

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
July 19, 2017**

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

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

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - STAR - 228 Dashiell - July 24 and 25
 - Rehabber Club Wood Window Repair Certification Course - August 18-19 - 458 Furr Drive
 - Historic Homeowner Fair - Saturday, August 26 - Pearl Stable - 9:30 AM - 3:00 PM
 - Living Heritage Symposium - September 7 and 8
 - Restored by Light - September 8 - Mission Concepcion - 8:30 PM

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-337 | 317 CEDAR ST |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-151 | 119 ADAMS |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-335 | 422 SHERMAN ST |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-331 | 1014 ST MARYS |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-358 | 1014 ST MARYS |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-350 | 401 S ALAMO |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-349 | 303 DONALDSON AVE |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-348 | 2213 N ST MARYS |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-334 | 621 CENTER ST |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-341 | 1201 E CROCKETT ST |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-347 | 102 NAVARRO ST |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-344 | 211 W FRENCH PLACE |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-342 | 111 DANIEL ST |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-355 | 130 E TRAVIS ST |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-346 | 117 E FRENCH PLACE |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-345 | 325 E PARK AVE |

Items # 12 & #15 were pulled for citizens to be heard. Item #13 was pulled from consent by staff. Item #11 was postponed by the applicant prior to the meeting.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2017-344

Applicant: George Vaughn/RVK Architects

Address: 211 W FRENCH PLACE

July 19, 2017

REQUEST:

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

1. Closure and redevelopment of two closed city streets interior to the proposed development.
2. Construction of a new porte-cochere with an extended covered walkway.
3. Construction of a one-story 2,500 square foot pavilion.
4. Construction of a playground.
5. Addition of 117 on-site parking spaces.
6. Addition of perimeter and interior lot fencing to match the existing fencing along the perimeter of the campus.
7. Landscaping modifications.
8. Rehabilitation of an existing 2-story historic structure.

FINDINGS:

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

HDRC on June 7, 2017 with the following stipulations:

1. **That the applicant explores ways to extend the interior walkway through the proposed parking lot to the public right-of-way to engage the pedestrian streetscape;** this stipulation has been met in the current submission. The applicant has noted that there is a delineated sidewalk that extends to W French Place as provided in the submission, but that the owner has a strong desire to not have a direct path through the parking portion of the property. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given the sidewalk provided and the programmatic context of the development.
2. **That the applicant consider reducing the length of the proposed covered walkway to the east to provide more space between the existing historic Carriage House and the covered walkway structure;** this stipulation has been met in this submission.
3. **That the applicant explores ways to differentiate the new architectural elements from the existing campus structures. This may be achieved through a slight variation in finish, color, texture, or another material transition that differentiates this phase of the campus as new;** this stipulation has been met in the submission.
4. **That the applicant provides a full landscape plan for final approval that indicate the dimensions of site setbacks and the locations of all new and remaining trees and plantings;** this stipulation has been met in this submission.

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

c. **PORTE-COCHERE AND COVERED WALKWAY** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new portecochere and a covered walkway. The porte-cochere will be located adjacent to the existing campus and serve as a drop off zone and transition point for churchgoers. The covered walkway is proposed to provide outdoor programmatic space, even in inclement weather. The design will be similar to the existing construction of the existing church and campus, and will feature standing seam metal hipped roofs and metal vertical posts for support. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style of the site or block should be incorporated. Additionally, details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures. Since the submission for conceptual approval, the applicant has pulled the walkway away from the historic Carriage House structure to spatially define their independent locations. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. **PAVILION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new 2,500 square foot one-story pavilion. The pavilion design will be similar to the existing construction of the existing church and campus, and will feature a standing seam metal hipped roof, metal roof dormers, and cast stone vertical posts for support. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style of the site or block should be incorporated. Additionally, details should be simple in design and

July 19, 2017

should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

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

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

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

h. **LANDSCAPING MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing landscape to include new native shrubbery, green space, trees, and ground cover. Approximately 15 large trees and 29 mid-sized trees will be planted, to include Texas Redbud, Pink Crape Myrtle, Lacey Oak, Live Oak, Texas Mountain Laurel, and Cedar Elm. An eight foot wide planting bed will be installed along Russell St. Additionally, the large trees planted along W French Place will set back 10 feet from the curb to provide parking lot shading and comply with the Parking Lot Shading requirement of the local landscaping ordinance. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

i. **HISTORIC STRUCTURE: REHABILITATION** – The applicant has proposed to rehabilitate an existing historic carriage house on the property. The 2-story brick structure was designed in the Queen Anne style and features a cross-gabled roof with a second story hipped roof dormer and lapped wood shingles in the dormers. The rehabilitation will include the stripping of paint from the brick, repair and replacement in-kind of the brick, rehabilitation of historic

j. **HISTORIC STRUCTURE: ROOF REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing composite shingle roof on the existing carriage house with a new standing seam metal roof. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations, roofs should be replaced in-kind unless an alternative roofing material was used historically on the structure, either as determined by historic evidence or based on the architectural style of the structure. Queen Anne structures of this configuration commonly had standing steam metal roofs. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends final approval of the proposal based on findings a through j.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

July 19, 2017

13. HDRC NO. 2017-342

Applicant: Raul Inclan Jr., Lisa Gomez

Address: 111 DANIEL ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Install a front yard, wrought iron fence and front driveway gate to feature four (4) feet in height.
2. Install a side yard fence on the east side of the property to feature horizontally oriented fence boards and six (6) feet in height.
3. Install a rear and side yard fence (north and west side) to feature horizontally oriented fence boards and eight (8) feet in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 111 Daniel was constructed circa 1910 and is found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features Folk Victorian architectural elements, is contributing to the Nathan Historic District and is located adjacent to a both a side and rear alley. At this time, the applicant has proposed to replace the existing chain link fencing with new, wrought iron and wood privacy fencing.
- b. WROUGHT IRON FENCE – In the front yard, the applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence that is to extend parallel to the public right of way sidewalk and extend slightly down the side property lines. The applicant has proposed a black, wrought iron fence to feature four (4) feet in height. The proposed fence will feature two top rails with no pickets extending past the top most rail. Wrought iron fences found throughout the Nathan Historic District features top rails with pickets that extend three to five inches above the top rail. Staff finds that the applicant should install a fence with a profile that is more consistent with the historic examples found in the district.
- c. PRIVACY FENCING – Along the eastern property line, the applicant has proposed to install a wood privacy fence to feature six (6) feet in height. The proposed privacy fence will feature a portion located within the side yard to extend from the fence at the property line to the side of the historic structure. Regarding the proposed design, the applicant has proposed to install horizontally oriented wood pickets. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.v., new fences should be constructed of materials that are similar in scale, texture, color and form as those found historically in the district. Staff finds that a fence with horizontally oriented pickets is not appropriate for the Nathan Historic District, where horizontally oriented, historic fencing pickets are not found.
- d. PRIVACY FENCING – Along the rear (northern) and side (western) property lines and alleys, the applicant has proposed to install a privacy fence to feature eight (8) feet in height. Regarding the proposed design, the applicant has proposed to install horizontally oriented wood pickets. Per the UDC Section 35-514, the maximum height for side and rear yard fenced is six (6) feet in height with the exception of properties with side or rear lot lines which abut an alley with a classification other than a local street or are located on a side or rear lot line of a single family lot which abuts a multi-family or commercial use. Staff finds the proposed eight (8) feet in height to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed privacy fence should not exceed four (4) feet in height until a point at which is it behind the side window on the west façade of the historic structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding b with the stipulation that the applicant install a wrought iron fence that features pickets that extend above the top rail.

Staff recommends approval of item #2 based on finding c with the stipulation that the applicant install vertically oriented privacy fence pickets.

Staff recommends approval of item #3 based on finding d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install vertically oriented privacy fence pickets.
- ii. That the proposed fence does not exceed more than four (4) feet in height until it passes the side window.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garza for approval of a four foot tall wrought iron fence in the front yard as submitted. Approval of a six foot tall privacy fence with horizontal fence boards on the east property line. Approval of an eight foot tall privacy fence with horizontal fence boards on the west property line until the front of the house where the fence is to drop to six feet in height. This approval includes the installation of a driveway gate to feature horizontal boards on the east side of the property.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

July 19, 2017

15. HDRC NO. 2017-346

Applicant: Mickey Conrad/LPA Inc.

Address: 117 E FRENCH PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to include the following scope of work:

1. Construction of a new 2-story gymnasium and fine arts facility.
2. Widening of an existing curb cut and entrance gate at E French Place.
3. Modifications to landscaping and hardscaping.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 117 E French Place is the campus of the San Antonio Academy. The property contains several structures, including a 1891 Queen Anne residential structure designed by architect J Reily Gordon; a 1890 Neoclassical residential structure; several carriage houses dating to the early 1900's; and several modern academic facilities. The applicant has proposed to construct a new fine arts and gymnasium facility at the location of an existing facility, constructed approximately 1977, which was determined to be non-contributing by staff on July 7, 2017. The proposed facility closely matches the footprint of the existing facility, totaling approximately 14,500 square feet. The structure will be two stories and feature a primary cross-gable roof form with subordinate shed roofs on the north and south facades. Materials will closely match those of the surrounding academic facilities, including a red standing seam metal roof, aluminum windows and canopies, and a stucco façade finish. The facility will be visible from McCullough Ave, E French Place, and a north alley, but will be set back from each right-of-way by a minimum of 30-40 feet.
- 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 – 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 historic examples or master site plans. The proposed structure is set back slightly from the adjacent modern facility to the north, and closely matches the south setback of the existing non-contributing structure to be demolished. The west side of the proposed structure appears to abut the neighboring facility. Campus buildings located to the northwest are also located directly adjacent to each other. Staff finds that the setbacks are consistent with established patterns and configurations on the campus.
- d. ORIENTATION & ENTRANCES – The applicant has proposed to orient the structure primarily towards the south. The main entrance will be accessed by existing and modified hardscaping and landscaping, which connects pedestrians to an existing parking lot to the east and additional campus buildings to the west. Secondary access will be provided at multiple access points on the north façade, which also faces an existing parking lot. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the existing contextual relationships on the campus.
- e. SCALE & MASS – The applicant has proposed a 2-story structure. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The proposed massing is consistent with neighboring academic facilities on the campus, as well as the former facility that it will be replacing. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.
- f. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Throughout this block, the foundation heights of historic structures are between two and three feet. The elevations for the front unit indicated a foundation height of two (2) feet. The foundation height for the rear 3-story units appears to be less than one foot per the submitted drawings. Staff finds that the front, 2-and-a-half story unit has a foundation height consistent with the Guidelines, but the applicant's proposed foundation height for the rear structures is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a primary cross-gable roof form with secondary shed roofs on the north and south facades to delineate entrances. The primary gable will be at its highest point to the south at the main entrance, and will step down at the interior transition from classrooms to a gymnasium. This height transition fronts the McCullough Ave view shed. Guideline 2.B.i for New Construction states that roof forms, including pitch, overhangs, and orientation, should be consistent with those predominantly found on the block. The roof form appears to respond to both neighboring modern academic facilities and the residential types found on both the campus and in the surrounding district. The roof form is a modern interpretation of gabled structures characteristic of the Monte Vista Historic District, and its execution limits the perception of its mass from the street view. Staff finds the roof form appropriate given the existing context of the campus facility and the surrounding district.

July 19, 2017

h. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window as compared to nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed several window and door openings that generally feature sizes that are found on historic structures, particularly the second floor windows with dividing mutins. The applicant has also incorporated modern aluminum curtain wall windows and brise soleil elements for shading. These modern window configurations are concentrated primarily at the south entrance. Additionally, the applicant has introduced a wall treatment below several of the second floor windows, where the wall slants inward from the primary finish elevation and meets the bottom rail of the second story windows, which are inset. This adds the illusion of depth and façade variation where windows are absent due to the interior function of the gymnasium. Staff finds the proposed window configurations appropriate given the modern nature of the structure.

i. **MATERIALS** – Based on the submitted renderings, the applicant is proposing to utilize a red standing seam metal roof, aluminum windows and canopies, and a stucco facade. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, materials should complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Additionally, materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. Contemporary interpretations of traditional materials are encouraged. Based on the existing materials found within the San Antonio Academy campus, staff finds the proposed materials acceptable for the location and the surrounding district context. However, given the mass of the McCullough façade, staff recommends that the applicant explore alternative material treatments or patterns to add visual interest and visually minimize the mass from the public right-of-way.

j. **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 applicant has proposed to incorporate traditional design elements, such as a cross-gable roof form and a stucco façade, with modern architectural details, including a curtain wall window system and aluminum brise soleil elements. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

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

l. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not provided staff with a comprehensive landscaping plan at this time, but has conceptually indicated the intended landscaping approach in the submitted rendered site plan. The applicant should explore options that reduce hardscaping and incorporate an increase landscape buffer from the McCullough right-of-way to be more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. The applicant is responsible for submitting a complete landscaping plan that indicates the location and species of any planting elements to remain, as well as the location and species of any new landscaping elements, prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

m. **HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has not provided staff with a comprehensive hardscaping plan at this time, but has conceptually indicated the intended hardscaping approach in the submitted rendered site plan. Hardscaping modifications will be concentrated at the south entrance of the new facility to accommodate the front entrance and building orientation. The applicant is responsible for submitting a complete hardscaping plan that indicates all materials, locations, and dimensions to the HDRC for final approval.

n. **CURB CUT MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has indicated on the application that the scope of work will include the widening of the curb cut and entrance gate at the E French Place entrance. Staff has not yet received drawings or photographs that indicate the existing conditions of the curb cut and entrance gate, nor detailed plans or elevations for the proposed modifications. The applicant is responsible for submitting this information for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- a. That the applicant explores differentiation in material or a change of pattern on the McCullough elevation to add interest and visually minimize the scale of the structure.
- b. That the applicant submits all material specifications and treatment as noted in finding i.
- c. That the applicant submits a comprehensive landscaping and hardscaping plan for final approval as noted in findings l and m.
- d. That the applicant explores ways to minimize any curb cut modifications to the E French Place entrance as noted in finding n to retain any historic configurations. The applicant should furnish drawings and photographs of existing conditions, along with the new proposal, for consideration for final approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Tony Garcia spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

July 19, 2017

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

17. HDRC NO. 2017-248

Applicant: Mark Tolley/Mission DG, LTD

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

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval amend a previously approved design to include modified roof design, foundation heights, modified site designs, the relocation of the swimming pool, site parking, the elimination of one structure and façade modifications to include a redesign of structures G and F.

FINDINGS:

- a. The St. John's Seminary campus first opened at this location in 1920 with the construction of the main, 3-story building located to the northeast of Mission Concepcion. A second building, Margil Hall, was constructed in 1935 to the rear of the main seminary building. St. Mary's Hall, to the north along Mitchell Street, was constructed in 1949. Several other buildings were constructed after 1951, including the chapel immediately to the east of the Mission Concepcion. Other site features include an allée of trees between Mission Road and the main seminary building, multiple sports courts and a historic koi pond.
- b. Mission Concepcion and the San Antonio Missions are an extremely significant cultural resource for the City of San Antonio. The Missions are the only World Heritage Site in the State of Texas and one of only a few listed structures in the United States. The historically significant St John's Seminary site was included in the nomination of the Missions as part of the World Heritage Buffer. The City and its partners are dedicated stewards to these important sites and have put in place a number of tools to ensure compatible development within the buffer zone. The Mission Protection Overlay Districts were submitted as a critical component to the World Heritage nomination for the Missions which ultimately gained approval from UNESCO.
- c. The applicant received final approval to construct seven new structures in addition to the demolition of accessory structures and the rehabilitation of St Mary's Hall, Drossaerts Hall and Margil Hall at the August 17, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with stipulations that a salvaging plan be provided for structures at 203 and 205 Felisa, that each vinyl window be inset at least 1 inch within each wall, that a detailed landscaping plan be submitted to staff, that the archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts and that the development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- d. UPDATED DESIGN – Several changes to the approved 2016 design are proposed. The applicant has claimed that an increased grade for the overall site is required to remedy drainage issues. This change has resulted in an overall increase in building heights as they related to the Mission Protection Overlay District. However, documentation that substantiates this claim has not been submitted for review. Other changes to the proposal include minor relocation of site elements and consolidation of smaller buildings.
- e. MISSION PROTECTION OVERLAY DISTRICT – This project falls within the MPOD-1 and complied with the height regulations under the previously approved design. The revised design exceeds the height regulations in several areas. In order to mitigate the non-compliance with the height regulations, the applicant explored the use of a flat roof design with low parapet wall, but is currently proposing a sloped roof that exceeds the height restrictions by several feet. The HDRC has discretion to recommend exceptions to the height requirements where special circumstances, such as existing visual obstructions, exist. If the revised building designs receive a Certificate of Appropriateness, a building permit shall not be issued unless the project is awarded a variance from the Board of Adjustment.
- f. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 31, 2017. Revised drawings, which indicated a flat roof design in order to more closely conform to the height requirements, were presented. A committee member indicated preference for the original roof design which was more in keeping with the historic buildings on the St John's Seminary campus. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on June 13, 2017, where committee members commented that amendments to the previously approved design should be shown throughout, noted that instances where the MPOD was encroached upon should be clearly shown and noted that the proposed buildings are set back to the furthest extent possible from the mission.
- g. SITE VISIT – DRONE DEMONSTRATION – Office of Historic Preservation staff met on site with members of the development team, a representative from the District 3 Council Office and other stakeholders on June 23, 2017, for a drone demonstration regarding proposed building heights in relationship to Mission Concepcion. The drone rose to the height of each building corner and was not visible from the marker in front of Mission Concepcion. In many cases, the drone was not visible from the marker in front of the mission at heights of more than one hundred feet. The demonstration provided substantial evidence that the visual impacts of the proposed new construction would be mitigated by the existing visual obstructions of historic buildings and vegetation.

July 19, 2017

Screen captures of the verified drone locations for the demonstration are provided in the exhibits.

- h. LANDSCAPING – The applicant previously submitted and received approval of both landscaping and tree preservation plans at the August 17, 2016, HDRC hearing. These documents included proposed parking located at the corner of E Mitchell and Mission Road and internally within the site to be surrounded by the proposed new construction and existing historic structures. The applicant also received approval to install new fencing to serve as a buffer between the proposed parking lot and the public right of way.
- i. MATERIALS – At the August 17, 2016, HDRC hearing, the applicant received approval for the use of materials that included cement plaster, Hardi board and batten siding, vinyl windows and doors, cast stone trim, wood trim and barrel tile roofing. The applicant has noted as of June 2017, that casement windows will be included as opposed to the previous divided light windows. Staff finds this appropriate.
- j. RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C. in regards to the relationship of solids to voids, the applicant has proposed a façade arrangement which features proportionately sized windows and facades which feature a base, midsection and cap. Staff finds the previously approved design as well as the proposed modifications addressed below to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. LOT COVERAGE – With the construction of multiple new structures, the applicant will be covering a large percentage of the available lot space, however, the existing Seminary structures provide the precedent with a campus-like design. Staff finds the applicant's proposed site design appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction D.i.
- l. SETBACKS – The applicant has presented a site plan which uniquely positions each new structure to have a setback that is consistent throughout the site, be oriented toward both the interior courtyard as well as address each street and feature primary entrance orientations that are situated to respond to the automobile circulation of the site. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.
- m. ARCHAEOLOGY-The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the local Mission Historic District, the Mission Parkway National Register of Historic Places District, the Mission Concepcion National Register of Historic Places District, and the recorded Battle of Concepcion battlefield area. Furthermore, the project footprint is within the site boundaries of previously recorded archaeological site 41BX12, which is also a registered State Antiquities Landmark (SAL). Under state law, the SAL designation mandates that the development project will require coordination with the Texas Historical Commission prior to the commencement of construction efforts. In addition, as illustrated on historic maps, the property is traversed by the Pajalache or Concepcion Acequia, a registered National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark. Human remains have also been recorded next to this project area, and could possibly extend into the property. The development project shall comply with the Health and Safety Code of Texas, a state law regarding human remains. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts. Archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area.

Findings related to site design modifications:

- n. SWIMMING POOL RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate the previously approved swimming pool location away from Drossaerts Hall to a more centralized location on the site. Staff finds this relocation appropriate and a minor change to the original approval.
- o. ADDITIONAL PARKING AREA – At the corner of Kalteyer and E Mitchell, a smaller building on the corner has been eliminated and replaced with additional surface parking lots. The applicant has noted that the previously approved structure has been removed to address utility and traffic concerns. The applicant has proposed to buffer this parking from the public right of way. However, staff finds that the smaller building at this corner contributed to the human scale of the overall development, and was an important buffer between the street edge and threestory buildings. The previously-approved configuration is more appropriate.

Findings related to building design modifications:

- p. BUILDINGS G & F MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to modify buildings G and F to move them further to the east on the site and away from Margill Hall. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and that through this modification the general size and massing will not be increased in a manner that will be inappropriate.
- q. ROOF DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to modify a previously approved roof design, building footprints, façade arrangements and foundation heights. Generally, the design merit and overall design has not been modified in a manner that removes it from the original design aspect. Regarding roof design, the currently proposed roof design is generally consistent with those originally proposed in regards to form and materials.
- r. FAÇADE ARRANGEMENTS – The applicant has proposed updated facades that include board and batten siding, stucco, protruding balconies and railings, casement windows, double doors, shed roof balcony canopies and small arched openings. Staff finds the proposed updates to be generally consistent with the originally approved design and to exhibit the original design's merit.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Mission Concepcion and the San Antonio Missions are an extremely significant cultural resource for the City of San Antonio. The Missions are the only World Heritage Site in the State of Texas and one of only a few listed structures in the United States. The historically significant St John's Seminary site was included in the nomination of the Missions as part of the World Heritage Buffer. The City and its partners are dedicated stewards to these important sites and have put in place a number of tools to ensure compatible development within the buffer zone. The Mission Protection Overlay Districts were submitted as a critical component to the World Heritage nomination for the Missions which ultimately

July 19, 2017

gained approval from UNESCO.

Staff recommends that the new construction complies with the height requirements of the Mission Protection Overlay Districts. However, the HDRC has the authority to recommend an exception to the height restrictions in unique circumstances where an application is in keeping with the spirit of the overlay district. The MPOD intent is to minimize visual impact of new construction from the experience of visiting the missions. The applicant has demonstrated that the existing vegetation and historic buildings on the site would mitigate any negative visual impacts to Mission Concepcion. Staff believes based on this evidence that the new buildings will not be visible from the Mission and that the intent of the Mission Protection Overlay District is met by this proposal. If the HDRC recommends approval of the current proposal, then a variance from the height restrictions must also be approved by the Board of Adjustment prior to issuance of a construction permit.

If the HDRC recommends approval, the following stipulations are to apply:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Brady Alexander, Rhett Smith & Lance Aaron all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request. Patti Zaiontz spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Cone move for approval of the amended design including building heights with staff's stipulations that include the requirement for archaeological investigations and the amendment of façade materials to include more stucco and less board and batten siding to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit..

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

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Garza

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2017-207

Applicant: Tyler Sibley/Pursuant Ventures

Address: 325 W MISTLETOE

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove and replace an original 6 over 1 window on the primary façade with a new 1 over 1 window.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 325 W Mistletoe a single-family home designed in the Craftsman Bungalow style and is estimated to be constructed between 1930 and 1935. The property appears on a Sanborn map in 1935.
- b. **WINDOW REMOVAL** – The original 6 over 1 window, located directly to the right of the property's main entrance, has been removed and replaced without approval. Administrative approval was granted to repair the original window on August 12, 2016. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved unless deteriorated beyond repair. The proposed removal and reuse of the 6 over 1 window is not appropriate.
- c. **HISTORIC TAX CREDIT VERIFICATION** – The window was previously deemed repairable when approved for Historic Tax Credit Certification on December 7, 2016. The property is currently in violation for requirements for final Historic Tax Credit Verification and is not eligible for the incentive unless the original window or a salvaged 6 over 1 window is returned in place of the new window.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on findings a through c.

CASE COMMENTS:

- Staff conducted a site visit on February 18, 2017, and noted that the window had already been removed and replaced without approval.
- The applicant requested Historic Tax Certification (case no. 2016-483) and was heard by the HDRC on

July 19, 2017

December 7, 2017. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 were met and the application was approved as submitted. Approval of Historic Tax Verification is contingent on consistency with all approvals and permits. Currently, the property is in violation and is not eligible to receive the incentive.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Cone out at 4:30 PM

19. HDRC NO. 2017-339

Applicant: Luis Garibay

Address: 437 DEVINE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform exterior modifications to the primary historic structure including modifications to the historic window fenestration.
2. Replace all existing, historic windows.
3. Install a new dormer on the west roof slope.
4. Enclose an existing porch door opening.
5. Construct a rear, first floor deck.
6. Construct a rear, two story addition.
7. Construct an accessory structure in the rear yard.
8. Install rear yard privacy fencing.
9. Install a front yard walkway.
10. Install a rear yard driveway to connect the primary driveway to the rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 437 Devine was constructed circa 1925 in the Craftsman style and is a contributing structure to the Lavaca Historic District. The structure features front facing gabled roofs, exposed brackets and rafter tails. Since its construction, the front porch has been partially enclosed creating two entrances, one on each side of what exists of the front porch. This modification does not appear on the 1951 Sanborn Map.
- b. A stop work order was issued on June 8, 2017, for work without a Certificate of Appropriateness which included fenestration modifications, the removal of the original front porch columns, a front porch knee wall, the removal of the original, wood windows, the removal of historic, wood siding and the construction of a rear addition.
- c. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS & WINDOW REMOVAL– The applicant has proposed exterior modifications which include the removal of the existing, original wood windows and the modification of window openings to facilitate the installation of large picture windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A. notes that existing window and door opening should be preserved. Additionally, historic wood windows should be preserved. The removal of the existing wood windows and modifications to the existing and original fenestration is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds the applicant should restore the structure to its previous state and install wood windows to match the profile of the originals that were removed.
- d. DOOR ENCLOSURE – The applicant has proposed to enclose a side, porch door. Staff finds the removal of this door opening appropriate given that it is not original to the structure and does not directly address the street as a street facing door would.
- e. DORMER INSTALLATION – On the western roof slope, the applicant has proposed to install a new dormer. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iii., new dormers should be located on non-primary facades and should be compatible with the architecture of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed dormer to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. REAR DECK – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a wood deck to feature a footprint of approximately 200 square feet. The height of the deck will match that of the foundation of the primary historic structure. Staff finds this installation to be minimal and appropriate.

July 19, 2017

- g. **ADDITION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition with both a first floor and attic level. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed a ridgeline and roof form that are consistent with that of the primary historic structure. Generally, the proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions; however, staff finds that a detail should be incorporated into the siding to differentiate the addition from the primary historic structure.
- h. **SCALE, MASS AND FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof height that matches that of the primary historic structure and a width that matches that of the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed a footprint that is appropriate for the square footage of the lot.
- i. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood siding, vinyl windows and an asphalt shingle roof. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. materials that match in type, color and texture of those found on the historic structure should be used in additions. Staff finds the use of wood siding and asphalt shingles to be appropriate; however, staff finds the use of vinyl windows to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that wood, or aluminum clad wood windows that feature a profile that matches those of the primary historic structure to be appropriate.
- j. **TRANSITION** – As noted in finding f, the applicant has not proposed a detailed to signify the transition from the historic structure to the rear addition. Staff finds that a vertical trim piece should be used at the connection of the two structures.
- k. **REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear accessory structure on an existing concrete slab. The 1951 Sanborn Map shows a chicken hatchery in the rear yard. The historic pattern for accessory structures on this block of Devine is to locate them in the northeast corner of the lot. This lot, however, features an accessory structure in the middle of the lot as well as one in the northeast corner.
- l. **REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that accessory structures should be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure in regards to height, massing and form, should be no larger in plan than forty percent of the primary historic structure's footprint, should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic structure, should feature window and door openings consistent with those found on historic accessory structures in the district and should feature garage doors that are similar to those found historically in the district. Generally, the applicant's proposed accessory structure is consistent with the Guidelines; however, the proposed garage door is not appropriate. Staff finds that two garage doors profiled and dimensioned similarly to historic carriage and garage doors should be installed.
- m. **PRIVACY FENCING** – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to install a wood privacy fence. Staff finds the location and materials appropriate. The proposed fence is not to exceed six (6) feet in height.
- n. **FRONT YARD SIDEWALK** – The applicant has proposed a front yard sidewalk to extend from the sidewalk at the public right of way, to the front porch and then east to the side driveway. There was previously the original front yard sidewalk as well as a sidewalk that ran to the east and west of the front yard sidewalk that were removed. Staff finds the proposed sidewalk of concrete pavers featuring 7' – 6" and 2' – 6" in width neither appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant reinstall the front yard sidewalk leading from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way to match the profile, width and materials as those found historically on Devine. The use of pavers of a matching width to lead to the side yard may be appropriate and should be submitted to staff for approval prior to installation.
- o. **DRIVEWAY** – The lot currently features a driveway on the east side of the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed to install a rear yard driveway to connect the existing driveway to the proposed rear accessory structure. Staff finds the installation of a driveway at this location to be appropriate; however, staff finds that a pervious material should be used in place of concrete, per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2, modifications to window fenestration and replacing the historic wood windows based on findings c and d. Staff recommends the restore the existing front porch columns and knee wall and infill the wall with appropriate windows to return the structure to its existing condition.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 through #8, enclosing the installation of a new dormer, enclosing an existing porch door opening, the construction of a rear deck and addition, the construction of a rear accessory structure and privacy fencing with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant include a vertical trim piece to serve as a transition between the existing structure and addition as noted in finding j.
- ii. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows that feature a profile that matches those of the primary historic structure to be appropriate as noted in finding i.
- iii. That the applicant install garage doors that are profiled similar to historic garage and carriage doors found in the district to include materials and width as noted in finding l.
- iv. That the rear privacy fence does not exceed six (6) feet in height.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #9, the installation of a front yard walkway, based on finding n. Staff finds that the applicant should install a concrete walkway to match that which was removed and to be consistent with those

July 19, 2017

found historically on Devine.

Staff recommends approval of item #10, the installation of a rear yard driveway, based on finding o with the stipulation that the applicant install a pervious paving material in place of concrete.

CASE COMMENT:

A stop work order was issued on June 8, 2017, for work without a Certificate of Appropriateness. All post work application fees have been paid

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Stephanie Faulkner spoke in opposition to the applicant's request

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of items #1 and #2 based on updated construction documents that comply with the Guidelines and staff's recommendation. Approval of items #3 through #8 with staff's stipulations. Approval of item #9 with staff's stipulations. Approval of item #10 with staff's stipulations. Craftsman detailing must be installed on the replacement columns.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2017-336

Applicant: Rene Fernandez

Address: 709 S ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear patio at the rear of the historic structure and an existing patio.
2. Paint the historic structure a bright yellow.
3. Install window cling signage on the primary entrance double doors. The clings are 15.5 inches in width and 52.5 inches in height and read "Azuca Sabor Latino".
4. Install wall signage on the front façade to read "Restaurant" to be neon lit and feature 10 inches in height and 7' – 5" in length.
5. Install wall signage on the front façade to read "Bar – Latino" to be neon lit and to feature 10 inches in height and 10'-4" in length.
6. Install a free-standing sign to the north (right) of the primary entrance to feature internal illumination, 11 feet in height and twenty-nine inches in width.
7. Install two wall sconces on each side of the storefront system.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 709 S Alamo was constructed circa 1910 and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features a brick façade with a castellated parapet wall on the street façade and a wood storefront system featuring a recessed entrance. The structure originally featured both a front and rear canopy. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear patio addition, install signage and paint the façade, all of which have been completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness and proper permits. Office of Historic Preservation Staff notified the applicant on October 18, 2016, that a Certificate of Appropriateness was needed for the proposed scope of work.
- b. REAR PATIO – The rear of the primary historic structure currently features an addition. The applicant has proposed a covered patio at the rear of the previously constructed rear patio to feature an overall height of approximately 11' – 6" and a trapezoidal footprint that features an extension past the side wall planes of the historic structure.
- c. REAR PATIO – Per the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should be located at the rear of the historic structure, should utilize a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the principle façade of the historic structure and should feature a transition between the old and the new. Generally, the proposed patio addition is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. PAINTING – Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 2.B., surfaces that were historically unpainted should not be painted. The façade was previously cleaned and all existing paint had been removed. Staff does not find the painting of the façade to be appropriate.
- e. SIGNAGE – The Guidelines for Signage 1.A. notes that each building will be allowed one major and two minor signs. A total requested size for requested signage should not exceed fifty (50) square feet. New signs should be

July 19, 2017

based on evidence of historic signs, should be designed to respond to the character and/or period of the area in which they are being placed and should identify the tenant without creating clutter or distracting from building features and historic districts. Additionally, signage should be designed in proportion to the façade, respecting the building's size, scale and mass and rhythms and sized of window and door openings.

f. WINDOW CLINGS – The applicant has proposed to install window cling signage on the primary entrance double doors. The clings are 15.5 inches in width and 52.5 inches in height and read “Azuca Sabor Latino” for a total square footage of approximately 5.7 square feet. Generally, staff finds the proposed window clings to be minor in nature and appropriate for the proposed location.

g. WALL SIGNAGE – Above the transom windows and below the cornice line and parapet wall, the applicant has proposed to install wall signage on the front façade to read “Restaurant” to be neon lit and feature 10 inches in height and 7’ – 5” in length. This block of S Alamo features structures that feature blade signs, window clings and small wall signs. There is no historic example of signage to this size or design on this block. While the size is appropriate for the structure, staff does not find the location nor the lighting source, neon, to be appropriate. Additionally this signage does not directly identify the business housed in the historic structure. Staff finds that the signage should be removed.

h. WALL SIGNAGE – Above the transom windows and below the cornice line and parapet wall, the applicant has proposed to install wall signage on the front façade to read “Bar – Latino” to be neon lit and to feature 10 inches in height and 10’-4” in length. This block of S Alamo features structures that feature blade signs, window clings and small wall signs. There is no historic example of signage to this size or design on this block. While the size is appropriate for the structure, staff does not find the location nor the lighting source, neon, to be appropriate. Additionally this signage does not directly identify the business housed in the historic structure. Staff finds that the signage should be removed.

i. FREESTANDING SIGNAGE – To the north (left) of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to install a free-standing sign to the north (right) of the primary entrance to feature internal illumination, 11 feet in height and twenty-nine inches in width. Per the Guidelines for Signage, 4.B.i., freestanding signs should not exceed 6 feet in height. The proposed signage is inconsistent with the Guidelines.

j. WALL SCONCES – To the right and left of the storefront system, the applicant has proposed to install two wall sconces that are twenty inches in width, twenty-two inches in height and extrude from the wall ten inches. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 5.B.iii., new light fixtures should be installed in a manner which does not distract from the façade of the building, should be installed in a manner that does not damage the historic façade, should be unobtrusive in design and should not rust or stain the building. Staff finds the proposed sconces to be inconsistent with the Guidelines due to their location and size.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1, the construction of a rear patio, as submitted based on findings b and c.

Staff recommends approval of item #3, the installation of window cling signage, as submitted based on finding f.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 and #4 through #7 based on findings d and f through j. Staff recommends the applicant remove the inappropriate wall sconces, remove the existing paint color and return to brick to its unpainted state and install signage that is consistent with the Guidelines and this block of S Alamo.

CASE COMMENTS:

The above requested rear addition, signage, painting and wall lighting were installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The post work application fee has not been paid.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move for approval of items #1-#5, denial of Item #6 and approval of item #7 with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2017-343

Applicant: Roberto Velasquez

Address: 803 BURLESON ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Restore the existing, wood windows.

July 19, 2017

2. Install new wood porch columns to replace the existing, wrought iron columns.
3. Install a new standing seam metal roof.
4. Paint the exterior.
5. Install a new wood fence to replace the existing chain link fence.
6. Construct a wood deck at the rear of the historic structure.
7. Convert an existing side door opening to a window opening.
8. Enclose a rear, side door.
9. Convert an existing rear window opening to a door opening.
10. Construct a carport structure at the rear of the property.
11. Enclose three original window openings in the proposed master bathroom.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 803 Burleson was constructed circa 1930 and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure features traditional architectural elements with hints of Craftsman detailing, primarily regarding roof structure and form, gable vent design and front entrance location. The footprint currently found on site is that which is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map, including an addition of historic character. The structure entirely features wood siding and wood windows. The applicant has previously received Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness for the repair of the existing foundation and the removal of vinyl siding with the repair of the original wood siding.
- b. WOOD WINDOW REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to repair the existing, wood windows. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved. The applicant’s proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. COLUMN REPLACEMENT – The historic structure currently features two, wrought iron front porch columns. The applicant has proposed to remove these two columns and install wood columns. The existing wrought iron columns are not original and were installed along with the concrete front porch. At this time, the applicant has not proposed a specific column design. Staff finds the replacement of the wrought iron columns to be appropriate; however, the applicant should submit to staff columns that feature appropriate proportions and trim that match the simple architecture of this historic structure.
- d. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The historic structure currently features an asphalt shingle roof. The applicant has proposed to install a standing seam metal roof. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, standing seam metal roofs should be installed on structures where they are architecturally appropriate. To be 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 galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam instead of the large profile ridge cap.
- e. PAINTING – The applicant has proposed to paint the structure a mid-toned green. All trim is to be painted white. Staff finds the proposed colors to be appropriate for a structure with Craftsman detailing as well as for the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- f. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing chain link fence with a new wood fence. At this time, the applicant has not provided staff with a fencing detail. Staff finds that a fence that is consistent with those found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District, which is consistent with the Guidelines, should be installed. Given the location of the existing chain link fence, at the side and rear of the lot, a wood privacy fence not exceeding six (6) feet in height is appropriate.
- g. REAR DECK – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a new wood deck. The applicant has noted that the deck will be twelve (12) feet in depth and sixteen (16) feet in length. The proposed deck will feature wood construction. Staff finds the location and size of the proposed deck to be appropriate and located in a manner which will not negatively impact the historic structure.
- h. CARPORT – At the rear of the property, the applicant has proposed to construct a carport in the location of a rear accessory structure that is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. At this time, the applicant has not submitted an application for the demolition of this accessory structure. Staff recommends the applicant repair the existing structure in place.
- i. WINDOW OPENING REMOVAL – In the proposed mater bathroom, the applicant has proposed to enclose three existing window openings. Two of these window openings are grouped, consistent with examples found on other facades of the historic structure and face the side street, Willow Street. The third window is located facing the rear of the lot. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., existing window and door openings should be preserved. The proposed removal of these three existing window openings is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. WINDOW OPENING MODIFICATION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to modify a double window opening to feature a door opening in the left window opening. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposed modification to be appropriate given that the original opening will not be removed; however, the width of the opening and head height should remain the same. The applicant should install a door that features simple detailing. The selected door is to be presented to staff for approval prior to installation.
- k. DOOR OPENING MODIFICATION – Facing Willow Street, the applicant has proposed to convert an existing door opening to a window opening. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., historic door openings should be preserved. Staff finds that through the installation of a window, the existing opening at this location will be preserved. Staff finds that the applicant should install a window that features a width, head

July 19, 2017

and sill height and profile to match those found throughout the historic house.

1. REAR DOOR REMOVAL – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to remove a side, rear door opening. Given its location at the side and rear of the structure, staff finds that it is not prominently located and is not a primary entrance. Staff finds the removal of this opening to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #9 based on findings a through g, j through l with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed drawing of the proposed replacement columns for staff's approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The proposed replacement columns should feature architecturally appropriate proportions as well as capitals and bases as noted in finding c.
- ii. That the applicant install a standing seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam. A large profile ridge cap should not be used as noted in finding d.
- iii. That the applicant provide staff with a detail of the proposed fencing for staff's approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness as noted in finding f.
- iv. That the proposed door installation in the rear facing window opening feature a width and head height that remain the same, that the door features simple detailing and that the door be submitted to staff for approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness as noted in finding j.
- v. That the proposed window installation in the rear, street facing door opening feature a width, head and sill height and profile that are consistent with the wood windows found on the primary historic structure as noted in finding k.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #10 and #11, the construction of a rear carport structure and the enclosure of three original window openings based on findings h and i.

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

22. HDRC NO. 2017-338

Applicant: David Ericsson

Address: 914 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Reconstruct the front porch.
- 2. Reinstall a front facing transom window.
- 3. Install a column on the side porch.
- 4. Infill a side porch door opening.
- 5. Install a door opening in an existing window opening.
- 6. Install a window opening in an existing door opening.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 914 N Pine was constructed circa 1910 and appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and features a protruding, front window bay and hipped and gabled roofs. The structure has been modified from its original design through the removal of the front porch. At this time, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct the previously removed front porch and modify window and door openings.
- b. FRONT PORCH – As noted in finding a, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front porch. The applicant has proposed for the reconstructed front porch to feature corrugated metal roofing, 2x6 rafters, a 2x8 double header and 4x4 wood columns. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v. porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original. Additionally, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. The applicant has designed the footprint of the porch to closely match that which is shown on the 1912 Sanborn Map.
- c. FRONT PORCH – Regarding details, the applicant has proposed to install 4x4 wood columns, a 2x8 double headers, a corrugated metal porch roof and exposed rafter tails. Typically, Folk Victorian structures features columns of greater mass, unless the columns are spindled. Staff finds that a 6x6 column with base and capital trim would be appropriate. In regards to the porch roof, corrugated metal is not a material consistent with porch roofs in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The porch roof should feature asphalt shingles to match that of the house

July 19, 2017

or a standing seam metal roof. In regards to the exposed rafter tails, this is an architectural element that is not common to Folk Victorian structures and should be eliminated.

d. TRANSOM WINDOW – The applicant has proposed to reinstall a previously enclosed transom window about the street facing front door. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. The new window should be wood and feature a profile consistent with that of the structure and architecture style.

e. SIDE DOOR AT FRONT PORCH– The applicant has proposed to enclose to side facing front porch door. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved. Additionally, two front porch doors is vernacular architectural element to San Antonio. The proposed enclosure of the side facing front door is not consistent with the Guidelines.

f. SIDE PORCH COLUMN – The north facade of the primary historic structure features a small porch with a street facing porch door and one column. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, temporary column. Staff finds that the new column should match those proposed for the front porch and should be 6x6 with capital and base trim.

g. SIDE PORCH DOOR REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, side porch door with a window. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door openings should be preserved. Given the location of this door and its relationship to the front façade of the structure, staff finds its removal to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant maintain the existing porch door.

h. SIDE PORCH WINDOW REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to replace one of the existing, north facing side porch windows with a door opening. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window and door opening should be preserved. While the existing window will be removed, staff finds the opening will remain. The proposed new door should match those found historically on the structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings b through d and f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install front and side porch columns that are 4x4 square and feature base and capital trim as noted in finding c as well as be chamfered. The applicant is to submit a detail of the porch columns to staff for approval.
- ii. That the applicant install a porch roof that matches that of the primary historic structure as noted in finding c.
- iii. That the applicant eliminate the exposed rafter tails as noted in finding c.
- iv. That the applicant install a transom window that is wood and matches the profile of the existing transom windows.

Staff recommends approval of item #5, the installation of a door opening in an existing window opening based on finding h with the stipulation that the proposed new door match those found historically on the structure.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #4 and #6 based on findings e, g and h. Staff recommends the applicant maintain these original door and window openings as originally constructed.

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 move for approval of items #1 through #3 with staff’s stipulations. Denial of item #4. Approval of items #5 and #6 with the stipulation that existing materials be reused.

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-332

Applicant: Nicole Garza Jim Cox/Jim Cox Designs

Address: 309 PIERCE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new 2-story single family home with an attached garage.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family home on the vacant lot located at 309 Pierce. The lot is located within the boundary of the Government Hill Historic District and is flanked to the north by a

July 19, 2017

1-story historic single family home, to the west by a 1.5-story historic single family home, and to the east by a vacant lot and a cluster of contributing residential structures ranging from 1 to 2 stories in height. The lot is also adjacent to Interstate 35 Frontage Road to the south. This area of the Government Hill Historic District is characterized primarily by 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family homes, many with rear accessory structures.

However, the configurations of the lots in the area vary in orientation, setback, lot coverage, and lot size.
b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

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

d. SETBACKS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. The orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. Additionally, established setbacks average to approximately 10 feet from the public right-of-way. The proposed structure will be set back from Pierce by 10 feet and closely match the setback of neighboring structures fronting Interstate 35 Frontage Road. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

e. LOT COVERAGE – New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The proposed footprint is less than this percentage. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

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

g. ENTRANCES AND MASSING – In the surrounding vicinity, historic structures are situated on narrow, deep lots, allowing for the front façade to be smaller in width than the side facades; however, the lot condition at 309 Pierce is wide and shallow. Therefore, the primary entrance will be located on the longest elevation, facing west towards Pierce. This is a departure from standard entrance configurations in the district. Historic single family homes in the area also utilize massing or a design element, such as a front porch with recessed entry, to clearly delineate the front entrance. As indicated in the elevations, the front door features a porch projection; however, the mass is set back from the projection to the north, and set back even further from the garage mass, which is the most prominent form in terms of location towards the Pierce right-of-way. Staff finds the entrance configuration inconsistent with typical patterns of the district.

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

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

j. ROOF FORM – The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction state that new structures should incorporate roof forms, including pitch, overhangs, and orientation, that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. The applicant has proposed an overall gable form that is reflective of historic homes in the area; however, each elevation contains several ridgelines with associated overhangs. Staff finds the number of roof forms and projections to be inconsistent with development patterns of the district.

k. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window as compared to nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed several window and door openings that generally feature sizes that are found on historic structures. However, the west (left) elevation contains several small fixed windows on the second story that are not consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document or historic fenestration precedents in the district. Additionally, the first floor of the west elevation includes larger windows that exceed the proportions indicated in the Historic Design Guidelines. All proposed window detailing can be modified to relate closer to historic examples, such as the use of approximately six inches of separation between double windows. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within walls to ensure that a proper façade depth is maintained. Additionally, the applicant should install wood windows that

July 19, 2017

include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

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

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

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

o. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not provided staff with a landscaping plan at this time. The applicant should provide this information prior to returning to the HDRC.

p. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install a six foot cedar plank privacy fence in the rear and side yard. The fence will be located along the west property line and extend into the front and side yard. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, front and side yard fences should be limited to a height of 4 feet. Staff finds the six foot privacy fence consistent with the guidelines up to the south façade boundary of the structure, but finds a six foot fence beyond that boundary inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval as submitted based on findings a through o. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items if they wish to return with a new design proposal:

a. That the applicant simplifies the roof forms and incorporate massing and configuration that are more consistent with the surrounding district as noted in finding j.

b. That the applicant orients the primary entrance of the structure towards Interstate 35 Frontage Road to be more consistent with the development pattern of the block.

c. That the applicant clearly delineates the front entrance utilizing a distinctive massing element or other formal design gesture, such as a prominent front porch that engages the streetscape, as noted in finding g.

d. 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 Government Hill Historic District as noted in finding k.

e. That the applicant submits a site plan indicating the location of any plants or trees to remain and the location of all proposed new landscaping elements.

f. That the applicant submits a fence proposal that includes exact dimensions of the proposed location. The fence in the front and side yard is limited to a maximum of 4 feet per the Historic Design Guidelines.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2017-220

Applicant: Robert Moritz

Address: 313 E LOCUST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new housing development to include three, 3-story buildings with a total of 4 dwelling units.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct three, 3-story buildings on the vacant lot at 313 E Locust, located within the Tobin Hill Historic District. The lot is flanked by a historic 2-story single family home designed in the Queen Anne style to the east, a parking lot and 2-story office complex to the west, and a residential alley to the north. The lot is located a distance of approximately one lot from the intersection of E Locust and McCullough Ave.

July 19, 2017

This stretch of E Locust is characterized by historic 1-story and 2-story single family homes, designed primarily in the Queen Anne and Craftsman styles; historic 2-story multifamily homes with larger footprints; two 2-story apartment complexes, one of which is non-contributing to the district; and a non-contributing convenience store at the corner of E Locust and McCullough. Additionally, the corner of E Locust and Paschal features a modern infill development containing four 2-story townhomes, each oriented towards Paschal St.

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

c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on June 28, 2017. Prior to the meeting, the applicant's proposal included four total units – three 3-story units and one 2.5-story unit – oriented back-to-back on the lot, with one 3-story unit located directly adjacent to the E Locust right-of-way. At the DRC meeting, the applicant shared a revised site plan that included two 3-story units facing E Locust, and two 3-story units located in the rear of the property, all facing the direction of E Locust. This was the proposal that the DRC reviewed and discussed. The DRC noted that the proposal was a departure from the traditional development pattern of the district, which does not feature two single-family homes in the front of the lot with two single-family homes of the same height in the rear of the lot. The DRC also wanted more clarification on how the alley condition would be treated. The DRC suggested exploring a more traditional configuration of having two taller single family homes oriented towards E Locust, and shorter single family homes in the rear of the lot that took on the massing, form, and appearance of a rear accessory structure. Tall single family homes with shorter rear accessory structures, or rear accessory dwelling units, are historically common in the Tobin Hill Historic District.

d. CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – As presented, the individual units reviewed as standalone structures exhibit features that are generally consistent with the overall principles in the Guidelines. However, when considering the proposed streetscape and context of the project, the proposed design does not relate well to the historic single-family residential nature of the district and the district's predominant developmental pattern. Of the historic structures on the immediate block of E Locust, bounded by McCullough to the west and Paschal to the east, one house is 2-stories in height, and the remainder are 1-story. Continuing east, on the block of E Locust bounded by Paschal and Gillespie, the historic homes are predominantly 2-stories in height. The applicant has submitted a survey of the existing heights of neighboring structures, and has indicated that the heights of these homes are 38 feet, 41 feet, 43 feet, 53 feet, and 64 feet. When viewed in the field, each of these structures is comparable in height, and does not exhibit over a 20 foot difference from the shortest to the tallest structure. Additionally, each of these structures is architecturally unique from one another, which creates diversity and character along the streetscape. At no point in the district are there two twin structures directly adjacent to one another.

e. SETBACKS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. The median setback should be used where a variety of historic setbacks exist. This block of E Locust contains historic structures that feature front yard setbacks of approximately 20-35 feet. Based on the submitted documentation, the neighboring historic structure to the east has a front setback of 32.11 feet. The historic 1-story structure two lots down has a setback of approximately 18.24 feet. The median of these setbacks is 25.2 feet. The applicant has proposed approximately a 25 foot setback. However, this setback on the drawings is measured to the finish wall of the structure and does not include the entry court/porch and steps, which appear to be at least six to ten feet in depth. The proposed setback is not consistent with the Guidelines, and should be increased to allow for 25 feet when measured from the front of the porch.

f. ORIENTATION & ENTRANCES – The applicant has proposed for two of the three units to face E Locust, and the units to be oriented towards the interior of the lot, oriented south towards the direction of E Locust. The pedestrian entry of the front units will be accessed from the south on E Locust. The pedestrian entry of the rear unit will be accessed from the south from an interior courtyard and driveway. The historic development pattern of the rear alley contains rear garages and parking spaces oriented towards the alley. Each of the three units contains rear-loading attached garages on the first floor, each of which are accessed from the rear alleyway to the north. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade should be oriented to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. Typically, historic entrances are oriented towards the primary street. This is true for this particular block of E Locust. Staff finds the orientation to be generally consistent with the Guidelines.

g. SCALE & MASS – The applicant has proposed three 3-story units. Two will be located along the street frontage of E Locust, and one will be located in the rear of the property, directly adjacent to an alley. Per the submitted elevations, the ridgeline of the front 3-story units is 37'-11 1/2", and the ridgeline of the rear 3-story unit is approximately a foot shorter at 36'-11 1/4". The floor heights of the front two units are not indicated on the submitted elevations, but appear to be approximately 9 to 10 feet in height. The floor heights of the rear unit are indicated in a section and measure 9'-0" for the first floor, 10'-0" for the second floor, and 8'-0" for the third floor. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Per the submitted elevations, the applicant has indicated that the 2-story historic structure directly to the east is approximately 35-40' in height per the applicant's submitted documents. Aside from this 2-story structure, the historic structures on the block of E Locust bounded by McCullough and Paschal are 1-story single family homes. The proposed massing is not consistent with the historic examples found on the block. Additionally, the rear 3-story duplex unit is a full story taller than all alley-facing structures. Staff does not find the proposal

July 19, 2017

consistent with the Guidelines.

h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Throughout this block, the foundation heights of historic structures are between two and three feet. The elevations for the front unit indicated a foundation height of approximately two (2) feet. Staff finds that the front, 2-and-a-half story unit has a foundation height consistent with the Guidelines.

i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include both hipped and gabled roofs. Both roof forms are found throughout the Tobin Hill Historic District as well as this block of E Locust; however, the proposed roof design is not typical of traditional hipped and gabled roof forms.

j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window, as compared to nearby historic facades, should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed several window and door openings that generally feature sizes that are found on historic structures. However, the rear elevation of the front units and the side elevation of the rear unit contain small, fixed square windows that are not consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document or historic fenestration precedents in the district. Additionally, per the plans for the front units, the east side elevation contains no fenestration at all. This blank wall on the west front unit will face towards McCullough Ave and will be directly visible from the public right-of-way. This blank wall space exceeds the continuous wall space recommendations in the Guidelines. With regards to materiality, the applicant has proposed to install Milgard vinyl doors and windows. Per the submission, the windows will feature either flat, sculptured, or simulated divided lites on the top sash of the double hung windows. According to the OHP Window Policy Document, wood windows are most appropriate. Windows should also maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, and false dividing lites are not encouraged. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within walls to ensure that a proper façade depth is maintained. All windows should feature traditional appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details. As submitted, several of the proposed window sizes, configuration, profile, and materiality are inconsistent with the Guidelines.

k. LOT COVERAGE – New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant has proposed to locate three units – two with a footprint of 2,193 square feet and one with a footprint of 2,328 square feet – on a lot featuring approximately 9,130 square feet. The proposed lot coverage is approximately 45.81% and is generally consistent with the Guidelines.

l. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite wood siding, standing seam metal roofs, and wood and metal mesh railings. Staff finds siding and roofing materials to be generally consistent with the Guidelines and compatible for new construction in the district. Staff finds that the siding should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four inches. Staff does not find the use of the wood and metal mesh railings characteristic of the Tobin Hill Historic District, nor the architectural details employed on the rest of the proposed structure. Staff finds that a simplified railing treatment with balustrades would be more 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 proposed front units feature a prominent third story gable, a secondary gable on the second floor with a hipped detail, bracketed gable detailing, and simple square columns with a capital and base. The rear unit features a modified ceiling plate, with a steeply-sloped shed roof and dormer. The porch entry is defined by a hipped roof overhang, and does not contain any column treatment. Defined porches are characteristic of the Tobin Hill Historic District. Staff finds these architectural details of the front units to be generally consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that a sloping soffit with no return is more consistent. No flat soffits should be employed at the eaves. The rear unit also lacks treatment and detailing. Additionally, identical front units are not characteristic of the district. A modified elevation should be proposed for one of the two front units to maintain the development pattern of the block and district.

n. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has indicated on the submitted site plan that ground AC units will be concealed by screens. The screens appear to be slightly wider than the AC units themselves, and only screen the view from the primary right-of-way, either E Locust or the rear alley. The side elevations of the units will be visible from the neighboring properties. Staff finds that the proposed screening method needs to be developed further to comply with the Guidelines.

o. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not provided staff with a landscaping plan at this time. The applicant should provide this information prior to returning to the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through n. Staff finds that the applicant should address the various inconsistencies with the Guidelines prior to returning to the HDRC:

- a. The applicant explores 2-story options or prototypes with a modified roof pitch to respond to the dominant historic massing context of the neighborhood.
- b. That the applicant explores alternative massing options for the rear unit to be more consistent with the historic structures along the alley streetscape.

July 19, 2017

- c. That the applicant utilizes a front setback that is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines as noted in finding d.
- d. That the applicant proposes a sloping soffit detail with no return.
- e. That the applicant proposes a simplified railing detail as noted in finding m.
- f. That the applicant develops a modified street elevation for one of the two front units to be more consistent with the development pattern of the district as noted in finding k.
- g. That the applicant proposes a fenestration pattern ,window opening proportions, and materials that are more consistent with the Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy document, and the historic examples found in the Tobin Hill Historic District as noted in finding j.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on June 28, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding c.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair