

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
September 20, 2017**

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

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

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
- - Historic Homeowner Fair & Infill Design Workshop - Saturday, September 30- Pearl Stable - 10:00 AM - 3:30 PM
- - STAR in Saint Cecilia - October 7 and 8
- - SApreservation 5k Series - Haunted Cemetery Tour - Saturday, October 21 - Fairchild Park - 9AM

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2017-445 | 3623 AVENUE B |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2017-456 | 127 CROFTON |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2017-489 | 111 TRAVIS (POSTPONED BY APPLICANT) |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2017-447 | 804 DAWSON |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2017-474 | 406 W COMMERCE |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2017-425 | 1108 S FLORES ST |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2017-440 | 1226 S PRESA |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-464 | 3200 MCCULLOUGH |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2017-468 | 900 BROADWAY |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2017-066 | 2450 ROOSEVELT |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2017-448 | 925 BURNET (TAX CERTIFICATION) |
| • Item #12, Case No. 2017-449 | 925 BURNET (TAX VERIFICATION) |
| • Item #13, Case No. 2017-482 | 7023 SYMPHONY LANE |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2016-446 | 1814 N PALMETTO |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2017-458 | 323 DEVINE |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2017-477 | 104 FIR (POSTPONED BY APPLICANT) |

Items # 1, #4, #6, #7, #11 were pulled for citizens to be heard. Item #8 was pulled for a recusal. Item #12 was pulled by staff.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2017-445

Applicant: Susan McFarland, AIA/McFarland Architecture

Address: 3623 AVENUE B

September 20, 2017

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to add one (1) level to the top of the existing parking garage at 3626 Avenue B, adjacent to Brackenridge Park.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct an additional level of parking to the existing parking structure at 3623 Avenue B, located near the corner of Avenue B and Tuleta Drive. The additional floor of parking will consist of a total of 10' – 6" in height being added. The total overall height of the parking garage post construction will be approximately 40' – 0".
- b. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to match all existing materials on the existing structure which includes galvanized steel framing, galvanized wire steel mesh and galvanized metal screen panels. The proposed materials are appropriate and consistent with the UDC regarding screening on parking structures.
- c. HEIGHT – The UDC Section 35-674(c) regarding height, structures located in RIO-1 can feature up to sixty (60) feet in height. The proposed addition will increase the overall height of the parking structure to approximately forty (40) feet. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed height will not negatively impact the immediate surroundings nor introduce height not common with the immediate area.
- d. LIGHTING – The applicant has noted the installation of four security light poles. The UDC Section 35-673(j) addresses lighting in the RIO. The applicant is responsible for complying with all lighting standards outlined in this section including that all parking light poles feature a 90 degree cutoff angle so as to not emit light above the horizontal plane.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the stipulation that the applicant comply with all lighting standards as outlined in UDC Section 35-673(j).

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Larry Demartino spoke in opposition to the applicant's request (Hector Gonzalez & Christopher Green yielded their time to Mr. Demartino- He received a total of 9 mins to speak).

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve the single addition floor with staff stipulations, applicant must return for path.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

4. HDRC NO. 2017-447

Applicant: Todd Worrich/Todra Ball, LLC

Address: 804 DAWSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace all the windows in the home with Jeld-Wen brand wood windows to match the original windows at the front elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 804 Dawson is a 1-story single family home constructed in the Folk Victorian style. The home features several elements of the Folk Victorian style, including a cross gable configuration, decorative awnings, and a front porch with turned columns. The home has undergone many visible modifications over the years, including window replacement, additions, and interior alterations. The home is a contributing structure in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace all of the existing windows in the house with new Jeld-Wen brand wood windows. The proposed windows will match the configuration of the existing original windows on the front of the house, which is two over two.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: NON-ORIGINAL WINDOWS – The applicant has requested to replace nonoriginal windows with new Jeld-Wen brand wood windows. As evidenced in the application, several types of windows have been installed in the home over the years, including vinyl windows with false divided lites, aluminum screens, and undivided wood windows. Several openings appear to have been modified over the years.

September 20, 2017

According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new windows should be installed to match the historic windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. The applicant's proposal to remove nonoriginal windows that are incompatible in size, material, configuration, form, and detail and install new wood windows to match the original profile evident on the north (front) façade is appropriate. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ORIGINAL WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to remove the original windows that exist on the north (front) elevation of the home. The windows are currently covered by incompatible aluminum screens and the applicant has stated that they are in poor condition. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in-kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. The applicant has not furnished substantial evidence that the **ITEM #4** windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The existing windows are also constructed of a high quality, durable wood that has lasted for decades. Reinvesting in original material yields a longer lifespan and eliminates the cost of modifying an opening to accommodate stock window sizes. Staff does not find the proposal to be appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the window replacement with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant restores the original windows on the north façade.
- ii. That the applicant submits final window dimensions and specifications to staff from the manufacturer prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The windows should not feature false divided lites and should not be clad in a metal product.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

6. HDRC NO. 2017-425

Applicant: Scott Glenn

Address: 1108 S FLORES ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Perform exterior modifications including the installation of garage doors on the alley (east) elevation and S Flores (west) elevation.
2. Perform exterior modifications including the removal of existing window openings and the installation of new openings.
3. Construct a one story rooftop addition.
4. Install signage on S Flores.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure located at 1108 S Flores was constructed circa 1950 and is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map, listed as repair facility for tractors and agricultural equipment. Photos from circa 1990 show the Flores façade with no window openings. At this time, the applicant has proposed exterior modifications, a rooftop addition and signage.

b. **EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS (S Flores)**– The applicant has proposed exterior modifications that includes the installation of a rolling garage door on the S Flores façade. A smaller rolling garage door would be installed in an existing pedestrian door opening. The applicant has proposed this location for automobiles to exit the structure on S Flores. Staff finds the removal of the non-original façade opening appropriate. The applicant has noted the installation of a stainless steel garage door with a satin finish. Staff finds this installation appropriate.

c. **EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS (S Flores)** – The applicant has proposed to removal all street level window openings and install a combination of both small, 24x36 inch window openings and 10x10 foot greenscreen landscaping walls. The existing window openings are not original to the structure. Staff finds the removal of the

September 20, 2017

non-original window openings and the installation of the proposed new openings to be appropriate. Staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information regarding the proposed greenscreen walls including proposed materials including landscape materials.

d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the upper four windows on the S Flores façade. Staff finds that an aluminum or metal clad window should be installed that features in installation consistent with the existing. The proposed replacement windows should be inset within the wall and feature a recess of at least two inches.

e. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS (Alley) – On the alley façade, the applicant has proposed the modifications that include the removal of one pedestrian door opening and the installation of two overhead rolling doors, a new pedestrian door opening and three windows. Given the location of this façade at an alley and not visible from S Flores, staff finds these modifications appropriate. The proposed window openings should feature windows with a profile consistent with those of industrial structures of this era. The proposed rolling doors should feature high quality materials to match the proposed steel door on the S Flores façade. The proposed windows should feature an inset of at least two inches within the existing walls.

f. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS (Daniel) – On the Daniel elevation, the applicant has proposed to remove six existing window openings, one pedestrian door and its associated side lights and an overhead rolling door and install three pedestrian entrances and overhead canopies. Staff finds the proposed modifications to be appropriate and consistent with the overall architectural character of the building. Additionally, the proposed entrance canopies are simple in nature, consistent with the architecture of the existing structure.

g. ROOFTOP ADDITION – At the rooftop of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a one story addition. The Guidelines for Additions 1.B.ii. notes that rooftop additions should be limited to rear facades to preserve the historic scale and form of the building from the street and minimize visibility from the public right of way. Full-floor second story additions that obscure the form of the original structure are not appropriate. The Guidelines for Additions 2.A.i. notes that new additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing historic context of the block, should be located near a side or rear façade, should utilize a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the principle façade and should feature a transition between the old and new.

h. ROOFTOP ADDITION – The proposed rooftop addition is proposed to feature an overall height of 9’ – 6”, less than the height of the existing structure and a width of 15’ – 7”. The applicant has proposed a parapet wall on the S Flores façade to read as a flat roof. The applicant has proposed materials that include a plaster finish, a parapet wall detail to match that of the original structure, metal cladding, and a hand crimped standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the form and massing of the proposed addition appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

i. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed a blade sign on S Flores to read “SoFlo” to feature metal construction, internal illumination and be mounted at the building corner. The sign will feature a total of approximately 36 square feet, included both sides. Staff finds the size, materials and general location of the sign appropriate; however, staff finds that if internal illumination is used, the sign should be back lit. A plastic or vinyl cabinet face should not be used.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

- i. That proposed window openings should feature windows with a profile consistent with those of this structure. The windows should feature an inset of at least two inches and should feature aluminum or metal frames that are colored in a dark color.
- ii. That the applicant provide staff with a color selections for all stucco, plaster and façade material colors.
- iii. That the proposed signage feature indirect or back lighting and that vinyl or plastic sign faces are not used.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell spoke in opposition of the applicant’s request

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

September 20, 2017

7. HDRC NO. 2017-440

Applicant: Mickey Conrad/LPA Inc.

Address: 1226 S PRESA ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval for the new construction of a townhome development to include 15 townhome units and 5 detached single family homes on the vacant lot addressed 1226 S Presa St. The project is participating in the Center City Housing Incentive Policy (CCHIP).

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct 15 townhome units and 5 detached, 2-story single family homes on the vacant lot located at 1226 S Presa St. The lot is located within Neighborhood Conservation District 1 (NCD-1) and is not zoned historic or located within a River Improvement Overlay (RIO) district. The project is participating in the Center City Housing Incentive Policy (CCHIP), which requires review and approval by the Historic and Design Review Commission as part of a project's eligibility. The Office of Historic Preservation and the HDRC are charged with reviewing the proposal for basic consistency and appropriateness relative to the established development pattern and existing context in the vicinity of the project utilizing design guidelines, including the Historic Design Guidelines and River Improvement Overlay building design principles in the Unified Development Code.
- b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on July 25, 2017. The DRC commended the applicant for addressing the corner units as true corner conditions and scaling the development appropriately for the context. Suggestions included the following: provide exhibits where the units meet the neighboring properties to give a sense of context and understanding of a 3-story height unit directly abutting a 1-story historic home; address the Vance elevations as their own unique address, and define their entrances at the pedestrian level, particularly the way the porch reads as an entrance; consider transitions and visibility, porch barriers, views of the complex from neighbors and vice versa; consider breaking up the continuity of the facades by introducing slight material or color variations; consider the impact of a 3-story board and batten condition on the Vance elevations; study historic door patterns and select windows that are proportionate to neighborhood context. Overall, the proposal was well received and commended for its handling of rooftop mechanical equipment, scale, form, and contextual considerations.
- c. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. Per the applicant's proposed site plan, the setbacks match the adjacent existing historic homes. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. SCALE & MASS – The applicant has proposed to construct a townhome development consisting of both attached and detached units with two-and-a-half to three stories. The height of the units range from approximately 34 feet to approximately 37 feet at the maximum roof ridgelines. 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. The property located adjacent to the edge of the Lavaca Historic District and is surrounded by 1-story and 2-story historic single family homes to the north and west, larger 2-story multifamily homes to the east, and 1-story and 2-story historic homes to the south, as well as commercial blocks exceeding 2 stories in height. However, the proposal directly abuts a 1-story historic single family home on S Presa St and on Vance St. The elevations at these meeting points are scaled appropriately to meet the existing structure, including a massing step-down and front setback at the S Presa edge. Staff finds the scale appropriate.
- e. 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 slab on grade foundations with a height less than one foot. However, the previous structures located on the site were commercial in nature and featured little to no foundation. Staff finds the proposal acceptable based on these considerations.
- f. 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 of the attached townhomes towards their respective primary streets of S Presa St and Florida St. The detached townhomes on Vance St are oriented towards an interior driveway, which is a departure from the traditional residential development of the Lavaca Historic District. However, these units feature prominent front porches that emulate the historic porch conditions of the district, and help define the pedestrian entrances along the streetscape. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. PORCHES – 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. The applicant has integrated 2-story porches with shed roofs on all facades of the development. The porches are uncovered on the first floor and screened on the second floor. They project towards the streetscape and are

September 20, 2017

pedestrian in scale. Additionally, the applicant has selected four paint colors – charcoal, sage, slate, and wine – to add visual differentiation and diversity to the otherwise consistent form of the porches. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the site context.

h. WALL PLANE ARTICULATION – The proposal features long facades with repeated jointed units. The façade on Florida St features eight consecutive units measuring three stories in height. The façade of these jointed units will be clad in board and batten siding from grade to roof level. According to the RIO guidelines in UDC Section 35-674, if a wall plane exceeds 50 square feet, two of the four following approaches should be employed: change in materials with each module to reduce mass; change in the height of each module; change of roof form of each module to help express different modules of the building mass; or change the arrangement of windows and other façade articulation features to divide a plane in to smaller components. The applicant has employed the technique of modifying the arrangement of the front porches, as well as installing downspouts at the joints, but the continuity of the wall plane between units, coupled with three story board and batten siding, minimizes the relationship with the pedestrian scale. The applicant should explore ways to demarcate the walls between units to better establish this relationship, either with a vertical trim piece, slight shift in wall plane for depth, exploration of color, or different method.

i. ROOF FORM – The proposed development integrates traditional gable roof forms with porches with shed roofs. Gable roofs and porches with shed roofs are common on historic residential structures in the vicinity. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

j. MATERIALITY – The proposed development includes vertical board and batten siding that features a smooth finish, an exposure of four inches, and boards that are 12 inches wide with battens that are 1-1/2” wide; fiber cement siding with the smooth side exposed; painted wood porches; a standing seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap, and a standard galvalume finish; wood trellises; and galvanized welded wire fencing. The materials are consistent and appropriate.

k. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS: PROPORTIONS – 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. Staff finds the proposed sizes acceptable.

l. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS: MATERIALITY – 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. The applicant has proposed Pella fiberglass windows and doors in the color black. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district should be implemented. 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. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

n. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT & SCREENING – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant has proposed recessed roof channels to conceal rooftop mechanical equipment from view. This approach also minimizes the overall roof height, as it eliminates the need to integrate mechanical equipment in an interior space. The applicant has also proposed a vertical wood screen trash enclosure at the intersection of S Presa St and Florida St. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

o. 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 an attached garage, oriented towards the interior of the lot. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has developed a landscaping plan to include several native and droughtresistant plants. The trees facing the primary streets include Red Oak, Red Bud, Cedar Elm, and Lacey Oak. Additional plantings include Yaupon Holly, Monterrey Oak, Anacacho Orchid, Passumhaw Holly, Cimarron Texas Ranger, Butterfly Iris, Upright Rosemary, Seabreeze Bamboo, Mexican Feather Grass, Flamenco Red Yucca, Flame Acanthus, Turks Cap, Pink Mulhy Grass, and Star Jasmine. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

i. The applicant explores ways to demarcate the walls between jointed units to better address the human scale, either by adding a vertical trim piece, slight shift in wall plane for depth, application of color, or different method to these units, as noted in finding h.

ii. That the applicant installs windows that feature meeting rails no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on July 25, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding b.

September 20, 2017

CITIZENS TO HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition to the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approval as submitted at hearing with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

8. HDRC NO. 2017-464

Applicant: Michael McChesney

Address: 3200 MCCULLOUGH AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new surface parking lot to accommodate 40 cars. The proposal includes the removal of an existing chain link fence, the removal of two existing trees, and the integration of new landscaping elements, including a buffer from the streetscape.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 3200 McCullough Ave is the campus of St. Anthony Catholic High School. The property contains several structures and elements, including the historic high school building, several sports fields, a pavilion, and mixed-use educational and recreational facilities. The applicant has proposed to construct a new surface parking lot on the southwestern boundary of the property. The lot will front McCullough Ave and an existing internal concrete driveway. The proposal includes 14 new parking spaces to the north of the existing internal concrete driveway.
- b. TREE REMOVAL – The existing area features grass, several trees, fencing, and several stumps. According to the submitted site plan, two trees will be removed, one oak and one 9' Mt. Laurel. The proposal accommodates several other existing trees and introduces new trees. Staff finds the tree removal appropriate based on these considerations.
- c. FENCE REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing chain link fence fronting McCullough Ave to make way for the proposed parking and site modifications. Chain link fences are prohibited in historic districts and are not characteristic of fences in Monte Vista. Staff finds its removal appropriate.
- d. PARKING LOT – The proposed parking lot hardscaping coverage will accommodate 40 new cars. The applicant has noted that the parking lot is needed, as the lease on an existing parking lot to the south has expired. The proposed parking lot will expand upon an existing internal asphalt driveway. A majority of the new hardscaping will be located at the southwestern corner of the property, just to the north of the existing parking lot on an adjacent lot. The proposal includes 14 new parking spaces to the north of the existing driveway that runs west to east. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, off-street parking for non-residential structures should be located at the rear of the site whenever possible. Parking should be accessed from side streets or alleys where feasible. The property is bounded to the north by E Kings Hwy, which is a residential streetscape. The proposal integrates existing hardscaping and parking and fronts a commercial thoroughfare with faster traffic and minimal residential context. Based on these contextual considerations, staff finds the location appropriate.
- e. LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING – The proposal includes a new 4' tall landscape buffer from the McCullough street and sidewalk. The proposed buffer includes a new river rock border, a shrub screen, and several new Mt Laurel trees. The landscaping plan also includes two new Cedar Elms between the first five parking spaces to the north as accessed from McCullough Ave. According to the Guidelines, off-street parking areas should be screened with a landscape buffer, wall, or ornamental fence two to four feet high—or a combination of these methods. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante move this item to the next agenda.

AYES: Guarino, Cone, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

RECUSAL: Laffoon

September 20, 2017

THE MOTION CARRIED

11. HDRC NO. 2017-448

Applicant: Cyrus Askin

Address: 925 BURNET ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 925 Burnet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 925 Burnet, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. The applicant has performed scopes of work that are consistent with issued Certificates of Appropriateness which includes the roof repair, siding repair, exterior door replacement, wood window repair and the replacement of non-original wood windows with vinyl windows.
- c. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 25-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through c.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cullen Jones- spoke in opposition to the applicant's request

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

12. HDRC NO. 2017-449

Applicant: Cyrus Askin

Address: 925 BURNET ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 925 Burnet St.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 925 Burnet, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. The applicant has performed scopes of work that are consistent with issued Certificates of Appropriateness which includes the roof repair, siding repair, exterior door replacement, wood window repair and the replacement of non-original wood windows with vinyl windows.
- c. The requirements for Historic Tax Verification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through c.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

17. HDRC NO. 2017-478

Applicant: Tobias Stapleton

Address: 205 OSTROM

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

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

September 20, 2017

5. Install two driveways/parking locations on the site.

FINDINGS:

General findings:

- a. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was originally reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 21, 2017. At that meeting, committee members commented on the proposed architecture and noted concerns regarding the proposed massing and turrets. A site visit was conducted with HDRC Commissioners, members of the River Road Neighborhood Association, neighbors and Office of Historic Preservation Staff on March 22, 2017. At that site visit, access was provided to both the exterior of the structure as well as the interior. This request was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on April 25, 2017. At that time, a new design was presented to the committee and received positive feedback.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – A second site visit was conducted by the DRC on June, 28, 2017. At that site visit, committee members viewed the structure and commented on its structural condition. Committee members noted at that time that there was a loss of architectural and structural significance. This request was reviewed by the DRC on July 25, 2017. At that meeting, committee members noted concern over the proposed setbacks in relationship to others found within the River Road Historic District and noted that the proposed flat roof of the second primary structure is not appropriate for the district.
- c. This request was heard at the August 2, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where the application was withdrawn by the applicant. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 12, 2017, where the applicant noted a change in the proposed roof form of one of the primary structures and provided additional information regarding structural analyses by structural engineers.
- d. The River Road Historic District has been intensely opposed to the demolition of structures located within the district. The criteria outlined for the demolition of a contributing structure noted in UDC Section 35-618 is important to the public process.
- e. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

Findings related to request item #1:

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

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

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

[The applicant has provided detailed cost estimate for rehabilitation of the structure which is approximately \$589,242. This bid was provided by a contractor who was approved by the applicant's financing provider. The applicant has noted that the rehabilitation or new construction at this site is limited to a contractor that is recommended and approved by their financial provider. The applicant has noted that financing for the proposed rehabilitation and new construction has been limited due to the current condition of the structure. Staff finds that an alternative opinion by a third-party contractor may result in a lower estimate for repairs. The applicant has not submitted additional bids at this time.

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

[The applicant has provided information in the form of a structural report from the selected contractor which notes that the structure is suffering from intense dry rot that has impacted the structure to the extent that certain beam joists and studs have been structurally compromised. Additionally, the structural analysis provided by the contractor notes the collapse of the floor in certain areas, the collapse of ceiling and the roof structure, infestation of wood worm and the presence of fungus throughout the structure. In addition to the report provided by the selected contractor, the applicant has provided structural analyses from two structural engineers. Neither report recommends repairs.]

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

September 20, 2017

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

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

Findings related to request item #2:

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

2b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards the intersection of Ostom and Magnolia Avenue. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

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

2d. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of 1' – 6". This is appropriate for the district and is consistent with the Guidelines.

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

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

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

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

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

2j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in natural and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, the proposed structure is consistent with the Guidelines; however.

Findings related to request item #3:

3a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new

September 20, 2017

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

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

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

3d. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has not specified the foundation height for this structure; however, staff finds that it should be comparable to that of the first structure and be consistent with the Guidelines.

3e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to modify the previously proposed flat roof form to include a gabled roof, consistent with the Guidelines.

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

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

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

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

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

Findings related to request item #4:

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

Findings related to request item #5:

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

RECOMMENDATION:

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

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

2. Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #2 and #3, the construction of two, two-story primary residential structure on the the lot, with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant install board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide, that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches

September 20, 2017

wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish on the proposed structure in request item #2.

ii. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. 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 should fully utilize architectural elements that are consistently found on structures with flat roofs throughout the district in a contemporary manner and incorporate materials that are appropriate for the proposed form for request item #3 as noted in findings 3e and 3j.

iv. That the applicant propose a design for the accessory structure that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 4a.

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

3. Staff recommends approval of items #4 and #5, the construction of two, two story accessory structures and the installation of a new driveway, based on findings 4a and 5a with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

ii. That garage doors that feature materials and a profile consistent with historic examples found in the district be installed.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Ana Ramirez, Larry Demartino, Hector H. Gonzalez, Christopher Green, Darla Piner, Jim Cullum (Firmir Gyzmaw & Fred Gonzales yielded their time to Mr. Cullum- he spoke for 9 mins), George Nash, & Ed Piner- all spoke in opposition to the applicant's request. Bill Morgan & Henrietta Paledes- spoke in support of the applicant's request.

WITHDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT

COMMISSIONER CAME OUT AT 5:00

18. HDRC NO. 2017-470

Applicant: Porter Dillard

Address: 810 N OLIVE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, two story residential structures on the vacant lot at 810 N Olive..

FINDINGS:

a. The request for conceptual approval of the construction of three attached, two story units at 810 N Olive was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 23, 2015. At that meeting, committee members recommended that the applicant provide more information regarding materials, site design, porch and column detailing and window and door specifications. Office of Historic Preservation staff found that the proposed new construction featured many inconsistencies with the Guidelines for New Construction and recommended this project take advantage of the suggestions of the Design Review Committee.

b. The request for conceptual approval was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on August 5, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. Staff's recommendation at that time was for denial of conceptual approval due to the applicant's inappropriate massing, lack of visual transitions, lack of information regarding the location and screening of mechanical equipment and the inappropriate garage doors. At the August 25, 2015, meeting of the Design Review Committee, committee members noted that the revisions to the design were appropriate.

September 20, 2017

- c. The request for conceptual approval was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on October 7, 2015, where committee members referred it to the Design Review Committee. At the time of this hearing, the Office of Historic Preservation's recommendation was for denial of conceptual approval due to inconsistencies with the Guidelines for New Construction including the proposed width, lack of information regarding an appropriate setback, the lack of appropriate window materials and the lack of appropriate garage door materials.
- d. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 12, 2015, where committee members noted that the proposed arches were inappropriate, that the applicant should devote more time to the presentation of application documents and that the applicant should produce better renderings. The request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 26, 2016. At that meeting, committee members expressed concerns regarding the installation of vinyl windows and the Neoclassical scaling.
- e. At the February 3, 2016, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, this project received conceptual approval with the stipulation that the applicant consider using alternative materials in order to separate the facades massing prior to returning for final approval. At the time of conceptual approval, the Office of Preservation's recommendation was for denial of conceptual approval due to the applicant's inappropriate massing and orientation.
- f. The request for final approval was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 13, 2016, where committee members noted that additional elements should be incorporated into overall porch design of the middle unit. The request for final approval was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on May 24, 2016. At that meeting, committee members noted that the proposed massing was problematic and had questions regarding landscaping.
- g. The current request, the construction of two, two story residential structures was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 12, 2017, where committee members noted that the separation of massing was a more appropriate scale for the district, noted concern regarding the proposed roof form for the townhouse structure, noted that the fenestration pattern was becoming consistent with the Guidelines and noted that the proposed column arrangement should be given more design attention.
- h. SETBACKS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new buildings should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. If no consistent setback has been established, the median setback of all buildings should be used. The applicant has provided a site plan noting a proposed setback of approximately thirty-five (35) feet for both structures. The applicant has noted per a diagram that this setback is consistent with that of two historic structures on the block. However, due to the depth of the lot, there is an opportunity for an increased front yard setback that would help to mitigate the exposure of the new construction along the street. Staff finds that a greater setback would be more appropriate such as meeting the setback that is the greater of the immediately adjacent historic structures.
- i. ORIENTATION – The front façade of new construction should be oriented in a manner that is consistent with the historic example of the block. This block of N Olive features three historic structures which feature orientations toward N Olive. The applicant has proposed to orient the new construction toward N Olive, consistent with the historic examples and the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.ii.
- j. FRONT PORCHES – Many historic structures feature front porches that are the primary points of entrance. The applicant has included points of entrance for each unit under the front porch, consistent with the historic examples found in the district. While the proposed points of entrance are consistent with those found historically in the district, staff finds the overall depth and massing of the porches to be inconsistent with historic profiles. Staff finds that the depth of the proposed porches should be increased and that the porches should be completely incorporated into the proposed building massing.
- k. 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. This block of N Olive features three structures that are oriented toward N Olive that feature one story in height and average widths of approximately thirty (30) feet. The applicant has proposed two, two story structures with a width of approximately forty-seven (47) feet and twenty-six (26) feet. Staff finds the townhouse structure, which will feature approximately 47 feet in width wider than the historic structures found in the immediate area. Staff finds the single family structure, which features a width of approximately 26 feet appropriate.
- l. SCALE & MASS – The northern most structure, the proposed townhouse unit features a mass that has been separated by a setback in building mass of the two attached units. Generally, staff finds this approach to be appropriate.
- m. HEIGHTS – As previously noted, the applicant has proposed two, two story residential structures. There are no two story residential structures oriented toward N Olive on this block. Staff finds that an increased setback, as noted in finding h, could lessen the visual impact of the proposed height.
- n. TRANSITIONS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii. applicants should Utilize step-downs in building height, wall-plane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition when the height of new construction exceeds that of adjacent historic buildings by more than one-half story. At this time, staff finds that the applicant has not incorporated a transition into the proposed design.
- o. 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 those of neighboring structures. The applicant has provided an elevation drawing showing the proposed new construction in context with neighboring structures. The proposed foundation heights appear to be approximately two (2) feet in height; however, the applicant should provide dimensioned elevations and measurements of neighboring structures to ensure consistency with the

September 20, 2017

Guidelines.

- p. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the townhouse structure to feature gabled roofs and shed porch roofs. Generally, the proposed roof form is appropriate for the district; however, staff finds that the larger gabled roof should be separated as to not span the entire width of the proposed structure.
- q. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a gabled and hip roof for the southern, single family residential structure. Staff finds the proposed roof design to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- r. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that generally are appropriately scaled and are comparable to the historic examples found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. While staff finds the applicant's proposed openings appropriate, staff finds the proposal to use vinyl windows inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.
- s. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – As noted in finding r, the applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally appropriate; however, staff finds that additional window fenestration should be added to each side elevation to reduce the amount of blank walls.
- t. LOT COVERAGE – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant's proposed building footprints are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.
- u. MATERIALS – In regards to materials, the applicant has proposed brick, fiber cement siding, a composition shingled roof, wood columns and round attic vents. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed siding should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four (4) inches and that the proposed attic vents be rectangular instead of round.
- v. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Staff finds the proposed reduction in mass by separating the two units to be appropriate. Proportionally, staff finds the proposed southern structure, the single family residential structure to generally feature architectural massing and form that is consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the northern structure should feature a roof form that features a separation of masses that includes a front facing gabled roof that does not span the entire width of the structure. Additionally, staff finds that an overall, detailed elevation of the proposed porch design should be developed that includes details for the proposed column design.
- w. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding u, staff finds that the proposed façade arrangement features details that should be further developed. Staff finds that the proposed windows and column bays should be revised to feature an arrangement that is appropriate for the proposed width of the structures; for the southern unit, this would include the removal of one of the proposed window bays and the installation of an additional column.
- x. GARAGE – At the rear of the proposed new construction, the applicant has proposed for each unit to feature a garage to accommodate parking for two (2) vehicles. Staff finds the applicant's proposed location for parking appropriate. The applicant has proposed garage door which in elevation share an appearance to traditional carriage doors. Staff finds the proposed location and style of the doors appropriate.
- y. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted that HVAC equipment will be located near the rear of the proposed new construction. Staff finds this placement appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the additional screening and enclosing of the HVAC equipment.
- z. SIDEWALKS – The applicant has proposed to install three, front sidewalks to connect the front porches of each unit to the sidewalk at the public right of way. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii., the historic alignment, configuration and width of sidewalks and walkways should be implemented into new construction. The historic example throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District is for one sidewalk to service each structure. Given the separation of the front entrances of each structure, staff finds the proposed sidewalk configuration appropriate.
- aa. SITE PAVING – According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i., large pavers, asphalt or other impervious surfaces should not be introduced where not historically located. Staff finds the applicant's proposal to install asphalt paving at the rear of the proposed structure inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant use pervious ground cover such as decomposed granite.
- bb. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a new driveway between the two proposed structures. The applicant has noted an overall width of ten (10) feet. Staff finds the proposed width appropriate; however, finds that the applicant should install a concrete or decomposed granite driveway.
- cc. LANDSCAPING – At this time, the applicant has noted the location of landscaping materials on site. Staff finds that a detailed site and landscaping plan should be developed upon further development of construction documents..

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings h through cc. Staff recommends the following:

September 20, 2017

- i. That the applicant study increasing the setback of both structures to reduce the impact of the proposed height as noted in findings h and m.
- ii. That the applicant provide a foundation height study to ensure that proposed foundation heights are consistent with those of neighboring historic structures as noted in finding o.
- iii. That the applicant address the lack of porch depth and incorporate the proposed porches into the proposed building massing.
- iv. That the proposed roof form of the northern most structure be modified as to not feature a front facing gabled that extends the entire width of the proposed structure as noted in finding p.
- v. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.
- vi. That an overall, detailed elevation of the proposed porch design should be developed that includes details for the proposed column design.
- vii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from neighboring properties and the public right of way.
- viii. That the rear parking location feature decomposed granite or a pervious paving material.
- ix. That a detailed landscaping plan be developed upon further development of construction documents.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2017-459

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture

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.
- 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. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the August 16, 2017, HDRC hearing, where it was withdrawn by the applicant. At that hearing, many neighbors and representatives from the Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association's Architectural Review Committee expressed concerns regarding the proposed density, proposed building massing, proposed building heights, proposed parking locations and proposed architectural details. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 22, 2017, where committee members commented on the inconsistency of the proposed development with the historic development pattern in the district, asked questions regarding the possibility to reorient the proposed new construction, suggested that the rear units be reduced in massing and noted the current issues with parking.
- d. 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.

September 20, 2017

- e. **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. The applicant has provided a site plan noting that the setbacks of the proposed new construction are the same or less than those of the historic structures at the corners of N Pine and N Olive.
- f. **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.
- g. **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, that address Burnet is appropriate. At the rear of units 1 and 2, the applicant has proposed units three and four, which are also to feature two stories, but feature an overall height and mass that is subordinate to those of units 1 and 2. Staff finds this modified massing to be more appropriate than the previous proposal of four structures that each shared equal massing.
- h. **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. Additionally, staff finds that a reduction in width of the proposed structures will both improve the proposed massing and architectural proportions.
- i. **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 Guidelines.
- j. **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 with front facing shed roofs and unit 4 to feature a roof form that matches that of unit 3. Gabled and hipped roofs are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the scale and massing of the proposed gabled roof for unit 1 to be of a scale that is not found historically in the district. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof form in unit 2 to be appropriate. Staff finds that the proposed roof form found in units 3 and 4 should be modified to include shed that is lesser in mass than currently proposed. Staff finds that the proposed shed roof should feature a steeper pitch and window dormers.
- k. **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. Generally the applicant has proposed window and door openings that are consistent with those found on historic structures throughout the district.
- l. **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. The applicant has proposed block framed vinyl windows. Staff does not find the use of block frame vinyl windows to be appropriate. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- m. **MATERIALS** – At this time, the applicant has proposed materials that include Hardi Artisan siding, Hardi lap siding, Hardi board and batten siding, cedar columns and a standing seam metal roof. A smooth finished 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 and a standard galvalume finish.
- n. **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 the proposed updates to massing have improved the proposed architectural details; however, development of massing and scale as well as architectural detailing should continue.
- o. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed for each structure to have a covered porche which

September 20, 2017

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.

p. 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.

q. 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.

r. 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.

s. 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.

t. 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.

u. 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on findings a through u. Staff finds that the widths of each structure should be reduced as noted in finding h. Generally, the proposed heights are appropriate and are consistent with historic examples found throughout the district as noted in finding g. As noted in findings n and o, the applicant should continue to develop massing and scale to provide proportions that are consistent with those found historically in the district.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia postpone this item to the next meeting

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2017-410

Applicant: David Armendariz

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 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

September 20, 2017

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, staff finds vinyl windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and OHP Window Policy Document. Staff finds wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

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

September 20, 2017

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. The applicant has consulted with an arborist on their significance. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided a full landscaping plan to staff that includes decomposed granite, ample grass, and a variety of landscaping species, including crape myrtles, esperanza, blue cypress,

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 10'-0" in width. The driveway will expand to a pad towards the interior of the lot. 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. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways should be limited to 10'-0" in width. Staff finds the proposed width consistent 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 final approval as submitted based on findings a through r. The proposed structure is incompatible with the development pattern of the Government Hill Historic District and is a departure from primary and accessory structure relationships. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items if they wish to return with a new design proposal:

1. 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 finding f.
2. 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.
3. That the applicant simplifies the overall massing and configuration of the roof form to be more consistent with the historic roofs found in the district as noted in finding i.
4. That the applicant installs wood or aluminum clad wood windows that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
5. That the applicant complies with the OHP Checklist for Metal Roofs. The roof must feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a standard galvalume finish, and a crimped ridge seam. The applicant must contact staff 24 hours prior to installation in order to schedule an inspection to verify that metal roof specifications are met.
6. That the board and batten siding features a smooth finish, an exposure of four inches, that the board and batten siding feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to remand this case to the DRC.

September 20, 2017

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2017-159

Applicant: Carlton Brown

Address: 421 LABOR
515 LABOR

REQUEST:

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

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

FINDINGS:

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

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

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

d. This request received conceptual approval at the June 21, 2017, HDRC hearing. At that time, staff did not recommend conceptual approval.

Findings related to request item #1:

a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of both structures to be within ten percent of the neighboring historic structures. Staff finds that the proposed setbacks should match those of the neighboring structures to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i.

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

c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure adjacent to a one story historic structure; however, there are examples of additional height located within proximity of the site. The construction of a two story structure may be appropriate; however, the overall height of the proposed new construction should not be inconsiderate of nearby single height historic structures.

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

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

f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front facing gabled roof. The majority of historic structures throughout Lavaca feature front facing shed roofs and both front and side facing gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof form appropriate. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has proposed an eave depth of

September 20, 2017

approximately two feet. Staff finds this detail appropriate; however, the exposed rafter tails should be eliminated if they do not serve a structural purpose.

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

h. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed cement tiles, stucco, and board and batten siding. The proposed board and batten should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide. Generally, these materials are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a galvalume finish.

i. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has noted the installation of contemporary windows that are black in color. Staff finds wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

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

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

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

Findings related to request item #2:

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

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

o. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed a two story structure adjacent to a one story historic structure; however, there are examples of additional height located within proximity of the site. The construction of a two story structure may be appropriate; however, the overall height of the proposed new construction should not be inconsiderate of nearby single height historic structures.

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

q. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front facing shed roof. The majority of historic structures throughout Lavaca feature front facing shed roofs and both front and side facing gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof form appropriate. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has introduced roof eaves with a depth of approximately two feet.

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

s. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed wood lap siding, smooth fiber cement siding, panelized smooth fiber cement panels, a standing seam metal roof. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Staff finds that the proposed wood siding and fiber cement lap siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches.

t. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has noted the installation of contemporary windows that are black in color. Staff finds wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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

September 20, 2017

sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. u. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the

historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, staff finds that the new construction features architectural details that are traditional in nature and are found historically throughout the Lavaca Historic District.

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

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

Findings related to request item #3:

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

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

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

aa. CHARACTER – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. note that new garages and outbuildings should relate to the period of construction of the primary structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has proposed materials that include board and batten siding. Staff finds this material appropriate. The proposed board and batten should feature boards that are feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.

bb. WINDOWS & DOORS – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv. states that the design of window and door openings should be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district in terms of their spacing and proportions. Generally, the applicant’s window openings are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

cc. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed a single width garage doors. Staff finds that two, separate garage doors should be installed. The applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v. in regards to detailing and materials.

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

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

Findings related to request item #4:

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

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

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

ii. CHARACTER – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. note that new garages and outbuildings should

September 20, 2017

relate to the period of construction of the primary structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The applicant has proposed materials to include fiber cement lap siding and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the proposed roofing materials appropriate; however, the proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume color. The proposed fiber cement siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches.

jj. WINDOWS & DOORS – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv. states that the design of window and door openings should be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district in terms of their spacing and proportions. Generally, the applicant’s window openings are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

kk. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed a single width garage door. Staff finds the proposed width appropriate. The applicant should provide staff with details for the proposed door.

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

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #4. While the applicant has made modifications to the proposed design to address previous comments, specifically in regards to architectural details and materials. The overall scale, height, and massing should be reconsidered to conform to the historic design guidelines and reduce visual impacts to neighboring historic properties.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for final approval

AYES: Garza, Bustamante, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: Guarino, Lazerine, Grube

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2017-472

Applicant: Vincent Rodriguez

Address: 1022 HAYS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing standing seam metal roof and install a new composition shingle roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 1022 Hays is a 2-story single family home constructed in approximately 1920. The home features woodlap siding, an asymmetrical front porch, hipped roof form with front and side gables, and standing seam metal roof that appears to be original. The home is a contributing structure in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

b. The applicant has requested to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new composition shingle roof in gray. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, when roof replacement is required, the roof should be repaired in-kind. According to Sanborn Maps, this property historically had a metal roof. The roof also appears to

ITEM#22
be original or has been in place for several decades. Metal roofs in the existing configuration are typical of the style of the home. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

September 20, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. If replacement is necessary, staff recommends that the applicant install a new standing seam metal roof to match the existing. The roof must feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a standard galvalume finish, and a crimped ridge seam. A bulky, raised ridge cap should not be used. The applicant must contact staff 24 hours prior to installation in order to schedule an inspection to verify that metal roof specifications are met..

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-454

Applicant: Wade Lewis

Address: 529 DEVINE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace existing, historic wood windows with vinyl windows.
2. Replace existing, aluminum windows with vinyl windows.
3. Repair siding to match the existing profile.
4. Paint the historic structure.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure at 529 Devine was constructed circa 1920 in the Craftsman style and feature a front gabled roof, asphalt shingle roof and double front porch columns. The historic structure features a number of its historic wood windows; however, many historic windows were previously replaced by aluminum windows, particularly at the rear of the structure.

b. WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT - The applicant has proposed to replace wood windows with vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that historic windows should be preserved. Staff performed a site visit on August 14, 2017, and found the removed wood window sashes to be in good condition. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood window sashes and reinstall in the house.

c. ALUMINUM WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace 3, non-original aluminum windows with new vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii. notes that non-original windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that while the proposed vinyl windows are not consistent with the Guidelines in regards to materials, their profile is more consistent with the profile of the historic windows than the existing aluminum windows.

d. SIDING REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to repair and install new siding where existing siding is damaged to match the siding of the historic structure. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. In Addition to the proposed siding repair, the applicant has noted that the house will be sanded and painted. Sanding should occur in a gentle method. Paint colors are to be submitted to staff for approval prior to painting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the replacement of wood windows. Staff recommends that all existing wood windows be repaired and that the removed sashes be repaired and reinstalled in the house.

Staff recommends approval of item #2, the replacement of aluminum windows, with the stipulation that the profile of the proposed vinyl windows match that of the historic structure's original wood windows and feature a framing depth that is consistent with the historic windows.

Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4, the repair, sanding and painting of siding with the stipulation that sanding be done in a gentle manner and that paint colors be submitted to staff for approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

September 20, 2017

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2017-467

Applicant: John Brearley

Address: 423 N HACKBERRY ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new two-story single family home on the vacant lot at 423 N Hackberry St.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story house on the vacant lot at 423 N Hackberry in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located mid-block between E Houston St to the north and Glorietta to the south. The lot is flanked to the north by a 2-story historic single family home, to the west by a series of historic 1-story single family homes, to the south by two vacant lots, and to the east by a non-contributing 1-story warehouse structure. This area of Hackberry St is transitional and features both commercial and residential structures.
- 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 September 12, 2017. The DRC mentioned that the existing context rhythm is mixed, but most commonly, foundations are 18-24 inches off grade. However, this project faces the issue of the ridge height being taller if the foundation were to be raised. A possible solution may be raising the porch entity and keeping the parking at grade. Regarding the parking configuration, the DRC noted that it is a departure from traditional development patterns. The DRC suggested a possible resolution of designing the front porch element as enclosed versus open to eliminate the issue of second story massing fronting the street, noting that there is precedent for this in historic districts. This approach may also offer more opportunity for fenestration on the front façade. The DRC did recognize the difficulties of shotgun lot, foundation considerations, nearby context, and the accommodation of a 2-story structure. The applicant was amenable to lowering the height to be more consistent with the context.
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback of approximately 10'-8" from the front façade to the front sidewalk. The historic structure immediately to the north of 423 N Hackberry features a side setback from the sidewalk of approximately 20'-0". This is the only historic structure that partially fronts N Hackberry on this block. According to a 1951 Sanborn Map, three 1-story residential structures occupied this block of N Hackberry and all featured a minimal front setback. Based on the historic development pattern and current context of the block, staff finds the proposed setbacks appropriate.
- e. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Hackberry. 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 greatly exceed the historic precedent. The only remaining historic residential structure on N Hackberry between E Houston and Glorietta is 2 stories. The remaining historic structures in the vicinity on Glorietta are 1-story. The applicant has noted on the submitted drawings that the proposed ridge line will be 28'-10" from the finish floor, which is approximately one foot from grade, bringing the total height to approximately 29'-10" feet. Both the first and second stories will feature 10'-0" tall interior ceiling heights separated by a web truss measuring 1'-6". The neighboring 2-story historic structure features a first floor ceiling height of 10'-0" and a second floor ceiling height of 8'-0". 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.
- g. PORCH CONFIGURATION AND MASSING – The applicant has proposed to incorporate a front porch on the front façade of the new structure. The porch mass will be inset approximately 6" from the front façade. The Historic Design Guidelines state that porches on new construction should be reflective of the development pattern of the district. Typically in historic districts, including Dignowity Hill, residential porch massing elements project the furthest towards the streetscape to engage pedestrians. Two story structures feature a second story that is set back from the porch. As proposed, the structure's second story extends over the front porch, which increases the massing on the street. This is addressed in Guideline 2.A.ii, which states that step-downs in building height, wallplane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition should be utilized. There is no historic precedent in the district for this porch form or massing strategy. Staff finds the porch inconsistent with the

September 20, 2017

Guidelines.

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. The applicant has noted that the foundation will be slab-on-grade and have a minimal height. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately eighteen (18) to twenty-four (24) inches. This is generally inconsistent with the Guidelines and the surrounding context.

i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a primary gable roof form with an additional front gable. There are historic examples of this roof form throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposed roof form generally consistent with the Guidelines.

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 are generally consistent with those found on historic structures in regards to location and size with the exception of the right and left elevations, which feature several small fixed windows that are not consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document or historic fenestration precedents in the district, as well as a series of ganged windows with minimal trim separation between them. All proposed window detailing can be modified to relate closer to historic examples, such as the use of approximately six inches of separation between double windows. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within walls to ensure that a proper façade depth is maintained.

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 based on the Historic Design Guidelines and the OHP Window Policy Document.

l. 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 does not meet this Guideline.

m. MATERIALS – Based on the submitted drawings notes, the applicant has proposed shake shingle siding, a composition shingle roof, and board and batten siding. However, the siding indicated as shake shingle is rendered as horizontal board siding. If horizontal 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.

n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally the proposed architectural features are consistent with the Guidelines and relate to historic examples found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

o. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant has indicated an A/C unit to the north of the proposed structure. The proposal includes a new 6' tall privacy fence, which will screen the unit from the public right-of-way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment and submitting full details for final approval.

p. DRIVEWAY & PARKING – The applicant has proposed a new front concrete driveway measuring approximately 10'-8" in length and approximately 10'-0" in width. The concrete terminates at the front façade of the proposed new structure's carport and transitions into crushed granite. 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 Dignowity Hill Historic District. The development pattern in the Dignowity Hill Historic District is most commonly for driveways to extend through the front yard to the side and rear yard of historic properties. Staff does not find the proposed front-loaded parking and driveway location to be consistent with the Guidelines or with the development pattern of the district.

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 new privacy fence measuring 6' in height is to be installed in the side and rear yard behind the front façade. Staff finds the proposed location and height appropriate; however, the applicant is to submit a detail of the proposed fence, including materiality and design, when returning to the HDRC for final approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend conceptual based on findings a through s. The applicant should address the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant provides information noting the setbacks of adjacent historic structures on a contextual site plan.
2. That the applicant reduces 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.
3. That the applicant sets the second story back from the front façade and modifies the front porch configuration and massing as noted in finding g. The porch should be the mass that projects furthest towards the streetscape to

September 20, 2017

reflect the developmental context of the area.

4. That the applicant explores ways to incorporate a raised foundation for a front porch or pedestrian entry to be more consistent with neighboring historic structures as noted in finding h, if feasible.
5. That the applicant explores ways to construct a driveway along the side of the proposed new construction as noted in finding p.
6. That the applicant introduces window sizes and proportions that are more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy Document, and adjacent historic structures to the right and left elevations as noted in finding i.
7. That that a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used based on findings i and j. 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. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
8. That the applicant provides additional information regarding exterior materials. Composite siding, whether lap or shingle, should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four inches for lap siding. Hardi shingles should not have a faux wood texture. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 12, 2017. The discussion is outlined in finding c.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to remand this case to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2017-462

Applicant: Clint Belew

Address: 228 LAVACA ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work including the repair of the existing foundation and painting.
2. Install a standing seam metal roof.
3. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 400 square feet.
4. Install a concrete mailbox.
5. Replace the existing, chain link fence with a metal cattle panel fence.
6. Install a driveway on the east side of the historic structure.
7. Modify the existing, front yard sidewalk.
8. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 228 Lavaca was constructed circa 1910 and is found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and features both gabled and hipped roofs, a front facing window bay and two brick chimneys.
- b. REHABILITATION – The applicant has proposed rehabilitative scopes of work to the exterior that include foundation repair and painting. Staff finds both to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. At this time, the applicant has not proposed a modification to the foundation skirting.
- c. ROOF REPLACEMENT –The structure currently features an asphalt shingled roof which the applicant has proposed to replace with a standing seam metal roof. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. notes that metal roofs should be used on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds the installation of a standing seam metal roof on this Folk Victorian structure to be appropriate. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to

September 20, 2017

21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam.

d. REAR ADDITION –At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature one story and approximately 400 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed a rear addition with a flat roof, insets on the both facades from the wall planes of the historic structure. The proposed flat roof is not consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the proposed form may be appropriate if reduced in width as to not be greater in width or massing that the roof slopes of the primary historic structure.

e. SCALE, MASS AND FORM – Regarding scale, massing and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that generally features a footprint and height that is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. As noted in finding d, the proposed roof form should be altered.

f. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include metal siding, metal columns and fixed windows. Staff finds that the proposed metal siding may be appropriate if installed and dimensioned similarly to historic wood siding. Staff finds that the metal columns, if featuring a profile and dimensions similar to those of the historic structure may be appropriate. Staff does not find the proposed fixed windows to be appropriate. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

g. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding d, staff does not find the proposed roof form to be appropriate. Additionally, the proposed window openings are not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A. Staff finds that window openings that are grouped and sized similar to those found historically in the district should be used.

h. FENCING – The property currently features a chain link fence which the applicant has proposed to replace with a metal cattle panel fence. Staff finds the proposed replacement to be appropriate; however, staff does not find the proposed solid base to be consistent with examples found throughout the district. The proposed fence shall not exceed four (4) feet in height beyond the front façade of the historic structure.

i. DRIVEWAY – The property currently does not feature a driveway. The applicant has proposed to install a driveway on the east side of the property. The applicant has not noted materials or specific dimensions. Driveways on this block consist of various materials and profiles. Staff finds that the proposed driveway should be consistent with the Guidelines and be no wider than ten (10) feet in height. Concrete, decomposed granite and gravel are all appropriate materials.

j. SIDEWALK – The property currently features a damaged, concrete sidewalk. The applicant has proposed to remove this sidewalk and install a concrete paver sidewalk. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A. notes that historic sidewalks should be repaired. Staff finds that the applicant should install a new sidewalk to match the profile of the historic.

k. CONCRETE MAILBOX – The applicant has proposed a concrete mailbox at the public right of way. Staff does not find this installation, in location or design to be appropriate for the Lavaca Historic District.

l. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The requirements for Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2, rehabilitation and standing seam metal roof installation based on findings b and c with the following stipulation:

i. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam. The applicant must schedule an inspection with OHP Staff prior to installation as noted in finding c.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the construction of a rear addition based on finding d. Staff recommends that the proposed roof form should be modified to a form that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure in regards to an overall height that protrudes into the area of the exiting roof slope. Additionally, staff recommends the following:

i. That the proposed metal siding may be appropriate if installed and dimensioned similarly to historic wood siding.

ii. That the metal columns, if featuring a profile and dimensions similar to those of the historic structure may be appropriate. Staff does not find the proposed fixed windows to be appropriate.

iii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

September 20, 2017

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the installation of a concrete mailbox.

Staff recommends approval of items #5 and #6, the replacement of fencing and driveway repair with the following stipulations:

i. That the proposed fence shall not exceed four (4) feet in height beyond the front façade of the historic structure as noted in finding i. Additionally, the proposed fence should not feature a solid base as proposed. The fence should feature mesh from the top rail to the bottom rail.

ii. That the proposed driveway not exceed ten feet in width that either concrete, gravel or decomposed granite be used as noted in finding i.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #7, the replacement of the existing concrete sidewalk based on finding j. Staff recommends the applicant repair or replace the existing concrete sidewalk in kind.

Staff recommends approval of item #8, Historic Tax Certification.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition the applicant's request

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve items #1, #2, #5, #6 & #8, and denial of items #3, #4, #7 all with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2017-476

Applicant: Frank Telles

Address: 411 MUNCEY

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a side addition to measure approximately 40 square feet.
2. Construct a rear addition to measure approximately 80 square feet, which will modify the existing roofline of the home.
3. Modify the existing fenestration on the left side of the home.
4. Install new windows on the right side of the home.
5. Replace all existing wood one over one windows with vinyl.
6. Install new front porch columns.
7. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 411 Muncey is a 1-story single family home designed in the Craftsman style. The home features a cross gable configuration, a standing seam metal roof, and deep overhanging eaves with exposed rafter tails. The home is a contributing structure in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to construct a rear addition, construct a side addition, modify the existing fenestration, install new porch columns, and replace existing one over one wood windows with box frame fixed vinyl windows. The additions will require the existing roofline to be modified.

b. **SIDE ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a side addition to measure approximately 40 square feet. The location of the addition will enclose an existing doorway and result in a visual extension of the front façade to the west. Staff finds the massing generally consistent with the Guidelines, but does not find the location appropriate.

c. **SIDE ADDITION: SETBACK** – According to Guideline 1.A.iv, a setback or recessed area should be utilized for a new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The side addition is not set back from the primary structure's front façade. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

d. **SIDE ADDITION: ROOF FORM** – The proposed addition will require the modification of the existing roof form. The proposal will incorporate a new side gable primary roof that extends above the ridgeline of the existing historic structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the height of side or rear additions should be limited to the height of the original structure. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

e. **SIDE ADDITION: MATERIAL TRANSITIONS** – According to Guideline 2.A.v for additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds the proposal to use woodlap siding to match the existing appropriate for the historic structure. However, this proposed addition does not utilize a clear setback strategy, and staff has not seen a proposal to visually differentiate the historic structure's material from the new addition.

September 20, 2017

f. **SIDE ADDITION: ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, additions in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Architectural details should also not visually compete with the historic structure. As noted in findings c and d, the addition does not clearly differentiate itself from the existing structure and modifies the original historic front facade. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with these Guidelines as submitted.

g. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The existing roofing material on the primary structure is gray composition shingles. The applicant has stated that both additions will utilize a roofing material to match the existing structure. Staff finds composition shingles to be appropriate.

h. **REAR ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure to be approximately 80 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the side or rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition is approximately one eighth the size of the overall footprint of the existing home. Staff finds massing and footprint size generally consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **REAR ADDITION: SETBACK AND TRANSITIONS** – According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The proposed addition is not set back from the existing structure and does not employ a material transition or small change in detail. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

j. **WINDOW OPENING REMOVAL** – The proposed additions require the removal of several existing window openings, including at least three on the west elevation and one on the rear elevation. The applicant has indicated that all windows are to be replaced. Guideline 3.C.i in the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions encourages the salvage and reuse of historic materials, where possible, that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

k. **INSTALLATION OF NEW WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to install new windows on the right façade of the home. The Historic Design Guidelines recommend avoiding new openings on the facades that engage the public right-of-way. Staff finds that the proposed windows feature proportions and configurations that are consistent with the primary structure and historic precedents in the district, but does not find the use of vinyl windows to be appropriate for the historic structure.

l. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all of the existing one over one wood windows with box frame vinyl windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.

m. **COLUMNS** – According to Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, added porch elements, such as stairs and railings, should be simple as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The proposed railings and columns appear generally compatible with the style and materiality of the home, but staff has not seen dimensioned drawings that indicate the width or dimensioned details of the columns.

n. **TAX CERTIFICATION** – The applicant has requested Historic Tax Certification. The applicant has received administrative approval to remove vinyl siding and rehabilitate the woodlap siding beneath, replace rotted trim with in-kind materials, and repaint the exterior. Per UDC Section 35-618, the applicant has met application documentation requirements; however, the scope of work submitted for approval by the HDRC is inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the side addition based on findings a through g.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the rear addition based on findings g through i. Staff finds that the general footprint is appropriate, but finds that the modified roofline needs to be subordinate to the primary historic roofline. with Item 3, Staff does not recommend the modification of the existing left window openings based on finding j.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the new window opening installations on the right façade of the home based on finding k with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant installs new wood windows in lieu of the proposed vinyl. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". 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. The final specification should be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 5, Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on finding l. Staff recommends that the applicant restore the existing windows in place. If there are windows deteriorated beyond repair, staff recommends that the applicant submits a window schedule that indicates which existing wood windows are deteriorated beyond repair and which are repairable to staff for review and approval. If staff determines a window to be deteriorated beyond repair, staff recommends that the applicant install double-hung, one-over-one wood windows. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". 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. The final specification should be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 6, Staff recommends approval of the new columns based on finding n with the stipulation that the applicant submits

September 20, 2017

final measured drawings to staff for review and approval.

Item 7, If the HDRC approves the scope of work, then staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to move for approval of items #2-#7 with staff stipulations. Item #1 only approved if late exhibits are approved by staff

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2017-481

Applicant: Daniel and Paulina Minesinger

Address: 235 YELLOW STONE

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a second story addition encompassing the full footprint of the existing home.
2. Modify the existing fenestration to include the removal of existing windows and installation of new windows, removal of two existing front doors, and removal of a front awning.
3. Construct a new front porch.
4. Replace the existing wood windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 235 Yellowstone is a 1-story duplex structure designed the simplified Craftsman style. The home features a symmetrical façade, original wood windows with wood window screens, original woodlap siding covered by non-original vinyl, and overhanging eaves with brackets. The home is a contributing structure in the Mission Historic District. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a complete renovation of the home to include a second story addition, new front porch, exterior modifications, and window replacement.

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. **CONTEXT** – According to Guideline 1.A.ii for Additions, new residential additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block. For example, a large, two-story addition on a block comprised of single-story homes would not be appropriate. In the surrounding vicinity, historic structures are situated on narrow, deep lots. The existing context of Yellowstone and the surrounding residential blocks, including W Highland Blvd, Loretta Place, and Haynes Ave, are 1 and 1.5-story residential structures on long, thin lots. There are no 2-story structures on the block of Yellowstone as bounded by Mission Rd and Roosevelt Ave. Staff does not find the proposal appropriate for its context and finds that a 2-story addition would overwhelm the structure's neighbors, especially given the existing setbacks, lot widths, and vegetation of the neighboring properties.

d. **MASSING AND SCALE** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Guideline 1.B.v stipulates that the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure and should be located at the rear of the structure whenever possible. The Guidelines also stipulate that the height of an addition should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The proposed addition doubles the height of the existing structure and completely transforms its original appearance. The addition will require the removal of the existing roofline and complete alteration of the facades that front the streetscape. Staff does not find the proposed massing and scale of the addition appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing fenestration of the home. As indicated on the submitted elevation drawings, the proposal includes removing the two existing front doors and installing a new door on center; removing the existing awning; removing an existing side shed porch; modifying the fenestration pattern on all elevations of the home, including removing original windows; and installing several new windows in new locations. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, original openings, including doors and windows, should be preserved or replaced in-kind. Filling in historic openings or modifying the existing fenestration pattern should be avoided. Additionally, the Guidelines recommend to salvage and reuse historic materials, where possible, that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition. Staff finds that the proposed

September 20, 2017

design drastically alters the current configuration of the home. The exterior modifications will result in a form that is a complete departure from the original historic structure's design. Staff finds the proposed modifications inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.

f. WINDOW REPLACEMENT AND NEW OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wood windows and wood screens with new windows. The elevations indicate that most of the existing openings will be removed or modified to incorporate new windows of varying sizes and configurations. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing windows should be preserved and restored in place. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new 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. Several of the proposed windows, including the long, thin horizontal windows and square windows, are not consistent with the design of the existing structure or neighboring precedents. There is also ample, continuous blank wall space on the proposed left and right elevations, which is not characteristic of the district. Staff finds the proposal to replace or completely remove existing openings inappropriate, and also finds several of the proposed window sizes inconsistent with the Guidelines and incompatible with the historic structure.

g. NEW PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch on the primary façade. The porch contains a hipped metal roof form with square columns and a simple railing. The porch will be elevated from the street and contain three stairs. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, replacement or new porch elements, should be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building, and should not incorporate elements and details that create a false historic appearance. The proposed porch creates a false sense of historic appearance and completely modifies the existing front fenestration. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

h. ROOF FORM – The Guidelines state that additions 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 front gable and rear hipped roof form that is reflective of historic homes in the area; however, the scale, height, and detailing of the proposed roof is drastically inconsistent with the surrounding context as noted in findings c and d.

i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include the existing historic woodlap siding, a composition shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof over the front porch, hardi trim in the gable, and a wooden front door. The applicant has not yet specified the materiality of the windows or scalloped siding. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, materials should complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Staff finds the materials generally consistent with the Guidelines.

j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Guidelines, additions should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. Character-defining features and details of the original structure should be considered in the design of additions, including roof form, porches, and the shapes of window and door openings. The proposed design as a whole eliminates several of the existing character-defining features of the existing property. Additionally, the modifications create a false sense of history or attempt to emulate traditional details without considering the existing fabric. The proposed bracketed gable is not proportionate to common details found in the Craftsman style and is not evident in the vicinity of the neighborhood. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines and a severe departure from the existing historic structure.

k. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted mechanical equipment at the rear of the property. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment from view of the public right of way.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through l. Staff finds that the proposal is a complete departure from the existing context of the neighborhood and results in a total modification of the character-defining features of the home. The applicant should address the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant explores rear addition iterations or alternative design strategies that do not extensively alter the existing height, fenestration, form, style, and appearance of the existing historic structure.
2. That the applicant provides a site elevation that places any proposed additions in context to determine the effect of a proposed design on neighboring historic structures.
3. That the applicant provides a clear site plan and floor plan that indicates the existing condition of the property and the proposed condition. This documentation should indicate lot lines, the existing rear accessory structure, existing landscaping and hardscaping, and both the existing and proposed footprint of the 1-story home.
4. That the applicant restores the existing wood windows in place. If a window is deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant should demonstrate evidence to that effect to staff. Staff recommends that the applicant submits a window schedule that indicates which windows are deteriorated beyond repair and which are salvageable. If a window is deemed deteriorated beyond repair by staff, the applicant should install double-hung, one-over-one wood windows to match the existing in size, profile, inset, sill detail, configuration, and meeting rail and stile dimensions.
5. That the applicant proposes a design solution that seeks to retain the existing fenestration pattern of the primary structure. Staff recommends that the applicant retains the existing fenestration, minimizes the introduction of new openings on the existing structure, and proposes new openings on an addition that feature proportions that are

September 20, 2017

more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy Document, and adjacent historic structures. The applicant should avoid continuous blank wall space.

6. That the applicant provides additional information regarding exterior materials, including windows, shingles, and porch elements.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to remand this case to the DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2017-473

Applicant: Jarrad Campos

Address: 228 SHERMAN ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Construct a rear addition of approximately 200 square feet.
2. Construct a connection between the primary historic structure and a rear accessory structure.
3. Perform exterior modifications including the removal of existing vinyl siding and the installation of Hardi siding.
4. Replace the existing, aluminum windows with new vinyl windows and install new doors.
5. Porch decking replacement and porch roof modifications.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure located at 228 Sherman was constructed circa 1920 and features traditional architectural elements include a front gabled roof. The structure currently features aluminum windows, vinyl siding and a number of small, rear additions and accessory structures.

b. REAR ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature approximately 200 square feet. 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 for the rear addition to feature a roof form and massing that are generally consistent with the Guidelines; however, the proposed addition’s walls should feature an inset from the wall plane of the historic structure. When returning for final approval, the applicant should submit an elevation of each façade of the proposed addition as well as details on materials including siding, windows and doors. Additionally, the applicant should adhere to all zoning setback requirements.

c. CONNECTION – The applicant has proposed to construct a partially enclosed connection between the primary historic structure and an existing accessory structure. This connection would replace existing, non-original additions and accessory structures. Staff finds the construction of an open air connection may be appropriate if detailed to feature a roof form and materials that are consistent with those found historically in the district; however, staff does not find a partially enclosed connection to be appropriate.

d. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has noted that the existing façade material of the primary historic structure is vinyl siding. The applicant has noted that no wood siding exists beneath and has proposed to install Hardi siding. Staff finds the installation of the proposed Hardi siding appropriate given that no original siding remains; however, the proposed Hardi siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure.

e. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, aluminum windows with new windows. The applicant has not specified materials at this time. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

f. DOOR INSTALLATION – The applicant has noted the installation of two French doors on the side elevation as well as a new door in the addition. Staff finds the proposed door to the addition to be appropriate; however, the applicant should propose to install a door that is consistent with the Guidelines and feature materials that are complementary with those found historically in the district. Regarding the installation of French doors, the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that new entrances should not be created on primary facades or where visible from the public right of way. Staff finds that the installation of a door at this location may be appropriate; however, the door should be profiles to be consistent with the existing, historic door

September 20, 2017

openings. French doors would not be appropriate.

g. PORCH – The applicant has proposed to install new porch decking as well as install a new porch roof. The new roof is noted to be standing seam metal. Staff finds that the existing concrete porch should remain visible. The proposed panels should be 18 to 21 inches in width, seams should be 1 to 2 inches in height a crimped ridge seam should be used where flashing occurs and a standard galvalume finish should be used.

h. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to modify an existing, rear accessory structure by removing a side wall and installing an overhead rolling door on the front façade. This accessory structure is not historic. Staff finds the proposed modifications to be appropriate; however, when returning for final approval, the applicant should provide elevations of each façade as well as details on the proposed garage door.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends the applicant provide the following when returning to the HDRC for final approval:

- i. That the applicant submit an elevation of each façade of the proposed addition as well as details on materials including siding, windows and doors. Additionally, the applicant should adhere to all zoning setback requirements.
- ii. That the proposed connection be open air and that details of its construction be submitted.
- iii. That the replacement Hardi siding feature a smooth finish and a four (4) inch exposure.
- iv. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.
- v. That a single width door be installed in place of the proposed French door.
- vi. That the existing concrete porch should remain visible. The proposed panels should be 18 to 21 inches in width, seams should be 1 to 2 inches in height a crimped ridge seam should be used where flashing occurs and a standard galvalume finish should be used.
- vii. That the applicant provide elevations of each façade of the accessory structure as well as details on the proposed garage door.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to remand this case to the DRC .

AYES: Guarino, Lazerine, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

COMMISSIONER LAZERINE OUT AT 8:15PM

29. HDRC NO. 2017-460

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

Address: 1110 BURNET ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Rehabilitate the historic structure including the repair to historic wood siding, trim, windows, columns and architectural elements.
2. Restore the front porch to its historic profile.
3. Install a standing seam metal roof.
4. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 1,100 square feet.
5. Remove the existing front yard fencing and install a new wood privacy fence at the rear of the property.
6. Install gravel over the existing ribbon strip driveway.
7. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 1110 Burnet was constructed circa 1910 and is found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The

September 20, 2017

structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and features both a front and side facing gabled roof. The structure originally featured a front porch which has been enclosed. The rear of the primary historic structure currently features a non-historic addition. The removal of this addition is eligible for administrative approval and is not included within the current request.

b. **REHABILITATION** – The applicant has proposed to rehabilitate the historic structure including the repair in kind of all historic siding, trim, windows, columns and other architectural features. In addition to the previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed to repair the existing wood windows and reuse salvaged wood windows as needed. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitation to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

c. **PORCH RECONSTRUCTION** – As noted in finding a, the historic front porch has been enclosed. At this time, the applicant has proposed to restore the porch to its original configuration, as noted in the 1912 Sanborn Map. The applicant has proposed for the reconstructed front porch to feature painted 6x6 wood columns with 1x6 bases, painted wood railing and a painted wood beam. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v. notes that porches should be reconstructed based on evidence of the original. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building. The applicant has proposed to utilize the existing porch footprint and to install architectural elements that are architecturally appropriate for the Folk Victorian style. Staff finds the proposed reconstruction consistent with the Guidelines.

d. **ROOF REPLACEMENT** – The structure currently features an asphalt shingled roof which the applicant has proposed to replace with a standing seam metal roof. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. notes that metal roofs should be used on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds the installation of a standing seam metal roof on this Folk Victorian structure to be appropriate. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam.

e. **REAR ADDITION** – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature one story and approximately 1,100 square feet. 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 for the addition to include both a rear facing gabled roof and a shed roof. While the gabled roof is appropriate for the architecture of the historic structure, staff finds the large shed roof to be inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant replace the proposed shed roof with a gabled roof or a roof form that is complementary of the architecture of the historic structure.

f. **SCALE, MASS AND FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature an overall height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **SCALE, MASS AND FORM** – Regarding footprint, the applicant has proposed for the addition to share a wall plane on the east façade that is the same as that of the historic structure. This addition would not comply with the side yard setback. Staff finds that an inset should be included to not only satisfy the Guidelines regarding a setback in wall planes, but also to comply with side yard setback regulations.

h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include Hardi board and batten siding, a standing seam metal roof, Hardi lap siding for foundation skirting, wood lap siding and block frame vinyl windows. Staff finds that the proposed board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide, horizontal siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure and that the standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Staff does not find the use of block frame vinyl windows to be appropriate. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

i. **FENCING** – The property currently features a chain link fence. The applicant has proposed to remove this fence and install a wood picket fence to feature six (6) feet in height. The applicant has proposed for the fence to extend to the front wall plane of the historic structure on the east façade. Staff finds that the proposed privacy fence should feature a setback from the front wall plane.

j. **DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS** – The driveway is currently a concrete ribbon strip that is deteriorated. The applicant has proposed to overlay gravel over the existing ribbon strip driveway. Staff finds that the applicant should adhere to the Guidelines for Site Elements and repair the existing, ribbon strip profile.

k. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – The requirements for Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

September 20, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3, the rehabilitation of the historic structure, the restoration of the front porch and the installation of a standing seam metal roof based on findings a through d with the following stipulation:

i. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam. The applicant must schedule an inspection with OHP Staff prior to installation.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the construction of a rear addition based on findings e through h. Staff recommends the following prior to a recommendation for approval:

i. That the applicant replace the proposed shed roof with a gabled roof or a roof form that is complementary of the architecture of the historic structure as noted in finding e.

ii. That an inset should be included to not only satisfy the Guidelines regarding a setback in wall planes, but also to comply with side yard setback regulations as noted in finding g.

iii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed within the addition that adhere to the following standards: 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Staff recommends approval of items #5 and #7, the installation of fencing, driveway modifications and Historic Tax Certification with the following stipulations:

i. That the proposed privacy fence feature a setback from the front wall plane on the east façade as noted in finding i.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #6, the overlaying of gravel over the existing ribbon strip driveway. Staff recommends the applicant repair the existing, concrete ribbon strip driveway.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cullen Jones- spoke in opposition to the applicant's request. Aaris Holland & Aimee Holland spoke in support of the applicant's request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to approve items #1-#3 with staff stipulations, #4 with staff stipulations, with windows, purposed roof line & setbacks as discussed today, #5 staff stipulations, #6 ribbon drive & #7 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2017-450

Applicant: Zamaira Velazquez

Address: 2059 W WOODLAWN

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove the existing stucco and install smooth stucco.
2. Remove 14 wood windows and install vinyl windows.
3. Enclose an existing side porch on the east elevation.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure located at 2059 W Woodlawn is a 1-story single family home designed in the Mission style. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including a textured stucco finish, arched entryways, and a flat roof with parapet details. The home also features a front gable roof with composition shingles. The house is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District.

b. STUCCO FINISH – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing textured stucco and replace all facades with new stucco with a smooth finish. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, stucco should be repaired by patching or replacing it with in-kind materials whenever possible. Similar materials that are compatible with the original in terms of composition, texture, application technique, color, and detail should be used when in-kind replacement is not possible. EIFS is not an appropriate patching or replacement material for stucco. Staff finds the proposal to install smooth stucco inconsistent with the Guidelines.

September 20, 2017

c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff finds several existing windows to be either missing or deteriorated beyond repair, but has not seen a final window schedule indicating which windows are beyond a repairable threshold. Replacement of all windows in an existing historic structure with vinyl windows is not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. PORCH ENCLOSURE – The applicant has proposed to enclose an existing side porch to create additional conditioned space. The Historic Design Guidelines encourage retaining existing porches; however, the existing porch on this home is not architecturally or historically significant. The proposal will not obscure any characterdefining features. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the existing stucco with the stipulation that the applicant install stucco with a finish that matches the texture of the existing. EIFS shall not be used in lieu of stucco.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of existing wood windows and installation of vinyl windows based in finding c. Staff recommends that the applicant restore the salvageable wood windows in place and propose a wood window to staff for the replacement of the windows that are deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant must furnish visual evidence that the window is deteriorated beyond repair to staff prior to replacement. The new windows much match the existing in profile, inset, and configuration.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the rear porch enclosure based on finding d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to restore wood windows & stucco

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2017-434

Applicant: Beth Rothwell

Address: 407 MISSION ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 407 Mission St.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 407 Mission St is a 1-story single family home constructed in the Queen Anne style. The home features several elements of the style, including a hipped roof with front gable, scalloped gable shingles, and decorative bracketing. The home is a contributing structure in the King William Historic District. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification.

b. The scope of work for the project is complete, and consisted of various items and upgrades, including the removal of a non-original front door opening and installation of a new window; replacement of rotted exterior wood elements; removal of a non-original rear porch and construction of a new rear addition and porch; and several interior upgrades, including plumbing and electric fixtures, countertops, cabinets, appliances, and finish hardware. The applicant received Historic Tax Certification in 2015.

c. Staff conducted a site visit on September 14, 2017, to examine the conditions of the property. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on June 15, 2017 for the installation of a standing seam metal roof with the stipulations that the roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. The approval also stipulated that a large profile ridge cap should not be used. As installed, the roof features an unapproved, raised ridge vent with modern capped ends that is not in compliance with the approval on record. The ridge detail must be corrected or receive approval from the HDRC in order for the property owner to participate in the tax incentive program.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

September 20, 2017

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

32. HDRC NO. 2017-469

Applicant: Hector Islas

Address: 708 E QUINCY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 32 existing wood windows with new Jeld-Wen brand wood windows. Of the 32 window openings, 26 will be slightly modified to accommodate the sizes offered by the manufacturer.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 708 E Quincy is a 2-story residential structure constructed in the Classical Revival style with Craftsman influences. The home features a double height front porch, a standing seam metal roof with a hipped dormer, and Corinthian columns. The structure is an individual local landmark designated in October 2006. The applicant is requesting approval to replace 32 existing wood windows with new Jeld-Wen brand wood windows. Of the 32 window openings, 26 will be slightly modified to accommodate the sizes offered by the manufacturer.

b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: OPENING MODIFICATIONS – The proposal requires the adjustment of 26 total existing window sizes to accommodate stock window sizes available by the manufacturer. The Historic Design Guidelines state that enlarging or diminishing openings to fit stock sizes should be avoided. The applicant has stated that contractors have quoted the restoration of the existing windows at three times the price of new wood windows. Altering sizes will require framing out the new opening, removing existing siding or installing in-kind siding to accommodate the new opening size, and restoring or replacing trim and sill elements, which will add to the total cost. The existing windows are also constructed of a high quality, durable wood that has lasted for decades. Reinvesting in original material yields a longer lifespan and eliminates the cost of modifying an opening to accommodate stock window sizes. Staff does not find the proposal to be appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.

c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITIONS – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, in-kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff conducted a site visit on September 13, 2017, to examine the condition of the windows. Of the windows that remain, staff found a total of three sashes on the southeast façade to be severely deteriorated due to paint loss, improper previous repair, and exposure to the elements, which has caused joint separation and extensive rot. Staff finds the replacement of these windows appropriate given these circumstances. Staff finds that all other remaining sashes are in repairable condition, requiring minor wood repair, reglazing, and/or repainting.

d. WORK WITHOUT APPROVAL – Staff conducted a site visit on September 13, 2017. All of the windows on the rear façade had been removed, totaling six assemblies and twelve sashes. This work was conducted without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the replacement of three total windows on the southeast façade based on finding c. The applicant must submit a final window schedule for this façade that indicates which windows are to be replaced to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the remaining wood windows based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that the windows be restored in place.

CASE COMMENTS:

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

September 20, 2017

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

33. HDRC NO. 2017-475

Applicant: Markus Lopez

Address: 1010 BURNET ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Modify the existing front porch columns
2. Construct a rear-side addition to feature approximately 60 square feet.
3. Demolish rear flat roof and secondary gable roof.
4. Extend existing primary gable roof over existing rear and proposed addition.
5. Install four (4) new window openings
6. Relocate two (2) window openings
7. Replace four (4) non-historic windows with historic wood windows.
8. Demolish existing rear porch, steps, and doorway to construct a new porch, steps, and doorway in respect to the proposed addition.
9. Repaint the structure
10. Receive Historic Tax Certification

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 1010 Burnet was constructed circa 1910 in the Craftsman style and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure features gable, shed, and flat roofs with standing seam metal as roofing material, wood and aluminum windows, wood siding, a front porch, and a rear porch.
- b. COLUMN REPLACEMENT – The applicant proposed to modify/replace the existing columns in the front porch with column details consistent with the historic character of the era in which the structure was built. The applicant has proposed to use tapered wood columns with brick masonry supports where linear wood columns currently exist. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B.iii. requires designs to be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish when in-kind replacement not feasible. Guidelines 2.B.iv. notes that new elements and details should not create a false historic appearance. While staff finds that in-kind replacement of the linear wood columns feasible, the applicant's proposed design is appropriate given the context of the neighboring structures. Staff recommends conceptual approval until the applicant provides measured drawings of column alterations.
- c. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear-side addition to feature approximately 60 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 3.1.A.i requires residential addition to be sited at the side or rear whenever possible. Guide lines 3.1.B.iv requires additions to respond to the size of the lot and to not double the existing building footprint. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. TRANSITION BETWEEN OLD AND NEW – According to the Guidelines, new additions should utilize a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The currently-proposed footprint of the addition with uniform roof plane is not consistent with this requirement. Staff finds that the addition should utilize a similar roof form that is subordinate or set below the existing rear gable, and a more narrow width which would allow the addition to be inset from the existing exterior wall planes.
- e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to demolish the secondary gable roof and flat roof over the rear of the structure and to expand the existing primary gable roof over the existing rear and the proposed addition. The Guidelines for Additions 3.1.A.iii requires the utilization of similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure for additions. Staff finds the demolition of the secondary roofs and the expansion of the primary roof in respect to the proposed addition appropriate.
- f. WINDOWS OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed to install four windows where no window openings exist on the rear of the buildings: two on the south elevation and two on the east elevation. The applicant also proposed to relocate two window openings, one on each side elevation. The applicant has proposed to use matching materials and design to match existing historic windows for the four (4) new window opening and the four (4) non-historic window replacements. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.6.B.iv. notes that new windows are to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Guidelines 2.6.B.vii requires nonhistoric incompatible windows to be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the proposed installation of new windows, the relocation of two window openings, and the

September 20, 2017

replacement of non-historic windows appropriate. Staff finds the proposal for new and relocated window openings appropriate and recommends conceptual approval at this time. Final approval may be sought provided measured drawings from the applicant.

g. REAR PORCH – The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing rear porch including the gable roof, wood columns, and concrete steps. The applicant proposed to construct a new porch offset to the right side of the original porch. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.7.B.iii. and iv. requires porch replacements to be in-kind or compatible, while porch elements, such as stairs, are to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposed demolition of the existing porch and the construction of the new porch in respect to the proposed addition appropriate.

h. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to use matching materials for all new elements introduced to the site including wood windows, wood siding, and metal standing seam roof. Staff finds the proposed materials appropriate and recommends conceptual approval at this time. Final approval may be sought provided measured drawings that include specifications for new windows, siding, and roofing materials and design.

i. PAINT REMOVAL – The applicant proposed to remove paint on the wood siding by pressure washing. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.1.A.iii prohibits the use of sand or water blasting as a method of paint removal. Staff recommends approval of paint removal with the stipulation that the applicant only uses the following acceptable methods: scraping, sanding, thermal removal, and only when necessary, mild chemical removals.

j. REPAINTING – The applicant proposes to prime and repaint the structure with color “Chelsea Gray” by Benjamin Moore. Staff finds the paint selection appropriate and recommends approval.

k. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION - The applicant has requested Historic Tax Certification. Per UDC Section 35-618, the applicant has not provided complete plans for the proposed work and therefore has not met the application document requirements.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend final approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 through 9 based on findings b through i with the following stipulation:

1. The new roof form must be offset and subordinate to the historic structure’s primary gable roof.
2. That the proposed addition be more narrow than the existing house and be inset from the existing exterior wall planes.
3. Paint removal may only be performed by scarping, sanding, thermal removal, and only when necessary, mild chemical removals – and is prohibited from sand or water blasting.
4. The proposed window replacements are to feature an installation that is consistent with those of the primary historic structure and matches the details noted in finding d. The proposed windows feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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 an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
5. Measured drawings and material specifications must be submitted for all details including column alterations, new roof with offset, windows, elevations, and site plan with setback – in pursuit of final approval.

Staff does not recommend Historic Tax Certification based on findings f. Complete plans including measured drawings must be submitted for HDRC to consider Historic Tax Certification.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve conceptually items #1-#9 with staff stipulations. Denial of tax certification.

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

34. HDRC NO. 2017-453

Applicant: Dustin Brisco

Address: 618 DAWSON ST

September 20, 2017

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace all original wood windows on the house with one-over-one wood insert replacement windows
2. Install a new, additional window opening on the front facade
3. Reinstall sidelights and transom at front entrance to resolve unapproved removal of front entry elements.
4. Introduce a new deck and railing to the front porch and replace existing non-original columns with large cedarwrapped columns.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 618 Dawson was constructed circa 1920 in a vernacular style and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The original front porch has been removed, but would have likely featured simple turned columns or wood columns with chamfered corners. Prior to work without approval, the house featured a symmetrical façade with two windows and a central front entrance with sidelights and transom.

b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT- According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in-kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. The applicant has not furnished substantial evidence that the windows were deteriorated beyond repair, and they have been replaced without approval. Reinvesting in original material would have yielded a longer lifespan. Furthermore, the proposed window trim (brickmould only with no sill detail) does not utilize traditional dimensions or trim types and is not appropriate. Staff does not find the proposal to be appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.

c. WINDOW OPENINGS – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new window openings should not be installed where they did not historically exist, especially on the primary façade. The proposed additional window opening on the front façade interrupts the character-defining symmetry of the front façade and is not appropriate.

d. FRONT ENTRANCE – The applicant has proposed to install sidelights and a transom window around the front door, to replace the original entry elements that have been removed. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.6.B.iv. notes that new windows are to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Guidelines 2.6.B.vii. notes that non-historic windows be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. The applicant has not provided sufficient information to verify whether the proposed sidelights and transom will be a match for the original. Detail architectural drawings must be submitted prior to final approval.

e. PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to install wood decking over the existing concrete porch foundation and to install a 38 inch high rail kit on both sides of the porch steps. The applicant cites similar porch designs within the district. While the design of the railing is appropriate, the porch foundation of this structure is not aligned with the front door steps and it is unclear whether the proposed modifications will result in a condition that is consistent with the Guidelines. The addition of new elements is not appropriate at this at this time due to insufficient information regarding the porch foundation and proposed decking.

f. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant proposed to replace the existing wood columns with larger cedar wrapped columns. The Guidelines Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.7.B.iii notes that the design should be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish when in-kind replacement is not feasible. Because the existing columns are not original, replacement may be appropriate where the proposed replacement is compatible with the style of the home. Box columns are more typical of the Craftsman Style and are not appropriate. This house would have likely featured simple turned columns or wood columns with chamfered corners. Until the overall porch design can be fully assessed by staff, a recommendation regarding the sizing and placement of columns cannot be made.

RECOMMENDATION:

There are a number of unresolved issues regarding the structural integrity and proposed design of the front porch. Staff remains concerned with the quality of work performed without approval, and lack of architectural detail provided in the drawings.

1. Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement at this time. The applicant has not provided an appropriate trim detail, or sufficient evidence that would warrant the replacement of the original windows with wood insert windows.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of the new window opening on the front façade. Staff recommends that the original window configuration and symmetrical appearance be preserved.
3. Staff recommends that the original sidelights and transom at the front entry be restored to their original appearance. Accurate drawings that depict a custom, wood-framed solution with appropriate detailing must be provided to staff prior to work proceeding.
4. Staff does not recommend any changes to the front porch at this time. The structural conditions need to be fully assessed and an overall design that restores the likely original appearance of the raised front porch should be submitted before individual porch elements are proposed.

CASE COMMENTS:

September 20, 2017

A Stop Work Order was issued on August 28, 2017 for unapproved work prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior modifications including windows, doors, and architectural details. The property has obtained Certificates of Appropriateness for the following work:

1. Skirting installation (5/13/2016)
2. Siding repair and replacement (5/13/2016)
3. Foundation repairs including installation of concrete piers (5/13/2016)
4. Installation of HVAC system in the rear yard (1/3/2017)

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cullen Jones spoke in opposition to the applicant's request

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC NO. 2017-466

Applicant: Ntando McIntosh

Address: 932 BURNET ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend a previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness regarding the design of a rear addition. The proposed amendments include:

1. The construction of a double height balcony on the west side of the structure.
2. The modification of façade arrangement for each façade of the addition including fenestration patterns.
3. The modification of materials to include vinyl windows and stucco.
4. The modification of window profiles to include fixed windows and windows with multiple divided lites.
5. The construction of a chimney on the east façade.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 932 Burnet was constructed circa 1905 and features strong Folk Victorian architectural elements including a circular wrap-around porch, a front window bay and side roof gables. This structure appears on the 1912 Sanborn maps.
- b. At the October 5, 2016, HDRC hearing, the applicant received final approval to perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the historic structure, construct a rear, two level addition and construct a side yard deck. At the November 16, 2017, HDRC hearing, the applicant received approval to modify the previously approved design by installing two additional dormers and a trellis to cover a side yard deck. At this time, the applicant has proposed to modify the rear addition once again to include a width, chimney and architectural details that were not previously approved. The requested modifications to the previously approved design began prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- c. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to modify the approved design of the rear addition, currently under construction. The applicant has proposed to modify the proposed width as well as architectural elements that include the following: the installation of a double height balcony to extend out from the west façade of the addition, the construction of a chimney on the east façade and modifications each façade including architectural details, façade arrangement, window profiles and materials.
- d. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Staff finds the proposed addition of a double height balcony to be inappropriate and inconsistent with both the previous approval and Guidelines for Additions. Staff finds that this addition should be removed.
- e. WINDOWS – The previously approved design was approved with the stipulation that wood windows be installed in to the addition. The applicant has proposed windows that feature profiles that differ from the one over one wood windows that were approved. Staff finds that the applicant should adhere to the previously approved design.
- f. MATERIALS – The previous design was approved with materials that included a standing seam metal roof, wood windows and doors and Dutch wood siding. At this time, the applicant has installed materials which include stucco, vinyl windows with multiple divided lites, a stucco covered chimney and fixed, picture windows. Staff does not find the modified materials list to be appropriate and finds that the applicant should adhere to the previously approved materials.

September 20, 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 through #5. Staff finds that the previously approved design should be adhered to.

CASE COMMENT:

The previous design which was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission has not been adhered to. Modifications have knowingly occurred in violation of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

MEETING MINUTES:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Garza to move for approval of meeting minutes from 7/5/2017, 7/19/2017 & 8/2/2017.

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Garcia, Laffoon

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 9:35 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair