

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
June 21, 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, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza
Absent:

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Susan Beavin, introduced the VP of SACS.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-288 | 835 LAMAR ST |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-187 | 417 N OLIVE |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-290 | 220 MUNCEY |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-309 | 233 FLORIDA ST |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-280 | 409 FLORIDA ST |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-289 | 815 N HACKBERRY ST |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-302 | 309 E MISTLETOE |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-294 | 404 E MISTLETOE |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-299 | 312 E MYRTLE |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-301 | 401 NORTH DR |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-274 | 526 E COURTLAND PLACE |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-286 | 1127 S ST MARYS |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-287 | 328 JOSEPHINE/923 AVE A/917 AVE A |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-284 | 131 E GRAYSON ST/127 E GRAYSON |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-291 | 211 BROOKLYN AVE |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-306 | 420 BROADWAY |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-303 | 121 SOLEDAD ST |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2017-305 | 200 RIVERWALK |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2017-304 | 637 N MAIN AVE |
| • Item #20, Case No. 2017-478 | SAN PEDRO CREEK FROM FOX TECH HIGH SCHOOL
THROUGHOUT DOWNTOWN |
| • Item #21, Case No. 2017-523 | 1401 N HAMILTON ST/ WEST END PARK |
| • Item #22, Case No. 2017-296 | 115 S ZARZAMORA |

Items # 21 was pulled for citizens to be heard. Item #16 was pulled for recusal by Vice Chairman Connor and item #20 was pulled for recusal by commissioner Laffoon.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

June 21, 2017

16. HDRC NO. 2017-306

Applicant: Adam Reed/Ford, Powell & Carson

Address: 420 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Perform exterior modifications to the Light Building including repair to plaster, cleaning of cast stone and masonry and painting of the plaster work.
2. Replace the existing windows in the Light Building
3. Remove the skybridge connecting the Light Building and the Print Building and construct a new vertical connector to join the two structures.
4. Construct a new curtain wall on the southern façade of the Light Building.

FINDINGS:

a. The Light Building was constructed in 1931 as the home of the San Antonio Light newspaper on the corner of Broadway and McCullough. The structure features five stories with ornamental facades on both street sides. The southern facing façade features a blank stucco wall and the rear (west) façade features brick tile and steel windows. Both the southern and western facades lack ornamentation. At the rear of the Light Building, the Print Building was constructed circa 1969. These two structures are connected by a sky bridge.

b. LIGHT BUILDING REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to perform a number of exterior repair and maintenance items to the Light Building including the repair of plaster elements, the cleaning of cast stone elements and masonry and painting. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.i.

c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The current windows in the Light Building are aluminum and are not the original windows. The current windows feature a one over one profile. The original windows featured a six over six profile. The applicant has proposed to install new, six over six windows that match the profile of the original. Staff finds this replacement appropriate.

d. CONNECTOR ADDITION – At the rear of the Light Building, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing skybridge and construct a vertical connector to join the two structures. Per the Guidelines for Additions, additions to non-residential structures should be located at the rear of the historic structure, should not lessen the historic character of the historic building when viewed from the public right of way, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the principal façade and should be subordinate in height to the primary historic structure. Staff finds the location of the proposed connector appropriate; however, staff has concerns regarding the massing and cladding of the proposed connector.

e. CONNECTOR ADDITION– The applicant has noted a both a glass curtain wall system and a solid paneling system to connect the Light Building to the Print Building. As currently proposed, staff finds the solid paneling system to add visual weight and mass to the proposed structure. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the amount of solid cladding and introduce more glazing to be consistent with the conceptual sketch that is included in the application documents.

f. CURTAIN WALL MODIFICATION – The southern façade of the Light Building is currently void of ornamentation of façade openings. The façade features brick from the street level to the top of the mezzanine level and then features stucco to the roof parapet. The applicant has proposed to modify this wall and install a glass curtain wall system. The applicant has proposed to maintain brick from the street level to the top of the mezzanine level and to create façade openings within this brick. The glass curtain wall system will span from the top of the brick to the top of the roof's parapet wall.

g. CORNER TOWERS – The applicant has proposed to maintain each corner tower; however, the applicant has proposed to install window openings on the southern façade of the tower on the southwest corner of the building. Staff finds this installation appropriate.

h. CORNER TOWER ADDITION – The only corner of the structure that does not feature a corner tower is the southeast corner. The applicant has proposed to construct a tower to be a contemporary interpretation of the original corner towers. While the location and general height will be consistent with the originals, staff finds the installation of the proposed corner tower adds additional massing to the rear of the historic structure that distracts from the historic facades. Staff finds that the applicant should remove the proposed new corner tower and leave the last column bay as it currently exists; however, staff finds that the inclusion of the proposed roof level light element is appropriate.

June 21, 2017

i. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District and is a designated Local Historic Landmark. A review of historic archival maps shows structures within the project area as early as 1873. Furthermore, an 1848 property survey map identifies ditches, possibly associated with the nearby Acequia del Alamo or Navarro Acequia, within the modern property. Thus, the project area may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

- i. Archaeology – Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- ii. That the applicant remove the proposed corner tower and maintain the existing last column bay as is as noted in finding h.
- iii. That the applicant remove the proposed solid cladding material proposed on the connector addition and incorporate glazing as noted in the early conceptual sketch included in the application documents as noted in finding e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

Recusal: Connor

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2017-478

Applicant: Steven Tillotson/Munoz & Company

Address: San Pedro Creek from Fox Tech High school throughout Downtown to the vicinity of the old stock yards

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform modifications and construct a linear park at San Pedro Creek. The 2.2 mile section of section of San Pedro creek that courses from Fox Tech High School through downtown to the vicinity of the old stock yards is subject to flood control improvements and other improvements. The applicant has proposed to modify the creek channel to contain the 100 year floodplain within the banks of the creek and reimagine the creek as a linear park. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

- 1. Final approval of landscaping, wayfinding signage and site elements to include lighting and pedestrian access elements such as railings and stair and terrace detailing.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to perform modifications and construct a linear park at San Pedro Creek. The 2.2 mile section of section of San Pedro creek that courses from Fox Tech High School through downtown to the vicinity of the old stock yards is subject to flood control improvements and other improvements. The applicant has proposed to modify the creek channel to contain the 100 year floodplain within the banks of the creek and reimagine the creek as a linear park. At this time, the applicant is seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for landscaping and site element details included in work packets 2, 3 and 5. Architectural and engineering work was approved at the December 7, 2016, HDRC hearing.

b. Work package 2 included 100 percent design for all scopes of work except for landscaping, irrigation and wayfinding at the December 7, 2016, HDRC hearing. At this time, the applicant has provided construction documents regarding the installation of various landscaping elements including plant materials, specific site details such as railings and terraces and wayfinding signage.

c. **LADNSCAPING** – The applicant has noted that the proposed landscape program includes generous areas of aquatic, riparian and upland plantings to improve water quality and habitat and to provide shade. The applicant has provided construction documents noting specific plant materials that will be installed.

June 21, 2017

d. LIGHTING – The applicant has provided information regarding the specific location of all proposed lighting, light intensities and fixture types and designs.

e. SITE DETAILING – The applicant has provided information regarding site detailing to include detailing for stairs, detailing for terraces, the locations of proposed tiled areas and interpretive art locations. Staff finds the proposed locations and detailing appropriate.

f. WAYFINDING SIGNAGE – The applicant has provided information regarding proposed pedestrian wayfinding signage. The proposed signage is to consist of pylon signs, table top signs, wall signs at restrooms, directional wall signs and will feature materials to include aluminum and stainless steel sheeting, stainless steel posts, acrylic polyurethane paints, vinyl graphics and powder coating finishes for interpretive panels. Staff finds the proposed heights, materials and locations appropriate.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:

i. Archaeology –The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

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 Cone to approve with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS

Recusal: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2017-523

Applicant: Google Fiber Texas, LLC

Address: 1401 N HAMILTON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct fencing and landscaping for the purpose of screening a utility structure for telecommunications at 1401 N Hamilton Street, Commonly known as West End Park.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct fencing and screening for a utility structure on the public property located at 1401 Hamilton, commonly known as West End Park. The structure is to house equipment for Google Fiber. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 13, 2016, and then by the Historic and Design Review Commission on December 22, 2016, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request was heard a second time by the DRC on March 7, 2016.

b. Since last attending the Historic and Design Review Commission, the previously installed barbed wire has been removed.

c. Per the UDC Section 35-640, the Historic and Design Review Commission will consider application affecting public properties such as city parks, open spaces, plazas, parking lots, signs and appurtenances.

d. The applicant has installed a utility structure that features a footprint of 12’x30’, an overall height of 10’ – 11” and materials that consist of wood paneling and a gabled roof form. The utility structure is located on a concrete foundation and is surrounded by an eight (8) foot tall chain link fence. Located within this fencing is additional mechanical equipment including a generator and gas meter. The utility structure is located fourteen (14) feet from the public right of way.

e. The applicant worked closely with the Council office and neighborhood association representatives to agree on the design of the fencing and screening. At the request of the neighborhood association, a public art component

June 21, 2017

has been incorporated into the proposed fencing. The proposed art component will consist of metal tabs that will be custom fabricated for installation. The applicant has noted that the design will be approved by Public Art San Antonio prior to fabrication and installation. Staff finds the proposed art component to be appropriate; however, the art component should screen all mechanical equipment from view.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through f with the stipulation that the project comply with all federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations regarding archaeology.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: John Whitsett & Patrick Vandohlen spoke in opposition of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-190

Applicant: Orville Fulkerson

Address: 100 AUDITORIUM CIRCLE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate the existing 881st Monument from the SW corner of the park to the north central section of the park.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to relocate an existing Vietnam Veterans Memorial at 100 Auditorium Circle in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Park. At the October 5, 2016, HDRC hearing, the HDRC approved as master plan for Veterans Memorial Plaza which includes the preferred location of this monument. The location and

b. Staff finds the current location of the monument is consistent with the approved master plan. Sufficient information which supports an amendment to the approved master plan has not been provided by the applicant.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: John Baines, Glen Bartholomew, John Tate, John B Reisz, Charles L. Jeffers, Bob Buchanan- all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request. Darryl Benton spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2017-242

Applicant: Salvador Valdez

Address: 220 LEIGH ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval to demolish a contributing rear accessory structure.

June 21, 2017

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 is requesting approval to demolish the rear accessory structure.

b. The applicant met with the Demolition and Designation Committee (DDC) on June 14, 2017 on site at 220 Leigh. The applicant noted that gas pipes had been disconnected years ago, and there is no plumbing, water, electricity, or sewage. The accessory structure is currently being used for storage. The Committee stated that demolition by neglect is not applicable in this scenario, as the applicant has owned the property for five years, and the deterioration far exceeds that time period. The DDC noted the severely deteriorated state of the foundation, and stated that the foundation was likely never pier and beam, but rigged together at the time of construction. The DDC noted that the roof has held up very well, as well as a majority of the interior elements, including the hardwood floors, interstitial wall structure, and windows, along with exterior columns and doors. It was determined that the salvage stipulation was extremely important in this case, as so much original material is still intact and viable for reuse.

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

d. 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. The structure, despite the current condition of the foundation, contains a substantial amount of original materials with a high quality of craftsmanship. 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 has noted that the property has been on the real estate market for some time, and while the primary home has garnered interest from potential buyers, the rear accessory structures have ultimately deterred buyers from purchasing the property. However, the applicant received confirmation from OHP staff in February 2017 that the two other rear accessory structures are non-contributing and may be approved for demolition upon the receipt of demolition applications. Staff does not believe that the marketability of the property has been fully explored without the removal of the two non-contributing rear accessory structures, which may impact the value of the property as a whole to potential buyers. Additionally, 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.

e. 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.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition based on findings a through e. If the HDRC recommends approval of the demolition, staff recommends that the applicant create a comprehensive 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

June 21, 2017

3, 2017.

• The applicant met with the Demolition and Designation Committee (DDC) on June 14, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia move to grant a COA for demolition with the stipulation that the applicant provide staff with a comprehensive salvage plan prior to receiving the COA.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. 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 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

June 21, 2017

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 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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.

June 21, 2017

- 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.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2017-311

Applicant: Ann Lewis/Lewis Signs

Address: 111 W JONES AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install one wall sign on the river façade of the new construction at 111 W Jones to feature an overall size of 1' – 1" in width and 14' – 0" in height for a total of approximately fifteen (15) square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install signage to face the San Antonio River and Museum Reach of the San Antonio River Walk at the new construction at 111 W Jones. At the May 17, 2017, HDRC hearing, the applicant received approval for the installation of one rooftop sign and two signs on Jones Avenue. The applicant has proposed to install one wall sign that is to read "Jones & RIO", will feature an aluminum cabinet with acrylic push through white lettering and will be internally illuminated. The sign is to feature yellow and black colors and will feature an overall size of 1' – 1" in width and 14' – 0" in height for a total of approximately fifteen (15) square feet.
- b. The UDC Section 35-681(c), notes that signage on properties abutting the River Walk is not to exceed eight (8) square feet in total size; however, additional square footage may be approved by the HDRC provided that the additional signage is in conformity and does not interfere with the pedestrian experience on the River Walk.
- c. Staff finds the installation of signage at the river is appropriate; however, wall signage similar to previously installed examples near this location would be more appropriate. These examples tend to be smaller and located on the retaining walls near or above the river level instead of mounted to the wall of the building.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed signage. Staff recommends the applicant install signage consistent with the examples found facing the river in the immediate vicinity.

CASE COMMENTS:

The river level signage examples provided by staff are located at 103 Ninth Street and at the Tobin Center at 100

June 21, 2017

Auditorium Circle.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

27. HDRC NO. 2017-238

Applicant: Corey Taylor/Image 360

Address: 918 S ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

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.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve item #1 and deny item #2 with staff stipulations.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2017-277

Applicant: Geoffrey Michael Myane

Address: 314 E COURTLAND PLACE

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear 1-story addition to be approximately 460 sq. ft.
2. Modify existing front porch columns.
3. Replace two non-original metal garage doors on the rear accessory structure with one single overhead metal door.

FINDINGS:

June 21, 2017

- a. The primary structure located at 314 E Courtland Place is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. A 2003 survey of Tobin Hill noted that a rear addition had been added to the structure and the front porch columns had been modified. The home is a contributing structure in the Tobin Hill Historic District.
- b. **PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove existing metal porch column supports and install antique or salvaged historic columns. As indicated in a survey of the Tobin Hill district in 2003, the existing metal columns are not original to the structure. According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, added porch elements should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The columns indicated in the drawings appear to be more neoclassical in nature versus Folk Victorian, and staff has not seen dimensioned drawings that indicate the dimensions, materiality, or exact location of the columns. Staff finds the removal and replacement generally consistent with the guidelines, but needs additional information to determine the replacement column's compatibility and appropriateness for the particular structure.
- c. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition is approximately a fourth of the size of the overall footprint of the existing home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **ROOF** – The proposed addition is 1-story in height and is subordinate to the existing roofline of the primary structure. The proposed addition will modify the existing rear roofline of both the primary structure and an existing rear addition to accommodate the new addition. The modification adjusts the rear ridgeline slightly and creates a new hipped roof over the proposed addition. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Staff finds the proposed roof form consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The existing roofing material on the primary structure is composition shingles. The applicant has proposed to install composition shingles to closely match the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **REAR WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL** – The proposed addition will require the removal of three existing one over one wood windows and an existing rear door. These elements are part of a previous rear addition. According to Guideline 6.A.i, filling in historic openings should be avoided, especially when viewable from the public right-of-way. These elements are not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given the rear location of the addition, and encourages the applicant to salvage or reuse the existing elements.
- g. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION** – The applicant has proposed to install a salvaged wood window frame on the rear addition. The window frame will be relocated from the interior of the existing structure and a single pane of glass will be installed in the center. Guideline 4.A.iii for Additions states that contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details should be considered. Additionally, Guideline 7.A.ii stipulates that architectural details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with these Guidelines and appropriate for the structure considering the rear placement of the salvaged window and its lack of view from the public right-of-way.
- h. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to use a salvaged wood door and a salvaged wood window on the addition. Staff finds the materiality consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed to woodlap siding on the addition that matches the existing siding on the historic structure as closely as possible. According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the proposed use of woodlap siding to be appropriate for the structure, but does not find the proposal as submitted consistent with the Guidelines due to a lack of differentiation of a material delineation between the existing and new structures.
- j. **REAR STAIRS AND RAILING** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new covered deck with stairs and railing on the rear of the proposed addition. According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance 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 and columns appear generally compatible with the style and materiality of the home, but staff has not seen dimensioned drawings that indicate the height of the proposed railing, the treatment of the decking or steps, or the size and configuration of the railing elements.
- k. **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

June 21, 2017

the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

1. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: GARAGE DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to remove two non-original metal garage doors on the rear accessory structure and replace them with a single overhead metal garage door. According to Guideline 9.B.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, replacement garage doors should be compatible with those found on historic garages in the district as well as with the principal structure. The rear accessory structure is viewable from the public right-of-way and contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That the applicant adds a vertical trim piece at the joint where the historic structure and the addition meet.
 - ii. That any condensing units, service areas, and roof-mounted equipment are concealed from the public right-of-way.
- Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the front porch modifications with the stipulation that the applicant submits final drawings that indicate all dimensions and material information of the front porch modifications to staff for final approval. The columns should be appropriate in scale and materiality for the Folk Victorian style of the home.
- Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the garage door replacement as submitted. Staff recommends that the applicant install two individual wood carriage doors to maintain the configuration of the contributing rear accessory structure and the materiality of historic garages in the district.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Spoke in opposition to the applicant’s request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve item #1 and deny item #2 with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2017-300

Applicant: Cesar Pereznegron

Address: 677 E WOODLAWN

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Replace one of two front garage doors.
- 2. Remove one of two front garage doors and install a new one over one aluminum window and enclose with siding.
- 3. Construct a rear addition to be approximately 170 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 677 Woodlawn is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1950 with Midcentury Modern influences. It is a contributing structure within the River Road Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a rear addition and replace a frontloading non-original garage door with a new one over one wood window and fiber cement siding.

b. GARAGE DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace one of two metal overhead garage doors. The doors are frontloading and located on the front façade of the structure. The doors are metal and nonoriginal to the home. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate, but has not yet received a material specification for the replacement garage door.

c. GARAGE DOOR REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove one of two metal overhead garage doors. The doors are frontloading and located on the front façade of the structure. The doors are metal and non-original to the home. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

d. WINDOW AND SIDING INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to infill the garage door opening with a new one over one aluminum window and fiber cement siding. The window measure 35.25 by 59.25 inches and will match the size and configuration of the existing windows on the primary structure and feature wide exterior

June 21, 2017

trim. The fiber cement board siding will infill the rest of the opening and created new conditioned interior space. At this time, staff has not received information on the siding dimensions and installation method; the dimensions or material of the exterior window trim; information on the proposed window inset and profile;

e. MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition is approximately a sixth of the overall size of the existing home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

f. SETBACK – In the site plan submitted by the applicant, the rear addition appears to eclipse the minimum 5 foot side setback. Though the site plan's dimensions are indicated as approximate, the applicant may need to obtain a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

g. ROOF – The proposed addition is 1-story in height and is subordinate to the primary roofline. The proposed addition will modify the existing rear roofline to accommodate the new addition. The modification will mimic the existing front dormer roof slope. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Staff finds the proposed roof form consistent with the guidelines.

h. ROOF MATERIAL – The existing roofing material on the primary structure is brown composition shingles. The applicant has not yet provided information on the roofing material for the new addition. Staff finds composition shingles that match the existing as closely as possible to be appropriate.

i. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The proposed addition will require the removal of one existing aluminum casement window on the rear façade of the primary structure. 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 given the rear location of the addition, and encourages the applicant to reuse the existing window if it is in good working condition.

j. NEW ADDITION SIDING – The applicant has proposed to use fiber cement siding on the addition. According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The siding material satisfies this Guideline and is compatible with the brick on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the guidelines, but has not yet received information on the profile, dimension, or installation method of the siding.

k. NEW ADDITION WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to install a new casement window on the north facing façade of the rear addition. Based on the submitted elevations, the window matches the proportions and configuration of the existing aluminum casement window to be removed from the primary structure to make way for the addition. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines, but has not yet received information on if the applicant will salvage the existing window or install a new window. Staff has also not received a window specification if the applicant is pursuing the latter option.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the garage door replacement with the following stipulation:

i. That the applicant submits a garage door specification to staff to review for final approval.

Item 2, Staff recommends conceptual approval of the garage door removal and window installation based on findings a through c, but has not yet received enough information to grant final approval. Staff recommends the following stipulations for final approval:

a. That the applicant submits a window specification that matches the submitted drawings in size, proportion, and configuration.

b. That the applicant submits the material and dimensions of the proposed window trim. The trim should match the material and existing trim dimensions found surrounding doors on the existing structure,

c. That the applicant submits specifications for the proposed new siding, including dimensions, installation methods, and finish.

d. That the applicant submits final elevation drawings with all appropriate dimensions.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on findings e through k with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant submits roofing material for the addition to staff for approval.

ii. That the applicant salvages the existing rear aluminum casement window for installation on the new addition if

June 21, 2017

feasible. If salvaging is not an option, the applicant should furnish evidence to that effect and submit a new window specification proposal to staff for approval.

iii. That the applicant submits specifications for the proposed new siding, including dimensions, installation methods, and finish, to staff for approval.

iv. That the applicant complies with all zoning setback requirements or obtains a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2017-268

Applicant: Varco Builders of Texas

Address: 1934 W SUMMIT

REQUEST:

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

1. Relocate a total of five wood windows from the rear façade of the property. The windows will replace five on the east façade that are in poor condition.
2. Install a total of five new one over one wood composite windows. The windows will be located on the rear façade of the structure.
3. Replace two non-original one over one aluminum windows on the east façade.
4. Install interior drywall behind two original one over one wood windows on the east façade. The window openings and their sashes will be rehabilitated and remain in place.
5. Remove two wood one over one windows and install a single pane of glass in the remaining opening. The existing exterior and interior trim will remain.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 1934 W Summit Ave is a single family home constructed in 1935 in the Tutor style. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District, designated in March 1995. The applicant is proposing to relocate original wood one over one windows from the rear façade to the east (side) façade, replace the rear window openings with new one over one windows, replace two non-original aluminum one over one windows with new one over one windows, install drywall behind two original one over one wood windows but retain the assemblies in place, and replace two original one over one windows on the east façade with a single pane of glass.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 26, 2017. In terms of the proposed window replacement, the DRC commented that retention of wood windows, where feasible, is a stipulation in the Historic Design Guidelines. Aolar screens are not appropriate. The applicant inquired about replacing the rear five wood windows only. The DRC suggested that if the rear wood windows were in good condition, the applicant may consider moving the rear windows to a location visible from the public right-of-way if any were deteriorated beyond repair. At the time of the meeting, only photos were presented to the DRC. The Committee expressed the need for photographs tied to specific windows proposed for removal. Additionally, the committee recommended developing a window schedule or plan to designate exactly which windows were being considered for replacement. The applicant submitted this document with their HDRC application.

c. WINDOW RELOCATION – Staff conducted a site visits on April 17, 2017, and again on June 8, 2017, to assess the condition of the windows and the property as a whole. Staff found that the five windows located on the rear façade of the structure are in excellent condition given their age (windows #14 through #18 on the submitted plans). Five out of six windows on east façade, closest to the public right-of-way, are the same size and configuration, but are in a state of disrepair due to direct sun exposure and faulty repair techniques over the years (windows #3 and #5 through #8 on the submitted plans; window #4 is in repairable condition). The applicant has proposed to relocate the five rear windows to the east side of the structure. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given the condition and the visibility from the public right-of-way of the windows on the east façade.

d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: REAR FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to replace the relocated rear

June 21, 2017

windows with new windows to match the existing in size, configuration, and profile. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, windows should be replaced with ones that match existing in terms of size type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the guidelines, but has yet to receive final window specifications that indicate all of these details.

e. ALUMINUM WINDOW REPLACEMENT – Two windows on the west façade were previously replaced with aluminum one over one windows (#22 and #23 on the submitted plans). The applicant has proposed to replace these windows with new windows to match the existing original windows on the structure in size, configuration, and profile. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, non-original windows should be replaced with ones that match those that would have been historically found on the structure in terms of size type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the guidelines, but has yet to receive a final window specification.

f. DRYWALL INSTALLATION: EAST FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to install interior drywall behind two one over one windows on the east façade of the structure. The windows themselves will be rehabilitated and retained on the exterior. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

g. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WEST FAÇADE – The applicant as proposed to replace two one over one wood windows and their central wood trim piece with a new solid pane fixed window. The surrounding original wood trim will remain on the interior and exterior, and the window pane will be custom fit to the opening. 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. If beyond repair, windows should be replaced with ones that match existing in terms of size type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. Staff's site visit revealed that the windows are in good condition and can be repaired. Staff finds the proposal to replace existing wood windows inconsistent with the guidelines

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the relocation of five windows from the rear façade to five openings of the same size on the east façade based on finding c.
Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the replacement of the rear windows based on finding d with the stipulation that the applicant submits final window specifications to staff for approval. Staff finds wood windows to be appropriate.
Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the aluminum window replacement based on finding e with the stipulation that the applicant submits final window specifications to staff for approval. Staff finds wood windows to be appropriate.
Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the drywall installation based on finding f.
Item 5, Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of two wood windows with a single glass pane based on finding e.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 26, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approval of items #1-#4 and the stipulation the applicant must try and repair

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2017-293

Applicant: Bob Bradley

Address: 1918 W MAGNOLIA AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Extend the front roofline to create a front porch.
2. Install new wooden porch decking on an existing concrete slab.

FINDINGS:

June 21, 2017

a. The primary structure located at 1918 W Magnolia Ave is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1930 in the Tudor style. The home features a hipped roof, textured stucco wall finish, and a character defining stone chimney on the front façade. It is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to extend the front roofline to create a front porch, install new wooden porch decking on an existing concrete slab, and install a new side gutter.

b. FRONT PORCH – The applicant has proposed to install a new roof that extends the front roofline to create a new front porch. The porch will extend the width and length of the existing concrete decking, which measures approximately 8 feet by 24 feet. The new roof will have a pitch of approximately 4:12 and will be covered with composition shingles to match the existing material of the primary structure’s roof. The new porch roof will be supported by pairs of painted wood columns measuring 4x4” with a trellis constructed with 2x2” painted wood beams. The trellis will be covered with flowering jasmine. According to Guideline 7.A.i, new porches should not be added where historically present. There is no evidence that a front porch historically existed on this structure, and a front porch configuration similar to the proposed submission is not characteristic of Tudor homes of this scale and configuration. Additionally, the proposed porch will partially conceal the front chimney, which is a character defining feature of the home. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the guidelines as submitted.

c. WOODEN DECKING – The applicant has proposed to cover the existing concrete decking slab, measuring approximately 8 feet by 24 feet, with new treated wood decking. The decking will extend the existing depth of the deck to provide an adequate level landing with the front door. The decking will be slightly raised from the concrete slab. According to Guideline 7.A.iii, original concrete porch floors should be preserved, and covering them with other materials should be avoided unless they were used historically. Staff does not find the proposal consistent 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.

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.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

32. HDRC NO. 2017-258

Applicant: Jorge Acosta/Urban Cuts The Barber's Lounge, LLC

Address: 306 AUSTIN ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a double-sided, vertically-oriented blade sign to project from the northwest corner of the front façade. The sign will be feature reverse channel letters, indirect lighting, and a total sign area of approximately 20 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The multitenant commercial structure located at 306 Austin St. is a designated historic landmark, with the common name of Wolfmueller Building. The building is 2 stories and features a symmetrical front façade with storefront windows on the first floor, five windows on the second floor, and a raised parapet. Primary façade materials are cast stone and brick with decorative patterning at the cornice level. The building was designated on October 27, 1988 as part of a comprehensive ordinance that landmarked nearly 1,100 structures. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new double-sided, vertically-oriented blade sign to project from the northwest corner of the front façade. The sign will be feature reverse channel letters, indirect lighting, and a total sign area of approximately 20 square feet.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on June 13, 2017. The committee noted how the

June 21, 2017

location of the building on a high-traffic corridor is key, where visibility from cars is the primary means of sign communication versus pedestrian. They did not have an issue with scale or the double-sided nature of the proposed sign. They also recommended that the applicant provide an updated photograph of the surrounding site conditions, as there is heavy tree coverage adjacent to the structure, as well as a prominent billboard, that may strengthen the case for the sign.

c. **EXISTING SIGNAGE** – A previous applicant received HDRC approval to install signage similar in size and materiality on March 19, 2015. The signage still exists and is located below the cornice on the south façade.

d. **NUMBER AND SQUARE FOOTAGE** – According to guideline 1.A.i, each building is allowed one major and two minor signs with a total square footage not to exceed 50 feet. The applicant’s proposal of a sign totaling approximately 20 square feet is generally consistent with the square footage requirement, but three signs already exist on the structure totaling approximately 35 square feet. Staff finds that additional signage would exceed the number requirement and does not find the proposal consistent with this Guideline.

e. **DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed to install a double-sided, vertically-oriented blade sign. The blade sign will project from the second story above an existing metal awning. The sign will be affixed to the brick portion of the structure. The sign will feature three colors – red, blue, and white – with white letters on a blue background. Guideline 1.D.iii states that colors on signs should be limited to three, and that white text on a dark background will increase legibility. Guideline 3.A.iii stipulates that projecting signs should only be used on building forms that historically had them, particularly commercial storefronts. Staff finds the design of the sign consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the structure.

f. **MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to utilize reverse channel lettering illuminated with indirect LED lighting. According to guideline 3.C.iv, reverse channel letters may be permitted. This material and lighting approach was approved for the existing sign on the south façade. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **LOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to install the projecting blade sign on the second story of the structure, adjacent to an existing window, awning, and balcony. Guideline 3.A.iii stipulates that projecting signs should only be used on building forms that historically had them, particularly commercial storefronts. Additionally, projecting signs should be mounted perpendicularly and allow eight feet of overhead space from the public right-of-way. The location will be minimally intrusive to existing material, requiring two small mounts. Staff finds the location of the sign consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding d. Staff recommends that the owner of the building submit a master signage plan that specifies appropriate signage areas for all tenants. Temporary signage may be approved in accordance with the UDC until permanent signage is approved.

If the HDRC approves this request, staff recommends the stipulation that the sign be mounted to the mortar rather than the historic masonry.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on June 13, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to deny the applicant’s request with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

33. HDRC NO. 2017-295

Applicant: Charles Riley

Address: 322 FURR DR

REQUEST:

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

June 21, 2017

1. Remove a non-original carport located on the east façade.
2. Add stairs to the east façade to accommodate existing door opening.
3. Construct an addition to the east façade of the structure to be approximately 65 square feet.
4. Construct a rear addition to be approximately 400 square feet.
5. Remove four existing windows and reuse them on the rear addition.
6. Replace two window openings with a single larger opening on the west façade and install a new window. The original windows will be reused on the addition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 322 Furr is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1940 in the Tudor style. The home features a smooth stucco wall finish, wood window screens with divided panels, and decorative gable bracketing. It is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is proposing to remove a non-original carport, add stairs to the east façade to accommodate an existing door opening, construct a side addition, construct a rear addition, remove six existing windows to be reused on the addition, and replace two existing window openings with a single larger opening and install a new window.
- b. CARPORT REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove a non-original carport located on the east façade of the primary structure. The carport is constructed of non-historic materials and is not appropriate for the style of the primary structure. Staff finds its removal acceptable.
- c. STAIR INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to install two new stairs on the east elevation at an existing door opening. According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, added porch elements, such as stairs and railings, should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines, but has not received information on the dimensions or materiality of the stairs.
- d. SIDE ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a side addition to the primary structure to be approximately 65 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the side or rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. Staff finds massing and footprint size generally consistent with the guidelines.
- e. SIDE ADDITION: SETBACK – The proposed side addition extends approximately one foot beyond the east façade of the historic structure. According to Guideline 1.A.iv, a setback or recessed area should be utilized for a new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The side addition is not set back from the primary structure. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SIDE ADDITION: ROOF AND DORMER DETAILING – The proposed addition is 1-story in height and is subordinate to the primary roofline. The proposed addition will modify the existing side roofline to accommodate the new addition. The modification will mimic the existing front dormer roof slope, pitch, and decorative wood detailing. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure, but should not be so similar as to evoke a false sense of history. Staff finds the subordinate roofline appropriate, but does not find the mimicking of the original decorative bracketing consistent with the Guidelines, especially in conjunction with the use of the same materials as the historic structure for the façade and roof.
- g. SIDE ADDITION: MATERIAL TRANSITIONS – The applicant has proposed to use stucco on the addition to match the existing structure. According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the proposal to use stucco appropriate for the historic structure. However, this proposed addition does not utilize a clear setback strategy, and staff has not seen a proposal to visually differentiate the historic structure's material from the new addition.
- h. SIDE ADDITION: ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, new buildings in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Architectural details should also not visually compete with the historic structure. As noted in finding f, the addition's dormer details evoke a false sense of history. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with these Guidelines as submitted.
- i. ROOF MATERIAL – The existing roofing material on the primary structure is gray composition shingles. The applicant has stated that both additions will utilize a roofing material to match the existing structure. Staff finds composition shingles to be appropriate.
- j. FOUNDATION – The foundation height for both proposed additions appears to match the existing foundation height, as indicated in the drawings. The height appears to be approximately two feet on the original structure. Staff finds the proposal to align the foundation height of the new additions with the primary structure consistent

June 21, 2017

and appropriate, but has not received documentation of exact dimensions or final material treatment.

k. REAR ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure to be approximately 400 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the side or 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 one third the size of the overall footprint of the existing home. Staff finds massing and footprint size generally consistent with the guidelines.

l. REAR ADDITION: SETBACK – The proposed rear addition is set back from the west façade by approximately two feet and from the existing east façade by approximately five feet. These setbacks obscure the addition from the view of the public right-of-way. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds that the setbacks satisfy this element of the Guidelines.

m. REAR ADDITION: ROOF – The proposed rear addition is 1-story in height and is subordinate to the primary roofline. The proposed addition will modify the existing side roofline to accommodate the new addition. The new roofline will feature a primary rear hipped roof and a secondary hipped roof at the northeast corner. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure, but should not be so similar as to evoke a false sense of history. Staff finds the subordinate roofline appropriate and finds the detailing of the roof consistent with the Guidelines.

n. REAR ADDITION: MATERIAL TRANSITIONS – The applicant has proposed to use stucco on the addition to match the existing structure. According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the setbacks consistent with the Guidelines.

o. WINDOW REMOVAL AND REUSE – The two proposed additions will require the removal of four existing one over one windows. All four are located on the west façade. Three will be removed to make way for the side addition, and one will be removed to enclose a new pantry space, just south of the location of the proposed side addition. The applicant has proposed to reuse these windows in the addition. 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 consistent with the Guidelines.

p. WINDOW OPENING MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to remove two existing window openings on the west façade and create a new larger single opening. A new wood window will be installed to fit the size of the new opening. According to Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing window openings should be preserved. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the non-original carport based on findings a and b.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the side stair installation based on findings a and c with the stipulation that the applicant submits dimensions and material information to staff for approval.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the side addition based on findings a through j.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on findings a through o with the follow stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits final drawings that indicate the height and material treatment of the foundation.
- ii. That any condensing units, service areas, and roof-mounted equipment are concealed from the public right-of-way.

Item 5, Staff recommends approval of the existing window removal and reuse on the addition based on finding o.

Item 6, Staff does not recommend the removal of the two existing window openings and installation of a single larger opening based on finding p.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve items #1, #2, #3, #4, #5 and denial of item #6 with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

June 21, 2017

THE MOTION CARRIED

34. HDRC NO. 2017-308

Applicant: David Morales/Helotes Builders

Address: 130 W LULLWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace two existing wood carriage garage doors with a single overhead metal garage door.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 130 W Lullwood Ave is a single family home constructed in 1929 in the Tudor style. The home features several elements reflective of the Tudor style, including a massive chimney with decorative chimney pots, steeply pitched roof, and decorative half-timbering. The house was designed by architect Robert McGarraugh, who was prolific along the Lullwood corridor. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The property is located on a corner lot and contains a rear accessory structure facing Howard St, also designed in the Tudor style. The rear accessory structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is proposing to replace two wood carriage garage doors with a single overhead metal garage door on the rear accessory structure.

b. According to Guideline 9.B.i, replacement garage doors should be compatible with the primary structure, as well as those found on historic garages in the district. When not visible from the public right-of-way, modern paneled garage doors may be considered. Because of the property's corner lot location, the garage is directly visible from the public right-of-way and engages the Howard St streetscape. The proposed single overhead metal garage features traditional decorative elements, but is a change in material and configuration and permanently modifies the historic double door opening. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to move for approval of the removal of the two garage doors with the replacement of single overhead acting door and the stipulation that the material be wood and not metal.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC NO. 2017-298

Applicant: Vicky Warrington/Timeless Renovations

Address: 215 E KINGS HWY NCB

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove an existing one over one non-original vinyl window and enclose the opening with siding.
2. Install three new fixed wood transom windows.
3. Install non-operable front shutters.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 215 E Kings Hwy is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1940 in the Colonial Revival cottage style. The home features several quintessential Colonial Revival features, including an accentuated front door, symmetrical façade, and decorative window detailing. The walls are clad in stucco. The home is a contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to remove an existing window opening containing a non-original vinyl window on a side elevation and install three new fix wood transom windows.

June 21, 2017

b. **WINDOW REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove a non-original one over one vinyl window located on the west façade of the structure. The window is located behind an existing privacy fence and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The window also appears to be located in a later addition to the home, which is clad in aluminum siding. According to Guideline 6.A.i, filling in historic window openings should be avoided, especially when viewable from the public right-of-way. This particular window is made of a non-original material and is not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

c. **NEW WINDOW LOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to install three rectangular fixed transom windows in the same general location as the window to be removed. The transom windows will be located above new interior kitchen cabinetry. According to Guideline 6.A.i, new openings should be avoided on the primary façade or when visible from the public right-of-way. As noted in finding b, this façade is not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. **NEW WINDOWS** – Per the applicant, the new windows will be made of wood and will be architecturally compatible with the style of the home. They will feature true divided lites with four panels. According to Guideline 6.B.iv, new windows should match the historic windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. The proposed windows echo the divided lites of the historic window screens of the original structure and are compatible with the sizes and configurations of windows found in Colonial Revival homes. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **SHUTTERS** – The applicant has installed shutters on the front façade of the structure. The shutters appear to be non-operational. Based on Google Street View images, the shutters were installed within the past year and a half. No Certificates of Appropriateness are on file for this work. According to Guideline 6.B.x, shutters should only be installed where they existed historically, and should match the height and width of the opening and be mounted to be operational or appear to be operational. They should not be mounted directly onto any historic wall material. The shutters are the approximate height of the historic window openings, but are not wide enough to functionally cover the width of the window openings if closed. Additionally, they do not appear to be operational and appear to be directly affixed to the façade material. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Items 1 and 2, Staff recommends approval of the window removal and installation of new windows based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits final measured exterior elevation drawings that show exactly where the three windows will be located on the façade.
- ii. That the applicant submits final window specifications to include material, configuration, profile, and details to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant should comply with the OHP Window Policy Document.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the shutter installation based on finding e.

CASE COMMENTS:

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of items #1 & #2, and denial of item #3 with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

36. HDRC NO. 2017-281

Applicant: Albert Davila, Jr.

Address: 369 CLUB DR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a front yard trellis in order to support an existing trumpet vine.

June 21, 2017

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 369 Club Dr is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1940 in the Spanish Eclectic style. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a freestanding wooden front trellis structure to support existing trumpet vines.

b. According to Guideline 7.A.i, new porch elements should not be added where not historically present. While the trellis is freestanding and not structurally affixed, it obscures the primary structure's historic elements, including stone façade and front window. Additionally, wood trellises are not historically common in front yards in Monticello Park Historic District, and are not historically characteristic of stone structures of this particular building style. The placement, design, and materiality are not appropriate for the structure and staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

37. HDRC NO. 2017-278

Applicant: Geoffrey Myane

Address: 701 EVERGREEN CT

REQUEST:

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

1. Demolish a rear accessory structure.
2. Remove an existing front door and install a one over one wood window.
3. Remove an existing chimney flue located in the center of the roofline.
4. Construct a 1-story rear addition to be approximately 360 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 701 Evergreen is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1925 in the Craftsman style. The home features several quintessential Craftsman elements, including a deep asymmetrical wraparound porch, decorative square columns with bases that extend to the ground, and a low-pitched roof with wide overhanging eaves. The home is a contributing structure in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to remove one of two existing front doors and install a window, remove an existing chimney flue, and construct a single story rear addition to be approximately 360 square feet.

b. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE DEMOLITION – The applicant has requested to demolish an existing rear accessory structure. The structure is viewable from the public right-of-way and features a hipped roof similar to that of the primary structure. The structure was determined to be contributing by staff on June 15, 2017. 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 the date of determination, 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, and form. If the applicant cannot meet the requirements for loss of significance, they must provide evidence that the structure poses an unreasonable economic hardship. The applicant has not provided information to substantiate the fulfillment of UDC Section 35-614(b). Staff does not believe this criterion for demolition has been met.

c. 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.

d. CHIMNEY FLUE REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing chimney flue located at the

June 21, 2017

apex of the existing rear hipped roof ridgeline. The flue is metal, not original to the structural, and not visible from the public right-of-way due to its placement and the height of the structure. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

e. MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition is approximately a fourth of the size of the overall footprint of the existing home. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines.

f. ROOF – The proposed addition is 1-story in height and is subordinate to the existing roofline of the primary structure. The proposed addition will modify the existing rear roofline to accommodate the new addition. The modification adjusts the rear ridgeline slightly and creates a new hipped roof over the proposed addition. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Staff finds the proposed roof form consistent with the Guidelines.

g. ROOF MATERIAL – The existing roofing material on the primary structure is a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has proposed to install a new standing seam metal roof to closely match the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

h. REAR WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL – The proposed addition will require the removal of four existing one over one wood windows. According to Guideline 6.A.i, filling in historic openings should be avoided, especially when viewable from the public right-of-way. These elements are not visible from the public right-of-way. 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 given the rear location of the addition, and encourages the applicant to reuse the existing elements.

i. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to use a salvaged wood door and a salvaged wood window on the addition, which is consistent with Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

j. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to use a salvaged wood door and a salvaged wood window on the addition. Staff finds the materiality consistent with the Guidelines.

k. MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to woodlap siding on the addition that matches the existing siding on the historic structure as closely as possible. According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the proposed use of woodlap siding to be appropriate for the structure, but does not find the proposal as submitted consistent with the Guidelines due to a lack of differentiation of a material delineation between the existing and new structures.

l. REAR STAIRS AND RAILING – The applicant has proposed to construct a new covered deck with stairs and railing on the rear of the proposed addition. According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance 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 and columns appear generally compatible with the style and materiality of the home, but staff has not seen dimensioned drawings that indicate the height of the proposed railing, the treatment of the decking or steps, or the size and configuration of the railing elements.

m. 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.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition of the rear accessory structure based on findings a and b.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the front door removal based on findings a and c.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the chimney flue removal based on findings a and d.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on findings a through m with the following stipulations:

iii. That the applicant incorporates a vertical trim piece at the joint where the historic structure meets the new addition on the east and west facades.

iv. That the applicant submits plans and elevations that indicate the dimensions of the proposed rear covered deck stairs and railing elements to staff for approval.

v. That any condensing units, service areas, and roof-mounted equipment are concealed from the public right-of-way.

vi. That the applicant submits final plans and elevations that indicate the changes listed above to staff for final approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

June 21, 2017

CASE COMMENTS:

In June 2017, the applicant submitted an application for non-contributing status for the rear accessory structure. Staff determined the structure to be contributing on June 15, 2017.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of demo of accessory structure with stipulation that applicant provide a salvage plan submitted to staff prior to COA, approval for removal of chimney flue and construction of one story addition with stipulation that the applicant use wood windows, and denial of the removal of door with staff stipulations

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

38. HDRC NO. 2017-159

Applicant: Carlton Brown

Address: 421 LABOR
515 LABOR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a two story single family residential structure featuring approximately 2,500 square feet.
2. Construct a two story single family residential structure featuring approximately 2,100 square feet.
3. Construct a two story accessory structure featuring approximately 1,120 square feet.
4. Construct a two story accessory structure featuring approximately 520 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct two (2), two story, single family residential structures on the vacant lots at 421 and 515 Labor Street in the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant has also proposed to construct two, two story accessory structures on the parcel. While there are two addresses at this location, there is only one parcel. The applicant has noted that the parcel will be subdivided.

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. ZONING – The lot is currently zoned commercial. The applicant has submitted an application to have the property rezoned to IDZ, which was heard by the zoning commission on April 18, 2017.

d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on April 12, 2017, where committee members noted that more than two stories in height was beyond precedent for the Lavaca Historic District, that the proposed roof tower was inappropriate, noted concern regarding how the proposed new construction would impact historic structures, noted that window openings should relate to those of historic structures in the district and noted that a large picture window was inappropriate. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on May 10, 2017, where committee members noted concern regarding the proposed massing and form, that the primary and accessory structures should read as two separate structures and noted concerns regarding the contemporary nature of the proposed design.

e. STAFF REVIEW – Office of Historic Preservation staff has met with the applicant on several occasions to review the proposed design and provide comments regarding the inappropriateness of the proposed massing and height. Very few modifications to the design have been made based on staff feedback.

Findings related to request item #1:

f. 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

June 21, 2017

along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of both structures to be within ten percent of the neighboring historic structures. Staff finds that the proposed setbacks should match those of the neighboring structures to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i.

g. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards Labor. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. 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 adjacent to a one story historic structure; however, there are examples of additional height located within proximity of the site. The construction of a two story structure may be appropriate; however, the overall height of the proposed new construction should not be inconsiderate of nearby single height historic structures.

i. SCALE & MASS – The applicant has proposed a tower toward that extends to above the top plate of the proposed second story. The proposed height of this tower is subordinate to that of the ridge height of the proposed roof. The height of the proposed roof is thirty-two feet in height. Staff finds this ridge height is considerably taller than neighboring historic structures.

j. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately one to two feet. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of approximately one foot.

k. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front facing gabled roof. The majority of historic structures throughout Lavaca feature front facing shed roofs and both front and side facing gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof form appropriate; however, staff finds that additional façade depth and separation could be obtained with the introduction of roof eaves.

l. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally consistent in size with those found historically throughout the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant has proposed contemporary window openings that are shaped to the form of proposed roof and massing elements on both the east and north elevations.

m. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed wood siding, stucco, a standing seam metal roof, cement tile and wood slats. Generally, these materials are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a low profile ridge cap and a galvalume finish.

n. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not noted window materials. Staff finds that the applicant should install windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds that the applicant should proposed massing and architectural forms that are complementary to historic structures in the Lavaca Historic District.

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

q. FRONT WALKWAY – The Guidelines for Site Elements note that new walkways should be consistent with those found historically throughout the district. The applicant has proposed straight sidewalks that are consistent in location with those found historically throughout the district. Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed concrete pavers as the proposed walkway material. The proposed pavers should feature a width that is consistent with the historic sidewalks found in the district.

Findings related to request item #2:

r. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has closely aligned the proposed new construction with the setback of that of the neighboring historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

June 21, 2017

s. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards Labor. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

t. 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 adjacent to a one story historic structure; however, there are examples of additional height located within proximity of the site. The construction of a two story structure may be appropriate; however, the overall height of the proposed new construction should not be inconsiderate of nearby single height historic structures.

u. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately one to two feet. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of approximately one foot.

v. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front facing shed roof. The majority of historic structures throughout Lavaca feature front facing shed roofs and both front and side facing gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof form appropriate; however, staff finds that additional façade depth and separation could be obtained with the introduction of roof eaves.

w. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed windows that generally are consistent with those found on historic structures in regards to proportion and size.

x. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed wood board and batten siding, panelized smooth fiber cement panels, a standing seam metal roof. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant should incorporate additional materials that feature historic dimensions such as lap siding.

y. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not noted window materials. Staff finds that the applicant should install windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

z. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building 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. Generally, staff finds that the new construction features architectural details that are traditional in nature and are found historically throughout the Lavaca Historic District.

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

bb. FRONT WALKWAY – The Guidelines for Site Elements note that new walkways should be consistent with those found historically throughout the district. The applicant has proposed straight sidewalks that are consistent in location with those found historically throughout the district. Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed concrete pavers as the proposed walkway material. The proposed pavers should feature a width that is consistent with the historic sidewalks found in the district.

Findings related to request item #3:

cc. To the southwest of the primary structure noted as request item #1, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story accessory structure featuring approximately 1,120 square feet.

dd. MASSING – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i. notes that new garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form. While there is not a principal historic structure on the lot, the proposed new construction of a primary structure is to feature two stories in height. Historic accessory structures throughout the district feature one story in height. Staff finds the construction of a two story accessory structure to be inappropriate. In addition to the proposed two story massing, the applicant has proposed to connect the primary and accessory structures via a second story walkway. Staff finds that the two masses should be separate.

ee. BUILDING SIZE – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii. note that accessory structure should not feature a footprint that is greater than forty (40) percent of that of the primary structure. Staff finds the footprint of the

June 21, 2017

proposed accessory structure generally appropriate.

ff. CHARACTER – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. note that new garages and outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the primary structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The applicant has proposed materials to include stucco and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the proposed roofing materials appropriate; however, staff recommends the applicant incorporate materials that are provide historic profiles, such as lap siding.

gg. WINDOWS & DOORS – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv. states that the design of window and door openings should be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district in terms of their spacing and proportions. Generally, the applicant’s window openings are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

hh. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed two single width garage doors. Staff finds the proposed width appropriate. The applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v. in regards to detailing and materials.

ii. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. state that the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Additionally, historic setback patterns of similar structures should be followed. The applicant has located the accessory structure at the rear of the property, where accessory structures are historically located. Staff finds the proposed location appropriate.

jj. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway, generally consistent with those found throughout the Lavaca Historic District. The proposed driveway should not exceed more than ten (10) feet in width.

Findings related to request item #4:

kk. To the south of the primary structure noted as request item #2, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story accessory structure featuring approximately, 520 square feet.

ll. MASSING – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i. notes that new garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form. While there is not a principal historic structure on the lot, the proposed new construction of a primary structure is to feature two stories in height. Historic accessory structures throughout the district feature one story in height. Staff finds the construction of a two story accessory structure to be inappropriate. In addition to the proposed two story massing, the applicant has proposed to connect the primary and accessory structures via a second story walkway. Staff finds that the two masses should be separate.

mm. BUILDING SIZE – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii. note that accessory structure should not feature a footprint that is greater than forty (40) percent of that of the primary structure. Staff finds the proposed footprint appropriate.

nn. CHARACTER – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. note that new garages and outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the primary structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The applicant has proposed materials to include stucco and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the proposed roofing materials appropriate; however, staff recommends the applicant incorporate materials that are provide historic profiles, such as lap siding.

oo. WINDOWS & DOORS – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv. states that the design of window and door openings should be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district in terms of their spacing and proportions. Generally, the applicant’s window openings are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

pp. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed two single width garage doors. Staff finds the proposed width appropriate. The applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v. in regards to detailing and materials.

qq. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. state that the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Additionally, historic setback patterns of similar structures should be followed. The applicant has located the accessory structure at the rear of the property, where accessory structures are historically located. Staff finds the proposed location appropriate.

rr. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway, generally consistent with those found throughout the Lavaca Historic District. The proposed driveway should not exceed more than ten (10) feet in width.

June 21, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #4. The overall scale, height, and massing should be reconsidered to conform to the historic design guidelines and reduce visual impacts to neighboring historic properties.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to move for approval as submitted.

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

NAYS: Guarino, Cone, Lazarine, Grube

THE MOTION CARRIED

39. HDRC NO. 2017-276

Applicant: Peter French/Rising Barn

Address: 2202 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a prefabricated structure on the lot at 2202 Broadway.

FINDINGS:

a. The lot at 2202 Broadway currently features a permanent structure to the far north of the lot and asphalt paving for parking for 28 automobiles and grassed landscaped areas throughout the remainder of the lot. The lot is bordered by Broadway to the west, Appler Street to the south and N Alamo to the east. A prefabricated structure has been installed on the site without a Certificate of Appropriateness and is the subject of this request.

b. **SITE DESIGN** – The site features asphalt paving which facilitates the parking of retail trailers. There are existing site elements that include grassed landscaping islands. At this time, the applicant has not proposed any modifications to the existing site regarding landscaping or parking.

c. **ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a 200 square foot structure near the southeastern corner of the lot. The applicant has proposed to orient the entrance of the structure toward the interior of the lot. Per the UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(a), two or more buildings on a site should be clustered to create open courtyard spaces. Additionally, the UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(b) notes that primary entrances should be oriented toward the street. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(b) in regards to entrance orientation.

d. **FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a "human scale" which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. Generally, the proposed structure features a human scale due to its small footprint. The proposed façade openings also relate to a human scale.

e. **FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT** – The rear of the structure, which fronts Appler features no façade separation or fenestration. This is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2).

f. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include stucco, corrugated metal panels and aluminum windows and doors. The applicant's proposed materials are consistent with the UDC.

g. **DECK** – Toward the interior of the site, the applicant has proposed a deck to serve as a courtyard sitting area and front porch. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

h. **WINDOWS** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2), windows help provide a human scale and should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls; windows should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them; windows shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the facade and grouped to establish rhythms. The proposed windows are consistent with the UDC.

i. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. The proposed structure features a utility box on the rear façade that faces Appler. This is not consistent with the UDC.

June 21, 2017

j. SIGNAGE – At this time, the applicant has not submitting information regarding the installation of signage for this structure. All signage must comply with the UDC Section 35-678.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install a primary entrance or orient the structure so that the primary entrance front Broadway or Appler.
- ii. That the applicant install fenestration on the current south elevation that currently lacks no elements that separate the façade.
- iii. That the applicant screen the mechanical equipment on the rear (south elevation).

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for approval, waving staff stipulations #1 & #2, and applying stipulation #3.

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

NAYS: Cone, Garza, Grube

THE MOTION CARRIED

40. HDRC NO. 2017-279

Applicant: Michael Frere/84 Lumber

Address: 327 RIVERSIDE DR
331 RIVERSIDE DR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 327 and 331 Riverside for 84 Lumber. The proposed sign is to include an overall height of sixteen feet and an overall width of eight feet. This sign is to replace the previously approved and installed monument sign.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 327/331 Riverside Drive is an industrial warehouse constructed circa 1955. The property is zoned industrial and is in the River Improvement Overlay, District 5. This property is not located within the Mission Historic District. At the November 2, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a monument sign that features an overall height of six (6) feet and an overall size of thirty-eight (38) square feet. The previously approved sign has been installed by the applicant.

b. HEIGHT – At this time, the applicant is requesting to install a new monument sign that is to include an overall height of sixteen (16) feet and an overall width of eight (8) feet. This sign is to replace the previously approved and installed monument sign. Per the UDC Section 35-678 (e), total signage for all applicant shall not exceed fifty (50) square feet unless additional square footage or signs is approved by the HDRC. Per the UDC Section 35-678(e)(4), freestanding signs shall be perpendicular to the street, two-sided and no taller than six (6) feet in height. The applicant's proposed height of sixteen (16) feet is not consistent with the UDC.

c. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed for the monument sign to feature an aluminum cabinet, internal illumination, vinyl graphics and red, white and blue colors. Regarding materials, lighting and colors, the proposed sign is consistent with the UDC Section 35-678(c).

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to move for approval with the stipulation that the sign be no more than 10ft in height.

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

NAYS:

June 21, 2017

THE MOTION CARRIED

41. HDRC NO. 2017-282

Applicant: Andrew Douglas/Douglas Architects

Address: 135 E COMMERCE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Modify the exterior staircase to directly connect to the River Walk. Direct access to the River Level Terrace of the Witte Building from E Commerce will no longer be provided.
2. Construct an elevator addition to the west side of the historic structure to be clad with stone cladding.
3. Remove the proposed metal balconies at the street level, second level and third floor balconies at all locations other than the proposed stair's landings. The rear balconies will remain.
4. Reduce the number and size of window openings on the west façade of the Witte Building.

FINDINGS:

- a. On October 16, 2013, the applicant received conceptual approval to rehabilitate the existing structure at 135 E Commerce, known as the Witte Building. Included in this conceptual approval was the restoration of the front (south) façade, the reconstruction of the historic decorative parapet wall, the removal of several rear additions, the construction of metal balconies on the north façade, the construction of a small, projecting balcony and a flat canopy at street level on the south façade and to remove an existing Hugman retaining wall and cantilevered walkway along the west side of the structure currently connecting E Commerce to an existing pedestrian bridge across the main river channel and construct a new pedestrian stair from E Commerce to the River Walk below. Stipulations for this approval included more detail be presented for final approval regarding the materials and installation method for the proposed balconies and the proposed street facing canopy.
- b. On December 3, 2014, the applicant received conceptual approval install a public/private elevator located in the southwest corner of the property. The applicant stated at that time that the proposed elevator would serve visitors to the San Antonio River Walk as well patrons of the Witte Building and that the owner was pursuing continual public access to the elevator. Stipulations for this approval included that the owner and operator of the proposed elevator offer continual elevator access to the public in order to facilitate pedestrian traffic from E Commerce to the River Walk level below, that the applicant address and provide more information regarding potential queuing at the elevator entrance on the River Walk level and that the applicant explore alternatives regarding the overall design and materials to mitigate the blocked view from the Witte Building's third story window, the use of complementary materials and the inclusion of a canopy (this canopy is not to be confused with the proposed and conceptually approved canopy attached to the existing structure's E Commerce façade).
- c. At the July 15, 2016, HDRC hearing, the HDRC approved the design with the stipulations that the applicant coordinate with the City of San Antonio Center City Development & Operations Department regarding public access to the proposed elevator and that an archaeological investigation is required.
- d. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 14, 2016, where committee members asked questions regarding the proposed stair circulation at the river level, the distance between the stair and elevator for a pedestrian path, proposed materials for both the stair and elevator tower and proposed landscaping materials for the green screen. Committee members expressed concern regarding the success of a proposed green screen, the materials used for the proposed elevator and stair tower and the queuing of pedestrians at the elevator entrance on the River Walk level.
- e. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on October 12, 2016. At that meeting, committee members discussed the updated proposals to the green screen, questioned the elevator's door orientation, noted that the stair seemed to be an intrusion on the River Walk and asked questions regarding the existing circulation at the River Walk level.
- f. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed design modifications noted in finding d and e was heard by the HDRC on November 2, 2016. At that time, the elevator structure predominately featured an exposed steel frame construction with "green" screen plantings facing E Commerce Street.
- g. Following the conceptual approval, the applicant participated in a number of consultations with Texas Historical Commission and National Park Service staff regarding the project's eligibility for State and Federal Historic Tax Credits. After receiving comments, the applicant's current proposal removes the previously-approved vegetation screen from the proposed elevator tower and has proposed a new cladding system. Staff supports the efforts of the applicant to utilize historic tax credits for the rehabilitation of this property. The Witte Building is positioned prominently on the River Walk at an important pedestrian access point. With the proposed modifications to the previously-approved design, there is new concern with the visual dominance of the new elevator on the River Walk.
- h. ELEVATOR CLADDING – In order to provide a cladding material that relates to the exterior materials of the Witte Building, the applicant has proposed the addition of cast-stone cladding with limited glass fenestrations per recommendation by the THC. With the additional cladding, the elevator now obstructs views of the Witte

June 21, 2017

Building and is more visually massive on the street. Staff finds that the previous exposed steel frame allowed for greater transparency and a lighter appearance. According to the historic design guidelines, new additions should be visually subordinate to the historic building and distinguishable as a contemporary element without distracting from the original structure. Staff does not find that the currently-proposed elevator is successful in this aspect. The applicant, in consultation with the THC, should explore additional options which increase the amount of fenestration and overall transparency and reduce the visual impact of the masonry cladding system. For example, portions of masonry could be grouped at the street and river levels with a more open and transparent structure at the 2nd and 3rd levels to preserve views of the Witte Building. Furthermore, while staff understands that the addition of a masonry component may result in an improved relationship between the elevator and the Witte Building, the proposed cast stone introduces a new material that is not currently found in the Witte Building. The addition of brick as a masonry component would be more consistent with the materials found in the Witte Building and would be more appropriate.

i. STAIR MODIFICATION – The applicant received final approval to construct a stair that would feature a River Walk level landing that did not impede on the public right of way, nor pose a threat to the facilitation of pedestrian traffic passing by the Witte Building. At this time, the applicant has proposed the River Walk level landing to the west of the pedestrian walkway with the stair case extending over the pedestrian walkway. This design would utilize an existing planting strip and funnel pedestrian traffic between the proposed stair case and the proposed elevator tower. Staff finds that the newly proposed location of the stair landing could potentially impede the flow of pedestrian traffic in the public right of way. The applicant has previously noted that the landing requirements of six (6) feet in depth between the elevator or building access point and the River Walk pathway has been met; however, the applicant should provide a dimensioned drawing to staff for verification.

j. ELEVATOR TOWER HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to construct the elevator tower addition to be less than the height of the primary historic structure, the Witte Building. Originally, the proposed elevator tower was to feature a reduced height as to not obscure historic window openings on the west façade of the Witte Building; however, it has since been increased in height and was conceptually approved at this increased height. At its current height of thirty-three (33) feet, staff the elevator tower appropriate; however, staff has concerns regarding the visual weight massing that will be exposed with the newly proposed stone cladding system.

k. ELEVATOR MODIFICATION – Previously, staff noted that an elevator which featured an entrance facing the pedestrian right of way at the Riverwalk level would promote queuing in the public right of way, which is prohibited by the UDC Section 35-672(a)(5). Additionally per UDC Section 35-672(p) a landing that is at minimum six (6) feet in depth shall be provided between an elevator or building access point or doorway and the River Walk pathway. The width of the landing shall further comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) and/or TAS (Texas Accessibility Standards) requirements. As noted in finding h, the applicant is to provide documents to staff noting that this requirement has been met. If the applicant is unable to meet this requirement, a variance will be required.

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

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

n. ARCHAEOLOGY – ARCHAEOLOGY- The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the Spanish Colonial Potrero. In addition, it is adjacent to the San Antonio River and the Main and Military Plazas National Register of Historic Places District. The project area is also in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX483 and 41BX984. Furthermore, a review of historic archival maps places structures within or adjacent to the property as early as 1767. Thus, the property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval at this time. Staff recommends that the proposed masonry cladding system of the elevator be greatly reduced in order to maintain a predominately transparent appearance. Staff also recommends that a more compatible masonry component, such as brick, be explored. Staff supports the applicant's efforts and will work diligently with the THC to reach a design solution that is respectful of this sensitive location and maintains project's eligibility for historic tax credits.

ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

June 21, 2017

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to move for approval as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Garcia, Brittain, 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 6:45 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair