

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
August 16, 2017**

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

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

- 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
  - STAR in Saint Cecilia - October 7 and 8

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Cherise Bell spoke about the HEB project, item #7 in opposition of it.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                               |                         |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-411 | 119 E MAGNOLIA AVE      |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-412 | 127 LOTUS ST            |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-409 | 512 N OLIVE ST          |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-384 | 2500 E COMMERCE ST      |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-334 | 621 CENTER ST           |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-404 | 1011 S MAIN AVE         |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-408 | 501 S MAIN AVE          |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-414 | 115 BROADWAY            |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-218 | ST PAUL SQUARE SIGNANGE |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-413 | 8514 MISSION RD         |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-416 | 1315 SAN PEDRO AVE      |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2016-398 | 2119 N IH 35            |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-442 | 2222 N ALAMO ST         |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-392 | 1314 MUNCEY             |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-387 | 815 N HACKBERRY ST      |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-415 | 903 W MARTIN            |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2017-365 | 1126 N ST MARYS         |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2017-299 | 203 MARY LOUISE         |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2017-382 | 293 W HERMOSA           |
| • Item #20, Case No. 2017-420 | 2136 W SUMMIT           |
| • Item #21, Case No. 2017-421 | 1115 E CROCKETT ST      |
| • Item #22, Case No. 2017-390 | 408 DEVINE ST.          |

Items # 5, #21 were pulled for citizens to be heard. Items #7, #13 & #20 were pulled for recusals. Item #17 was pulled by staff.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

August 16, 2017

**5. HDRC NO. 2017-411**

Applicant: Davis Sprinkle/Sprinkle & Company Architects

Address: 119 E MAGNOLIA AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a complete restoration of structures located at 119 E Magnolia. The scope of work will include:

1. Repair and replacement of wood windows on the primary structure.
2. Repair and replacement of exterior doors on the primary structure.
3. Enclosing of an existing rear porch addition to create conditioned space.
4. Removal of an existing window opening on the north (rear) façade and the installation of new French doors.
5. Construction of a terrace on the north (rear) façade.
6. Construction of a porte-cochere on the west side of the structure.
7. Removal of the existing composition shingle roof and installation of a standing seam metal roof.
8. Cleaning and repointing of brick as required.
9. Repair and replacement of terra cotta capitals on the front porch columns.
10. Repair and replacement of wood windows on the rear accessory structures.
11. Construction of a new covered porch on the existing rear cabana.
12. Construction of a rear carport to span the width between the two rear accessory structures.
13. Installation of an inground pool and hot tub.
14. Repair and installation of hardscaping to include a new driveway and parking pad on the west side of the property, a walkway leading to the backyard on the east side of the property, a pad connecting both rear accessory structures beneath the proposed carport, concrete pavers between the primary structure and carport, and hardscaping surrounding the proposed pool.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 119 E Magnolia is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1917 by builder A.G. Dugger. The home was designed in the Neoclassical style, and features several of the style's characteristic architectural elements, including a façade dominated by a curved full-height porch with Ionic columns, a second story balcony on the front façade, and an elaborate doorway surrounded by sidelights and a half elliptical transom. The house is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The property also contains two rear accessory structures, both constructed in 1917. One was historically a garage, and the other a maid's quarters. These structures are also contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a plan for a full restoration of both the primary structure and the rear accessory structures, along with the construction of a new carport, exterior modifications, and landscaping and hardscaping modifications.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATIION – As of August 9, 2017, the applicant has not applied for Historic Tax Certification. Based on the scope of the project, staff recommends that the applicant apply for this incentive.

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

- d. WOOD WINDOWS – The applicant has stated that wood windows will be repaired and replaced as required. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic wood windows should be preserved. There are several window configurations on this structure that are character defining, including tripanel casement windows with transoms and thin divided lites, six over one double hung windows, six over one double hung windows, and more. The applicant is required to submit a comprehensive window schedule for final approval that indicates which windows are missing, deteriorated or damaged beyond repair, or repairable. If a window is deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant must furnish visual evidence to that effect. All proposed new windows must be made of wood and match the historic configuration of a particular opening.
- e. EXTERIOR DOORS – The applicant has stated that exterior doors will be replaced where required. Based on the submitted photographs of the existing structure, all exterior doors are either missing or non-original. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given these circumstances with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- f. REAR PORCH ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to enclose an existing rear porch addition and create conditioned space. The existing porch is constructed of woodlap siding and simplified square columns and posts, but is in severe disrepair. While the existing fenestration pattern is evident, no windows remain. According to a 1951 Sanborn Map, a rear porch in a similar configuration had already been constructed by this time. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, enclosing side and rear porches should be avoided. Original architectural details should not be obscured by any screening or enclosure materials. Alterations to side and rear porches

August 16, 2017

should result in a space that functions, and is visually interpreted as, a porch. Staff finds the proposal to condition the space acceptable given the historic fenestration pattern evident in the remaining porch structure, but finds that the porch should be rehabilitated to match the same materials and opening sizes as closely as possible, as the porch addition is historic in its own right and integral to the architecture of the home. Additionally, the applicant should indicate an approach to the skirting at the ground floor of the structure.

g. REAR TERRACE AND PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct new a rear terrace and porch. The terrace will feature a low railing and new staircase to provide access to the backyard. The porch roof will feature a low-slope shed with a standing seam metal roof. The terrace will require that an existing window opening be modified to a door. The structure will be open-air and the existing original façade will be visible. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements should be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines, but requires full documentation, including dimensions and materials, for final approval.

h. PORTE-COCHERE – The applicant has proposed to construct a new porte-cochere on the west façade of the structure. Presently, a non-original metal carport exists at the proposed location. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the reconstruction of porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres should be based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Side porches and porte-cocheres are historically common in Neoclassical residential architecture. The proposed design is not based on historic photographs, but is compatible with the style of the home and includes simplified columns that distinguish it from the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

i. STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing composition shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof. 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 the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines. However, the applicant has not rendered the standing seam metal roof onto the drawings for the curved roof atop the front portico. The applicant should define how the standing seam metal roof will be installed for final approval.

j. FAÇADE REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to clean and repoint the façade where required. The applicant has stated that the cleaning procedure will use low-pressure hot water and a mild detergent if required. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A.iv, the gentlest means possible should be utilized when cleaning masonry. Any abrasive, strong chemical, sandblasting, or high-pressure cleaning method should be avoided. Guideline 2.B.ii states that any repointing of historic masonry should use mortar that matches the original in color, profile, and composition, as incompatible mortar can exceed the strength of historic masonry and cause deterioration. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

k. TERRA COTTA CAPITALS – The applicant has proposed to repair and replace the terra cotta capitals on the front porch columns where required. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, porch elements, such as ceilings, floors, and columns, should be repaired in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish of the original. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

Findings for the rear accessory structures and proposed carport, items #10 through #12:

l. EXISTING WOOD WINDOWS – The applicant has stated that wood windows will be repaired and replaced as required. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic wood windows should be preserved. There are several window configurations on the rear accessory structures that are character defining. The applicant is required to submit a comprehensive window schedule for final approval that indicates which windows are missing, deteriorated or damaged beyond repair, or repairable. If a window is deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant must furnish visual evidence to that effect. All proposed new windows must be made of wood and match the historic configuration of a particular opening.

m. EXISTING EXTERIOR DOORS – The applicant has stated that doors windows will be repaired and replaced as required. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic wood windows should be preserved. Based on the submitted photographs, some wood doors exist. The applicant is required to submit a comprehensive door schedule for final approval that indicates which doors are missing, deteriorated or damaged beyond repair, or repairable. If a door is deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant must furnish visual evidence to that effect. All proposed new doors must be made of wood and match the historic configuration of a particular opening.

n. NEW OPENINGS – Based on the submitted documents, the applicant has proposed to install two glass sliding doors on the existing cabana to face south. There appears to be additional modified or added openings on the rear accessory structures. The applicant is required to provide all new window and door opening specifications, as well as all exterior elevations indicating where alterations are made, for final approval.

o. FAÇADE MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, outbuildings and their distinctive features should be repaired in-kind. When new materials are needed, they should match existing materials in color, durability, and texture. The applicant is responsible for indicating all materials used in façade repair where required on both existing accessory structures for final approval.

p. NEW COVERED PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a new covered porch on the front (south) façade of the existing cabana. Based on the submitted documents, the porch will include a flat roof with thin, simple columns. The applicant has not indicated the material specifications. According to the Historic Design

August 16, 2017

Guidelines, new porch elements should be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines, but requires full documentation, including dimensions and materials, for final approval.

q. NEW CARPORT – The applicant has proposed to construct a new rear carport. The carport will span the distance between the two existing rear accessory structures. The proposal includes an open air space for two cars and a small partially enclosed terrace element added to the east elevation of the existing studio. The carport will provide alley access for cars to enter the carport. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.

Findings for site elements, items #13 and #14:

r. POOL – The applicant has proposed to install an inground pool on the east side of the rear lot. Pools in this location are common along E Magnolia Ave, and are eligible for administrative approval. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and UDC, but the applicant will be required to indicate how the proposal is integrated with any proposed hardscaping for final approval. Dimensions are required.

s. HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed several hardscaping modifications, including the replacement of the existing driveway and rear parking pad, installation of new walkways, installation of rear concrete pavers, and installation of new hardscaping surrounding the proposed pool, rear carport, and new covered porch off of the cabana. The applicant has not indicated the dimensions of these elements nor the overall total impervious coverage that will be introduced.

t. RETAINING WALL – The applicant has indicated a proposed retaining wall on the east side of the property. Based on the submitted application, the construction of the primary structure, and a site survey, the slope of the site decreases significantly from the front to the rear of the lot. The applicant is responsible for indicating the height, material, and dimensions of the proposed retaining wall for final approval. As stated in the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, new site elements should work with, rather than change, character-defining topography.

u. LANDSCAPING – The applicant is responsible for submitting a complete landscaping plan for final approval, to include all species, locations of new plants, and modifications of existing elements.

v. GATES AND FENCING – The applicant has indicated two automatic gates and fencing on the proposed site plan and several elevations. The applicant is responsible for providing all dimensions, material specifications, and heights for proposed site elements for final approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. That the applicant submit a comprehensive window and door schedule for final approval that indicates which windows and doors are missing, deteriorated or damaged beyond repair, or repairable, as indicated in findings d, e, l, and m. If a window or door is deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant must furnish visual evidence to that effect. All proposed new windows must be made of wood and match the historic configuration of a particular opening.
2. That the applicant submits specifications for all replacement exterior doors as noted in findings e and m. Staff finds solid wood doors appropriate with a design that is compatible with Neoclassical architecture.
3. That the applicant uses a low-pressure wash and mild detergent where necessary, and uses a mortar compatible to the original in color, profile, and composition as noted in finding j.
4. That the applicant submits details on how the standing seam metal roof will be applied to the curved roof on the front façade portico, or submit plans for an alternative material on this portion of the roof.
5. That the applicant retains the same materiality, fenestration configuration, and details when developing a final solution for transforming the rear porch addition into a conditioned space. The addition of solid walls to enclose the space should be avoided to maintain the appearance of a porch. The applicant should also develop a strategy for the rear enclosed porch skirting.
6. That the applicant submits all dimensions and material specifications for final approval for all structures.
7. That the applicant submits a site section indicating the location and dimensions of the proposed retaining wall and any additional topographical modifications.
8. That the applicant submits a complete hardscaping, landscaping, and fencing plan with all dimensions and a final ratio of landscape to hardscaping coverage as indicated in findings s and u.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 16, 2017

**7. HDRC NO. 2017-408**

Applicant: Dale Carse

Address: 501 S MAIN AVE  
503 S MAIN AVE  
505 S MAIN AVE  
507 S MAIN AVE  
509 S MAIN AVE  
400 S FLORES ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a surface parking lot to be bound by E Cesar E Chavez Blvd to the south, S Flores to the west, Old Guilbeau to the north and Main to the east.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a surface parking lot to be bound by E Cesar E Chavez Blvd to the south, S Flores to the west, Old Guilbeau to the north and Main to the east. These lots previously featured non-contributing commercial structures which each received Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition.
- b. PEDESTRIAN ACCESS – The UDC Section 35-672(a) notes that pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has noted the installation of new sidewalks around the site to be six (6) feet in width. This is consistent with the UDC.
- c. PAVING MATERIALS – The UDC Section 35-672(a)(3) notes that paving materials for pedestrian pathways shall use visually and texturally different materials than those used for parking spaces and automobile traffic. The applicant has proposed concrete pathways and sidewalks. This is consistent with the UDC.
- d. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – The applicant has noted a primary use on the lots to be automobile parking. This is permitted in RIO-3 at this location due to its distance from the river right of way. Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(2), there is no maximum percentage of lot line coverage by surface parking in RIO-3. The applicant’s proposed parking location and site design is consistent with the UDC.
- e. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed one curb cut to facilitate automobile entry into the parking lot. This curb cut and corresponding entry is to be located on Old Guilbeau Street, at the interior of the site, removed from major automobile and pedestrian thoroughfares. Staff finds the proposed curb cut location to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has noted an overall curb cut width of 54’ – 8”. While the UDC notes that a width of twenty-five (25) should not be exceeded for curb cuts, staff finds that the location of the curb cut on the interior of the site will not negatively impact automobile or pedestrian traffic on nearby streets.
- f. PARKING BUFFERING – Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3), parking areas should be screened or buffered from view of public streets, the San Antonio River and adjacent residential uses. The applicant has noted the installation of planted parking screens, a steel picket fence that is to be six (6) feet in height and additional setbacks and landscaped buffered within the property line. Staff finds the proposed installation appropriate.
- g. LIGHTING – The applicant has proposed parking lot lighting in the form of light poles. The applicant has noted these at eight (8) locations. Additionally, the applicant has proposed locate security kiosks, utility boxes and security access infrastructure on the site. Each of these will be located within the screened area. Staff finds their installation to be appropriate.
- h. ARCHAEOLOGY- The project area is located within the River Improvement Overlay District. In addition, the property is likely traversed by the San Pedro or Principal Acequia, a designated National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark, Local Historic Landmark, and previously recorded archaeological site. Moreover, a review of historic archival maps shows a structure within or directly adjacent to the project area as early as 1886. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology. The archaeology consultant shall submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through g with the following stipulation:

- i. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology. The archaeology consultant shall submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

August 16, 2017

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2017-442**

Applicant: John Mize/Ford, Powell & Carson

Address: 2222 N ALAMO ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting final approval for plans for the Alamo Colleges District Support Operations Administrative Complex. The applicant is proposing the following scope of work:

1. Construct a two-story structure to the north that is approximately 45,984 gross square feet.
2. Construct a three-story structure to the south that is approximately 168,140 gross square feet.
3. Construct a two-story parking structure along Josephine Street that is approximately 58,800 square feet.
4. Construct two surface parking lots.
5. Make other site improvements including landscaping, interpretive landscaping of the acequia path, water features, outdoor amphitheater, and site signage.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property at 2222 N Alamo is the site of the previous Playland Park. This property is zoned as an individual landmark based on the Acequia del Alamo, also known as the Madre Acequia.
- b. The proposal received conceptual approval on December 7, 2016. The approval carried the following staff stipulations:
  1. **That the applicant submits a landscaping plan with plant material list** – This stipulation has been met in the current submission.
  2. **That the applicant submits a signage package with details** – This stipulation has not been met in the current submission. The applicant will return to the HDRC with a separate request for final approval of a signage package for the complex.
  3. **That the applicant submits all site and building details as required for final approval, including lighting** – This stipulation has been met in the current submission.
  4. **That the applicant complies with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology** – This stipulation will continue to apply for final approval.
- c. **SETBACKS** – The property is set between Cunningham Street to the north, N Alamo Street to the west, E Josephine Street to the south, and Fort Sam Houston to the east. The proposed three-story building is set back 24 feet from the left property line. The proposed new construction has a left setback of 124 feet, right set back of 10 feet, and a varying rear setback ranging between approximately 25 feet and 150 feet. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., front facades should align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established, or a median setback of buildings should be used along the street frontage. Staff made a site visit on November 9, 2016, and found vacant, commercial, and residential lots along the west side of N Alamo Street with varying setbacks. Staff finds the proposed small setback along N Alamo appropriate and consistent with existing setbacks found along the block, and thus consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **SCALE & MASS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., if there is more than a 50% variation in the scale of buildings on the adjacent block faces, then the height of the new building shall not exceed the tallest building on the adjacent block face by more than 10%. There are two-story structures near the site across the street. Although the proposed three-story is taller, based on the size of the lot and the proposed setbacks, staff finds the proposed three-story building appropriate for the site and surrounding context.
- e. **ROOF FORM** – The proposed new construction will have a flat roof, be made of textured concrete panels with clean lines and mid-century style influences. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i, roof forms that are consistent with those predominately found on the block should be incorporated. Staff finds the proposed flat roof form is similar to a mid-century modern building across the street. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS** – The proposed façade arrangement features a base, midsection and cap delineated by horizontal features. The fenestration pattern varies on each of the facades establishing a relationship with the exterior and interior functions. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C., the façade configuration should avoid blank walls. Staff finds the proposed façade configuration consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **LOT COVERAGE** – The proposed site plan includes natural vegetation, swales, outdoor commons, trails, acequia pathways, and buffers around mature trees. The approximate foot print of the two buildings is 64,000 square feet and 58,800 square feet for the parking structure. The developable tract is a total of approximately 12.6 acres, 60% of which will be preserved for natural elements. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., limit

August 16, 2017

new construction to no more than 50% of the total lot area. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

h. MATERIALS – The proposed material include tilt-up concrete panels with a form liner to provide pattern and texture, glazing and metal panels as exterior materials. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i, materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials found in neighboring historic properties, and do not use imitation or synthetic materials. Staff finds the proposed materials appropriate and compatible with adjacent structures.

i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New structures should be designed to reflect their own time while respecting the historic context of the district. Staff finds the proposed structures incorporate additional materials that separate and define various levels and functions of the proposed facades that contribute to the overall reduction of the perceived massing.

j. PARKING STRUCTURE – The proposed parking structure is 58,800 square feet and two stories tall. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.iii, new parking structures should be designed similar in scale, materials, and rhythm of the surrounding buildings. The proposed new parking structure features similar materials, form, and design as the other proposed two structures; the parking structure is two-stories and the other proposed structure is three. Staff finds the proposed parking structure consistent with the Guidelines in terms of scale, materials, and mass.

k. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed a comprehensive landscaping plan for the 60% of natural elements that will be preserved on the site. The landscaping includes ample native and drought-resistant fauna, including canopy trees, ornamental trees, shrubs, grasses, groundcovers, and turfgrass. Staff finds the landscaping proposal consistent and appropriate for the context of the site.

l. SURFACE PARKING – The applicant is proposing three surface parking lots. The proposed lots are behind the building along N Alamo and can be accessed from the interior drive. The proposed lots are surrounded by newlyplanted trees. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.i, off-street parking areas should be screened with a landscape buffer, wall, or ornamental fence, or a combination of these methods. Staff finds the proposed landscaping around the proposed surface lots to be appropriate.

m. SIGNAGE – There is signage noted in the rendering that is not being reviewed at this time. Any signage proposed would need to be submitted for review and approval. The applicant has stated that the signage package will be submitted to HDRC at a later time for review.

n. ARCHAEOLOGY: REPORT – The acequia is incorporated into the site design by carving away at diagonal section of the first and second floors of the building where the acequia crosses the structure. This area will be treated as an interpretive landscape, with a water feature and site signage telling the history and impact of the Acequia Madre. The site signage is to be approved in a separate application submitted at a later time. Where the buildings are interrupted by this site feature, an outdoor amphitheater will stem from the acequia plaza. An archeological investigation by Raba Kistner was conducted in 2016 and submitted to OHP and Texas Historical Commission staff. The report was approved by both entities.

o. ARCHAEOLOGY- The property is in close proximity to the Fort Sam Houston National Register of Historic Places District and the Brackenridge Park National Register of Historic Places District. The project area is also traversed by the Acequia del Alamo, a National Historic Engineering Landmark and Local Historic Landmark. In addition, historic archival maps show structures within the property as early as 1886. Thus, the property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required for the project area. The project is subject to the Antiquities Code of Texas. The preferred treatment plan will be to leave it as a natural drainage ditch per its original construction during the Spanish-Colonial time period. Any later additions, such as concrete, should be retained. Treatment plans should be reviewed by the Texas Historical Commission and Office of Historic Preservation.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

i. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The preferred treatment plan will be to leave it as a natural drainage ditch per its original construction during the Spanish-Colonial time period. Any later additions, such as concrete, should be retained. Treatment plans should be reviewed by the Texas Historical Commission and Office of Historic Preservation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology. The applicant will return with a separate request for final approval of a signage package for the complex.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Connor, Lazarine, Laffoon, Kamal, Bustamante, Garcia, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**RECUSE: Guarino**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 16, 2017

**17. HDRC NO. 2017-365**

Applicant: Benito Polendo

Address: 1126 N ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to rehabilitate the structure located at 1126 N St Marys. The scope of work will include:

1. Modifications to the fenestration on the primary facades facing N St Marys and Brooklyn, including window opening widening, door relocation, and the installation of new insulated steel windows.
2. Construction of an exterior entryway element on the façade facing Brooklyn Ave.
3. Extension of the parapet height.
4. Hardscaping and landscaping modifications.
5. Installation of new signage, to be developed and submitted at a later time.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The property located at 1126 N St Marys is a 1-story commercial structure. The building is constructed of cast in place concrete frames with clay tile infill and concrete pan-joint roof construction. The building is the former location of an Arrow Upholstery & Drapery store and is within the RIO-2 boundary at the intersection of N St Marys and Brooklyn Ave. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to perform window modifications, install new entryway elements, modify an existing parking lot slope to include a pedestrian walkway, and perform hardscaping modifications.

b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on August 8, 2017. At this meeting, the applicant stated their intent to incorporate high quality insulated storefront steel windows into the modified openings. The DRC was supportive of all proposed window modifications based on the RIO guidelines and the fact that the existing building footprint and general configuration will be retained. The DRC was also in favor

c. WINDOW MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing windows and replace with a new insulated glass and divided lite steel frames on the two primary elevations facing N St Marys and Brooklyn Ave. The existing windows are a mix of aluminum store front windows on the N St Marys elevation and steel frame divided lites on the Brooklyn Ave elevation. The applicant received administrative approval to begin replacing windows in-kind to match the existing in dimensions, materials, and design. The current proposal will alter the materiality of the windows on the N St Marys elevation and alter the openings on both N St Marys and Brooklyn Ave. While the installation of this new storefront system will alter the existing opening, staff finds that the main design intent of the existing original structure will largely remain intact. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-676(i).

d. PARAPET – The applicant has proposed to add height to the existing parapet to conceal new mechanical equipment from the public right-of-way. The proposal will add approximately 3 feet to the existing height. This will be achieved with a lightweight structure and will be covered in a stucco finish to match the existing façade texture. A detail at the top of the parapet, either painted or tiled, is proposed. Staff finds the approach consistent with the UDC.

e. INSTALLATION OF NEW ELEMENTS – The applicant has proposed to construct a new architectural element on the exterior of the existing structure, located in the center of the elevation facing Brooklyn Ave. The elements appear to measure approximately 5 feet taller than the existing flat roofline, though no dimensioned drawings have yet been provided. The applicant's proposals are generally consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) and (2) in terms of massing and location, though final material specifications have not yet been provided.

f. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a pedestrian walkway along the Brooklyn Ave elevation. This walkway will partially require cutting into the sloped elevation of an existing parking lot. This modification will include stairways to account for the slope grade change. The walkway will extend to the intersection of Brooklyn Ave and N St Marys and will join with an existing public sidewalk. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the UDC, but has not yet seen a site plan with definitive dimensions, materials, or how the walkway will be treated when it joins with the existing sidewalk. Staff has also not seen a site section or elevation of the proposed staircases. This information is required for final approval.

g. HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to install a new outdoor seating area adjacent to the N St Marys right-of-way. The area currently contains faux grass, some small shrubbery, and a temporary walkway. The outdoor seating area will introduce new hardscaping to accommodate tables and chairs. Based on the commercial context of the corridor, staff finds the proposal appropriate. A final material specification and hardscaping plan is

August 16, 2017

required for final approval.

h. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not yet submitted a site plan that indicates any new proposed landscaping. The applicant is required to provide this for final approval.

i. PARKING LOT MODIFICATIONS – On the east façade, the applicant has proposed to install a new door to be identical to the easternmost door of the south façade and a new storefront system to provide access from the proposed parking area into the structure. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-676(i).

j. MATERIALITY – The applicant has stated that the new architectural elements will be clad in stucco. This is generally compatible with the existing structure, but staff has not received information on the proposed finish, final color, or final texture. This information is required for final approval.

k. SIGNAGE – The applicant has verbally indicated that the new architectural elements will potentially feature signage. The floor plan also indicates that the building will be multitenant in the future, which has been confirmed by the applicant. The applicant is required to provide a comprehensive signage plan for final approval

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through j. The applicant should consider the following when working towards final approval:

1. That the applicant confirms all design decisions, including architectural details, materials, and other specifications as noted in the findings.
2. That the applicant indicates all hardscaping and landscaping modifications or additions as noted in findings e and f. The documentation should include a full site section that indicates how the proposed walkway will affect the existing parking lot's slope, along with information on the proposed staircases and any ADA requirements.
3. That the applicant submits a comprehensive, multi-tenant signage plan as noted in finding j.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on August 8, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.

**THIS ITEM WAS PULLED BY STAFF- APPLICANT ASKING FOR FINAL APPROVAL**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to approval with staff stipulations; the applicant must include architectural details and window details.

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2017-420**

Applicant: Gary Perkins

Address: 2136 W SUMMIT

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to reconstruct a porte-cochere on the east side of the property. The reconstruction will involve rebuilding an exterior wall of a non-original side addition that has suffered extensive water damage.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure located at 2136 W Summit Ave is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1933 in the Colonial Revival style. The home features several elements of the architectural style, including an accentuated front door with pediment, double-hung window sashes with multiple divided lites, and a side-gabled roof configuration. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to reconstruct a non-original porte-cochere on the east side of the home. The request includes rebuilding one exterior wall on a side addition that has experienced severe water damage.

b. PORTE-COCHERE – The existing porte-cochere is constructed of wood structural members and clad in stucco. The second story terrace features stucco-clad square pillars, a low wrought iron fence, and a tiled deck. The portecochere is supported by simple square wooden posts. The structure, along with the 1-story portion of the home to which it is structurally affixed, is not original to the historic structure. According to a 1950 Sanborn Map, the footprint of the original home is confined to the 2-story structure. The side addition and porte-cochere were added sometime after 1951. The structural elements of this addition are currently failing. The wooden beams supporting the porte-cochere decking are rotting and bowing from water infiltration, which is causing the exterior stucco to

August 16, 2017

shed from the siding and expose additional interior structural elements, like wall studs. The interior wall of the 1-story side addition is also experiencing water infiltration from the shifting beams, which has resulted in interior damage and flooding. Based on these urgent considerations, the applicant received administrative approval to begin demolishing the structure.

c. RECONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the porte-cochere mostly in-kind. The wrought iron fencing will be retained and the stucco columns will be reconstructed to match the existing. The tile decking will be replaced with treated cedar beams. The new structure will incorporate a drainage system under the deck and a gutter to direct rain away from the structure. The brick masonry detail above the 1-story addition will be replaced with an LVL supporting beam to be painted white. Based on the fact that the porte-cochere and 1-story element of the home are non-original to the historic structure, staff finds the proposed modifications and reconstruction strategy appropriate for the style of the home.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant submits final drawings to staff for approval.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**RECUSAL: Grube**

**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 Quinterilla

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 gravel 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

August 16, 2017

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. 2017-421**

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 carport at the rear of the property.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct an open air carport at 1115 E Crockett, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed carport will be located at the rear of the previously approved new construction.
- b. CARPORT – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. note that new accessory structures should be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure on the lot in terms of their height, massing and form, should be no larger in plan than forty percent of the historic structure’s footprint and should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The applicant has proposed a footprint of approximately 400 square feet and has proposed materials to include metal columns and a standing seam metal roof. Given its location within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, staff finds the installation of wood materials, rather than metal to be appropriate.
- c. CARPORT – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. note that the predominant orientation for accessory structures should be used. The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure adjacent to the side alley, which will provide access to the structure. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a location that is consistent with the location of historic accessory structures throughout the district. Staff finds the proposed location to be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant use wood columns and beams in place of the proposed metal.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 16, 2017

**23. HDRC NO. 2017-402**

Applicant: David Merritt/Merritt Development Group

Address: 114/118 SOLEDAD ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an eight story hotel on the San Antonio River.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of an eight story hotel, not including the River Walk Level at 114/118 Soledad Street, located on the flood channel of the San Antonio River Walk. The applicant received conceptual approval of demolition of the Solo Serve Building with new construction of a hotel on July 6, 2016, with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant submit additional details regarding the future treatment of the portion of the site that will not feature this proposed new construction and a projected timeline for development for consideration by the HDRC. *This portion of the site has been sold and the structure at this location remains.*
  - ii. That the applicant provide an updated landscaping plan noting all proposed landscaping and plant materials as well as site lighting prior to returning to the HDRC. *The applicant has submitted a detailed landscaping plan.*
  - iii. That the applicant provides information on the location and screening of all mechanical equipment. *The applicant has noted the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.*
  - iv. That the applicant address the lack of fenestration on the western portion of the north and south facades. *The applicant has added fenestration to these facades.*
  - v. That the applicant ensure that each window is inset at least two to three inches within walls. *The applicant has provided wall sections noting the proper window recession.*
  - vi. That archaeological investigations are required.
- b. DEMOLITION – At the December 21, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received approval to demolish the Solo Serve Building, construct the foundation for the proposed new construction and retain the lower 11’ – 0” of the historic wall along the river with the following stipulations:
  - i. That all stone removed from the historic wall be accessed and stored and that a salvaging plan be provided to staff for the stone’s incorporation.
  - ii. That the applicant attend a Design Review Committee meeting prior to submitting for final approval of elevations and materials.
  - iii. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required for all ground disturbing activities, including those associated with demolition and new construction. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- c. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan that notes public access ways across the site from Soledad Street to the Riverwalk. Additionally, the applicant has connected the various functions of the site in a coordinated system. This is consistent with the UDC.
- d. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – The UDC Section 25-672(a)(5) addresses pedestrian access along the Riverwalk pathway and how it shall not be blocked by queuing, hostess stations and tables and chairs. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- e. VIEWS – The section of the Riverwalk currently features somewhat of a canyon effect given the location of multi-height structures along the river on both the east and west sides. The applicant has proposed to setback the structures massing and has incorporated setbacks and offsets within the structure’s façade. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed massing appropriate and sensitive to the historic Riverwalk features. Additionally, the applicant’s proposed setbacks preserve existing views of the river north of the site from various vantage points south of the proposed new construction.
- f. SOLAR ACCESS – The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study noting the proposed development’s shadow on the San Antonio River for both the summer and winter solstices. The applicant’s study has noted that the proposed development is consistent with the UDC in regards to solar access to the river.
- g. SITE DESIGN – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Staff finds the applicant’s proposal appropriate and consistent with the UDC in regards to providing clearly defined pedestrian access points, activity nodes that will not only activate the site, but also the public right of way.

August 16, 2017

- h. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(e) regarding landscape design, a variety in landscape design must be provided with no more than seventy-five (75) percent of the landscape materials, including plants being the same as those on adjacent properties. Additionally, according to the UDC Section 35-674(f), indigenous, non-invasive plant species and tropical plant species are permitted. The applicant has provided a detailed landscaping plan noting landscaping and paving materials that are consistent with the UDC and appropriate for the site.
- i. **PAVING MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted a stone patio adjacent to the public right of way at the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(g), a separate paving materials that is clearly distinguishable from the adjacent patio paving materials is to be used. The applicant has noted paving materials that include including tile, irregular formed concrete and concrete pavers at various levels and locations on the site.
- j. **STREET FURNISHINGS** – Street furnishings adjacent to the Riverwalk are to be constructed of high quality materials that are complementary to the tradition and craftsmanship of the Riverwalk. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673 (i) in regards to street furnishings. Any and all proposed changes to River Walk landscape adjacent to property must be coordinated with and approved by Center City Development & Operations Dept., and any proposed use of River Walk public property (including placement of tables & chairs) must be approved by Center City Development & Operations Department.
- k. **LIGHTING DESIGN** – Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project’s design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. The applicant has provided information on the proposed landscaping plan regarding site lighting.
- l. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant has noted the location of mechanical equipment on the roof to be screened by parapet walls. Staff finds that additional mechanical locations, such as fire hydrant connections and any other mechanical equipment at street level should be noted on all elevations.
- m. **STREET FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed pedestrian entrance locations along Soledad street in addition to utility entrances. Staff finds that the applicant should provide information and detailed elevations for the street elevation as well as product information regarding all doors. Staff finds that an alternative to the proposed steel roll up door should be presented to staff.
- n. **STREET FAÇADE** – The applicant has provided staff with a site plan of the property; however, the applicant is to provide staff with a site plan noting the block context and verifying that the front façade of the proposed new construction will match that of the neighboring historic structures. There should be a design element to close the void between the proposed new construction and the existing structure to the north at the street façade.
- o. **BUILDING SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed many human scaled elements at the river and street levels including materials with human scaled proportions, human scaled floor heights and human scaled façade penetrations. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to incorporate balconies and other façade elements that on an individual level maintains a human scale. This is consistent with the UDC.
- p. **BUILDING MASSING** – As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed various setbacks in massing to prevent a dominating effect on the Riverwalk. The applicant has proposed tower massing on approximately half of the proposed Riverwalk frontage of the site. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and commends the applicant for reducing the overall impact of new construction on the Riverwalk.
- q. **BUILDING HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. This site is in close proximity with various structures of significant height including Riverview Towers, the Holiday Inn San Antonio Riverwalk and the Courtyard San Antonio Riverwalk. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed height appropriate.
- r. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) and EIFS are not allowed. The applicant has proposed materials that include stucco, aluminum storefront systems, aluminum windows, cast stone, salvaged stone from the existing structures on site and brick.
- s. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical

August 16, 2017

mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed modulating features throughout and has addressed staff's previous concerns regarding lack of fenestration on the east and west facades near Soledad.

t. FAÇADE COMPOSITION – The applicant has noted on the west façade the use of brick at two varying heights. Staff finds that brick heights should be uniform throughout the Soledad façade.

u. ELEVATION DRAWINGS – The applicant has provided a colored rear elevation. Staff finds that colored elevations for each façade should be submitted for staff's review to verify appropriateness of material colors.

v. FAÇADE COMPOSITION – The UDC Section 35-674(e) states that building should feature three distinctive segments: a base, midsection and cap. The applicant has consistently separated the proposed new construction's facades to include these three sections. To accomplish this, the applicant has incorporated both massing elements and changes in materials and has included an ornamental building cap. This is consistent with the UDC.

w. WINDOWS – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. The applicant has proposed fenestration patterns that promote the existence of a human scale as well as relate to the uses of spaces behind them. This is consistent with the UDC. Per the applicant's wall sections, windows will be recessed significantly within the wall at each opening.

x. STONE WALL – The applicant has provided elevations noting the design of the rear wall, which will feature materials from the original wall. The proposed wall features both contemporary openings as well as openings that relate to historic walls found along the River Walk. Staff finds the proposed wall as well as the reuse of stone throughout the site appropriate.

y. ARCHAEOLOGY- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the Main and Military Plazas National Register of Historic Places District. A review of historic archival maps places structures within the property as early as 1767. Moreover, the property is within the former location of the Veramendi Palace, a Spanish-Colonial structure. In addition, the site is known to be along the route of Ben Milam's march from the Molino Blanco to Main Plaza in 1835 during the Siege of Bexar. Ben Milam was killed during the siege, reportedly interred within the Veramendi Palace grounds, and later exhumed and buried in modern-day Milam Park. A Mexican battery was also reportedly constructed on the Veramendi Palace property in 1836. Furthermore, the project area abuts the San Antonio River, an area known to contain archaeological evidence of over 12,000 years of human activity. Therefore, the property may contain archaeological deposits, some of which may be significant. Thus, archaeological investigations are required for all ground disturbing activities, including those associated with demolition and new construction.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant return to the HDRC for all site and building signage.
- ii. That cast stone or metal cornices be installed in place of EIFS.
- iii. That an alternative door to the proposed steel door is installed as noted in finding m.
- iv. That as construction progresses and plans for the adjacent building are developed, that the street wall terminate at the adjacent building to eliminate the interstitial space between the buildings. Proposed solutions may be presented to staff.
- v. That the applicant provide additional information regarding material colors and that EIFS not be used.
- vi. That the two mid-height cornices on the Soledad façade align at a uniform height as noted in finding t.
- vii. That the applicant submit rendered elevation drawings, site plans and architectural documents verifying the setbacks from neighboring historic structures and a detailed street level elevation noting the location and details of all doors, windows and mechanical connections.
- viii. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required for all ground disturbing activities, including those associated with demolition and new construction. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 16, 2017

**24. HDRC NO. 2017-391**

Applicant: Matt Wilson/Chandler Signs

Address: 901 E HOUSTON ST

**REQUEST:**

- The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage to include the following:
1. One wall mounted, internally illuminated sign to feature extruding channel letters to feature two sign components, the top being round and reading "Tru" with the bottom being square and reading "Hilton". The round component is to feature nine feet in width and height for a total square footage of approximately 63 square feet. The square component is to feature 2' – 6" in height and 6' – 9" in width of the total square footage of approximately 17 square feet. This sign will be located on the east façade. This sign is identified as Sign A.
  2. Four wall mounted, face lit channel letters to feature two sign components, "TRU" letters and a square component reading "Hilton" The TRU letters are to feature 8' – 1 ¼ inches in width and 5 feet in height. The Hilton component is to feature 7' – 3 1/2 " in width and 2' 8 ½" in height. The TRU component will feature approximately 40 square feet and the Hilton component will feature approximately 20 square feet. Signs will be located on the north and south facades. These signs are identified as signs B through E.
  3. One monument sign to feature an overall height of ten (10) feet and an overall width of six (6) feet to be double sided and feature internal illumination. The monument sign will be located at the corner of Elm and E Houston. This sign is identified as Sign F.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to install signage on the previously approved addition to the historic structure at 901 E Houston, a property bordered by E Houston to the South, Star to the north and Elm and IH 37/US 281 to the east. No signage at this time is being installed to the historic structure at this location.
- b. WALL SIGNAGE (A) – The applicant has proposed to install one wall mounted, internally illuminated sign to feature extruding channel letters to feature two sign components, the top being round and reading "Tru" with the bottom being square and reading "Hilton". The round component is to feature nine feet in width and height for a total square footage of approximately 63 square feet. The square component is to feature 2' – 6" in height and 6' – 9" in width of the total square footage of approximately 17 square feet. This sign will be located on the east façade. This sign is identified as Sign A. The proposed square footage exceeds that recommended by the Historic Design Guidelines; however, given the overall size of the east façade and the location of this structure adjacent to an elevated highway, staff finds the proposed square footage and location to be appropriate. Staff finds that the proposed signage should be back lit.
- c. WALL SIGNAGE (B – E) – The applicant has proposed to install four wall mounted, face lit channel letters to feature two sign components, "TRU" letters and a square component reading "Hilton" The TRU letters are to feature 8' – 1 ¼ inches in width and 5 feet in height. The Hilton component is to feature 7' – 3 1/2 " in width and 2' 8 ½" in height. The TRU component will feature approximately 40 square feet and the Hilton component will feature approximately 20 square feet. Signs will be located on the north and south facades. These signs are identified as signs B through E.
- d. WALL SIGNAGE (B – E) – The applicant has provided staff with an exhibit noting site lines for the proposed signage from various vantage points in the vicinity. Given the orientation of the addition's facades, the four signs would face southwest, southeast and north. Staff finds the proposed locations and orientations appropriate. Additionally, the proposed size in relationship to the scale of the building facades is appropriate.
- e. MONUMENT SIGN – At street level, the applicant has proposed to install a monument sign to feature an overall height of ten (10) feet and an overall width of six (6) feet to be double sided and feature internal illumination. The monument sign will be located at the corner of Elm and E Houston. This sign is identified as Sign F. The sign's location is at a heavily traveled street corner with multiple passing lanes of traffic on both Elm and E Houston. The Guidelines for Signage notes that freestanding signage should not exceed six (6) feet in height. Staff finds that applicant adhere to the Guidelines for Signage regarding the height of free standing signage.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3, signs A through F with the following stipulations:

- i. That all signage is face or back lit.
- ii. That all signage faces are constructed of metal and not vinyl or plastic.
- iii. That the proposed monument sign not exceed six (6) feet in height.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal move to approve the applicant's request with staff stipulations.

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

August 16, 2017

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2017-406**

Applicant: Martin Phipps

Address: 303 KING WILLIAM

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a limestone planter in the front yard planting strip on both King William and Beauregard Streets to feature heights ranging from six to eighteen inches.
2. Install a wrought iron fence outside of the existing property line to feature eighteen inches in height.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property at 303 King William features the primary historic structure which was constructed circa 1880 and an existing front yard wrought iron fence, which per the provided site plan is located on the property line.
- b. FENCING – At the base of the existing front yard fencing and outside of the property line, the applicant has proposed to install an eighteen (18) inch tall wrought iron fence. The proposed fencing would be located in the public right of way; however, there are historic examples of fencing located adjacent to the sidewalk at the public right of way on King William Street and throughout the King William Historic District. Staff finds this installation to be appropriate based on existing, historic examples.
- c. PLANTING BOX – In the public planting strip between the sidewalk and streets, the applicant has proposed to construct a limestone planter to feature saw chopped limestone and heights to range from six to eighteen inches in height. As the proposed wrought iron fencing, the proposed limestone planter is proposed to be located within the public right of way. Landscaping materials vary in the planting strips along King William Street; however, there are no historic examples of raised or walled planting beds in the planting strips. Staff does not find this installation appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the installation of a limestone planting box within the front planting strip based on finding c.

Staff recommends approval of item #2, the installation of wrought iron fencing based on finding b. The applicant is responsible for meeting any right of way permitting requirements that may apply..

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2017-410**

Applicant: Nicole Garza

Address: 309 PIERCE

**REQUEST:**

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

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family home on the vacant lot located at 309 Pierce. The lot is located within the boundary of the Government Hill Historic District and is flanked to the north by a 1-story historic single family home, to the west by a 1.5-story historic single family home, and to the east by a

August 16, 2017

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

However, the configurations of the lots in the area vary in orientation, setback, lot coverage, and lot size.

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

c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on July 11, 2017. The DRC noted that the attached garage is a departure from typical configurations in the district, but recognized the limitations of the lot size and the associated easements, stating that the solution is appropriate for the constraints. A key concept discussed was the massing of the building and its proposed roof forms. The DRC noted that the typical configuration of structures in the area is a projection of the front entryway towards the streetscape, which is the opposite condition indicated in the submission; the proposed structure's garage mass is the element that projects closest to Pierce. The DRC suggested simplifying the various roof forms and incorporating shed dormers to make ridgelines less complex, and to allow the central mass to read as one distinct element, which responds more closely to the historic massing found in the surrounding vicinity. The applicant met again with the DRC on July 25, 2017. The DRC discussed the development pattern in the area and the configuration of the roof forms of the historic houses in the vicinity, suggesting that the applicant take inspiration from neighboring precedents. The DRC recommended that the applicant explore adding a front porch to remain consistent with the neighboring homes fronting IH 35 N. The DRC also recommended exploring raising the foundation height in response to historic precedents. Façade materials were discussed, including the lack of board and baton siding precedents in the historic district, and the DRC recommended incorporating horizontal lap siding or another façade element that responded to the neighborhood materials. The DRC recommended that rock veneer be avoided.

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window as compared to nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. Overall, the applicant has incorporated window sizes and proportions that are consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document and historic fenestration precedents in the district. However, the lack of windows on the second story loft element on the west elevation is not consistent with historic configurations on 2-story homes in the district. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within walls to ensure that a proper façade depth is maintained. Additionally, the applicant should install wood windows that include traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.

August 16, 2017

k. GARAGE – The applicant has proposed to construct an attached garage. The garage will be located at the northeastern portion of the property and will be the mass projecting closest to the Pierce right-of-way. The garage door will be a double-wide overhead door and orient towards the north, facing the adjacent house. The garage mass will measure 20'-4" in width. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new garages should follow the historic pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. Historic garages and outbuildings are most typically located at the rear of the lot, behind the principal building. There is no historic precedent for an attached garage in the Government Hill Historic District. The development pattern in the vicinity is most commonly a detached rear accessory structure accessed from a rear alley or secondary or side street. According to Sanborn Maps, the lot was originally divided along the approximate location of the existing curb cut and contained two historic houses. The lot width is similar to the width of the adjacent homes to west of the property. The lot can accommodate a rear accessory structure accessed from Pierce Avenue and feature enough remaining space to construct a 2-story single family home. Staff does not find the proposed garage configuration appropriate for the district or consistent with the Guidelines.

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

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

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

o. TREE REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove several trees from the property, including a tree located in approximately the center of the lot, and several trees along the property's lot line. The tree located in the center of the lot is not a heritage tree. The trees located along the lot line are smaller and are not heritage trees. However, the applicant should consult with the City Arborist to determine tree species and their significance.

p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not yet provided staff with a full landscaping plan at this time indicating any new trees, shrubbery, or additional plantings to be introduced on the property.

q. HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing concrete apron near the center of the lot on Pierce and install a new concrete driveway measuring 16'-0" in width. The applicant has also proposed to construct a concrete walkway measuring 13'-4" in length near the center of the property, slightly south of the concrete apron to be removed. Staff finds the proposed walkway width and material consistent with historic precedents in the district, but finds that its entrance should terminate at the façade facing IH-35 Frontage Road to be more consistent with entrance patterns along the block as noted in finding g. Regarding the driveway, concrete driveways are contextually appropriate and historically common in the Government Hill Historic District. However, according to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways should be limited to 10'-0" in width. Staff finds the proposed width inconsistent with the Guidelines.

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

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- a. That the applicant orients the primary entrance of the structure towards Interstate 35 Frontage Road to be more consistent with the development pattern of the block as noted in findings f and q.
- b. That the applicant explores ways to incorporate a detached garage as noted in finding k to be more consistent with the overall development pattern of the Government Hill Historic District.
- c. That the applicant reduces the width of the proposed driveway to 10'-0" to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and historic driveways in the district.
- d. That the applicant removes the shed roof element on the 2nd story of the left elevation to simply the overall massing and configuration of the roof form to be more consistent with the historic roofs found in the district as noted in findings i and j.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for conceptual approval with staff stipulations and to remove stipulation #1 & #2.

August 16, 2017

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**27. HDRC NO. 2017-400**

Applicant: Mariela Valdivia

Address: 319 W MITCHELL ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new four (4) story multi-family apartment complex with 81 units.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a four story, multi-family structure to feature 81 residential units at 319 W Mitchell Street, location in RIO-4. The property is bound by W Mitchell to the south, King Roger Street to the west and McKay Avenue to the north. The applicant has proposed surface parking on the eastern portion of the site.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on July 11, 2017, where committee members noted that the substantial buffering around the site reduced the impact and scale of the proposed new construction on neighboring structures, that the materials were consistent with UDC standards for construction in the River Improvement Overlay and that the proposed roof structure seemed to be appropriate.
- c. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed to construct a pedestrian sidewalk across the site on along W Mitchell, King Roger Street and at the rear of the site on McKay Avenue. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. CURBCUTS – The applicant has proposed curb cuts on W Mitchell and King Roger Street. According to the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(B), curb cuts should not exceed more than twenty-five (25) feet in width. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- e. AUTOMOBILE ACCESS & PARKING – As noted in finding a, the applicant has proposed surface parking on the eastern portion of the site, utilizing an existing surface parking lot. Per the UDC Section 36-672(b)(2)(A), parking areas should be located toward the interior of the site. Additionally, per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3), parking areas should be screened or buffered from view of public streets, the San Antonio River and adjacent residential uses. Staff finds the proposed parking location to be appropriate; however, the surface parking should be buffered with landscaping elements as noted per the UDC from view of public streets.
- f. BUILDING ORIENTATION & ENTRANCE – Per the UDC Section 35-673(b), buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street with secondary entrances located on the interior of the property. Primary entrances should be distinguishable by architectural features such as an entry portal, change in material or color, change in scale or the addition of columns, canopies or lintels. Staff finds that a distinguished entrance on the W Mitchell façade has not been included into the design. There are no architectural elements on this façade that would distinguish a primary entrance facing Mitchell.
- g. LANDSCAPE DESIGN – The applicant has provided a site plan noting locations of tree plantings and lawn coverage. As noted in finding e, landscaping buffers are needed to screen surface parking. The applicant is to submit a detailed landscaping plan to include landscaping materials and plant species to staff when submitting an application for final approval.
- h. SITE FURNISHINGS – The applicant has noted site furnishings to include a swimming pool and outdoor landscaped areas. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(i) in regards to street furnishings and the standards for proper placement and materials.
- i. LIGHTING – Site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape and architectural design of a property. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to site lighting.
- j. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), buffering and screening should be used to screen mechanical and service equipment from view from the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment from view at the public right of way.
- k. BICYCLE PARKING – Bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO Districts. Bicycle parking shall be placed in a well-lit and accessible area. UDC bicycle parking requirements in UDC 35-526 can be met through indoor bicycle storage facilities in lieu of outdoor bike rack fixtures. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- l. HUMAN SCALE – According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a “human scale” which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into

August 16, 2017

modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed multiple components to achieve this which include recessed balconies and human scaled façade openings. This is consistent with the UDC.

m. FAÇADE SEPARATION – For proposed new construction in the RIO-4 where a façade is longer than seventyfive (75) feet, additional steps must be taken to separate the façade. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature variations in wall planes and façade openings including fenestration and balcony openings. Staff finds that additional variation in the wall planes and the inclusion of deeper balconies or recessed or covered fenestrations would be more consistent with this requirement.

n. FAÇADE SEPARATION – For proposed new construction in the River Improvement Overlay, each façade must be organized into three distinct segments; a base, midsection and cap. The applicant has achieved this through the use of alternating materials at the street level as well as the use lintels to serve as horizontal banding at each level and as the building cap. This is consistent with the UDC.

o. HEIGHT – The UDC Section 35-674(c) addresses height issues within the River Improvement Overlay District. The applicant has noted an overall height of approximately fifty (50) feet, appropriate for RIO-4, which allows up to eighty-four (84) feet in height.

p. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials to include stucco, stone cladding and metal guardrails. The proposed materials are consistent with the UDC. Generally, the proposed materials are appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed stone cladding beneath the gabled roof on the W Mitchell façade should be eliminated to provide a uniform façade element at the building corner.

q. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a combination of hipped roofs with a flat and gabled roof on the E Mitchell façade. Staff finds the use of hipped roofs to be inappropriate at this scale given their historic use on single family residential structures and that they are not found historically on structures this size. Staff finds that the incorporation of flat or contemporary roof forms would be more appropriate. Additionally staff finds that the gabled roof on the W Mitchell façade should be eliminated and a uniform, flat roof line be featured at this location. A gabled and flat roof are not historically found in combination, and the visibility of the hipped roof from Mitchell results in an incongruous façade and reads as the side of the building versus the primary façade.

r. WINDOW FENESTRATION – In regards to window fenestration, the UDC Section 35-674 (2) states that windows help provide a human scale to a façade and therefore should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, they should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them, they shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and grouped to establish rhythms and that curtain wall systems should be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the proposed curb cuts do not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width each as noted in finding d.
- ii. That the applicant buffer all surface parking from the public right of way and provide a detailed landscaping plan as noted in findings e and h.
- iii. That the applicant provide an architectural and site lighting plan as noted in finding j.
- iv. That the applicant provide onsite bicycle parking as noted in finding l.
- v. That the applicant modify the proposed roof form to feature a flat or contemporary roof form that would be found historically on a structure of this mass and to eliminate the front facing gabled roof on the W Mitchell façade.
- vi. That the applicant eliminate the proposed stone cladding beneath the front facing gabled roof on the W Mitchell façade.
- vii. That the applicant introduce additional façade variation, separation of wall planes, deeper balconies and recessed fenestrations.
- viii. ARCHAEOLOGY- The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Kamal, Bustamante, Garcia, Garza, Grube**

**NAYS:**

**RECUSAL: Laffoon**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

August 16, 2017

**28. HDRC NO. 2017-381**

Applicant: Christine Garcia

Address: 515 S ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install new faces on the existing cabinet pole sign to the north of 515 S St Mary's.
2. Install new faces on the existing wall cabinets.
3. Install new signage above the primary entrance pediment in front of a historic signage location.
4. Remove an existing blade sign with a digital attachment.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed signage modifications for both building mounted and site signage at 515 S St Mary's, commonly known the Hermann Son's Building. The applicant has proposed to completely remove an existing blade sign that once featured a digital attachment. Staff finds this removal appropriate.
- b. SIGN REFACING – A pole sign currently exists in the parking lot immediately north of the historic structure that features a cabinet noting parking. On both the north facing and west facing (river facing) facades, there is existing wall signage totaling approximately 72 square feet each. The applicant has proposed to reface each existing sign with new vinyl graphics.
- c. PEDIMENT SIGNAGE – Above the pediment at the primary entrance on N St Mary's, the applicant has proposed to install signage that would obscure the existing signage which reads "Grand Lodge, Order of the Sons of Hermann in Texas". The Guidelines for Signage, 1.A.i notes that new signage should be based evidence of historic signs or sign attachment parts along the building storefront where possible. Design signs to respect and respond to the character and/or period of the area in which they are being placed. Signs should identify the tenant without creating visual clutter or distracting from building features and historic districts. Staff finds that the proposed new signage at this location would distract from historic signage and is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, the historic street façade does not lend itself to wall mounted signage.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2, the refacing of pole and wall signage based on finding b. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the installation of a new pediment sign based on finding c. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the removal of an existing blade sign based on finding a.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to move for conceptual approval with staff stipulations, except stipulation #2.

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**29. HDRC NO. 2017-397**

Applicant: Eduardo Villalon

Address: 415 WILLOW DR

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a one and a half story single family home.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a one and one-half story residential structure on the vacant lot at 415 Willow Street in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed new construction will feature a total of approximately 1,400 square feet.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. SETBACKS & 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

August 16, 2017

along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of twenty (20) feet from the front porch to the front sidewalk. The historic structure immediately to the north of 415 Willow features a setback from the sidewalk of approximately six (6) feet. This is the only historic structure oriented toward Willow on the west side of the street. On the east side of the street, two primary structures feature setbacks of approximately twenty (20) feet. Staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate.

d. 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 Willow Street. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. 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 greatly exceed the historic precedent. Each of the three historic structures that are oriented toward Willow as well as the majority in the immediate vicinity feature heights of one story. The applicant has noted a top plate height of 15' – 1" with an approximate seven feet of height from the top plate to the ridge line for an overall height of approximately twenty-two (22) feet. Staff does not find the proposed height to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the overall height should be reduced through the shortening of the second story or the lowering of the top plate height to produce an overall height that is comparable with the heights of neighboring, historic structures.

f. 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. The applicant has noted a foundation height of approximately eighteen (18) inches. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) inches. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed both a front and side gabled roof. There are historic examples of both front and side gabled roofs throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. On both the front and side gabled roofs, the applicant has incorporated gable returns, which are not elements found on historic structures. Staff finds that the proposed gable returns should be eliminated.

h. 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 and door openings that are generally consistent with those found on historic structures in regards to location and size with the exception of the right elevation, which features only one window opening. Staff finds that the applicant should install additional window fenestration on the right elevation as well as on the second level of the left elevation.

i. WINDOW MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance, and feature traditional trim and sill details. At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials; however, staff finds that one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows should be used.

j. 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.

k. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed cedar porch columns, a standing seam metal roof, lap siding, board and batten siding and decorative staggered edge siding. The applicant has noted the installation of composite siding. Staff finds the installation of composite siding to be appropriate; however, if composite siding is used, a smooth finished should be used along with an exposure of four inches for lap siding. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.

l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally the proposed architectural features are consistent with the Guidelines and relate to historic examples found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposed gable returns should be eliminated and that additional window fenestration should be introduced on both the right and left elevations as noted in findings g and h.

m. COLUMN DESIGN – The applicant has proposed cedar front porch columns; however, at this time has not included a column detail determining trim and dimensions. Staff finds that a column not to exceed six (6) inches in width should be used.

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

o. DRIVEWAY – To the south of the proposed new construction, the applicant has proposed to install a front yard driveway to feature nine (9) feet in width and twenty (20) feet in length. The development pattern in the Dignowity Hill Historic District is for driveways to extend through the front yard to the side and rear yard of historic properties. Staff finds the proposed location and width to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the driveway should be extended along the side of the property to be consistent with development patterns throughout the district.

August 16, 2017

p. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed a front yard sidewalk to lead from the sidewalk at the public right of way to the front porch to be centered on the front door and to lead from the front walk to the driveway. The proposed sidewalk is to be three (3) feet in width. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

q. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not at this time provided information regarding landscaping. The applicant is responsible for submitting a landscaping plan when returning to the HDRC for final approval.

r. FENCING – The applicant has noted per the site plan that a hog wire fence to be three (3) feet in height is to be installed in the front yard. Staff finds the proposed location and height appropriate; however, the applicant is to submit a detail of the proposed fence when returning to the HDRC for final approval

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the applicant provide information noting the setbacks of adjacent historic structures and that the proposed new construction matches.
- ii. That the applicant reduce the proposed height through the shortening of the second story or the lowering of the top plate height to produce an overall height that is comparable with the heights of neighboring, historic structures.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate a sloping soffit design and eliminate the gable returns on the proposed gabled roofs as noted in finding g.
- iv. That the applicant introduce additional window fenestration to the right and left elevations as noted in finding h.
- v. That that a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used based on finding i. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail (need to add detail here). Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- vi. That the applicant provide additional information regarding exterior materials and if composite siding is used, a smooth finished should be used along with an exposure of four inches for lap siding. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish as noted in finding k. Hardi shingles should not have a faux wood texture.
- vii. That the applicant provide a detailed drawing of the proposed porch columns and that the columns not exceed six inches in width as noted in finding m.
- viii. That the proposed driveway extend along the side of the proposed new construction as noted in finding o.
- ix. That the proposed front fence not exceed four (4) feet in height as noted in finding r.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to move for conceptual approval with staff stipulations except stipulation #2

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**30. HDRC NO. 2017-396**

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

Address: 814 BURNET ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct four, two story residential structures on the vacant lot at 814 Burnet.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to construct four, two story residential structures on the four vacant lots at 814 Burnet, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This lot is located mid-block between N Olive and N Pine Streets. The applicant has proposed for each residential structure to be located on each of the four lots with a designated parking location or carport. The two lots at adjacent to Burnet are to house units 1 and 2. The two rear lots are to house units 3 and 4.

August 16, 2017

- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. LOT COVERAGE – Many lots in the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature a primary residential structure that fronts a primary street with one or more accessory structures toward the rear of the site. The applicant has proposed to locate two of the two story units on the lots at the rear of the lots adjacent to Burnet Street with a composition similar to that of a primary historic structure with a rear accessory structure.
- 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. Per the applicant's proposed site plan, two of the residential structures are to address Burnet with setbacks of 12 and 16 feet from the property lines. These two structures would be the only two on Burnet with an orientation toward Burnet. The proposed orientations of units 1 and 2 are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The locations of units 3 and 4 are consistent with those of historic, rear accessory structures. The setbacks of units 1 and 2 should be greater than the side setbacks of both historic structures at the corners of N Pine and N Olive.
- e. ENTRANCES – Per 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 toward Burnet. 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. These two lots are located across Burnet from a two story historic structure and to the immediate west of a two story historic structure. Staff finds heights of two stories for units 1 and 2, the address Burnet is appropriate; however, staff has concerns regarding the proposed heights and massing of units 3 and 4, as two story accessory structure, as these are presented, are not typical throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- g. SCALE & MASS – The applicant has noted overall widths of thirty-six and forty feet. The average width for historic structures in the immediate vicinity is between thirty and thirty-five feet. Staff finds the proposed width to be inappropriate and finds that widths should be reduced to become consistent with the nearby historic examples. Additionally, the proposed development pattern has no historic precedent. More variation in building orientation and massing among structures would be appropriate.
- h. 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. Neighboring historic structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. The applicant has proposed foundation heights of two feet for each unit. This is consistent with the UDC.
- i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for unit 1 to feature a hipped roof, unit 2 to feature a front and side gabled roof, unit 3 to feature a side gabled roof and unit four to feature a front and side gabled roof, matching that of unit 2. Gabled and hipped roofs are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District; however, many feature more detailed or complex roof form than what is found in the current proposal.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window and door openings that lack the amount of fenestration typically found on historic structures. The overall ratio of solids to voids should relate to those found on neighboring historic structures and should be consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, be recessed within the window frame, feature traditional materials or appearance, and feature traditional trim and sill details. At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials; however, staff finds that one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows should be used.
- l. MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has proposed materials that include Hardi lap siding, Hardi board and batten siding, a standing seam metal roof and cedar columns. A smooth finish should be used along with an exposure of four inches for the proposed lap siding. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Architectural details, such as well-proportioned porch elements, window coverings, roof eaves, and variations in wall planes add depth and visual interest and contribute to the overall quality of the design. Staff finds that as proposed, the structures lack adequate architectural details for compatibility within the historic district.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed for each structure to have a covered porch which are designed as stoops with shed roofs. Staff recommends the applicant incorporate additional porch massing and work to include the design of the porches into the overall building's mass.
- o. COLUMN DESIGN – The applicant has proposed cedar front porch columns; however, at this time has not included a column detail determining trim and dimensions. Staff finds that a column not to exceed six (6) inches

August 16, 2017

in width should be used.

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

q. **SIDEWALK** – The applicant has noted the installation of a front yard sidewalk for units 1 and 2; however, has not included these on the site plan. The proposed sidewalks should relate to those found historically in the district in terms of location, width and material and should be centered on the front porch of units 1 and 2.

r. **DRIVEWAY** – On both the east and west sides of the lots, the applicant has proposed to install driveways to feature nine (9) feet in width. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that driveways should relate to historic driveways in the district and should not exceed (10) feet in width. The proposed driveways are consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds the installation of two separate driveways located consistently with the pattern within the district is appropriate.

s. **PARKING** – The applicant has noted that each structure is to have designated parking, either in the form of a covered carport or in the form of open air parking. Staff finds the proposed parking locations to be appropriate.

t. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has noted the location of trees and driveways on the site plan; however, a detailed landscaping plan should be submitted to staff prior to submitting for final approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval at this time. Staff finds each unit to possess width that exceed those of neighboring historic structures and finds the rear two units to feature a massing that is inappropriate for the district as noted in findings f and g. Additionally, staff finds the structures to be lacking in architectural detail as noted in findings m and n.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**31. HDRC NO. 2017-393**

Applicant: Mariela Valdivia

Address: 319 W MITCHELL ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Remove an existing container, temporary shed, and canopy.
2. Construct a new 2,412 square foot metal canopy structure with fully enclosed bay for secured storage and an open bay for materials storage. The structure is pre-engineered metal building to be constructed atop a 5 inch concrete slab.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The address 350 Hoefgen Ave is the site of the Southern Pacific Railroad Station, constructed in 1902. The complex was designed by Southern Pacific Railroad architect Daniel J. Patterson in the Mission Revival style. The complex is a designated local landmark and was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1975.

The lot is also located within the St. Paul Square Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a 2,412 square foot metal canopy structure with fully enclosed bay for secured storage and an open bay for materials storage on the southeast edge of the property.

b. **REMOVAL OF EXISTING STRUCTURES** – The request includes the demolition and removal of an existing shipping container, temporary shed, and canopy, all which are non-contributing to the site or the district. The structures are made of lightweight metal. Staff finds their removal acceptable.

c. **CONTEXT** – This portion of the designated lot is located to the south of the historic Southern Pacific Railroad Station landmark complex and just north of the Alamodome. The lot is flanked to the east by railroad lines, which are elevated on an overpass. Due to the elevation, this area of the lot is generally not visible from the public right-of-way or Montana St below.

d. **FOOTPRINT** – The proposed structure has a footprint measuring 36 by 67 feet, totaling 2,412 square feet. The proposed structure is larger than the existing utility structures on the southern edge of the lot, but comparable to the San Antonio Amtrak Station building to the north. Staff finds the proposal appropriate given the site-specific context.

e. **MASSING AND SCALE** – The proposed structure will measure approximately 1-story in height. This is comparable and compatible to the historic structures on the lot. Staff finds the height acceptable.

f. **FAÇADE MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to construct a pre-engineered structure. The façade materials will be factory-finished metal wall panels with a ribbed texture. The color is specified as almond beige. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, materials should be used that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. Additionally, vinyl siding, plastic, or corrugated metal sheeting are not

August 16, 2017

appropriate materials in historic districts. While the existing structures to be removed are of a similar materiality, the historic structures on the lot, as well as the structures in the St. Paul Square Historic District, do not feature pre-engineered metal siding. Based on the location of this structure and its relationship to the Southern Pacific Railroad Station landmark, staff does not find the use of ribbed metal panels appropriate.

g. ROOF – The proposed structure features a flat roof constructed of factory-finished metal roof panels. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, roof materials should be similar in terms of form, color, and texture to traditionally used in the district. Additionally, roof forms should be consistent with those predominantly found in the vicinity in terms of pitch, overhangs, and orientation. Non-residential building types in the district typically flat and screened by an ornamental parapet wall. This is evident in the historic structures found on the lot. Staff finds the use of a flat metal roof with factory-finished panels inconsistent with the forms used in the district.

h. OPENINGS – The primary (east) façade of proposed structure features two open bays framed by steel framing members and one enclosed bay with an overhead rolling door. The other three facades do not contain openings. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, blank walls should be avoided, particularly on elevations visible from the street. No new façade should exceed 40 linear feet without being penetrated by windows, entryways, or other defined bays. While this structure is minimally visible from the public right-of-way, openings should be incorporated. Alternatively, based on the configurations of the existing station structures, a façade in this setting should be visually broken utilizing façade treatments. Staff does not find single-plane walls appropriate.

i. FENCING – The proposal incorporates existing fencing on the front façade to secure the open storage bays. Based on the submitted drawings, the metal fencing appears to be chain link. Chain link is not an appropriate material in historic districts or on historically-designated properties.

j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, architectural details for new construction should incorporate details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. Contemporary material interpretations are encouraged, but modern materials should be implemented in a way that does not distract from historic structures. Generally, the introduction of a pre-engineered storage shed with few openings is not encouraged in a historic district, especially on a lot with structures that are of local and national significance. The context, while industrial in nature, calls for a site-specific structure that works with, rather than departs from, the established character of the historic structures.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the demolition and removal of an existing container, temporary shed, and canopy based on finding b.

Item 2, staff has concerns regarding the placement of this structure within the context of the nearby historic structures which are of local and national significance. Staff recommends a structure that is site-specific and works with, rather than departs from, the historic district. Substantial design changes should be made to increase the quality of the canopy including more traditional building materials, elimination of chain link, and additional landscaping or screening to buffer the structure from pedestrian areas.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **COMMISSIONER GRUBE OUT AT 5:17 PM**

**32. HDRC NO. 2017-401**

Applicant: Shelton Grona

Address: 1102 S FLORES ST

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a carport structure at the rear of the primary historic structure.

#### **FINDINGS:**

a. The historic structure at 1102 S Flores was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure, known as Fire Station #12, features a tan brick façade, decorative roof parapet wall and barrel tile canopies. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a new carport to

August 16, 2017

replace the existing carport structure.

b. CARPORT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new accessory structures should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form, should be no larger than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint, should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details and should feature garage doors with similar proportions and materials as those traditionally found in the district.

c. CARPORT – The applicant has proposed a carport structure which features a footprint of approximately...Staff finds the proposed footprint to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii.

d. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include galvalume posts, a galvalume roof and galvalume trim. As noted in finding a, the primary historic structure features materials that include tan brick. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. notes that materials that complement those of the primary structure and district should be used for new construction. With the exception of roofing materials, galvalume is not used in a historic context in the Nathan Historic District. Staff finds that the applicant should proposed columns and beams of cedar or a comparable wood. A galvalume standing seam metal roof would be appropriate.

e. GARAGE DOOR – The applicant has proposed a galvalume, overhead rolling garage door. Historic accessory structures throughout the Nathan Historic District often feature wood garage doors or carriage doors. The proposed garage doors are neither appropriate for the district not consistent with the Guidelines.

f. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed to locate the carport at the rear of the primary historic structure, oriented toward the secondary street. Staff finds this orientation to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the applicant incorporate wood materials to replace the galvalume materials as noted in finding d.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate garage doors that relate in size and material to those found historically in the Nathan Historic District at noted in finding g

**APPLICANT NOT PRESENT**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**33. HDRC NO. 2017-395**

Applicant: Jim Poteet/Poteet Architects

Address: 217 CEDAR ST

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. To install fiberglass columns to replace the existing porch columns.
- 2. To install composite tongue and groove porch decking.
- 3. Reconstruct an existing, rear 1940’s porch enclosure to match the current footprint.
- 4. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 84 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 217 Cedar Street was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian Style. The structure features a modified L-plan, a wraparound porch, a brick chimney, a standing seam metal roof and two street facing entrances. The rear of the structure features a porch that was enclosed as a screened porch circa 1940.

b. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has noted that the existing, historic porch columns have been previously coated with stucco which has trapped moisture within the columns causing irreparable damage. The applicant has also noted that the original wood bases were previously discarded and replaced with concrete pavers.. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii. notes that columns should be replaced with columns that are compatible in scale, massing and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions and finish, when repair is not possible.

c. PORCH COLUMNS – At this time, the applicant has proposed to install replicas of the tapered Tuscan columns

August 16, 2017

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

d. PORCH DECKING – The applicant has noted that the existing porch decking is yellow pine and has sustained damage including rot. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing porch decking with composite porch decking that is to feature a profile which matches that of historic tongue and groove porch decking. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A. notes that original wood porch floors should be preserved. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B. notes that porch floors should be replaced in kind with materials that are compatible in scale, massing and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions and finish, when repair is not possible. Staff finds the installation of a composite decking material appropriate based on evidence provided by the applicant.

e. REAR PORCH ADDITION – The rear of the historic structure currently features an enclosed porch that has significant structural damage. The applicant has proposed to reframe and reconstruct this enclosed porch with six of the original ten wood windows and board and siding. The removal of the corner windows will allow for proper framing. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.ii., 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 the proposed reframing and removal of four windows inappropriate as it would remove character defining features of the existing, enclosed porch.

f. REAR ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure and to the right (west) of the existing porch, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition of approximately 84 square feet. The proposed addition will feature an attached porch, materials to include board and batten siding to distinguish it from the original structure. The applicant has noted the installation of a standing seam metal roof and shiplap skirting. The details of the standing seam metal roof should match those of the primary historic structure, including seams that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a color to match the original. The proposed skirting is to match the profile of that of the original skirting.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the installation of fiberglass replacement columns. Staff recommends that the applicant first attempt to locate historic, replacement columns.

Staff recommends approval of item #2, the replacement of the existing porch decking.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #3, the reframing of a rear addition.

Staff recommends approval of item #4, the construction of a rear addition based on finding f with the following stipulations:

i. That the standing seam metal roof match that of the primary historic structure, including seams that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a color to match the original. The applicant must contact staff 24 hours prior to installation in order to schedule an inspection to verify that metal roofing specifications are met.

ii. That the foundation skirting match the profile of that of the original skirting.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to move for approval as submitted with stipulation that column samples be submitted to staff for final approval.

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

**NAYS: Kamal**

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

**34. HDRC NO. 2017-405**

Applicant: Adrian Gracia

Address: 131 KEARNEY ST

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT PRIOR TO MEETING**

August 16, 2017

**35. HDRC NO. 2017-394**

Applicant: Joseph Milligan

Address: 505 W RUSSELL PLACE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the first and second floor rotted wood porch decking with AZEK slat gray tongue and groove composite decking.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 505 W Russell Place is a 2-story single family home constructed in approximately 1910 with Queen Anne, Craftsman, and Neoclassical influences. The home features a primary hipped roof with front gable, simple Doric porch columns, and a 2-story covered porch on the entirety of the front façade. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace rotted wood porch decking with AZEK brand composite decking in the color slate gray.
- b. The applicant is proposing to replace existing rotted wood decking on the porch with AZEK brand composite decking. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, porch floors should be replaced in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair or, if not feasible, replaced with a material that is compatible in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. Based on the photographic evidence provided in the application, staff finds that the existing wood decking can be repaired. Staff does not find replacement on the first floor consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. Work began and was completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The final installation includes the exposed grain on both levels of the porch. While AZEK brand composite decking is a compatible substitute material in terms of joinery, profile, and size, staff finds that the exposed faux grain is not appropriate. Staff finds that the AZEK brand would be appropriate on the second floor porch decking, which is less visible from the public right-of-way, with the smooth side exposed only.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff finds that maintaining replacing the decking with in-kind material is most appropriate.

If the HDRC finds that the proposed replacement material is appropriate, then staff recommends that portions of the new material be limited to the second story and that the decking be installed with the smooth side exposed to eliminate the faux wood grain exposure.

**CASE COMMENTS:**

Work began and was completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The decking is currently installed with the wood grain side exposed on both the first and second floors of the porch. Post-work application fees have not been paid.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**36. HDRC NO. 2017-407**

Applicant: Michelle McKenna

Address: 305 LAMAR ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear addition at 305 Lamar.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 305 Lamar was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition. The applicant has received administrative approvals in the past for door opening restoration, wood window opening restoration, façade restoration and roof repair. There was an existing addition at this location featuring similar massing and dimensions that was structurally unsound. The applicant removed this addition and began reframing prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- b. REAR 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 historic structure. The applicant has proposed a shed roof, which is not consistent with the hipped and gabled roof of the primary historic structure. The applicant has proposed an inset on east façade to transition from the historic structure to the proposed addition.

August 16, 2017

c. SCALE, MASSING & FORM – Regarding scale, massing and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature an overall height and roof form that will be subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i.

d. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted materials that are to include wood siding, an overhead rolling glass door, fixed windows and an asphalt shingle roof to match that of the historic structure. Staff finds that staff finds that one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows should be used and that the proposed wood siding should match that of the primary historic structure. Staff does not find the proposed overhead rolling door appropriate.

e. TRANSITION – As noted in finding b, the applicant has proposed a transition on the west side of the rear addition; however, that addition should also feature a transition on the east side of the addition that insets it from the wall plane of the primary historic structure.

f. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – While the proposed location and overall scale of the addition is appropriate, staff finds that a similar roof form as well as similar window and door openings should be incorporated into the addition to ensure that architectural details are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval at this time. Staff recommends the applicant address the inconsistencies with the Guidelines which are noted below prior to receiving final approval.

i. That the applicant install a hipped or gabled roof to relate to those of the primary historic structure as noted in finding f.

ii. That the applicant install a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used based on finding d. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail (need to add detail here). Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

iii. That the applicant install an inset on the east façade to differentiate the addition from the primary historic structure as noted in finding e.

#### **CASE COMMENT:**

The demolition of the existing, rear addition and construction of the proposed rear addition began prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine approve with staff stipulations #2 & #3, not #1.

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

**NAYS:**

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

**37. HDRC NO. 2017-385**

Applicant: Victor Chapa/CMRE Enterprises

Address: 306 E CAROLINA ST

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 23 windows with triple pane vinyl windows; 17 are original wood windows, five (5) are aluminum.

#### **FINDINGS:**

a. The historic structure located at 306 E Carolina was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and is a contributing structure to the Lavaca Historic District. The structure featured both hipped and gabled roof forms, wood and aluminum windows and wood siding. At this time, the applicant has noted that all existing windows have been removed from the structure and has proposed to install vinyl windows as replacements

b. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that historic windows should be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the historic windows to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the historic windows that have been removed are to be repaired and reinstalled. If the removed windows are beyond repair, staff finds that the applicant should reconstruct the historic windows to historic specifications to be reinstalled.

August 16, 2017

c. Regarding the existing, aluminum windows that have been removed, staff recommends the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the historic wood windows. The applicant has not provided sufficient information to warrant any window replacement. Staff recommends that the historic windows that have been removed are to be repaired and reinstalled. If the removed windows are beyond repair, staff finds that the applicant should reconstruct the historic windows to historic specifications to be reinstalled. Additionally, staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows in the dormer openings where aluminum windows once existed that are appropriate for the architectural style of the structure. The applicant is to submit the wood windows to staff for approval prior to installation. Replacement insert windows of any kind are not recommended.

**CASE COMMENT:**

The removal of the existing windows was done without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garcia moved to approve with staff's stipulations 2 and 3. Stipulation three has been met as of September 14, 2017. Window specifications are to be submitted to staff prior to selection and installation. Contact OHP staff for an inspection regarding framing upon completion of the reframing of the rear addition. (210) 207-0035. .

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**AT THIS TIME, HDRC WENT INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION- 6:01-6:16.**

**Move to Adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:17 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino  
Chair