

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
June 7, 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, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza
Absent: Cone

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Brady Alexander spoke on #38. Lance Aaron & Rhett Smith spoke about brass pins.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-275 | VARIOUS DOWNTOWN LOCATIONS |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-079 | 637 N MAIN AVE/ FOX TECH HIGH SCHOOL |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-252 | 111 W HOUSTON ST/ FROST TOWER |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-251 | 200 S ALAMOT, HEMISFAIR CIVIC PARK |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-247 | 710 S ST MARYS, 511 S PRESA ST |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-269 | 2322 BUENA VISTA ST |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-227 | 1118 S ALAMO ST, 825 S ST MARYS, 1414 S ALAMO ST, S ALAMO AT CHAVEZ |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-024 | 311 BARRERA |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-120 | 615 HAYS ST |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-272 | 3700 N ST MARYS |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-169 | 720 LAMAR ST |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-240 | 521 PALMETTO |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-263 | 211 W FRENCH PLACE |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-254 | 301 E HOUSTON ST |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-241 | 735 E GUENTHER ST |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-244 | 143 CEDAR ST |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-260 | 323 LEIGH ST |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2017-273 | 218 COLLEGE ST |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2017-257 | 219 PEREIDA ST |
| • Item #20, Case No. 2017-243 | 3100 BROADWAY |
| • Item #21, Case No. 2017-236 | 834 VIRGINIA BLVD |

Items # 13 & #19 were pulled for citizens to be heard. Item #2 was pulled for recusal by Chairman Guarino.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2017-079

Applicant: William Triplett/HEB
Address: Fox Tech High School

June 7, 2017

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install landscaping elements for CAST Tech.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install landscaping elements at Fox Tech High School for CAST Tech. The applicant has proposed various landscaping elements to include interior courtyard water features, courtyard paving and various plant materials to include, ground cover such as decomposed granite, trees and shrubbery. Staff finds the proposed landscaping materials and proposed design to be appropriate for the site. The addition of natural elements will significantly improve the pedestrian environment.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding a with the stipulation that the development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

Recusal: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2017-263

Applicant: George Vaughn/RVK Architects

Address: 211 W FRENCH PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to develop a vacant 1.571 acre lot next to Christ Episcopal Church of San Antonio, along with a .6 acre consisting of two (2) closed streets: W Russell Place and Lewis Street. The development will include the following:

1. Closure and redevelopment of two closed city streets interior to the proposed development.
2. Construction of a new porte-cochere with an extended covered walkway.
3. Construction of a one-story 2,000 square foot pavilion.
4. Construction of a playground.
5. Addition of 117 on-site parking spaces.
6. Addition of perimeter and interior lot fencing to match the existing fencing along the perimeter of the campus.
7. Landscaping modifications.

FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 211 W French is currently a vacant lot. The lot was previously the site of the Thunderbird Apartments, which was approved for demolition by staff administratively on July 11, 2016. The lot is currently owned by the applicant, Christ Episcopal Church of San Antonio, whose present campus is located directly west of the site. The applicant has proposed to redevelop the site at 211 W French as an extension of its existing campus. The applicant is seeking conceptual approval for the redevelopment, which includes the enclosure and redevelopment of two closed city streets interior to the lot, construction of a porte-cochere with an extended covered walkway, construction of a one-story 2,000 square foot pavilion, construction of a playground, addition of 117 on-site parking spaces, addition of perimeter and interior lot fencing to match the existing fencing along the perimeter of the campus, and landscaping modifications.

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. STREET ENCLOSURES AND REDEVELOPMENT – The applicant has proposed to enclose and redevelop two existing city streets. The streets have ceased operation and are closed from public access. With the redevelopment of the site, W Russell Place will be transformed into a parking lot, which will be accessible by vehicles from Howard Street to the north. Lewis Street will also be redeveloped into parking spaces, and will be accessible from either the Howard Street entrance or from the primary entrance at W French Place. In effect, the proposal will

June 7, 2017

maintain vehicular transport, but will be slowed and controlled for the use of the church. Staff finds the proposal acceptable and appropriate for the site.

d. **PORTE-COCHERE AND COVERED WALKWAY** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new portecochere and a covered walkway. The porte-cochere will be located adjacent to the existing campus and serve as a drop off zone and transition point for churchgoers. The covered walkway is proposed to provide outdoor programmatic space, even in inclement weather. The design will be similar to the existing construction of the existing church and campus, and will feature standing seam metal hipped roofs and metal vertical posts for support. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style of the site or block should be incorporated. Additionally, details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures. However, new construction should not attempt to mirror what already exists. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent at the conceptual review level.

e. **PAVILION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new 2,000 square foot one-story pavilion. The pavilion design will be similar to the existing construction of the existing church and campus, and will feature a standing seam metal hipped roof, metal roof dormers, and cast stone vertical posts for support. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style of the site or block should be incorporated. Additionally, details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures. However, new construction should not attempt to mirror what already exists. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent at the conceptual review level.

f. **PLAYGROUND** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new playground on the interior of the lot. The playground will feature ample green space, including a wide expanse of open grass, a southern perimeter of trees, and several smaller trees located adjacent to the covered walkway and within the playground itself. The playground will also contain a children's play structure located at the northwest of the green space boundary. Staff finds the proposal acceptable and appropriate for the context and layout of the site.

g. **ADDED PARKING SPACES** – The applicant has proposed to add 117 total new parking spaces to the lot. The parking spaces will be uncovered. Approximately half of the parking spaces will be located at the present location of the closed streets in the interior of the lot (W Russell Place and Lewis Street). These locations are not directly adjacent to the public right-of-way, and the W Russell Place location is not viewable from the public right-of-way. Approximately half of the parking spaces will be located adjacent to W French Place and concealed with a landscape buffer. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, parking areas for non-residential and mixed-use structures should be placed at the rear of the site, behind primary structures to hide them from the public right-of-way. When behind the structure is not feasible, parking should be placed to the side of the primary structure. Though approximately half of the parking spaces will be adjacent to the public right-of-way on W French Place, they will be screened from the sidewalk. This approach is also an extension of the parking strategy currently employed on the present campus to the west. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given the site and context-specific considerations.

h. **PERIMETER AND INTERIOR LOT FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to install fencing on the perimeter of the lot fronting W French Place and along the interior parking lot. The fencing will be made of brick and wrought iron to match the fencing that currently exists on the adjacent campus. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **LANDSCAPING MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing landscape to include new native shrubbery, green space, trees, and ground cover. Approximately 24 tall trees and 24 medium sized trees will be installed. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal based on findings a through i. As the applicant moves forward to final approval, the applicant should address the following in their submittal:

- a. That the applicant explores ways to extend the interior walkway through the proposed parking lot to the public right-of-way to engage the pedestrian streetscape.
- b. That the applicant consider reducing the length of the proposed covered walkway to the east to provide more space between the existing historic Carriage House and the covered walkway structure.
- c. That the applicant explores ways to differentiate the new architectural elements from the existing campus structures. This may be achieved through a slight variation in finish, color, texture, or another material transition that differentiates this phase of the campus as new.

June 7, 2017

d. That the applicant provides a full landscape plan for final approval that indicate the dimensions of site setbacks and the locations of all new and remaining trees and plantings.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2017-257

Applicant: Luis Narro

Address: 219 PEREIDA ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new iron front yard fence measuring 4 feet in height.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 219 Pereida St is one-story single family home constructed in 1910. The home is designed in the Queen Anne cottage style and features imbricated fish scale shingles in the front pediment and front gable. It is a contributing structure in the King William Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to erect a new iron front yard fence measuring four feet in height.

b. LOCATION – The property does not currently contain a front yard fence. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, front yard fences should not be installed in historic districts that have not historically had them. In the King William Historic District, front yard fences are historically common and characteristic. Staff finds the location of the fence appropriate for the particular district.

c. HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed a fence that measures four feet in height. According to guideline 2.B.iii, front yard fences should be limited to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

d. MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed that the fence be constructed of iron posts with metal panels similar in size and appearance to cattle wire panels. According to guideline 2.B.v, new fences should utilize materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those used in the district. Fences with posts and wire panels are common in the King William Historic District, but the fences characteristic to the district are constructed of wooden posts versus metal. The posts are also thicker in footprint, typically 3x3" or 4x4", versus the smaller width of the metal posts submitted in the application. Staff finds the materiality inconsistent with the guidelines and the characteristic fencing of the district as submitted.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the fencing based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the applicant utilizes cedar posts instead of the submitted metal posts to be consistent with the fencing that is characteristic of the King William Historic District. The applicant must submit final drawings and material specifications to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The drawings must indicate the final height, depth, and width of all fence elements, including metal panels, cedar posts, and top and bottom rails. The specifications must indicate the specific materials selected for construction, including color and finish, and must match the submitted drawings.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

June 7, 2017

22. HDRC NO. 2017-271

Applicant: Jason Peters

Address: 303 KING WILLIAM

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install fencing adjacent to the existing front yard fence.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 303 King William features the primary historic structure which was constructed circa 1880 and an existing front yard wrought iron fence. The existing front yard fence is located approximately 1 foot within the front yard. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence of approximately sixteen (16) inches in height to be installed parallel to the existing front yard fence.

b. At the base of the existing front yard fencing, the applicant has proposed to install the sixteen (16) inch tall fencing. Staff finds the installation of fencing at this location to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, the applicant's proposed materials are also consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 4.B.

c. PLANTING STRIP – A fence of approximately 16 inches in height was installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or permit from Development Services Department in the planting strip which is located in the public right of way. Installations in the public right of way are prohibited by city code.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding c.

CASE COMMENT:

Work was done without a Certificate of Appropriateness and a notice was issued on April 17, 2017. Post work application fees have been paid.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell, Margaret Leeds, Rosalyn Cogburn, all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to deny the applicant's request.

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

NAYS: Bustamante

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-231

Applicant: Cody Doege

Address: 402 E LOCUST

REQUEST:

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

1. Install new rear driveway of Turfstone material to include a new curb cut on the alley side. The driveway will measure 14'-0" in width on Paschal Street and 15'-4" on the alley.
2. Install five parking spaces made of Turfstone material to include three angular spots and two spots off the driveway near the neighboring fence.
3. Install new landscaping with native trees and ground cover.
4. Replace original wood windows with new one over one aluminum clad wood windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 402 E Locust St is a two-story single family home constructed in 1910 and designed in the Classic Revival style with Craftsman influences. The house features a two-story front porch with four Corinthian columns and four Corinthian pilasters, a low-pitched hipped roof with decorative brackets, and three attic dormers with decorative detailing. The house is located at the intersection of E Locust St and Paschal St and is a contributing structure in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The applicant is proposing to install a Turfstone paving driveway in the rear of the property with five parking spaces, install new landscaping with

June 7, 2017

native trees and groundcover, and install 34 aluminum clad wood windows.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on May 30, 2017. Regarding the rear landscaping, the committee suggested the use of Turfstone would not produce favorable results with off-street parking. The DRC recommended the use of decomposed granite, which is inherently reversible and permeable, in a configuration that was less regimented for individual cars. They also recommended that the applicant explore ways to create a wider landscape buffer along Paschal St by pushing the parking area towards the existing side privacy fence and away from the public right-of-way. The DRC agreed that the proposed 14'-0" driveway width off Paschal St should be reduced per the Historic Design Guidelines. They also recommended creating a landscape plan with more dimensions that showed the entire site versus just the backyard to convey how much total impervious coverage will be introduced into the lot. Regarding the windows, the DRC discussed potential methods of remediation, but commented that a final discussion would need to be resolved with the entire commission at the HDRC hearing.

c. APPLICATION TIMELINE – The applicant submitted an updated rear driveway, parking, and landscape proposal on June 1, 2016 that took the DRC's comments into consideration. The timing of the submission did not leave adequate time for staff to fully review the proposal against the Historic Design Guidelines. The following findings and recommendations are based on the initial proposal submitted by the application deadline.

d. DRIVEWAY CONFIGURATION – The applicant is proposing to install a new driveway in the rear of the lot with access from both Paschal St and the rear alleyway. 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. There is no existing driveway on the property; however, there are rear driveways with access to the alley found on the block. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. DRIVEWAY WIDTH – Staff conducted a site visit and found the existing curb cut on Paschal to be approximately 12' in width. The applicant is proposing to increase the width of the curb cut to 14' and install a driveway that will be 14'-0" in width from the Paschal St entrance. The width will increase to 15'-4" in to the end of the drive as it approaches the alley. Guideline 5.B.i states that historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines. Staff recommends that the width of the existing curb cut remain unchanged and that the applicant propose a 10' wide driveway that can increase in width as it approaches the alley.

f. SURFACE MATERIAL – The proposed driveway and parking pads will be made of a pervious Turfstone material with a thickness of 3 1/8". The pavers will be a pewter color. According to guideline 5.B.i, driveways similar in material found in the district should be used; however, pervious surfaces may be considered for replacement to increase stormwater infiltration. Staff finds the proposal appropriate for the site and consistent with the Guidelines.

g. PARKING CONFIGURATION – The applicant has proposed to include five parking spaces accessed by the proposed driveway. Three will be positioned at a 60 degree angle and located adjacent to Paschal St. Two will be parallel with the proposed driveway and the side yard fence. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for off-street parking, parking areas for corner lots should be placed behind the primary structure and set back as far as possible from the side streets. The three angled parking spaces are directly adjacent to the Paschal St sidewalk. There is no screening proposed for these spaces. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

h. LANDSCAPING: GENERAL – The proposal will introduce new vegetation, to include natural grass, native trees, and groundcover. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with the stipulations listed in the recommendations.

i. LANDSCAPING: SCREENING – The applicant has proposed to install groundcover vegetation along the Paschal St sidewalk. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, off-street parking areas should be screened with a landscape buffer two to four feet high. The current proposal indicates small trees on the public planting strip facing Paschal St, but does not indicate tall plantings or trees fronting the sidewalk to provide screening for the pedestrian. In this instance, where the parking is located on a prominent corner lot in a historic district and is being introduced on a site for the first time, a landscape buffer is required. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines as submitted.

j. NEW WINDOWS – Staff conducted a site visit and noted that the windows have been replaced with a metal product. The applicant has confirmed that the windows are aluminum clad wood windows. 32 of the 34 windows are one over one, and two located on the second floor of the front façade are one over one with false dividing lites on the top sash. There is no application, Certificate of Appropriateness, or permit on file for the replacement of the windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved unless deteriorated beyond repair. If repair is not feasible and replacement is required, guideline 6.B.iv stipulates that windows should be replaced in-kind or should match the historic windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. The aluminum windows

June 7, 2017

installed do not appear similar in profile as an historic wood window that would typically be found in a structure of this age and style. Staff finds the replacement windows inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the installation of a new driveway based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the driveway be reduced in width to conform with the Historic Design Guidelines. Staff recommends that the width of the existing curb cut remain unchanged and that the applicant propose a 10' wide driveway that can increase in width as it approaches the alley. A revised site plan will need to be submitted reflecting these changes prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the parking space configuration at this time based on finding e. Staff recommends that the angled parking spots be removed and additional space be introduced adjacent to the neighboring lot line to reduce the parking visible and directly next to the Paschal St right-of-way to be more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and the parking pattern of the historic district.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the landscaping proposal based on findings f and g with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant selects native and/or xeric plants that thrive in local conditions and reduce watering usage per the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements. See UDC Appendix E: San Antonio Recommended Plant List—All Suited to Xeriscape Planting Methods, for a list of appropriate materials and planting methods. Plant materials with a similar character, growth habit, and light requirements as those found in the area should be selected.

ii. That the applicant introduces a landscape buffer on the Paschal St side to screen the driveway and off-street parking.

iii. That the applicant provides a finalized landscaping plan with species to staff for approval.

iv. That all revised plans reflect the revisions listed to meet the stipulations.

Item 4, Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on finding h.

CASE COMMENTS:

- The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on May 30, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.
- The window replacement was done prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The post-work application fee has not yet been processed.

CASE COMMENTS:

- The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on May 30, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.
- The window replacement was done prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The post-work application fee has not yet been processed.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner & Rick Schell spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to approve application retaining staff stipulation #3 with the new parking design and that the applicant provide wood screens for window openings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

June 7, 2017

24. HDRC NO. 2017-265

Applicant: Nathan Bailes

Address: 314 DONALDSON AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Retain 7 new vinyl one-over-one windows installed on the rear façade of the structure
2. Retain 3 vinyl one-over-one windows installed on the west façade of the structure with wood trim around the window openings and partially on the face of each window
3. Retain 1 vinyl one-over-one window installed on the east façade of the structure with wood trim around the window openings and partially on the face of each window

FINDINGS:

a. The structure is a one-story home with Spanish eclectic influences with stucco siding. It is a contributing structure located in the Monticello Park Historic District, designated in 1995.

b. A proposal was heard by the HDRC on April 20, 2016, for approval to replace 21 existing wood windows with 21 new wood windows. The HDRC action approved repair of the front five windows, labeled #1 through #5, and replacement in-kind for the remaining 16 windows based on the findings of fact. This proposal was never executed and the applicant ultimately replaced five windows and installed 16 vinyl windows without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

c. The HDRC previously denied request items #1 and 2 on February 1, 2017. That request included to remove 5 original wood one over one windows and replace with 5 new wood windows, and remove 16 original wood one over one windows and replace with 16 new vinyl one over one windows.

d. On March 1, 2017, the HDRC approved replacement of the front five windows with new wood windows.

e. On May 1, 2017, the Board of Adjustment heard the request to appeal the Historic Preservation Officer's denial of the proposed vinyl windows and window screens. The Board of Adjustment did not grant the appeal and upheld the decision.

f. The Design Review Committee reviewed this request on May 31, 2017; the commissioners present supported the compromise and suggested that screens may also be taken into consideration.

g. At this time the applicant is proposing to replace 7 wood one-over-one windows along the rear façade and install 7 new vinyl one-over-one windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii. and the *Guidelines for Windows*, historic windows if beyond 50% deteriorated, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff finds the proposed vinyl one over one windows not consistent with the Guidelines.

h. Staff made a site visit on May 4, 2017, and found that the windows along the rear façade cannot be seen from the street. However, staff finds that in-kind wood one over one windows are a more appropriate replacement option according to the Guidelines.

i. The applicant is proposing to replace 3 wood one-over-one windows on the left façade, and one wood one-over one window on the right façade with new vinyl one over one windows with a wood trim around the opening to match the existing wood trim around the front wood windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii. and the *Guidelines for Windows*, historic windows if beyond 50% deteriorated, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. The proposed vinyl windows with wood trim are not consistent in terms of material and installation, but are consistent in terms of configuration, size and glass type. At the site visit, staff found that these four windows are set towards the rear, but that they are still visible from the street. Staff finds that in-kind wood windows would be more appropriate per the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through h.

CASE COMMENTS:

June 7, 2017

- HDRC 4/20/16
- HDRC 2/1/17
- HDRC 3/1/17
- The applicant received a stop work order as work was done outside the scope. The applicant has provided the required application and the post-work application fee has been paid.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia move for approval as presented with wood screens.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2017-192

Applicant: Richard Gross

Address: 1025 DAWSON ST NCB

REQUEST:

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

1. Modify existing window and door opening on the rear façade and install a new, sliding glass door.
2. Replace wood windows that are beyond repair with new non-wood windows.
3. Enclose an existing window opening on the rear of the side addition with siding.
4. Modify an existing door opening to become a window opening on the east elevation near the rear of the structure. Siding will be installed in the enclosed opening.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 1025 Dawson was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps. The structure was constructed in the Craftsman style and has since been modified to include a side addition nears its front façade and a modified front façade which includes a modified front porch, replacement wrought iron porch columns and a brick façade. The side addition as well as rear additions appear on the 1951 Sanborn map. The exhibits currently show a rear addition that is not proposed by the applicant at this time. Additionally, the applicant has not submitted a detail or wall section of the proposed doors or windows at this time. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Committee at the May 3, 2017, HDRC hearing, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.

b. REAR FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS– On the rear façade, the applicant has proposed to modify an existing door and window opening. The proposed modification is to occur on the rear façade of the original structure. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.1., historic window and door openings are to be preserved and should not be enlarged or diminished. The proposed modifications are not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. SIDE ADDITION MODIFICATIONS – Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.1., historic window and door openings are to be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the rear facing window appropriate given its location on a rear facing façade.

d. REAR ADDITION MODIFICATIONS – The rear of the primary historic structure features an addition with a side (east) facing door. The applicant has proposed to remove this door and install a window in its place that is to match the existing wood windows in the addition in regards to size and profile. Staff finds the proposed modification appropriate given that the addition is not original to the historic structure given its location at the rear of the primary historic structure and its differing roof form. Additionally, this addition is not found on the 1912 or 1951 Sanborn maps. The applicant should install a window that features a matching profile to that of the rear addition as well as one that is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document that is to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details. If the windows that will be removed from the side addition are matching in size as those on the rear addition, they should be installed in place of the existing door.

e. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has noted the replacement of the existing windows with new, same size and type modern windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that historic windows should be preserved. Staff finds the windows on site to be in good condition and should be

June 7, 2017

repaired.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings b and e. Staff recommends the applicant maintain the rear façade arrangement and repair the existing windows.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4 based on findings c and d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve, that windows be in-kind and that the windows and sliding glass door are approved by staff prior to installation.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2017-202

Applicant: Richard Gross

Address: 503 & 507 NOLAN

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a deck between 503 and 507 Nolan and a deck to surround both structures.
2. Perform exterior modifications to 503 Nolan that include the removal of window and door openings and fenestration alterations.
3. Perform exterior modifications to 507 Nolan that include the removal of window and door openings and fenestration modifications.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 503 Nolan was constructed circa 1955 and features simple architectural elements including a front and rear gabled roof. The structure at 507 Nolan appears on the 1951 Sanborn map and features side gabled roofs and traditional architectural features. This request was heard at the May 3, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.

b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 10, 2017, where committee members noted that all proposed window openings should be consistent in size with historic window openings, noted that existing openings should remain and noted that a finish floor elevation should be established to determine the height of the proposed deck.

c. DECKS – Between both structures, the applicant has proposed to construct a wooden deck. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to construct a wooden deck to surround both structures. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations note that porches should be constructed based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District, historic porches are featured on the front and side of historic structures; however, there is no historic example for the construction of a deck to surround a historic structure nor is there a historic example of the connection of two separate historic structures. Staff does not find the proposed decks appropriate nor are they consistent with the Guidelines.

d. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed exterior modifications to the structures at both 503 and 507 Nolan which includes the removal of a front window opening, the centering of the front door, the installation of new window openings and install canopied above each door. The applicant has noted on the application documents that each opening will feature similar windows. Staff finds that a window with a traditional dimension should be added and that each opening should feature traditional proportions. The installation of large, fixed frame windows is not appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings b through d.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Chris Mongeon spoke in support of the applicant's request.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

June 7, 2017

27. HDRC NO. 2017-256

Applicant: Ross Wood/Frost Bank

Address: 425 SOLEDAD ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an eight (8) foot fence in between 425 Soledad and 425 Soledad, bldg 2. The fence will be wrought iron.

FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 425 Soledad includes a seven story modern office tower and a one story motor bank. The two buildings are separated by a small internal walkway enclosed by various walls and hardscape features. The applicant has proposed to construct a wrought iron fence eight feet in height to enclose this internal walkway from public access. The walkway primarily serves as a walking buffer zone for Frost Bank employees walking into the property's buildings from the parking structure located across the street. The fence will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and is internal to the complex.

b. According to UDC-Section 35-673(h), which governs wall and fence height in the RIO districts, fences made of wrought iron are a permitted material. The section also stipulates that fences or walls should not exceed 72 inches, or six feet, in height. Staff finds the proposed fencing material to be appropriate, but finds the proposed height of the fence to be inconsistent.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend the fence installation as submitted. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the height to six feet to comply with UDC Section 35-673(h). If the HDRC recommends approval of the eight foot proposal as submitted, the applicant will need to obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

28. HDRC NO. 2017-250

Applicant: Christopher Mongeon

Address: 1115 NOLAN

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

29. HDRC NO. 2017-206

Applicant: Matt and Amanda Holmes

Address: 301 W HOLLYWOOD AVE

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

30. HDRC NO. 2017-262

Applicant: Lewis Fisher/Fisher Heck Architects

Address: 301 BARRERA

REQUEST:

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

1. Install new front yard fencing constructed of painted wooden posts and wire mesh.
2. Replace existing rear wooden vertical slat 6 foot privacy fence with new red cedar horizontal slat 6 foot privacy fence to match same footprint.
3. Install a new wooden handrail on three sides of the porch.
4. Modify existing wooden front porch steps and install a new set of wooden steps on the west side of the porch.

June 7, 2017

5. Install a new flagstone walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 301 Barrera is a one-story duplex constructed in the Folk Victorian style. The home features several Folk Victorian elements, including a prominent side-gabled roof, front porch with column spindlework, and a symmetrical front facade. The home is a contributing structure in the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant is seeking approval to install new front yard fencing where fencing has not historically existed, replace an existing rear wooden fence, install a new handrail on the porch, modify existing front porch steps, and install a new flagstone walkway in the front yard.
- b. **NEW FENCING: LOCATION** – The property is located on a corner lot and does not currently contain a front or side yard fence. The applicant has proposed to install a fence along the south, east and west sides of the front yard. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, front yard fences should not be installed in historic districts that have not historically had them. In the Lavaca Historic District, front yard fences are historically common. Staff finds the location of the fence appropriate for the property and the particular district.
- c. **NEW FENCING: HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed a fence that measures four feet in height. According to guideline 2.B.iii, front yard fences should be limited to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **NEW FENCING: MATERIALITY** – The applicant has proposed that the fence be constructed of wooden posts and wire mesh. The wooden posts will be painted white to match the primary structure's exterior trim. Gates of the same material will be located at the walkway to the sidewalk and adjacent to the existing driveway. According to guideline 2.B.v, new fences should utilize materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those used in the district. Fences with posts and wire panels are characteristic of the Lavaca Historic District. The guidelines also state that the fence should respond to the design or materials of the main house. The fence proposal includes wooden posts painted white to match existing wood trim and columns on the house. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines based on these district and property-specific considerations.
- e. **REAR FENCE REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing six foot wooden vertical slat privacy fence with a new six foot western red cedar horizontal slat fence in the same location. The new fence will also include two swinging wooden gates at the Indianola St driveway approach and the interior driveway at the east side of the house. According guideline 2.A.i for Site Elements, replacement fences should match the existing historic material as closely as possible. The existing privacy fence is not original to the property, but is compatible with the home and the district. However, the proposed use of horizontal slats instead of the existing vertical slats is not characteristic of the district. Staff finds the proposed location and height consistent with the Guidelines but the material and configuration as submitted inconsistent.
- f. **NEW HANDRAIL** – The applicant has proposed to install a new handrail on the front porch. Based on the submitted narrative and elevations, the handrail will be made of wooden newel posts that frame the front entry, simple square balustrades, and a flat top rail. The handrail will utilize the existing wood columns as integral posts in its design. All handrail elements will be painted white to match the existing columns and the trim on the home. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv, added porch elements should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. New elements should not be designed in a way that conveys a false sense of historic appearance. Porch railings are not common historic elements for Folk Victorian homes of this configuration, which feature a porch that sits very low to the ground. The columns of this particular home, which are character defining elements, are very thin and delicate, and staff has not yet received detailed elevation drawings or plans that indicate the height of the proposed railing or the dimensions of the balustrades, newels, and rails, or information on how the proposed railing will interact with the existing columns in terms of structure. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- g. **FRONT PORCH STEPS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing front porch steps and install new steps on the east side of the porch for driveway access. Both sets of steps will be wooden and painted to match the color of the existing wooden porch decking. The new steps on the east will measure the length from the front façade to the existing porch column. The modified steps on the front will be on center with the main façade and measure the span of the two existing doorways. Currently, the existing front steps are on center with the left door and do not line up with the existing walkway or sidewalk approach. According to guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, added porch elements, such as stairs, should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The proposed stairs on both the front and east sides of the porch are compatible with the style and materiality of the home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.
- h. **NEW WALKWAY: LOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a new walkway from the front sidewalk to the new front porch steps. The walkway will be located on center with the new stairs and the front façade as a whole. However, the proposed location will not align with the existing internal sidewalk approach nor the pedestrian curb cut in the public right-of-way to the street. According to guideline 5.A.iii for Site Elements, the historic alignment, configuration, and width of walkways should be maintained. The proposed walkway will be

June 7, 2017

located to the right of the existing public curb cut. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines and incompatible with the existing site conditions.

i. **NEW WALKWAY: MATERIAL** – The existing front walkway includes a concrete approach from the sidewalk and loose gravel and stone up to the existing front steps. The applicant has proposed to utilize flagstone material for the new walkway. The applicant has not submitted a material specification, and the walkway as indicated on the submitted plans is a solid rectilinear element. According to guideline 5.A.ii for Site Elements, replacement materials should match the existing material as closely as possible. Flagstone is not a common material used for front yard walkways in the district. Staff finds the use of flagstone inconsistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the new front yard fencing based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the applicant submits final drawings and specifications to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The submittal must specify the final height, location relative to the property line, measurements and detailing of the cedar posts, and material specification of the wire mesh.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the rear fence replacement based on finding e with the stipulation that the applicant utilize vertical slats instead of horizontal slats. The applicant must submit final material specifications and elevation drawings prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the porch railing installation based on finding f.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the modification of the existing front porch steps and the addition of new side porch steps based on finding g.

Item 5, Staff does not recommend approval of the new walkway as submitted based on findings h and i. As noted in the findings, the applicant should explore walkway configurations that accommodate and integrate the location of the existing curb cut from the street, such as a slightly curved approach, if they would like to return with an alternative design solution. The proposal should be of a width consistent with historic walkways in the district, and utilize a material common to the district, such as poured concrete.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve as submitted without staff recommendations.

AYES: Guarino, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Conner

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2017-268

Applicant: Varco Builders of Texas

Address: 1934 W SUMMIT

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

COMMISSIONER BRITTAIN LEFT AT 5:02 PM

32. HDRC NO. 2017-266

Applicant: David and Lydia Lerma

Address: 458 FURR DR

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace four one over one wood windows with new one over one wood windows, located on the second story of the home. Two of the windows are located on the rear façade and two are located the east (side) façade.

June 7, 2017

2. Replace three sets of tri-panel wood windows with rectangular fixed windows in the same opening size. The existing windows feature two side panels each with 4 true divided lites.
3. Replace two non-original window panes constructed of a single pane of plexiglass with a single fixed panel of double pane glass. These windows are located on the east (side) façade of the home.
4. Replace a set of two hinged panels that open to the outside and contain true divided lites with a single fixed panel of double pane glass. These windows are located on the east (side) façade of the home.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 458 Furr Drive is a single family home constructed in 1940 in the Spanish Eclectic style. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District, designated in March 1995. The applicant is proposing to replace a total of seven existing wood windows with new wood windows.

b. In July 2016, the applicant submitted an application to replace a total of 27 of 28 existing wood windows with new one over one wood windows. A few of these windows had been damaged by a fire in the home. The applicant received HDRC approval on July 20, 2016 to replace 19 of a total 28 existing wood windows with new one over one double hung windows. The HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness also issued approval to repair seven windows with in-kind materials. Since that time, the applicant has solicited estimates for the repair of these windows, and has stated that these windows are deteriorated beyond repair and are hazards to building occupants.

c. ONE OVER ONE WINDOWS – Staff conducted a site visit on May 26, 2017. The four wood one over one windows located on the second floor are not presently operable. They do not have functioning weights, have expanded into their pockets due to exposure to humidity, and a few contain broken glass panes. However, the extant assembly is in good condition. None of the windows exhibit joint separation, interior rot, or checking of the wood. They are of high quality material and craftsmanship and can be restored. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., windows should only be replaced if approximately 50% or more of the assembly is deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds the proposal to replace the three windows with true divided lites with new one over one wood windows inconsistent with the guidelines.

d. DIVIDED LITE WINDOWS – Staff conducted a site visit on May 26, 2017. All three of the tri-panel windows feature vertical side panels with 4 true divided lites. They are original to the home. On all three of the assemblies, the lowest lite, adjacent to the sill, has deteriorated severely. Several lower wood rails have disintegrated due to rot, or are partially or completely separated from the rest of the assembly. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., windows should only be replaced if approximately 50% or more of the assembly is deteriorated beyond repair. While the lower rails and stiles of the side panels are severely deteriorated, these portions constitute approximately 20% of each panel, and less than 10% of the entire tri-panel assembly. Replacement wood pieces can be fabricated and installed to match the existing configuration. Additionally, the one set of existing side hinge windows are in good condition and can be repaired. These particular windows are extremely unique and characteristic of the home and should not be replaced. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines.

e. NON-ORIGINAL SINGLE PANES – Two of the three sets of tri-panel wood windows have been altered over time, and their central panel, which historically featured two operable side hinge windows that opened to the outside, have been removed and replaced with a single pane panel, which appears to be plexiglass or a similar quality. Staff finds the proposal to install a new double pane glass panel acceptable given the non-historic nature of the existing material.

f. SET OF SIDE HINGE WINDOWS – One of the sets of the tri-panel wood windows has original two hinged panels in the central bay that open to the outside and contain true divided lites. These windows are located on the east (side) façade of the home. The applicant has proposed to replace these operable hinged windows with a new double glass panel. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., windows should only be replaced if approximately 50% or more of the assembly is deteriorated beyond repair. These operable windows are in reparable condition and are character defining elements of the home and should be retained. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommends approval of the replacement of the four one over one windows based on findings a through c.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend the replacement of the three windows with divided lites with fixed glass panels based on findings a, b, and d. If the HDRC approves this request, staff recommends the stipulation that the applicant submits replacement window specifications to staff for final approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the non-original single pane panel replacement based on finding e with the stipulation that the applicant submits replacement window specifications to staff for final approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

June 7, 2017

Item 4, Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the original side hinge operable windows based on finding f. If the HDRC approves this request, staff recommends the stipulation that the applicant submits replacement window specifications to staff for final approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve item #1 with in-kind replacement, #3 submit to staff for approval and denial of items #2 & #4.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

33. HDRC NO. 2017-205

Applicant: Andrew Holbrook

Address: 531 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a new 2-story rear accessory structure.
2. Modify the existing hardscaping.

FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 531 E Huisache is a single family home designed in the Craftsman style. The house features several quintessential Craftsman elements, including exposed roof rafter tails, a deep asymmetrical porch, and front columns with sloping sides. The house is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is proposing to construct a new 2-story rear accessory structure.

b. The applicant received HDRC approval to demolish an existing 1-story rear accessory structure on May 17, 2017. The structure was in severe structural disrepair with missing façade elements and fire damage. At the hearing, a similar 2-story structure was proposed, but the HDRC advised that the applicant withdraw and resubmit with modifications. In the findings from May 17, staff recommended the following: 1. That the applicant provides examples of two-story rear accessory structures in the neighborhood to demonstrate its compatibility with the historic district. 2. That the applicant modifies the proposed windows to comply with the OHP Window Guidelines Policy Document. 3. That the applicant removes the roof dormers. 4. That the applicant explores ways to salvage and reuse the woodlap siding from the existing accessory structure in the new garage to provide visual interest while ensuring compatibility with the primary structure and the district as a whole. At the time of this recommendation, the applicant has satisfied recommendation #1, and has verbally agreed to recommendations #2, #3, and #4. Staff is awaiting final updated drawings with these modifications.

c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 26, 2017. Regarding the proposed new 2-story accessory structure, the DRC recommended that the small 2x2' windows be deleted and windows that comply with the OHP Window Policy document be introduced. They also recommended that a trim piece be added between the two rectangular windows, similar to the existing window pattern on the primary structure. The DRC also recommended that the roof dormers be deleted.

d. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the same location as the former accessory structure. The proposed footprint closely matches the width of the former structure. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 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.

e. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – The applicant has proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the same orientation as the previous structure, facing the public right-of-way and an existing driveway. 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 lot.

f. SCALE – The applicant has proposed to replace the former one-story rear garage with a new two-story garage with a second story apartment. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent

June 7, 2017

with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. There is evidence of historic and new 2-story accessory structures in Monte Vista. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines, but has not yet seen a height comparison between the existing structure and the proposed accessory structure.

g. WINDOW OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed to install a small rectangular fixed window on the east elevation measuring approximately 1x2'. 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. Staff finds the use of the 1x2' window inconsistent with the Guidelines.

h. DOOR OPENINGS – The proposed accessory structure does not contain a door for entry into the structure. Currently, the only means of access provided are the proposed garage doors. According to guideline 5.A.iv for New Construction, window and door openings should 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. Staff finds the lack of a door inconsistent with these Guidelines and inconsistent with modern code regulations.

i. MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed the use of hardi board with a 5 ½" profile for the new garage siding. 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. Additionally, guideline 3.A.ii also states that new construction should incorporate salvaged historic materials where possible, and guideline 3.B encourages the use of traditional materials, such as wood siding, in a new way to provide visual interest while still ensuring compatibility. The existing accessory structure, while deteriorated, contains portions of original woodlap siding that may be salvaged and incorporated into the new garage to provide visual interest while ensuring historic continuity. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines considering the potential opportunity to salvage existing materials from the original rear accessory structure.

j. ROOF DETAILS – The applicant has proposed a shed roof with two shed dormers facing the public right-of-way. The guidelines stipulate that architectural details of new construction should keep with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should also be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the primary structure or adjacent structures, and details more ornate than those found on the primary structure should be avoided. Staff finds the use of dormers incompatible with the style of the primary structure and inconsistent with the Guidelines.

k. HARDCAPING – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing concrete driveway to the rear of the lot. The existing width will be maintained through the length of the existing house and the proposed addition, but will widen to accommodate the new accessory structure. The hardscape will give access to the proposed rear accessory structure, which contains a two car garage. Currently, the rear lot is primarily grass with an existing hardscape. According to Guideline 3.B.i for Site Elements, large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they were not historically located. Staff finds the extent of the hardscape generally compatible with the Guidelines, but has yet to receive confirmation on all final dimensions from the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the existing accessory structure or hardscape modifications as submitted based on findings a through j. The applicant should address the following items if they wish to submit a revised design proposal:

- a. That the applicant modifies the proposed windows to comply with the OHP Window Guidelines Policy Document.
- b. That the applicant removes the roof dormers.
- c. That the applicant explores ways to salvage and reuse the woodlap siding from the existing accessory structure in the new garage to provide visual interest while ensuring compatibility with the primary structure and the district as a whole
- d. That the applicant installs a door on the ground floor of the structure for accessibility.
- e. That the applicant submit a final landscaping plan indicating all dimensions, locations, and materials of hardscaping or landscaping modifications.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Tony Garcia & Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

34. HDRC NO. 2017-242

Applicant: Salvador Valdez

Address: 220 LEIGH ST

REQUEST:

June 7, 2017

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish one rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 220 Leigh St is a one story single-family home constructed approximately 1930 in the Craftsman cottage style. It is a contributing structure within the Lavaca Historic District. The property contains a rear accessory structure constructed in 1931, which is also contributing to the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant has requested approval to demolish the rear accessory structure.

b. SCOPE – The applicant is requesting approval for demolition only. There are not replacement plans proposed at this time.

c. UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(b), in order for unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. In the submitted application, the applicant has indicated that the structure no longer serves a purpose and poses a safety and health hazard due to rodents and termites. The applicant indicated that he attempted to collect reasonable costs for repair and restoration and furnished these documents as exhibits to the application. One company, Olshan Foundation, declined to give a foundation repair estimate because the foundation was deteriorated beyond repair; Baird Foundation could give no guarantee that the structure would meet leveling requirements for foundation repair, but quoted an estimate at \$36,698.50 for the work. A quote from BRC Remodeling Group estimates a sum \$135,180.00 to bring the structure up to city code requirements and habitable. The total cost of these estimates is \$171,878.50. The applicant has indicated that he received a demolition estimate for \$6,800.00. While the quoted combined cost of foundation repair and renovation exceeds the demolition quote and the current appraised value of the structure, staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) have not fully been met. Additionally, the structure, despite the current condition of the foundation, contains a substantial amount of original materials with a high quality of craftsmanship.

d. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – In January 2017, the applicant submitted an application for non-contributing status for three outbuildings located at the rear of the property. Two of the structures were determined to be noncontributing, but the structure in question was determined to be contributing. The review describes the structure as a one story, single bay residential structure constructed in 1930 featuring a front gable and full porch with simple wooden column porch supports. The structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map, and newspaper archives revealed advertisements for a two-room furnished apartment in 1931. In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Since February 2017, additional substantial evidenced has not been furnished by the applicant or owner to qualify the removal of significance. Additionally, the structure exhibits a high degree of integrity of site, function, form, and materiality, and retains original columns, woodlap siding, elements of its cedar pier foundation, wood windows and shutters, front door, and roof structure, including bracketed eave details. Staff does not believe this criterion for demolition has been met.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition based on findings a through d. If the HDRC recommends approval of the demolition, staff recommends the stipulation that the applicant create a salvage plan to submit to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CASE COMMENTS:

In January 2017, the applicant submitted an application for non-contributing status for three outbuildings located at the rear of the property. Two of the structures were determined to be non-contributing, but the structure in question was determined to be contributing. This determination of contributing status was made final on February 3, 2017.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to remanend this case to the Demo Committee.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC NO. 2017-238

Applicant: Corey Taylor/Image 360

Address: 918 S ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

June 7, 2017

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

1. Install a free standing monument sign to feature MDO panels, laminated graphics and metal sign posts. The applicant has proposed for the sign to feature a width of sixty (60) inches and a height of seventy-two (72) inches.
2. Remove the front yard natural grass and install xeric materials including decomposed granite.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install a monument sign in the front yard at 918 S Alamo, a historic structure located within the King William Historic District. This particular block of S Alamo features commercial characteristics including building signage in the form of both monument and wall signage.
- b. SIGNAGE – The proposed signage is to feature MDO panels, laminated graphics and metal sign posts to feature a width of sixty (60) inches and a height of seventy-two (72) inches. Per the Guidelines for Signage 4., freestanding signs should be located near the public right of way, should not exceed six (6) feet in height and should not exceed more than twenty-five (25) square feet on each side for a total of fifty (50) square feet.
- c. LAWN REMOVAL – The front yard currently features xeric materials including decomposed granite. As of April 2016, natural grass existing in the front yard. The wholesale removal of the natural grass and installation of xeric plant materials has been completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness and is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.ii. Staff finds that natural grass should be reinstalled in the front yard.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1, the proposed signage with the stipulation that the applicant reduce the overall square footage to not exceed fifty (50) square feet and a height that is not to exceed six (6) feet in height.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the removal of the natural grass and installation of xeric landscaping materials. Staff recommends that the natural grass be installed.

APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move this case to the next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

36. HDRC NO. 2017-249

Applicant: Mauricio Namé

Address: 445 DEVINE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear addition and covered patio to the primary structure.
2. Replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new roof of the same material to be continued on the addition.
3. Replace all existing wood windows with new vinyl windows to match existing opening profiles.
4. Remove five existing one over one wood windows a wood door from the rear of the primary structure to accommodate the addition.
5. Enclose one of two front doors with siding to match existing.
6. Add one side door to the west elevation of the primary structure.
7. Construct new stairs and railing on the west elevation and add railings to the existing front porch and porch steps.
8. Construct a new 2-story rear accessory structure.
9. Add additional hardscaping to the side and rear of the lot.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 445 Devine is a one-story single family home constructed in the Craftsman style. The house features two front gables with decorative bracketing, wide overhanging eaves, and square brick porch columns. The house is a contributing structure in the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant is proposing to

June 7, 2017

construct rear addition to be approximately 790 square feet plus rear patio, replace the existing shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof to be continued on the addition, remove four rear windows and one rear door to accommodate the addition, add a side door and stairway with railing to the west façade of the primary structure, enclose one existing front door, construct a new 2-story rear accessory structure with a footprint of approximately 576 square feet plus second floor balcony, and modify the site to include new hardscaping, grass, and landscaping.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on May 30, 2017. The DRC commended the applicant on his approach to the treatment of the addition in terms of scale, materiality, and size. The DRC did not recommend approval of the proposed window replacement. The DRC requested that the applicant explore ways to reduce impervious coverage, and requested that a final detailed site plan be submitted if the applicant seeks final approval of the entire site. The DRC requested that the applicant reduce the overall height of the rear accessory structure and provide exhibits and renderings from the right-of-way that may help reduce the overall imposing nature of a two-story structure in this context. They also recommended that the applicant furnish evidence of the surrounding context of the district that qualifies a modern design on this particular lot. The applicant elucidated on material choices for the rear accessory structure, and the DRC requested that they submit rendered elevations to convey these choices. Staff has not received these updated drawings at the time of this recommendation.

Findings for primary structure, items #1 through #7:

c. MASSING & 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 addition is approximately 70% the overall size of the existing home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to reduce the height of the roof slightly for the new addition. The roof will follow the same pitch as the existing structure. Generally, the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions, the maximum height of new additions should be determined by examining the line-of-sight or visibility from the street. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. ROOF MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new roof of the same material. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

f. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing windows with new energy efficient vinyl windows. All windows are wood and one over one. The applicant has indicated that many windows have been exposed to the elements, improperly maintained, and have instances of broken glass panes. However, based on the images submitted in the application, the windows appear to be in salvageable condition. The windows do not visibly exhibit joint separation or severe checking of the exterior wood. They are of high quality material and craftsmanship and can be restored. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., windows should only be replaced if approximately 50% or more of the assembly is deteriorated beyond repair. Staff has not yet received demonstrable evidence that the windows are unable to be restored. Staff has also not received manufacturer specification for the proposed new windows. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

g. REAR WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL – The proposed addition will require the removal of four one over one wood windows and one rear door. 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 staff's recommendations.

h. NEW SIDE DOOR – The applicant has proposed to add a new side door on the west elevation of the primary structure. The door will provide access to the side and rear of the house without requiring that an occupant walk through the new master bedroom to access the proposed rear patio. The new door will not require the removal of any existing openings and will be installed between existing window openings. According to guideline 6.B.ii, new entrances should be compatible in size, scale, shape, proportion, material, and massing with historic entrances. The plans and elevations indicate that the new door will be compatible to those existing on the historic home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

i. NEW RAILINGS AND STAIRCASE – The applicant has proposed to construct two new railings: one on the front patio, and one at the location of a new proposed doorway on the west elevation. The railings will be made of wood and feature simple posts with flat top and bottom rails. The railing on the front elevation will include a stair rail along existing concrete steps. The railing on the west elevation will align with a new proposed stairway to accommodate the foundation height of the existing home. According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance

June 7, 2017

and Alterations, added porch elements, such as stairs and railings, should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The proposed railings on both the front and west sides of the structure are compatible with the style and materiality of the home without detracting from its historic character. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

j. FRONT DOOR REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to enclose one of two existing front doors with siding to match the material and profile of existing. According to Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the guidelines.

k. NEW WINDOWS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to install windows that are similar to the profile, size, proportions, and inset as those on the existing structure, which is consistent with Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

l. MATERIALS: WINDOWS & DOORS – The applicant has not specified window or door materials; however, per the provided application documents, the applicant has proposed windows and doors that are consistent with those found on historic structures. Staff finds wood windows and doors to be appropriate for an addition to a historic Craftsman home.

m. MATERAILS: FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to use the same profile and dimension of the existing wood lap siding on the façade of the new addition. The proposal includes the installation of a vertical trim piece at the joint of the original structure and the new addition. According to guideline 2.A.v for additions, side of 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. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for this particular addition given the integrated nature of the addition's roof form and the character defining nature of woodlap siding on Craftsman Bungalow homes.

n. 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 proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
Findings for rear accessory structure, item #8:

o. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new 2-story accessory structure in the rear of the lot. The proposed first floor footprint is approximately 576 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 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.

p. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – The applicant has proposed to orient the new accessory structure towards the street. 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.

q. SCALE & MASS – The applicant has proposed a two-story accessory structure with a sloped roof. According to the dimensions on the submitted elevations, the lowest point of the roof measures 21'-6" and the highest point measures 31'-3", both which are viewable from the public right-of-way. The first floor height measures 12'-0" and the second floor height measures 9'-6" up to approximately 18'-6" following the roof slope. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. The ridge height of the primary gable of the existing historic home appears to measure approximately 20'-0" from the ground. In an elevation submitted by the applicant that indicates the height of the proposed accessory structure relative to the existing home, the new structure appears to eclipse the existing home's ridge height by over 10'-0" at its highest point. Additionally, the stairway on the side of the structure, which is viewable in full from the driveway, is almost the same height as the subordinate gable on the existing historic home. The height of the proposed structure would not only impact the view from the public right-of-way of the existing structure, but also affect the viewshed of the one and 1.5 story single family homes behind the lot on Leigh St. Staff does not find the height of the proposed accessory structure consistent with the Guidelines or appropriate for the lot or the district.

r. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a two-story accessory structure with a sloped roof. The lowest point of the roof measures 21'-6" and the highest point measures 31'-3". The roof is proposed to be standing seam metal. The guidelines stipulate that architectural details of new construction should keep with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should also be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the primary structure or adjacent structure. Staff finds the use of a sloping roof incompatible with the historic district, which is comprised of a high concentration of front and side gables or hipped roofs, especially within the immediate context of the lot. While similar roof styles can be found immediately adjacent to the Lavaca Historic District, there is no precedent for its use on a 2-story rear accessory structure within the district, especially in an area that is surrounded by one story singlefamily

June 7, 2017

homes. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

s. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed to install nine longitudinal rectangular fixed windows, five larger rectangular fixed windows with single muntins, and two large windows that follow the sloped roof pitch on the northeast and northwest elevations. 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. Staff finds the windows inconsistent with the Guidelines.

t. MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed the use ICF concrete as the façade and structural material. The applicant has stated that the intention is to make the structure tornado-proof by utilizing this modern material. 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. Structures made exclusively of concrete are not characteristic of the district or surrounding context. Additionally, the elevations and renderings indicate multiple façade colors, but staff has not received material specifications that are tied to these delineations. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

u. MATERIALS: WINDOWS & DOORS – 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.

v. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, new buildings in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. New outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. While the applicant's proposal is reflective of its time, the architectural details are not consistent with the Craftsman elements of the primary structure or the character of the Lavaca Historic District.

Findings for site modifications, item #9:

w. HARDCAPING – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing concrete driveway to the rear of the lot. The existing 11'-4" width will be maintained through the length of the existing house and the proposed addition, but will curve slightly and widen to a rectangular pad that terminates approximately 6' from the side property lines. The pad will terminate between 5' and 8'-3" from the rear property line, which is angled. The hardscape will give access to the proposed rear accessory structure, which contains a two car garage. Currently, the rear lot is primary grass with a thin concrete walkway with an angular path through the lot. According to guideline 3.B.i for Site Elements, large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they were not historically located. Staff finds the installation of the hardscape inconsistent with the Guidelines, and has yet to receive confirmation on all final dimensions from the applicant.

x. SIDE WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a walkway on the northwest side of the property. The walkway will lead from the proposed new door and staircase towards the rear of the lot. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, new walkways should follow the historic alignment, configuration, and width of the property and district. Staff finds the width and location indicated on the submitted site plan generally consistent with the Guidelines at a conceptual level, but the applicant has not confirmed the material or specific dimensions at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on findings a through m with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant lower the ridgeline of the addition to be below that of the primary structure, per one of two potential design approaches submitted.
- ii. That the applicant submits new window and door specifications for both the primary structure and the new addition to staff for final approval. The applicant should refer to the OHP Window Policy Document for guidance on windows that are appropriate.
- iii. That the applicant submits final plan drawings that indicate where the new condensing unit will be located on the property.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the roof replacement based on finding e with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant comply with the Checklist for Metal Roofs in the Historic Design Guidelines. 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. In lieu of the standard galvalume finish, staff recommends that the applicant match the red color of the existing roof as closely as possible to maintain the color scheme of the original home's design.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on finding f.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the removal of existing rear openings based on finding e with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant salvages the wood windows for reuse on the addition where feasible. As indicated in

June 7, 2017

recommendation #1, the applicant must submit a final window schedule to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. If any existing windows are deteriorated beyond repair or otherwise unsalvageable for reuse, the applicant must furnish evidence to that effect to staff.

Item 5, Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of an existing front door based on finding i.

Item 6, Staff recommends approval of the new side door based on finding g.

Item 7, Staff recommends approval of the two porch railings and side staircase based on finding g and h.

Item 8, Staff does not recommend approval of the 2-story rear accessory structure based on findings n through v. The application should address the following inconsistencies with the Guidelines if they wish to return with a new design proposal:

i. That the applicant explores overall massing similar to historic structures and historic accessory structures in the vicinity as noted in finding p.

ii. That the applicant reconfigures the roof form to be more consistent with the roof forms of the Lavaca Historic District as noted in finding q.

iii. That the applicant integrates window opening proportions that are more consistent with the Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy document, and the historic examples found in the Lavaca Historic District as noted in finding r.

iv. 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 t.

v. That the applicant incorporates architectural details and materials that are representative of the historic context of the district as noted in findings q through u.

Item 9, Staff does not recommend approval of the hardscaping additions and modifications based on findings w and x. The applicant should address the following items if they wish to return with a new proposal:

a. That the applicant reduces hardscaping where feasible to minimize the reduction of the presence of natural grass and plantings.

b. That the applicant produce a final site plan that indicates all material choices, exact dimensions, and planting palette for approval..

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on May 30, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Susan Beavin spoke regarding concerns about the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of items #1, #2, & #4.

Approval of item #3 with stipulations that applicant must use wood windows which will be verified by staff. Denial of items #5, #6, #7, #8 & #9.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

37. HDRC NO. 2017-229

Applicant: Ricardo McCullough

Address: 1021 N PALMETTO

REQUEST:

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

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a single family house 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.

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. **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

June 7, 2017

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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

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

h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed multiple roof forms that include two sloped roofs and a habitable flat rooftop terrace. Both of these proposed roof forms are not historically found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. 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 and incompatible with the district.

i. 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.

j. 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.

k. MATERIALS – In regards to material, the applicant has proposed materials to include siding of an unspecified material and stucco for the walls, along with a standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the use of stucco and siding in appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District; however, a material specification is required to make a final determination. Additionally, 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.

l. 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.

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. The architectural details of the proposal are not consistent with context

June 7, 2017

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.

n. **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.

o. **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. A driveway is not historically found on the property; however, the placement is consistent with the historic development pattern of the district. Staff finds the proposed location consistent with the Guidelines.

p. **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.

q. **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:

- a. 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.
- b. 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.
- c. That the applicant explores overall massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity as noted in finding f.
- d. That the applicant reconfigures the roof form to be more consistent with the roof forms of the district as noted in finding h.
- e. 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 Historic District as noted in finding i.
- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. That the applicant implements a concrete driveway in lieu of pavers to be more consistent with the development pattern of the district as noted in findings o and p.
- i. 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 Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move to next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

June 7, 2017

Applicant: Mark Tolley/Mission DG, LTD

Address: 222 E MITCHELL ST/ ST JOHN'S SEMINARY

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

39.

AMENDMENT TO WINDOW POLICY DOCUMENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Kamal amendment is adopted.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Bustamante, Garza

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:25 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair