic graphics will be illuminated. The proposed design, materials and lighting are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. The Guidelines for Signage 4.B.i. notes that the overall height of freestanding signs should not exceed six (6) feet in height. The proposed signage is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed height of the sign should not exceed six (6) feet in height.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the proposed total height does not exceed six (6) feet in height.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve 10ft with a single pole- must be on the side walk side of the installation.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

MEETING MINUTES:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval of meeting minutes from 8/16/2017 & 9/6/2017

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante & seconded by Commissioner Garcia to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon, Kamal, Connor

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.

October 4, 2017

- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair