

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
August 2, 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, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**  
**Absent: Connor, Lazarine, Garcia**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
  - Rehabber Club Wood Window Repair Certification Course - August 18-19 - 458 Furr Drive
  - Historic Homeowner Fair & Infill Construction Panel Discussion- 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. 2017-379 | 127 LOTUS ST                     |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-373 | 210 ADAMS ST                     |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-217 | 1111 E CROCKETT ST               |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-235 | 1115 E CROCKETT                  |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-369 | 1666 E PYRON AVE                 |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-370 | 331 RIVERSIDE                    |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-347 | 102 NAVARRO ST                   |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-357 | 607 E EVERGREEN                  |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-356 | 418 DONALDSON AVE                |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-375 | 1918 W MAGNOLIA AVE              |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-351 | 724 N CHERRY                     |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-378 | 423 MISSION ST                   |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-376 | 555 FUNSTON PLACE (SOLAR PANELS) |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-377 | 555 FUNSTON PLACE (SOLAR PANELS) |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-374 | 236 FURR DR.                     |

Items # 3, #4 & #12 were pulled for citizens to be heard.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. HDRC NO. 2017-217**

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Studio Ziga

Address: 1111 E CROCKETT ST

**REQUEST:**

August 2, 2017

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 1111 E Crockett.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 1111 E Crockett in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between N Olive Street and N Pine Street. The historic structure was damaged by fire in April 2016. An emergency demolition permit was obtained from Development Services Department on April 7, 2016.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval at the May 17, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant propose a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found on this block of E Crockett. *The applicant has noted a foundation height of 18 to 21 inches.*
  - ii. That the applicant provide a street elevation and additional massing information to determine the new construction's impact on the neighboring historic structures. *The applicant has provided a street elevation and additional massing documents.*
  - iii. That the applicant incorporate window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines. *The applicant has amended previously designed window openings to feature traditional dimensions.*
  - iv. That the applicant install wood windows that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details. *The applicant has proposed block framed vinyl windows.*
  - v. That the applicant provide a column detail noting the installation of a capital and base.
  - vi. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment. *The applicant has noted the screening of the mechanical equipment on the updated site plan.*
  - vii. That the applicant incorporate a front yard sidewalk. *The applicant has noted the installation of front yard sidewalks on the updated site plan.*
  - viii. That the applicant provide a landscaping plan noting landscaping materials. *The applicant has noted the installation of grass and new trees.*
  - ix. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed carport's materials. *The carport has been removed from the proposed scope of work.*
- c. The proposed new construction at 1111 E Crockett has been proposed in addition to new construction at 1115 E Crockett. Currently, these are two separate lots; however, the applicant has proposed to remove the lot line through a certificate of determination.
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately twenty-six (26) feet.
- e. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward E Crockett. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. There are examples of two story historic structures in the vicinity including one on the northwest corner of N Olive and E Crockett; however, this block of E Crockett is entirely composed of single story structures. The applicant has provided a street section noting the proposed new construction in relationship with the existing, historic structures. Staff finds the proposed new construction's massing and height to be appropriate.
- g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately eighteen to thirty inches. The applicant has proposed a foundation height ranging from eighteen to twenty-one inches. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front gabled roof. Gabled roofs are featured throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District as well as on the majority of the historic structures on E Crockett. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window openings on each façade that feature proportions similar to those found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed a small fixed window on the front façade that is located in an upstairs bathroom. Staff finds that this window should be a sash window like other similarly sized windows.
- k. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed new construction is consistent with the Guidelines for

August 2, 2017

New Construction 2.D.i.

- l. **MATERIALS** – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed first floor materials to include horizontally oriented Hardi siding, a second floor of board and batten Hardi siding, eight inch square cedar columns, hog wire and cedar guardrails, cedar timber trusses and a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has noted that the proposed Hardi siding will feature a smooth finish. Staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.
- m. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed block framed vinyl windows. The applicant has provided staff with a wall section noting an installation depth of one inch. Staff finds that the applicant should provide additional product information for the windows including a product specification sheet that notes window sash profiles, consistency with historic window profiles, colors and track colors.
- n. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposed architectural details to be generally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has incorporated the double height porch within the massing of the proposed structure, has proposed roof forms that are consistent with those found throughout the neighborhood and has proposed appropriate materials.
- o. **COLUMN DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed eight in square cedar columns. Given the proposed height and porch massing, staff finds the proposed columns to feature an appropriate size; however, each column should feature both a capital and base.
- p. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant has noted the screening of all mechanical equipment.
- q. **DRIVEWAY** – To the east 1111 E Crockett, the applicant has proposed to install a ribbon strip driveway. The applicant has noted the removal of an existing curb cut and the installation of a new curb cut and apron to facilitate vehicular access to this driveway. The applicant has noted a total width of nine feet and materials of concrete with decomposed granite between each ribbon strip. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- r. **SIDEWALK** – The applicant has proposed to locate a front yard, concrete sidewalk to connect from the proposed front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. Staff finds this installation appropriate; however, the proposed sidewalk should feature a width consistent with those on this block of E Crockett.
- s. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has noted landscaping materials to include decomposed granite, grass throughout the traditional front and rear yard lawn areas and new trees. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- t. **FENCING** – Front yard fences are found along this block of E Crockett; however, the majority of those that currently exist are chain link fences. The applicant has noted the installation of a cattle panel fence. Staff finds the installation of this fence appropriate; however, the height is not to exceed four (4) feet in height in the front yard.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the applicant provide additional product information for the windows including a product specification sheet that notes window sash profiles, consistency with historic window profiles, colors and track colors for approval by staff as noted in finding m.
- ii. That the proposed front yard fencing does not exceed four (4) feet in height as noted in finding t.
- iii. That the applicant install a sash window in the upstairs bathroom on the front façade as noted in finding j.
- iv. That all Hardi siding feature a smooth finish, that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Liz Franklin, Evelyn Brown, Cullen Jones, Lulu Francois- all spoke in opposition to the applicant’s request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Garza to move for approval with staff stipulations, with the stipulation that there is no parking in rear.

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

**NAYS:** Cone

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 2, 2017

**4. HDRC NO. 2017-235**

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

Address: 1115 E CROCKETT ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 1115 E Crockett.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 1115 E Crockett in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between N Olive Street and N Pine Street and adjacent to an unpaved alley, Lowe Street.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval at the May 17, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant propose a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found on this block of E Crockett. *The applicant has noted a foundation height of 18 to 21 inches.*
  - ii. That the applicant provide a street elevation and additional massing information to determine the new construction's impact on the neighboring historic structures. *The applicant has provided a street elevation and additional massing documents.*
  - iii. That the applicant incorporate window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines. *The applicant has amended previously designed window openings to feature traditional dimensions.*
  - iv. That the applicant install wood windows that that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details. *The applicant has proposed block framed vinyl windows.*
  - v. That the applicant provide a column detail noting the installation of a capital and base.
  - vi. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment. *The applicant has noted the screening of the mechanical equipment on the updated site plan.*
  - vii. That the applicant incorporate a front yard sidewalk. *The applicant has noted the installation of front yard sidewalks on the updated site plan.*
  - viii. That the applicant provide a landscaping plan noting landscaping materials. *The applicant has noted the installation of grass and new trees.*
  - ix. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed carport's materials.
- c. The proposed new construction at 1115 E Crockett has been proposed in addition to new construction at 1111 E Crockett. Currently, these are two separate lots; however, the applicant has proposed to remove the lot line through a certificate of determination
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of twenty feet from the front property line. The applicant has noted the historic structure immediately to the east of the proposed new construction features a setback of approximately twenty-two feet.
- e. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward E Crockett. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. There are examples of two story historic structures in the vicinity including one on the northwest corner of N Olive and E Crockett; however, this block of E Crockett is entirely composed of single story structures. The applicant has provided a street section noting the proposed new construction in relationship with the existing historic structures. Staff finds the proposed new construction's massing and height to be appropriate.
- g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights.

August 2, 2017

Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately eighteen to thirty inches. The applicant has proposed a foundation height ranging from eighteen to twenty-one inches. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof with a front facing dormer. There are examples of hipped roofs on this block of E Crockett as well as throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed roof form is consistent with the Guidelines.

i. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window openings on each façade that feature proportions similar to those found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed a small fixed window on the front façade that is located in an upstairs bathroom. Staff finds that this window should be a sash window like other similarly sized windows.

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

l. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed first floor materials to include horizontally oriented Hardi siding, a second floor of board and batten Hardi siding, eight inch square cedar columns, hog wire and cedar guardrails, cedar timber trusses and a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has noted that the proposed Hardi siding will feature a smooth finish. Staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.

m. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed block framed vinyl windows. The applicant has provided staff with a wall section noting an installation depth of one inch. Staff finds that the applicant should provide additional product information for the windows including a product specification sheet that notes window sash profiles, consistency with historic window profiles colors and track colors.

n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposed architectural details to be generally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has incorporated the double height porch within the massing of the proposed structure, has proposed roof forms that are consistent with those found throughout the neighborhood and has proposed appropriate materials.

o. COLUMN DESIGN – The applicant has proposed eight in square cedar columns. Given the proposed height and porch massing, staff finds the proposed columns to feature an appropriate size.

p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant has noted the screening of all mechanical equipment.

q. DRIVEWAY – To the west of 1115 E Crockett, the applicant has proposed to install a ribbon strip driveway. The applicant has noted the removal of an existing curb cut and the installation of a new curb cut and apron to facilitate vehicular access to this driveway. The applicant has noted a total width of nine feet and materials of concrete with decomposed granite between each ribbon strip. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

r. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed to locate a front yard, concrete sidewalk to connect from the proposed front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. Staff finds this installation appropriate; however, the proposed sidewalk should feature a width consistent with those on this block of E Crockett.

s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted landscaping materials to include decomposed granite, grass throughout the traditional front and rear yard lawn areas and new trees. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

t. FENCING – Front yard fences are found along this block of E Crockett; however, the majority of those that currently exist are chain link fences. The applicant has noted the installation of a cattle panel fence. Staff finds the installation of this fence appropriate; however, the height is not to exceed four (4) feet in height in the front yard.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

i. That the applicant provide additional product information for the windows including a product specification sheet that notes window sash profiles, consistency with historic window profiles, colors and track colors for approval by staff as noted in finding m.

ii. That the proposed front yard fencing does not exceed four (4) feet in height as noted in finding t.

iii. That the applicant install a sash window in the upstairs bathroom on the front façade as noted in finding j.

iv. That all Hardi siding feature a smooth finish, that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large

August 2, 2017

profiled ridge cap shall not be used

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Liz Franklin, Evelyn Brown, Cullen Jones, Lulu Francois- all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval with staff stipulations and with the stipulation that the applicant add wood screens to the windows & return to HDRC for car port

**AYES:** Guarino, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube

**NAYS:** Cone

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**12. HDRC NO. 2017-369**

Applicant: Frank Perez, Jr..

Address: 1666 E PYRON AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to reconstruct privacy fencing along the front (northern) and side (western) property lines as well as within the front yard to enclose a swimming pool located in the front yard.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 1666 E Pyron was constructed circa 1955 and features architectural elements from both the Ranch and Minimal Traditional styles. The structure features low sloping front and side gabled roofs and simple detailing. At this time, the applicant has proposed to reconstruct privacy fencing along the front (northern) and side (western) property lines as well as within the front yard to enclose a swimming pool located in the front yard.
- b. The Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C. notes that privacy fences should be set back from the front façade of the building rather to reduce their visual prominence and that privacy fences should not be located within the front yard. The lot at 1666 E Pyron is a corner lot that features a structure which fronts the corner of E Pyron and Symphony rather than addressing one specific street. The location of the proposed fence in relationship to the structure relates similarly to that of the privacy fence being constructed toward the rear or behind the primary façade of a historic structure in a typical lot condition. Staff finds the proposed height and location of the fence to be appropriate and finds that it will not obscure or detract from the façade and architectural elements of the structure.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding b.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garza move for denial of the applicant's request.

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2017-371**

Applicant: Tobias Stapleton

Address: 205 OSTROM

August 2, 2017

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the historic structure located at 205 Ostrom.
2. Construct a two story, primary residential structure on the east end of the lot.
3. Construct a two story, primary residential structure on the west end of the lot.
4. Construct two, two story, rear accessory structures at the rear of each two story structure.
5. Install two driveways/parking locations on the site.

**FINDINGS:**

General findings:

- a. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was originally reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 21, 2017. At that meeting, committee members commented on the proposed architecture and noted concerns regarding the proposed massing and turrets. A site visit was conducted with HDRC Commissioners, members of the River Road Neighborhood Association, neighbors and Office of Historic Preservation Staff on March 22, 2017. At that site visit, access was provided to both the exterior of the structure as well as the interior. This request was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on April 25, 2017. At that time, a new design was presented to the committee and received positive feedback.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – A second site visit was conducted by the DRC on June, 28, 2017. At that site visit, committee members viewed the structure and commented on its structural condition. Committee members noted at that time that there was a loss of architectural and structural significance. This request was reviewed by the DRC on July 25, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted concern over the proposed setbacks in relationship to others found within the River Road Historic District and noted that the proposed flat roof of the second primary structure is not appropriate for the district.
- c. The River Road Historic District has been intensely opposed to the demolition of structures located within the district. The criteria outlined for the demolition of a contributing structure noted in UDC Section 35-618 is important to the public process.
- d. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

Findings related to request item #1:

1a. The structure located at 205 Ostrom was constructed circa 1935 and is located within the River Road Historic District. The structure features architectural elements that are indicative of the Minimal Traditional Style that can be found in the district. The house features many of its original materials including wood siding and wood windows. However, modifications to the form of the historic structure have resulted in the removal and enclosing of the front porch, which now presents itself as a screened porch. Despite these modifications, staff finds the house to be a contributing resource within the River Road Historic District due to its construction date and architectural style.

1b. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

*A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*

[The applicant has provided detailed cost estimate for rehabilitation of the structure which is approximately \$589,242. This bid was provided by a contractor who was approved by the applicant's financing provider. The applicant has noted that the rehabilitation or new construction at this site is limited to a contractor that is recommended and approved by their financial provider. The applicant has noted that financing for the proposed rehabilitation and new construction has been limited due to the current condition of the structure. Staff finds that an alternative opinion by a third-party contractor may result in a lower estimate for repairs

*B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*

[The applicant has provided information in the form of a structural report from the selected contractor which notes that the structure is suffering from intense dry rot that has impacted the structure to the extent that certain beam joists and studs have been structurally compromised. Additionally, the structural analysis provided by the contractor notes the collapse of the floor in certain areas, the collapse of ceiling and the roof structure, infestation of wood worm and the presence of fungus throughout the structure.]

*C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.*

August 2, 2017

[The applicant has not provided staff with information noting the active marketing of this property to potential purchasers. The applicant has noted that the structure has been vacant for approximately twenty-three years. The applicant has owned this property for approximately one year. The UDC Section 35-614 lists the criteria for establishing an unreasonable economic hardship in the context of long-term ownership of a property, not the purchase of a property with the intent to demolish the existing, historic structure.

1.c. Staff finds that the applicant has not demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship on the owner should demolition not be approved. In accordance with UDC 35-614, when an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information which may show a loss of significance in regards to the subject of the application in order to receive historic and design review commission recommendation of approval of the demolition. If, based on the evidence presented, the historic and design review commission finds that the structure or property is no longer historically, culturally, architecturally or archeologically significant, it may make a recommendation for approval of the demolition. In making this determination, the historic and design review commission must find that the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission that the structure or property has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Additionally, the historic and design review commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner, and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect.

Findings related to request item #2:

2a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed an orientation that is consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district. Regarding setbacks, this lot features an irregular shape, presenting itself as an island. The applicant has proposed a setback that is similar to setbacks found along a typical street in the front, while side setbacks and close to side streets.

2b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be

oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards the intersection of Ostom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

2c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with an overall height of 24' – 3". Many structures in the immediate vicinity feature either one or one and a half stories of height. While the applicant has proposed two stories, many of the neighboring structures feature additional height and steep pitched roofs. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

2d. 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. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of 1' – 6". This is appropriate for the district and is consistent with the Guidelines.

2e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include both front and side gabled roofs. Each street, Ostom, Magnolia Avenue and the intersection of the two will have a gable oriented towards them. Staff finds the proposed roof forms appropriate.

2f. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has featured window openings that feature historic heights and widths as well as window groupings that are found historically on Craftsman structures. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

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

2h. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the use of a standing seam metal roof and board and batten siding. Staff finds that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. A large profiled ridge cap shall not be used.

2i. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

2j. 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 natural and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the proposed structure is consistent with the Guidelines; however.

Findings related to request item #3:

August 2, 2017

3a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has sited this structure in the middle of the lot. Generally, given the dimensions and shape of the existing lot, staff finds this arrangement appropriate.

3b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrances towards both Ostrom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

3c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with an overall height of 24' – 0" for the primary mass and 28' – 9" for the two stair towers. Many structures in the immediate vicinity feature either one or one and a half stories of height. While the applicant has proposed two stories, many of the neighboring structures feature additional height and steep pitched roofs. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

3d. 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. The applicant has not specified the foundation height for this structure; however, staff finds that it should be comparable to that of the first structure and be consistent with the Guidelines.

3e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a flat roof for the second structure. Historic roof forms throughout the River Road Historic District typically feature gabled or hipped roofs. There are historic structures located throughout the district that feature flat roofs, typically coupled with decorative roof parapets and Spanish Eclectic detailing. Staff does not find the proposed roof form appropriate nor is it consistent with the Guidelines.

3f. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has featured window openings that feature historic heights and widths as well as window groupings that are typical for historic structures in the district.

3g. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprint is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

3h. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the use of both vertical and horizontal siding; however, has not noted the material. Staff finds the use of wood or Hardi board siding to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the horizontally oriented Hardi siding should feature an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.

3i. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

3j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As previously noted, the applicant has proposed a flat roof in combination with horizontal and vertical siding. Typically, flat roofs that are found throughout the River Road Historic District feature Spanish Eclectic architectural detailing including decorative roof parapets. Staff does not find the proposed roof to be appropriate in relationship to the proposed materials and adjacent proposed structure. Staff finds that a second structure that matches the design of the structure in request item #2 would be more appropriate.

Findings related to request item #4:

4a. ACCESSORY STRUCTURES – To the rear (west) of the structure noted in request item #2 and to the side (south) of the structure noted in request item #3, the applicant has proposed to construct two, two story accessory structures to accommodate vehicular parking as well as a second level dwelling unit. The proposed accessory structures feature an overall profile and massing that is subordinate to the proposed, primary residential structures, feature appropriately detailed garage doors and feature architectural detailing that's consistent with the historic examples found throughout the River Road Historic District. Staff finds the proposed accessory structures appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

Findings related to request item #5:

5a. DRIVEWAYS – The applicant has proposed to introduce one new curb cut on the property to exist with an existing curb cut that is located on Ostrom Drive. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that historic profiles are to be used for the creation of curb cuts and that typical driveway widths are to be used, typically no wider than ten feet in historic districts; however, there are examples in the immediate area of curb cut and driveway widths that are wider than ten feet in width. Staff finds that the proposed driveway location are appropriate.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff does not recommend approval of demolition based on findings 1.a. through 1.c.

If the HDRC finds that a loss of significance has occurred or finds that the criteria for establishing an unreasonable economic hardship have been met and approves the requested demolition, then staff makes the following recommendations regarding the requested new construction:

2. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #2, the construction of a two-story primary residential structure on

August 2, 2017

the east end of the lot, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish on the proposed structure in request item #2.
  - ii. That the applicant install wood windows that are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Window Policy Document as noted in finding n that are to include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details for structures #2 through #4.
  - iii. That the applicant should fully utilize architectural elements that are consistently found on structures with flat roofs throughout the district in a contemporary manner and incorporate materials that are appropriate for the proposed form for request item #3 as noted in findings 3e and 3j.
  - iv. That the applicant propose a design for the accessory structure that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 4a.
  - v. Archaeological investigations may be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the flat-roof, two-story structure on the west end of the lot, based on findings 3e and 3j. Staff recommends that the applicant propose a second, primary residential structure that is similar to that proposed in request item #2 in regards to massing and roof form.
4. Staff recommends approval of items #4 and #5, the construction of two, two story accessory structures and the installation of a new driveway, as submitted based on findings 4a and 5a.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** George Nash, Raleigh Wood, Larry De Naptino, Hector Hernandez, Christopher Green, Mimi Quintanillo, Fermin Guzman, Fred Gonzales- all spoke in opposition to the applicant’s request. Cassie Hays 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..

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**17. HDRC NO. 2017-366**

Applicant: Kathy Schroeder

Address: 1919 W GRAMERCY PLACE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing composition shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof on the primary structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property located at 1919 is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including a cross gable configuration with steep roof pitches, decorative half-timbering in the front and side gables, and a gabled entry with arched doorway. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace an existing composition shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof.
- b. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920’s, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to its fire resistance, ability to be customized in regards to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation. Often marketed as being able to mimic the appearance of slate tile roofs, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material for Tudor Revival Style homes throughout the 20th century.
- c. According to Sanborn Maps, homes in the Monticello Park Historic District were originally constructed with

August 2, 2017

asphalt, clay barrel tile, or cementitious tile roofs. There does not appear to be a historic precedent for metal roofs in this area except in limited uses specific to front porch stoops on very few homes.

d. Staff performed a windshield survey of the surrounding blocks within the Monticello Park Historic District on July 27, 2017, to determine if many of the roofs in the area had been replaced with standing seam metal. On W Gramercy Place, between cross streets Lake Blvd and N Elmendorf St, two roofs have been replaced with standing seam metal. Photos of these homes are included in the exhibits. Overall in the district, approximately 20 of over 1,200 homes feature a roof replacement.

e. In general, the proliferation of the Tudor Revival Style in the United States represents a movement which rejects industrialization in favor of a more hand-crafted aesthetic. Tudor Revival homes, such as the one at 1919 W Gramercy Place, often featured intricate detailing and local material. Roofs were typically shingled (usually with wood, slate or composition shingles).

f. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should only be installed on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a metal roof is not appropriate for this style of house or within the context of the Monticello Park Historic District, regardless of whether this application of materials is regionally popular.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through f. Staff recommends that an in-kind replacement of asphalt shingles be installed. If metal is desired by the applicant for its lifespan, then staff recommends a metal product that mimics the appearance of traditional shingles based on finding e.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**18. HDRC NO. 2017-352**

Applicant: Luis Garibay

Address: 830 N PINE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 830 N Pine.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure located at 830 N Pine St is a 1-story single family home constructed in the Folk Victorian style. The home features several elements of the architectural style, including spindlework front porch detailing, scalloped gable shingles, and bracketed shingled awnings above floor-to-ceiling windows. The home also features a symmetrical front façade with two paired gables flanking either side of the front porch entrance. An addition was added to the home sometime after 1950. The house is a contributing structure in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification.

b. The scope of work largely consists of restoration work that is eligible for administrative approval, including foundation repair, roof replacement, painting, and window repair and reglazing. The scope also includes a full remodel of the interior.

c. Staff conducted a site visit on July 24, 2017, to examine the conditions of the property. Foundation repair and roof replacement had already been performed per previously-issued administrative Certificates of Appropriateness, and interior remodeling was taking place. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on April 17, 2017 for the installation of a standing seam metal roof with the stipulations that the roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. The approval also stipulated that a bulky, modern ridge cap should not be used. As installed, the roof features an unapproved, raised ridge vent with capped ends that is not in compliance with the approval on record. The ridge detail must be corrected or receive approval from the HDRC in order for the property owner to participate in the tax incentive program.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of Historic Tax Certification at this time. Staff recommends that the ridge detail be corrected or receive approval from the HDRC in order for the property owner to participate in the tax incentive program as noted in finding c.

**APPLICANT NOT PRESENT**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to move this item to the next agenda due to the applicant's absence.

**AYES: Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

August 2, 2017

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**19. HDRC NO. 2017-372**

Applicant: Allison Hu

Address: 609 HAYS ST

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT BEFORE HEARING**

**20. HDRC NO. 2017-380**

Applicant: Carlos Quintenilla

Address: 220 PEREIDA ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to pour a new solid concrete driveway to measure 9'-8" in width and 22'-0" in length.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure located at 220 Pereida St is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1910. The home is designed in the Craftsman style and features a primary hipped roof with deep overhanging eaves and exposed rafter tails, a central gable on the symmetrical front façade, deep front porch with square columns, and a front door with transoms and sidelights. The house is an individual local landmark and a contributing structure in the King William Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to pave the existing front yard gravel driveway with concrete.

b. LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete driveway where a gravel driveway currently exists. The driveway will be confined to the front yard and will not extend the full depth of the lot. The driveway will measure 9'-8" in width and 22'-0" in length. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new site elements should work with the existing character-defining topography. Driveways should be limited to 10 feet in width to maintain consistency with historic driveway configurations. The proposed width and location of the driveway is consistent with historic locations on the block, as evidenced by the presence of gravelly driveways along the block. Staff finds the location consistent with the Guidelines.

c. MATERIAL AND CONFIGURATION – The applicant has proposed to construct the driveway of solid poured concrete. The color and finish will match the existing concrete apron. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new driveways should incorporate a similar configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. On this block of Pereida between S St Marys and Cedar St, none of the driveways of the historic residential properties are paved. There is precedent on surrounding blocks for historic ribbon driveways. Based on the fact that none of the driveways on this block have been paved by impervious coverage, and that there is precedent for ribbon driveways historically in the vicinity, a solid driveway of impervious material should be avoided. Staff does not find the proposal as submitted consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant install a ribbon driveway with either grass or gravel between the two concrete ribbons as noted in finding c.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2017-360**

Applicant: 1718 Architecture

August 2, 2017

Address: 202 SAN ARTURO

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear addition at 202 San Arturo.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 202 San Arturo was constructed in 2008 and features two stories in height. At the rear (east) of the primary structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a three story addition. This structure is located within the Lavaca Historic District. While the Historic Design Guidelines are generally intended for additions to historic structures, the general principals and guidelines for additions are applicable to non-historic additions as well in order ensure compatibility within the historic district.
- b. ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed to locate the addition at the rear of the existing structure, has proposed a shed roof and has proposed a setback from the wall planes of the existing structure. While the proposed location and setback from the existing structure are appropriate, the proposed roof form is not consistent with the Guidelines. The existing structure features a gabled roof and a flat roof with parapet walls. The proposed roof form is neither consistent with those found on the existing structure nor with those found throughout the Lavaca Historic District.
- c. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature an overall height and roof form that will be greater than that of the existing structure. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i., which notes that additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of scale and mass.
- d. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that include wood columns, stucco to match that of the existing structure, windows and trim to match that of the existing structure, corrugated metal, a standing seam metal roof to match that of the existing structure and paint to match. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panel widths and seam heights that match those of the existing structure.
- e. TRANSITION – As noted in finding b, the applicant has proposed a transition between the proposed addition and the existing structure by the use of setbacks and through an open air first level at the addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, the proposed addition matches the architectural details of the existing structure as well as features materials which are complementary to those found historically throughout the district.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the applicant reduce the overall height of the proposed addition to be subordinate to that of the existing structure.
- ii. That the applicant install all windows to match the installation method used on the existing structure and that all details are match those of the existing structure.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2017-359**

Applicant: Jennifer Morey

Address: 630 MISSION ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Remove the existing, composition shingle roof on both the main structure and the accessory structure and install a standing seam metal roof on both.
2. Modify the side and rear of the historic structure by enclosing seven window openings currently in an enclosed,

August 2, 2017

original porch.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 630 Mission Street was constructed circa 1925 in the Craftsman style and is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The historic structure features both a front and rear porch. Currently, the rear porch has been enclosed a four ganged windows as well as a rear door have been installed. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing roof, enclose these rear window openings and install two rectilinear windows.

b. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The structure currently features an asphalt shingle roof. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs should be used on structures where they are appropriate for the style or construction period. Standing seam metal roofs are found historically on Craftsman structures in San Antonio. The proposed installation is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed roof should feature seams that are one to two inches in height, panels that are eighteen to twenty-one inches in width, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap. A large ridge cap should not be used.

c. PORCH ENCLOSURE – The rear porch is historic to the structure and as currently modified, the façade represents the openness of an enclosed porch. The applicant has proposed to remove the ganged window openings and install two windows to feature a width of forty inches and a height of twenty-four inches. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.ii. applicants should refrain from enclosing side and rear porches, particularly when connected to the main porch or balcony. Original architectural details should not be obscured by any screening or enclosure materials. Alterations to side and rear porches should result in a space that functions, and is visually interpreted as, a porch. Staff finds that the proposed rear modifications would result in a façade that no longer reads as a rear porch.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of item #1, the installation of a standing seam metal roof based on finding b with the stipulation that the proposed roof feature seams that are one to two inches in height, panels that are eighteen to twenty-one inches in width, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap. A large ridge cap vent should not be used.

The applicant must contact staff 24 hours prior to installation in order to schedule an inspection to verify that metal roof specifications are met.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the modification of the side and rear of the historic structure by enclosing seven window openings currently in an enclosed, original porch.

**APPLICANT WITHDREW REQUEST #2**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to move for approval of item #1. Applicant will return to DRC for item #2

**AYES: Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2017-367**

Applicant: Hollie Sanchez

Address: 106 MAGNOLIA DR

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the construction of a new 2-story rear accessory structure to include a detached carport on the ground floor with living quarters above.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure at 106 Magnolia Dr is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman style. The home features a low sloped hipped roof form with deep overhanging eaves, a symmetrical façade with a prominent central porch entry way flanked by two hipped roofs, and decorative wood window screens with Craftsman detailing. The home is a contributing structure in the River Road Historic District. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of the construction of a 2-story rear accessory structure to contain a 2-car garage carport on the ground level and living quarters on the second level.

b. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new two-story accessory structure along the east and

August 2, 2017

rear lot lines of the property. The proposed square footage of the structure has not been indicated, but the footprint appears to be approximately 40% of the existing primary structure. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. Large outbuildings, garages, and accessory structures are common in the River Road Historic District, particularly in the close vicinity of 106 W Magnolia Dr. Staff finds the proposal acceptable based on these district-specific considerations.

c. **ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new accessory structure that will be oriented towards W Magnolia Dr. Guideline 5.B.i for new construction stipulates that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation common in the district. Rear garages with access from the primary street are common in the vicinity and staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. **SETBACKS** – Based on the submitted site plan, the applicant has indicated that the proposed structure will be offset from the side and rear setback by approximately one to three feet respectively. Guideline 5.B.ii for new construction stipulates that setbacks should be reflective of those common in the district. The lot sizes in River Road are historically small, and several properties on W Magnolia Dr feature rear accessory structures that are directly adjacent to side and/or rear lot lines. Based on UDC guidelines, a minimum of 5' should be incorporated from any lot line. The proposal as submitted is consistent with the Guidelines, but will require a variance from the Board of Adjustment. Additionally, staff has not seen a site plan with dimensions that clearly defines these setbacks. Staff conducted a site visit on July 27, 2017 to examine the exterior conditions of the property, and there appears to be a large utility pole either on the property or directly adjacent to the fence line. The pole has wires that hang in the vicinity of the proposed structure. Staff has not seen a current site plan that indicates where this pole is located relative to the proposed structure, nor received information on if this utility pole is a functional utility element or simply erected for support of existing lines.

e. **SCALE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new two-story carport garage with a second story apartment. Based on the submitted elevations, the structure will measure 18'-0" without including the roofline, which appears to add another 5 to 6 feet to total 23 to 24 feet in height. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Rear two story structures are present in the River Road Historic District based on staff observation, but the few that exist are obscured by dense foliage or are visually subordinate to the primary structure. Staff has not seen a line of sight study from the public right-of-way that determines the structure's visual impact on the primary historic structure. Staff has also not seen a contextual site plan or elevation that indicates how the proposed structure will affect its neighbors. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

f. **FENESTRATION: WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed to install three windows on the second story of both the front and right elevation of the structure. These windows, based on the submitted elevations, will be one over one and feature trim to match the primary structure. Additionally, three smaller rectangular windows will be installed on the left elevation. These windows are not consistent with the OHP Window Policy document, nor historic window proportions in the district. The rear elevation is void of fenestration. The applicant should ensure that window and door openings are incorporated on every façade. The applicant should refer to the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy document to ensure that appropriate window materials and an appropriate framing depth is used.

g. **MATERIALITY: WALLS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. The applicant has proposed the use wood siding for the new accessory structure, but has not yet specified the material or profile, or if it will match that of the primary structure.

h. **MATERIALITY: WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has indicated that the trim of the windows and doors will be wood to match the size and detailing of the primary structure. However, the applicant has not specified the material of the windows and doors, nor provided detailed specifications on their installation. Staff finds wood windows and doors to be appropriate.

i. **ROOF DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof using asphalt shingles to match the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

j. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed to utilize simplified architectural details derived from the architectural language of the primary structure, including a hipped roof, simple square columns, a simple railing on the second floor, and wood siding. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on findings a through j. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items before returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant submits a line of sight study from the street to assess the visual impact of any proposed rear structure to staff for review as noted in finding e.
2. That the applicant submits a site plan that includes all setback dimensions as noted in finding d.
3. That the applicant submits a contextual site plan and/or elevation study that illustrates the proposed structure's impact on neighboring structures, lot lines, utility poles and wires, and landscape features as noted in findings d and e.
4. That the applicant proposes window sizes and a fenestration pattern that is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy Document as noted in finding f.

August 2, 2017

5. That the applicant submits material information for the proposed windows and doors as noted in finding h.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Garza move for approval based on the updated exhibits acquired after the recommendation was finalized, including a line of sight study, updated elevations, and a site plan. The conceptual approval carries these stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant submits material information for the proposed windows and doors as noted in finding h.
- 2) That the applicant lower the height of the first story of the rear accessory structure. The height should be lowered as much as possible while still maintaining an allowable height for cars.
- 3) That the applicant install windows on the rear façade of the structure.
- 4) That the applicant indicate all dimensions in the final drawings, including the structure's distance from the side and rear setbacks.

**AYES: Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2017-316**

Applicant: Gloria Sanchez

Address: 109 MAGNOLIA DR

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove eight existing one over one wood windows on the side elevations of the primary structure and replace with new one over one aluminum windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure at 109 Magnolia Dr is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman style. The home features a symmetrical façade, a hipped roof with deep overhanging eaves, a prominent central covered entryway with a hipped roof, and eight over one porch screens on the front façade. The home is a contributing structure in the River Road Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace eight existing wood one over one windows on the sides of the home with new vinyl windows. Staff responded to a call on June 15, 2017 that original windows were being replaced at this property without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The work has already been completed.
- b. The historic structure features one over one wood windows and decorative wood screens on the front façade. The windows that the applicant has proposed to replace appear to be original to the structure. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that historic windows should be preserved. When deteriorated beyond repair, windows should be replaced in-kind to match the material, configuration, profile, and inset as the original. Staff finds the installation of aluminum windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**CASE COMMENTS:**

Work began without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Post-work application fees have not been paid.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 2, 2017

**25. HDRC NO. 2017-389**

Applicant: Armando Bravo

Address: 402 QUENTIN DR

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 17 steel casement windows with new, one over one, vinyl windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 402 Quentin was constructed circa 1945 and is a contributing structure to the Monticello Park Historic District. The structure features both wood, one over one windows and steel casement windows, a rough cut stone façade and hipped roofs. A stop work order was issued by Office of Historic Preservation staff on July 18, 2017, for replacement of the existing, steel casement windows without a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- b. EXISTING WINDOWS – The historic structure features steel casement windows and two, wood one over one windows. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, steel casement windows and install seventeen vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that historic windows should be preserved. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii. notes that non-historic windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The two, one over one wood windows appear to be original to the structure. Staff finds the installation of one over one windows to match the profile of the two, wood windows appropriate; however, the proposed material of vinyl is not consistent with the Guidelines

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of seventeen vinyl windows to replace the existing, steel casement windows. Staff recommends the applicant reinstall the removed casement windows unless information can be provided that notes that the steel casement windows are not original to the structure.

**CASE COMMENT:**

Work began without a Certificate of Appropriateness and a stop work order was issued on July 18, 2017. All post work application fees have been paid

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Thom Simmons spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Cone, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**TIM CONE OUT AT 5:45 PM**

**26. HDRC NO. 2017-354**

Applicant: Dina Saad

Address: 2125 W MISTLETOE

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Remove non-original glass block windows and infill with siding to match existing on the primary structure.
2. Construct new front porch columns and railings to replace non-original metal supports.
3. Remove one existing door and awning structure from the east elevation and infill with siding to match on the primary structure.
4. Demolish an existing 1-story rear accessory structure.
5. Construct a new 1-story rear accessory structure with patio.
6. Remove one tree measuring 20" in diameter from the east side of the property.

August 2, 2017

7. Construct a new 1-story open carport on the east side of the property to accommodate two cars.
8. Remove the existing ribbon driveway and install a 20'-0" concrete driveway. Existing river stone between the existing driveway ribbons will remain.
9. Install a new concrete walkway between an existing concrete walkway and the new driveway.
10. Modify the existing grade in the rear and sides of the property.
11. Remove existing planters on the east side of the property and install new planters.
12. Install new poured in place concrete stepping pads in the rear of the property.
13. Install new paverstone walls in the rear of the property.
14. Install a wrought iron fence in the front yard to measure 4 feet in height.
15. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 2125 W Mistletoe Ave is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1940 in the Craftsman style. The home features a low sloped hipped roof with front gable, an asymmetrical front porch, and a side chimney constructed of stone. The house is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The property also contains a 1-story rear accessory structure constructed around the same time period out of the same materials of the primary structure. The accessory structure appears on a Sanborn Map in 1950. The structure is also contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.  
Findings for primary structure, items #1-3, and 14
- b. FRONT WINDOW MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to remove two panels of glass blocks on the front façade of the structure. The location, configuration, and materiality of these blocks are not consistent with similar structures found on the block nor the architectural style or construction period of the building. Staff conducted a site visit on July 27, 2017 and noticed that the glass block openings had different trim, sill detail, and profile. Staff finds the removal of these glass blocks and infilling the openings with siding to match existing acceptable.
- c. FRONT PORCH – The applicant has proposed to remove non-original metal porch supports and construct new porch columns and a railing in place. The proposed columns are square and feature simple square bases and capitals. The columns also are slightly wider at the base and evoke the Craftsman style. The railings will be simple square balusters with thin top and bottom rails. All handrail elements will be painted white to match the existing columns and the trim on the home. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv, added porch elements should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Porch columns are common for homes of this configuration, and are evident in the neighboring blocks. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- d. DOOR AND AWNING REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing side door on the east elevation and an awning above the doorway and install a new fireplace. The portion of the structure where the door and awning are located is an addition that was added sometime after 1950, as the footprint does not exist in the 1950 Sanborn Map. The applicant has also stated that the level of the home is different and requires occupants to step down where the addition is located. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic openings should be preserved. This opening and the awning are not original to the structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION: SCOPE – The scope of work for the primary structure largely consists of restoration work that is eligible for administrative approval, including rehabilitation of original wood windows, repair of siding in-kind, removal of non-original siding, replacement of portions of the roof in-kind, gutter and soffit repair, and foundation repair. The scope of work also includes porch modifications, interior remodeling, and electrical work.
- f. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION: EXISTING CONDITION – Staff conducted a site visit on July 27, 2017, to examine the exterior conditions of the property. Overall, staff finds that the property is in need of reinvestment and commends the applicant for undertaking its rehabilitation in a way that returns the property back to its original configuration and materiality.
- g. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION: REQUIREMENTS – The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.  
Findings for rear accessory structure, items #4 and 5:
- h. UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(b), in order for unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. The structure, despite the current condition of the foundation, contains a substantial amount of original materials with a high quality of craftsmanship. In the submitted application, the applicant has indicated that the structure does not have an adequate foundation upon which to build or modify. The applicant has stated that her contractor advised against rehabilitation due to drainage and exterior grading issues that cause the accessory structure to flood with each heavy rainfall. However, staff has not seen signed letters or estimates from certified contractors, engineers, architects, or landscape architects regarding the infeasibility of rehabilitation for the structure. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) have not fully been met.
- i. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – The existing rear accessory structure is a 1-story hybrid apartment garage. The structure appears on a 1950 Sanborn Map in the same configuration. Staff conducted a site visit on July 27, 2017

August 2, 2017

to assess the structure. The façade materials match those of the primary structure, including wood siding, wood windows, and shingle roof. The structure also features the same gable and eave detailing as the primary structure. A non-original addition exists at the rear of the structure and is constructed of woodlap siding in a different dimension than the original structure, and a non-original metal garage door has been installed a garage opening. Based on these considerations, staff has determined that this structure is contributing to the district. . In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff does not believe this criterion for demolition has been met.

j. **NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new 1-story rear accessory structure in the same general footprint and location as the existing rear accessory structure. The front façade will closely match the existing structure’s front façade, but will not contain a garage door. Based on findings h through j, staff has not received sufficient information to support the demolition of the rear accessory structure to assess the evaluation of the replacement plans. Additionally, no application for demolition has been submitted at this time.

Findings for new carport, items #6 and 7:

k. **TREE REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove one existing tree with a 20” diameter to construct a new carport. The tree is located on the east side of the lot and is approximately 30-40 feet in height. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing heritage trees should be preserved. According to UDC Section 35-523, single family residential lots must maintain a 38% canopy cover. This lot is heavily shaded and abundant with ample heritage trees that exceed this percentage. With this tree removed, 196” of tree diameter will remain on site. Based on these site specific considerations, staff finds the proposal acceptable with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

l. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant as proposed to construct a new 1-story open carport on the east side of the lot. The proposed footprint measures approximately 24’ by 28’, or approximately 672 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. The proposed footprint eclipses 40% of the size of the primary structure as viewed on the submitted site plan. However, large outbuildings, garages, and accessory structures are common in this portion of the Monticello Park Historic District, particularly in the close vicinity of 2125 W Mistletoe. Additionally, nearby lots feature multiple rear accessory structures that individually eclipse the allotted percentage. The structure is also an appropriate footprint for the size of the lot when considering existing structures. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

m. **ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new carport that will be oriented towards W Mistletoe. Guideline 5.B.i for new construction stipulates that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation common in the district. Rear garages and outbuildings with access from the primary street are common in the vicinity and staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

n. **SETBACK** – Based on the submitted documentation, the east façade of the new accessory structure will be offset from the side setback by approximately 5 feet. The setback from the rear lot line will be approximately 60 feet. Guideline 5.B.ii for new construction stipulates that setbacks should be reflective of those common in the district. A minimum of 5 feet should be incorporated from any lot line. The proposal as submitted appears to be consistent with the guidelines and UDC standards, however staff has not yet seen a definitive setback measurement from the applicant. A setback of less than 5 feet would require a variance.

o. **SCALE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story carport. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Rear and side 1-story structures are common along this block in the Monticello Park Historic District based on staff observation. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

p. **MATERIALITY** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. The applicant has proposed to use materials that are similar to the primary structure, but has not yet seen final material specifications for the walls or columns.

q. **ROOF DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof form using shingles to match the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

r. **FENESTRATION** – The proposed carport contains storage space on the east side of the structure. All elevations are void of fenestration. According to the Historic Design Guideline for New Construction 2.C.ii, blank wall space should be avoided. Blank walls facing neighboring structures are not a characteristic consistent of the historic structures found on the block. Staff finds the proposed fenestration inconsistent with the Guidelines.

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

Findings for site modifications, items #8 through 13:

t. **DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing ribbon driveway and pour a concrete driveway measuring 20’-0” in width slightly to the east of the existing driveway’s location. Existing riverstone will be retained in the proposal on the west side of the driveway. The driveway will extend at the proposed width to meet the opening of the proposed 2 car carport. Contextually, in this area of the Monticello Park Historic District, neighboring homes exhibit double-wide driveways poured in concrete. However, according to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, historic driveways

August 2, 2017

should be preserved. Additionally, historic driveways typically measure approximately 10'-0" feet in width. The existing driveway exhibits this historic driveway configuration. Staff does not find the wholesale removal of the existing ribbon driveway consistent with the Guidelines.

u. NEW WALKWAY – The applicant as proposed to install a new concrete walkway between an existing walkway from the sidewalk to the street and the new proposed driveway. The new walkway will match the approximate width of the existing walkway and provide access from the driveway to the main entrance of the home. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, the historic alignment, configuration, and width of sidewalks and walkways should be followed. The walkway is interior to the lot and will not affect any existing heritage trees or character defining landscaping elements. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

v. GRADE MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing grade in the rear and sides of the property. The applicant has stated that there are several drainage issues on the property that are made evident when it rains. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, character defining topography should be maintained. The proposed grade changes are minimal and are intended to facilitate proper runoff, and will not impact the significant landscape or topographical elements of the historic lot. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

w. PLANTER AND HARDSCAPING MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to remove existing planters on the east side of the property and install new planters. The new proposal includes a raised veggie plot, which will be viewable from the open carport. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible, and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. If used, small plantings should be incorporated into the design. The removal of lawn areas to mulched planting beds or pervious hardscapes in locations where they would historically be found, such as along fences, walkways, or drives. More than 50% of historic lawns should not be removed. The proposed planters and gravel walkway will reduce a minimal portion of the lawn, but will be mostly impervious due to the material. Additionally, the planters to be removed do not appear to be historic to the property. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

x. STEPPING PADS – The applicant has proposed to install poured in place concrete stepping pads in the rear of the property. The pads will lead from the rear porch to a rear gate. A total of 13 individual pads are indicated in the site plan. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they were not historically located. However, these pavers will not be visible from the public right-of-way and will not reduce abundant existing pervious landscape. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

y. PAVESTONE WALLS – The applicant has proposed to install new pavestone walls in the rear of the lot. These walls will be installed at the rear of the carport and adjacent to the proposed new accessory structure. Staff has only received a site plan indicating the location of the pavestone walls, which states the walls will be 16" in height. The applicant has stated that the pavestone walls will match an existing wall located at the rear of the primary structure. Staff has not yet seen an elevation drawing or material specification confirming these specifications.

z. FRONT FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard fence constructed of wrought iron. The fence will measure 4 feet in height. According to Guideline 2.B.v for Site Elements, new fences should utilize materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those used in the district. Fences made of thin wrought iron posts can be found along this corridor of W Mistletoe. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the guidelines based on these district-specific considerations, but has not seen a final elevation drawing of the fence.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the non-original glass block openings findings a and b.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the front porch modifications based on findings a and c with the stipulation that the applicant submits detailed dimensions and material information for the columns and railings to staff for approval.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the removal of an existing door and awning structure based on findings a and d.

Items 4 and 5, Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition of the existing rear accessory structure and construction of a new rear accessory structure based on findings h through j. The applicant may present additional materials to the HDRC that provide evidence of an unreasonable economic hardship or loss of significance of the structure.

Item 6, Staff recommends approval of the existing tree removal based on finding l with the stipulation that the applicant comply with all tree preservation requirements per UDC Section 35-523.

Item 7, Staff recommends approval of the construction of a 1-story carport structure based on findings l through s with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant proposes an alternative elevation for the east façade that incorporates fenestration to staff for approval.

ii. That the applicant submits final material specifications and elevation drawings with dimensions to staff for approval.

iii. That the applicant complies with all setback standards as required by zoning and obtain a variance if required.

Item 8, Staff does not recommend approval of the ribbon driveway removal and installation of a 20'-0" wide concrete driveway based on finding t. Staff recommends that the applicant submit a proposal that retains a portion of the ribbon driveway closest to the public right-of-way and widens as the driveway approaches the carport.

Item 9, Staff recommends approval of the new walkway based on finding u. If the HDRC does not approve the proposed driveway as submitted, staff recommends the stipulation that the applicant submit an updated walkway proposal to staff for review and approval.

Item 10, Staff recommends approval of the existing grade modifications based on finding v with the stipulation that the

August 2, 2017

applicant submits final grading information to staff for approval.

Item 11, Staff recommends approval of the removal of existing planters and installation of new planters with the stipulation that the applicant submit elevation drawings and materials of the proposed veggie plot to staff for approval.

Item 12, Staff recommends approval of the installation of concrete stepping pads in the rear of the property based on finding x.

Item 13, Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of new pavestone walls in the rear of the property at this time based on insufficient information as noted in finding y.

Item 14, Staff recommends approval of the fence installation based on finding z with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant submits a detailed elevation drawing that indicates all dimensions of the fence, including width, height, depth, and location of all balustrades, rails, footings, and other design elements to staff for final approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

ii. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

Item 15, Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on findings e through g.

**CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:** Alejandro Soto spoke in support but with concerns.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

Items #4 and #5: the demolition of the rear accessory structure with new construction is approved with the following staff stipulations:

i. That the applicant provide final drawings for the replacement accessory structure to staff for approval.

ii. That the applicant provide a salvage plan to staff for approval.

iii. That the applicant incorporate as much salvaged material as possible in the new structure.

Item #6: approved with staff stipulations.

Item #7: approved with the stipulation that the applicant use the drawings presented at the hearing, which includes a window on the east elevation of the carport. Stipulations i and ii from the recommendation are to be retained.

Item #8: denied as submitted. The applicant may submit an updated driveway proposal to staff for review and approval. The applicant met this requirement on August 8, 2017. The applicant has approval to install a ribbon driveway to be 7' in total width slightly to the east of the existing ribbon driveway. The driveway will include brick pavers directly to the south of the concrete pad and fence. The applicant has approval for this driveway configuration based exclusively on the drawings submitted to staff on the date above. If the driveway proposal is to be altered, the applicant must resubmit to staff for review and approval.

Items #9, #10, #11, #12, #14, #15: approved with staff stipulations.

Item #13: approved with the updated staff stipulations:

i. That the walls match the existing in materiality and dimension as closely as possible per a photograph submitted to staff.

ii. That the applicant provides a final landscaping plan to staff for approval that includes all heights and locations of any pavestone walls.

**AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Kamal, Brittain, Bustamante, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Kamal, 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.

August 2, 2017

- Adjournment.

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

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair