

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
7 Feb 2018**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 PM, in the Board Room at the 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, Chair; Bustamante, Vice Chair; Fish; Lazarine; Grube; Kamal; Laffoon

ABSENT: Garza, Connor, Brittain, Garcia

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - Social Run Series, February 22—Tobin Hill, Government Hill, Old Lonestar Brewery, and Monte Vista
 - Action to amend HDRC Schedule of Hearings: additional HDRC meeting suggested for Friday, March 2, 2018, 8:30 am, to review an updated design proposal for a multi-family development at 803 N Cherry adjacent to the Hays Street Bridge. All commissioners present approved date and time.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in support of consent agenda items #1 and #14.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda, which consisted of:

- Item #1, Case No. 2017-566 402 CENTER ST, 406 CENTER ST, 139 N SWISS, 126 N CHERRY, 122 N CHERRY, 120 N CHERRY, 134 N SWISS, 130 N SWISS, 126 N SWISS
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-065 420 BROADWAY
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-064 1927 N IH 35
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-031 803 BURLESON ST
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-037 812 BURLESON ST
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-020 1839 E HOUSTON ST
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-032 233 DONALDSON AVE
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-033 403 GILLESPIE
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-060 3015 BROADWAY
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-043 722 MASON ST
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-047 117 E FRENCH PLACE
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-056 301 BURLESON ST
- Item #15, Case No. 2017-053 922 N PINE ST
- Item #16, Case No. 2018-006 16 LEDGE LANE
- Item #17, Case No. 2018-050 325 E PARK AVE
- Item #18, Case No. 2018-051 1244 VIRGINIA BLVD
- Item #19, Case No. 2018-052 1244 VIRGINIA BLVD
- Item #20, Case No. 2018-040 219 DELAWARE
- Item #22, Case No. 2018-055 226 DONALDSON AVE
- Item #23, Case No. 2018-060 211 W HOLLYWOOD AVE
- Item #25, Case No. 2018-057 1138 IOWA ST

Items #3, #13, #21, and #24 were pulled for commissioner recusals and/or citizens to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

3. HDRC NO. 2018-063

Applicant: Philip Parsons & Suzan Lambillotte

Address: 511 MISSION ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 511 Mission.

FINDINGS:

- a) The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 511 Mission Street, located within the King William Historic District.
- b) Rehabilitative scopes of work have been approved administratively including painting, landscaping, HVAC upgrades, fencing, foundation skirting installation and roofing. In addition to the previously noted exterior items, a number of interior scopes of work have been completed including interior finishes, electrical and mechanical improvements and insulation installation.
- 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on findings a through c.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

RECUSALS: Guarino.

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2017-608

Applicant: Timothy Proctor/Laney Development Group, LLC

Address: 421 S PRESA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of the massing and façade materials of a proposed thirteen story, mixed use tower. The property is bound by S Presa on the east, Cesar E Chavez on the south and S St Mary's on the west. The structure will feature structured parking as the 2nd and 3rd levels.

FINDINGS:

- a) The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for tower massing and façade materials for a proposed thirteen story, mixed use tower at 421 S Presa. The property is bound by S Presa on the east, Cesar E Chavez on the south and S St Mary's on the west. The structure will feature structured parking, retail and residential space. At the December 6, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission meeting, the applicant received conceptual approval for the street and garage levels.
- b) **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – 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) **FAÇADE ALIGNMENT** – The proposed new construction should be aligned in a manner that is not dominant of the setback of the neighboring historic structure. The applicant has addressed stipulations at conceptual approval of the ground floor massing and setback and has met staff's requirements.
- d) **ALLOWABLE HEIGHT** – There is no height restriction for new construction in RIO 3, consistent with the Downtown District. The applicant has proposed a height of approximately 152 feet. Cesar E Chavez Boulevard is a dividing boundary between the Downtown District and the neighborhoods to the south. While the proposed tower is dramatically taller than the residential and small commercial structures located to the south, the proposed height is appropriate within the context of the Downtown District.
- e) **HEIGHT COMPATIBILITY** – UDC Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. The majority of neighboring structures are well below the allowable building height. The proposed podium at 3 stories is compatible with these lower buildings, and the overall tower height is of similar height as other towers in the near vicinity. The proposed tower is also located on the southwestern most corner of the La Villita Historic District, and there is an immediate contrast between the proposed height of the tower and the height of the neighboring historic buildings to the north. Staff finds that this impact can be mitigated by aligning ground floor elements with the established heights of the neighboring buildings.
- f) **HUMAN SCALE** – Per the UDC Section 35-674(b), all building should appear to have a human scale. In general, this scale can be accomplished by using familiar forms and elements interpreted in human dimensions. Facades shall contain a discernible pattern of mass to void, or windows and doors to solid mass. Opening shall appear in a regular pattern or be clustered to form a cohesive design. The applicant has proposed multiple architectural elements at the street level to provide a human scale including individual unit porches, pedestrian scaled entrances and pedestrian seating locations. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g) **FAÇADE SEPARATION** – The UDC Section 35-674 (b)(4) notes that a façade in RIO-3 that features more than thirty (30) feet in length should be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has met this requirement for the tower's massing by introducing protruding balconies that span various lengths, horizontal elements that include vegetation and fenestration patterns which emphasize verticality. This is consistent with the UDC. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to develop the proposed balconies and vertical separation elements.
- h) **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(e) in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. The applicant has proposed an architectural cap that includes penthouse

residential units. Staff finds that the massing and design of the architectural cap is appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

- i) **TOWER MASSING** – While the RIO standards are generally silent in regards to tower design, the Downtown Design Guide provides guidance for tower massing and form. Buildings more than 10 stories tall should be tapered and should be designed to reduce overall bulk. Tower siting and massing should also maintain key views. A building’s top should be delineated with a change of detail and meet the sky with a thinner form, or tapered point. Unarticulated, flat-topped buildings are discouraged. In terms of proportion, a tower should generally appear taller than it is wide. The applicant has reduced the width of the tower since first being heard by the HDRC and has incorporated vertical façade elements to introduce verticality and reduce visual width. Staff finds that both of these design solutions are appropriate and reduce the bulk of the tower. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to work to reduce visual massing and width through the further development of balconies, vertical fins and façade elements that promote verticality.
- j) **MATERIALS** – The UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. For the ground level, the applicant has proposed materials that include stainless steel mesh, composite wood panels, large format local limestone featuring a smooth finish, metal panels, wood panels and stone. Each of the proposed materials are consistent with the UDC.
- k) **MATERIALS** – Regarding tower cladding materials, the applicant has proposed perforated metal panels and thin concrete panels. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate.
- l) **SIGNAGE** – At this time the applicant has provided conceptual information regarding building signage. All signage will need to be reviewed in full by the HDRC prior to installation.
- m) **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the La Villita Local Historic District, and the La Villita National Register of Historic Places District. The property is also in close proximity to previously recorded site 41BX303. A review of historic archival documents shows structures within the property as early as 1873. This archival review also identifies the Pajalache or Concepcion Acequia, a designated Local Historic Landmark and National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark, likely traversing the project area. Therefore, the property may contain archaeological sites, some of which may be significant. Thus, archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed tower massing and ground floor material palette based on findings c through k with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant continue to develop the proposed balconies and vertical separation elements to emphasize verticality throughout each façade.
- ii. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- Archaeological investigations are required for all below-ground disturbing activities, including those associated with new construction. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

RECUSALS: Guarino.

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2018-062

Applicant: Robert Murray

Address: 222 W GUENTHER ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Demolish the rear accessory structure at 222 W Guenther.
2. Receive Historic Tax Certification for the rehabilitation of the historic structure at 222 W Guenther.

FINDINGS:

- a) The historic structure at 222 W Guenther was constructed in the Craftsman style and features protruding gabled front porch roofs, a side gabled roof, a brick chimney and a rear accessory structure. At this time, the applicant has proposed to demolish the rear accessory structure and has also requested Historic Tax Certification for the primary historic structure on the property.
- b) **DEMOLITION** – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only. There are not replacement plans proposed at this time. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historical development pattern within a historic district.
- c) **CONTRIBUTING STATUS**- In January 2018, the applicant submitted an application for non-contributing status for the rear accessory structure. The structure was determined to be contributing. The structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map; however, the structure features a narrower footprint than that which currently exists. While several original materials are intact, many elements have experienced deterioration; however, staff finds the structure is still contributing to the district.
- d) **UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP** – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614, no certificate shall be issued for demolition of a historic landmark unless the applicant provides sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission of unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant. In the case of a historic landmark, if an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information regarding loss of significance. In order for unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. In the submitted application, the applicant has indicated that the structure no longer serves a purpose and poses a safety and health hazard due to structural shifts, deteriorated elements and inappropriate electrical wiring. The applicant has provided a second report from a contractor noting that the repair of the existing structure would be cost prohibitive. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) has been met based on the documentation provided.
- e) **LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE** –In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to the substantial deterioration of original materials.
- f) **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – At the November 15, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received approval to install new roofing, perform foundation repair, repair damaged wood siding and painting. The applicant has also noted interior improvements which include installation of new drywall, electrical upgrades, plumbing upgrades, repair of wood interior elements and the installation of new insulation. Other exterior rehabilitative scopes include window repair. 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item #1, the demolition of the rear accessory structure with the stipulation that materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding, wood doors and wood windows be salvaged for use on site in future construction.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

RECUSALS: Guarino.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Note: Commissioner Connor arrived at 3:38 PM.

24. HDRC NO. 2017-655

Applicant: Christopher O'Malley

Address: 1910 E HOUSTON, 430 N MONUMENTAL, 129 FLORENCE ALLEY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for approval of a proposed site plan for nine, single family residential structures.

FINDINGS:

- a) The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the construction of nine, two story, single family residential structures on the vacant lots at 1910 E Houston, 430 N Monumental and 129 Florence Alley. The lots are currently zoned commercial and are located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b) **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – 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) **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 10, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that setbacks should be deeper than those of historic structure, that the E Houston street facades should be developed to address the street and noted that the creation of access driveways on Florence and N Monumental may be appropriate.
- d) **LOT COVERAGE** – The applicant has proposed to divide the existing, three lots into nine separate lots to construct nine, two story, single family residential structures. Generally, the individual lot coverage proposed on each lot is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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. The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature a similar setback to those found historically adjacent to the proposed new construction. Staff finds that the proposed new construction should feature setbacks that are deeper than those found adjacent historically.

- 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 N Monumental and Florence Alley. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g) BUILDING WIDTHS – The applicant has proposed narrow façade widths for structures fronting N Monumental and Florence Alley. For the two structures that are proposed to front E Houston, the applicant has proposed architectural elements to address the width fronting E Houston. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- h) MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided specifics regarding materials. Per the Guidelines, the use of wood or Hardi siding, shingle or metal roofing and wood and aluminum clad wood windows are appropriate.
- i) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New building should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposed site plan to be appropriate; however, architectural details should be developed in a manner that is reflective of the historic elements found in the immediate vicinity of the proposed new construction.
- j) 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.
- k) DRIVEWAY LOCATION – The applicant has proposed for the driveways to have access to E Houston, N Monumental and Florence Alley. Each driveway generally presents itself in a manner similar to those found historically in the district. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- l) LANDSCAPING – At this time the applicant has not provided as landscaping plan. The applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan when submitting for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed site plan based on findings a through l with the following stipulations:

- i. That the setbacks of the proposed new construction be greater than those found historically adjacent to the proposed new construction.
- ii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view at the public right of way.
- iii. That a detailed landscaping plan be developed and submitted at the time of final approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2018-013

Applicant: Thelma Arredondo

Address: 117 BUFORD

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 729 square feet.
- 2. Construct a water closet addition on the west elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a) The structure at 117 Buford was constructed circa 1920 in a vernacular style and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure features a gable roof and wood siding with a covered front porch to match. The structure features approximately 780 square feet.
- b) REAR ADDITION – The applicant proposes to construct a 27 feet wide by 27 feet long addition to the rear of the historic structure to match its width. The proposed addition would add 729 square feet to the current 780 square feet structure. The addition would maintain an 11 feet setback to the rear property line. The Guidelines for Additions 3.1.B.iv. notes that an appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within historic districts and that residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint regardless of size. Staff finds the addition should feature an inset condition to distinguish between old and new forms and reduce the overall square footage.
- c) MATERIALS - The applicant has proposed to install wood siding to feature a six inch exposure and corner trim that matches the existing structure. The applicant also proposes to paint the exterior addition the same color as the existing structure. The Guidelines for Additions 3.3.A.i notes that using materials that match in type, color, and texture should include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Staff finds the proposed materials for the addition appropriate, provided the applicant also includes a vertical trim piece on each side elevation distinguishing between the existing structure and the addition.
- d) ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to construct a roof for the addition that matches the form (gable) and materials (shingle) of the existing roof. Staff finds the proposal for the roof of the addition appropriate and in compliance with the Guidelines for Additions 3.1.A.iii regarding a similar roof form and 3.3.A.i. regarding complementary materials.
- e) WINDOWS & DOORS – The applicant has proposed to install two windows on each side façade and one door on the rear façade. The applicant has proposed to install white, aluminum frame, double pane windows to match the existing windows installed in the primary historic structure. While staff finds the window materials to be inconsistent with the Guidelines, staff finds their installation appropriate given the existing materials installed at this structure.
- f) UTILITY CLOSET –The applicant has proposed to construct a utility closet addition on the west elevation of the structure. Staff finds this location and construction, which extends from the footprint of the primary historic structure to be inconsistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.1.A.i (minimize visual impact), 3.1.B.i (Subordinate to principle façade), 3.1.B.iv (footprint), and 3.5.A.i (visibility of mechanical equipment). Staff finds that this closet should be relocated to the rear elevation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends final approval based on findings b through f with the following stipulations

- i. The addition includes an inset condition to distinguish between old and new forms and reduce the overall square footage of the addition.
- ii. The applicant must reduce the size of the proposed windows to match windows in the existing structure as noted in finding e. 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. An updated window schedule must be submitted to staff before final approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2018-045

Applicant: Gloria Torres

Address: 2142 W MAGNOLIA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to paint the exterior brick of the historic structure in a champagne color to match the color of a previously-approved new rear addition.

FINDINGS:

- a) The structure located at 2142 W Magnolia Ave is one-story single family home constructed in 1935. The original structure is primarily brick with Tutor style elements, including a cross-hipped roof form with composition shingles. It is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b) **PAINTING** – The applicant is requesting approval to paint the brick façade of the historic structure a champagne color to match the new previously-approved addition façade color. Per the applicant and evidence of remaining patches of light tan paint, the structure had previously been painted. However, the façade has been cleaned and is presently unpainted. The original brick, a sandy tan color, is exposed. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 2.B., surfaces that were historically unpainted should not be painted. Staff does not find the painting of the façade to be appropriate.
- c) According to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, historically unpainted brick should not be painted. Brick structures built prior to the 1870s were largely constructed of handmade bricks, which were generally softer, more porous, and weaker than bricks made at the turn of the 20th century. These handmade bricks were frequently painted or coated because the strength of the brick was insufficient without a coating for stabilization. However, as machine-made bricks became the norm during the latter half of the 19th century, bricks became inherently stronger and did not require paint or coatings for protection and strength. These bricks commonly featured harder “dress” surfaces, which were meant to face the exterior of the structure and remain unpainted. 2124 W Magnolia was constructed in the 1930s and was historically unpainted. Painting historically unpainted brick on structures of this era can lead to trapped water in the porous material, eventually destroying the brick due to the damaging effects of water infiltration and freeze-thaw cycles. Unpainted brick of this era is inherently high strength and low-maintenance on its own. Once these structures are painted, consistent repainting is required to maintain the aesthetics of the brick.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

28. HDRC NO. 2018-042

Applicant: Leonardo Abad

Address: 231 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a metal light pole featuring adjustable height in rear yard.

FINDINGS:

- a) The structure at 231 Adams, also known as the Schulze House, is a two-story brick structure featuring Folk Victorian architectural elements and was constructed in 1891. The backyard features predominantly a natural lawn, as well as a one-story garage structure and a few trees. A basketball half-court featuring a concrete slab was approved administratively on January 18, 2018.
- b) LIGHT - The applicant has proposed to install a light pole featuring an adjustable height, a square column, and a rectangular lamp of metal material. Per Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.iii, staff finds that the design of the light is obtrusive to the character of the property. However, staff finds that the proposed location and installation of the light pole appropriate and that a lamp featuring a traditional configuration and materials would be compatible with this property.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the light installation based on finding b. The request is eligible for administrative approval if the applicant submits a light pole/lamp design that is compatible with the property and does not feature a height or luminosity that creates light pollution for neighboring properties.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

29. HDRC NO. 2018-048

Applicant: Brett Ingram/Ingram Roofing & Construction

Address: 210 W LYNWOOD

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing non-original aluminum screen windows on a porch addition with five sets of wood and vinyl casement windows.
2. Replace the existing primary structure and accessory structure roof with a new acrylic coated galvalume standing seam metal roof in the color charcoal.

FINDINGS:

- a) The primary structure located at 210 W Lynwood is a 2-story single family home constructed in approximately 1940 in the Colonial Revival style with Spanish Eclectic influences. The home features a symmetrical front façade with two masonry chimneys on either side and flat, terra cotta colored clay tile roofing. The home is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The property features a rear accessory structure which also contains flat, terra cotta colored clay tile roofing. The accessory structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b) WINDOW SCREEN REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace existing non-original aluminum window screens on a side porch addition with five sets of new hybrid wood and vinyl casement windows. The new windows will feature 6 divided lites to match existing window patterns on the home. The window modification will also add new board and batten siding beneath the openings. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, non-historic incompatible windows with should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the proposed window proportions and configurations to be a significant upgrade to the current condition of the porch, which is located at the corner of the lot and visible from the public right-of-way. The proposal is also an upgrade from the existing metal screens and framing. Staff finds that hybrid wood and vinyl windows may be appropriate for replacing incompatible metal windows if the windows meet all the required specifications listed in the recommendation.

- c) **ROOF REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing flat, terra cotta colored clay tile roofing on both the primary and accessory structures with a new standing seam galvalume metal roof in the color charcoal. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iv., roofing materials should be replaced in-kind whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Historic materials should be retained and reused when large-scale replacement of roof materials is required, specifically roofs constructed of slate or clay tile. New roofing materials should match the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile, and style. The clay tile roofs are character defining features of the style and materiality of the structures. Additionally, clay tiles, including barrel tiles and flat tiles, are historically common on houses of various styles on W Lynwood, as well as to the south on W Elsmere Place. Staff finds that a standing seam metal roof would substantially alter the style and visual elements of the home.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the window replacement based on finding b with the following stipulations:

- i. That the windows feature true divided lites or lites that are raised from the exterior glass. Faux divided lites or lites internal to the window panes are not appropriate. The applicant is required to submit a final window specification, including section detail, to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the board and batten siding features boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2018-046

Applicant: Christopher Green

Address: 114 ARMOUR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a 1-story rear addition to measure approximately 298 square feet.
2. Construct a 1 ½ -story rear accessory structure to measure approximately 328 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a) The primary structure located at 114 Armour is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1926 in the Craftsman style. The home features exposed rafter tails, one over one wood windows, and vertical boards with scalloped edges adorning the front facing gable. The home is a contributing structure in the River Road Historic District.
- 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.

Findings for rear addition, item #1:

- a) **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the primary structure measuring approximately 298 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should not double the size of the primary structure and should be subordinate to the existing structure. Additionally, 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 and extends 1'-6" beyond the east façade. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

- b) ROOF – The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. The addition should be subordinate to the primary structure and should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The proposal extends the existing rear gable, which is slightly shorter than the existing structure's primary ridgeline. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the structure.
- c) ROOF MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install asphalt shingles to match the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d) WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to install ten windows in the new addition. Four windows will be relocated from the existing rear façade to the exterior wall of the addition. Six new 30x60 windows will be installed in pairs in three openings on the west, south (rear), and east façade. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new windows and openings should respond to the proportions that exist on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- e) WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to salvage four existing windows for reuse on the new addition and to install six new wood windows to match the existing on the historic structure in terms of configuration, dimensions, and inset. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- f) FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to install new board and batten siding to match the profile of the siding on the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- g) TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW – According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, additions should provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms through materials, an inset in footprint, and/or design details. The proposal, as noted in finding c, extends beyond existing east façade by 1'-6". Staff finds that this extension should be eliminated and that the applicant should incorporate an alternative transition between the historic structure and new addition for their final approval submission.
- h) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition incorporates and retains similar architectural detailing as the existing structure and is consistent with the Guidelines.

Findings for rear accessory structure, item #2:

- i) MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new accessory structure in the rear of the lot to measure approximately 328 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. The proposed accessory structure is consistent with this Guideline and with similarly-scaled accessory structures in the River Road Historic District. However, the applicant has not yet indicated the proposed overall height of the structure relative to the ridgeline of the primary structure.
- j) ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – Guidelines 5.B.i and 5.B.ii for new construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation and setbacks common in the district. The structure will be set back from the side and rear lot lines by five feet and will be oriented towards the interior of the lot. Staff finds the proposal for orientation and setback consistent with the Guidelines.
- k) WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to install a total of eleven windows on the proposed structure. The windows appear to measure 30x60 or a similar dimension and proportion. The proposal includes two paired windows and one set of three ganged windows, which feature architecturally appropriate trim pieces and proportions. One door for egress will be installed on the east elevation. According to the OHP Window Policy Document, windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.
- l) WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Windows, windows used in new construction should feature traditional materials or appearance. The applicant has yet to specify the materials for the new windows and doors. Staff finds wood to be appropriate.
- m) FAÇADE MATERIALS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, new construction should incorporate materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. The applicant has proposed to incorporate board and batten siding and trim detail to match the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.

- n) ROOF – The applicant has proposed a simple gable roof form with shingles to match the primary structure. The proposal also incorporates a full-width porch and canopy covering the front door. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and compatible with the historic home.
- o) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The Guidelines stipulate that architectural details of new construction should keep with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should also be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the primary structure or adjacent structures. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear addition based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduces the footprint of the addition on the east façade to be in line with the existing footprint of the primary structure and incorporates a transition between the existing structure and addition as noted in findings c and i.
- ii. That the applicant installs new one over one wood windows where existing windows are not being reused and submits a specification to staff for final approval. 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. 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.
- iii. That the board and batten siding features boards and battens that match the existing on the historic structure in terms of width and profile.

Item 2, Staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear accessory structure based on findings k through q with the following stipulations:

- iv. That the applicant installs new one over one wood windows and submits a specification to staff for final approval. 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. 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.
- v. That the board and batten siding features boards and battens that match the existing on the historic structure in terms of width and profile.
- vi. That the applicant submits documents for final approval that include all dimensions, including the overall height of the structure, the sizes of all openings, and the details of the porch railings, columns, and balustrades.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2018-044

Applicant: Joseph Gamez

Address: 170 HERMINE BLVD

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace existing windows with vinyl windows.
2. Install a concrete patio.
3. Install a concrete driveway.
4. Construct a rear addition.

FINDINGS:

- a) The structure at 170 Hermine was constructed circa 1930 in the minimal traditional configuration and features elements of the Spanish Eclectic architectural style including an arched entryway and stone façade. During a site visit conducted by staff on January 9, 2018, staff found that the stone façade was being removed to install Hardi siding, original windows were replaced with vinyl windows and the installation of a front porch and rear deck had been initiated. The applicant has since returned the stone façade to its configuration and is seeking approval of the remaining work.
- b) WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has replaced four (4) sets of wood, double-hung windows with fixed vinyl windows with two divided lights . The applicant has proposed to install wood trim to supplement the visual impact of replacing the wood windows with the new vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations notes that new windows are to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when the original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Per the applicant, the original wood windows were deteriorated and have been discarded. Staff does not find a vinyl replacement consistent with Guidelines. Staff also finds that the proposed window screens and trim featuring four divided lights do not accurately represent the original, double-hung configuration of the wood windows.
- c) COMPLIANT WINDOWS - Staff finds that the proposed windows should 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 which will allow for the installation of an appropriate wood screen. 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.
- d) PATIO – The applicant has partially installed a concrete rounded patio centered to the front façade.. Staff finds that there is no evidence of an existing patio in this location or configuration associated with this structure or its architectural style. Staff does not find the patio consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.
- e) DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete driveway to replace the existing, unpaved gravel driveway. The proposed driveway will feature 9 feet in width and 110 feet in length. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i, new driveway configurations should be similar in material, width, and design to that historically found on the site and that pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary. Given that the surrounding properties also include fully paved or concrete ribbon strip driveways, staff finds the proposed driveway appropriate.
- f) ADDITION – Staff was able to confirm on a site visit conducted on February 2, 2018 as well as through late photograph submissions also received on February 2, 2018 that an addition was being constructed in the rear of the property. While staff finds the additional generally appropriate in massing and location, staff cannot confirm the selected siding material at this time due to a lack of construction documents in the initial application and a delayed follow-up by the applicant.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend the replacement of windows as proposed based on finding b. Staff recommends the applicant install windows that match the existing wood double-hung windows in both material and configuration as noted in finding c. Staff also recommends that the window openings that have been removed on the south side openings be reinstalled.
2. Staff does not recommend the installation of the concrete patio based on finding d. Staff recommends the immediate removal of unapproved work.

3. Staff recommends approval of the concrete driveway as proposed based on finding e.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of the addition at this time based on finding f. The applicant can resubmit when the proper construction documents are provided.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to approve item #3 with staff stipulations and to deny items #1, 2, and 4.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

32. HDRC NO. 2018-054

Applicant: Ricardo McCullough

Address: 1021 N PALMETTO

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval to construct a 2-story single family home on the vacant lot at 1021 N Palmetto.

FINDINGS:

- a) The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family home to feature approximately 2,015 square feet on the vacant lot at 1021 N Palmetto, located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located at the intersection of N Palmetto and Burlison and is flanked to the west and the south by 1-story historic single-family homes. The blocks in the vicinity are predominantly defined by 1-story historic homes with a few 2-story historic homes, including one across the street from the vacant lot.
- b) The applicant received conceptual approval from the HDRC on December 20, 2017. The approval carried the following stipulations:
 1. **That the applicant reduces the floor plate height to reduce the overall height of the structure as noted in finding g;** this has not been fully addressed in the current submittal.
 2. **That the applicant removes the proposed chimney roof element and proposes an alternative solution for access to the rooftop terrace as noted in finding i;** this stipulation has not been addressed in the current submittal.
 3. **That the applicant explores a front porch design that creates a true porch condition. The porch should extend towards the street and feature more depth to be more consistent with the porch depths and configurations of the Dignowity Hill Historic District as noted in finding f. The final porch design of the rear elevation should respond to the changes made on the front porch and share similar design elements;** this stipulation has not been fully addressed in the current submittal.
 4. **That the applicant proposes windows on the left elevation that feature proportions and configurations that are more consistent with historic window patterns in the district as noted in finding j. Staff finds one over one windows to be appropriate and encourages the applicant to carry the window pattern of the three other elevations over to the left elevation for consistency;** this stipulation has not been met in the current submittal.
 5. **That the applicant submits final drawings and material specifications that are comprehensive, accurate, and meet the 80% complete construction document requirement for final approval. The current submission contains several inconsistencies between plans and elevations that must be resolved in order for consideration for final approval;** this stipulation has not been fully met in the current submittal.

6. **That the applicant submits a comprehensive hardscaping and landscaping plan for final approval that indicates all mechanical equipment and screening methods, if applicable;** this stipulation has not been fully met in the current submittal.
- c) The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 27, 2017. The DRC commented on the combination of stucco and lap siding, which is not common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, nor generally in historic districts in the city. The DRC suggested a more consistent window pattern, sizes, and placement that were more representative of those found in the district and more consistent with the Guidelines. The DRC suggested to utilize the curb cut off Burleson instead of introduce a new curb cut with pavers as a driveway on N Palmetto. The DRC emphasized the importance of studying the surrounding context and responding to the neighborhood conditions, including providing exhibits or drawings that convey reasoning for design choices. The applicant met again with the DRC on December 12, 2017, with a revised design proposal that included window proportions and placement that were consistent with the Guidelines, updated exterior materials, a more defined porch, a new rear porch, and a relocated curb cut and driveway. The DRC found the driveway relocation to be appropriate. The DRC recommended installing one over one wood windows to be consistent with historic structures and the Historic Design Guidelines. The DRC also recommended reducing the floor plate height and roof pitch of the structure to limit the overall height of the building to be more consistent with surrounding historic structures. The DRC found the rear roof condition, including the rooftop terrace, to be favorable, and found that the extension of the standing seam metal roof on the edges of the terrace helped minimize its visible impact from the public right-of-way and is a more appropriate solution than a flat railing that extends the width of the façade. Overall, the DRC found that the applicant's overall design has made significant progress. The chimney element under consideration in this recommendation was not presented at the DRC meeting. The applicant submitted updated drawings to OHP staff on December 14, 2017.
- 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 proposed to orient the structure to face N Palmetto Street, which is consistent with the development pattern found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback that per the application documents is to be within five feet of the adjacent setbacks. The applicant is to provide field measurements to confirm setbacks of adjacent structures and proposed a setback that is consistent. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- e) **ENTRANCES: ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance towards N Palmetto. This is consistent with the Guidelines and the pattern of neighboring homes.
- f) **ENTRANCES: PORCH** – The applicant has proposed a front entrance that projects approximately four feet from the primary setback of the front façade. Historic structures throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature distinct porches that engage the pedestrian streetscape and feature numerous widths, depths and roof styles. The front and rear porch will both feature a standing seam sloped metal roof. Staff finds that the general porch roof form and condition may be appropriate for the district, but finds that the submitted drawings contain several inconsistencies in terms of porch column placement and depth regarding the rear porch.
- 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. The applicant has proposed a two story structure with a rooftop terrace. The highest point of the structure is indicated to be approximately 27'-4", not including the foundation or chimney access element above the primary ridgeline. The height is generally consistent with the two-story structures nearby; however, the block is predominantly single-family homes with a maximum height of approximately 20 feet at the roof ridgeline. Staff recommends that the applicant attempts to reduce the floor plates where feasible to further reduce the height of the structure to be more compatible with the surrounding context of the block. Staff also recommends that the chimney access detail be removed.
- h) **FOUNDATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Historic structures found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature foundation heights of two to three feet in height. The applicant has provided information that notes a foundation height of approximately 1 to 2 feet. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent.

- i) **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a gable roof form and a habitable flat rooftop terrace on the rear elevation. The proposal also includes a chimney-like element with a small gable to provide access to the rooftop terrace. The cross gable pitch is commonly found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Guideline 3.A.iv states that new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs in the district. Staff finds the gable roof form and terrace condition generally consistent, but finds that the chimney element holds no precedent and is not appropriate. Staff finds that the standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, and a crimped ridge seam.
- j) **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS: PROPORTIONS AND PLACEMENT** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed several window openings that are consistent with historic precedents. However, staff finds that the left elevation features window sizes that are not consistent with the Guidelines, OHP Window Policy Document, or historic patterns in the district. Additionally, the paired windows do not feature a ganged condition. Staff finds that trim and framing details should be incorporated to be more consistent with window precedents in the district.
- k) **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.
- l) **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include horizontal smooth composite siding and wood siding, simple wooden porch posts, a standing seam metal roof, and aluminum-clad wood windows. Generally, staff finds these materials appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District; however, all final material specification are required for final approval.
- m) **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has verbally stated their intent to install aluminum-clad wood windows. Staff finds the proposal appropriate. The windows should comply with the OHP Window Policy Document for New Construction.
- 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. The architectural details of the proposal are an interpretation of the context of the neighborhood, which features Craftsman bungalows, Queen Anne cottages, and Folk Victorian homes in the direct vicinity. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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 is responsible for accommodating mechanical elements when proposing a design for final approval.
- p) **DRIVEWAY: LOCATION** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways that are similar to the historic configuration found on site or in the district should be incorporated. Currently, a curb cut exists off Burselson, which the applicant will utilize for a rear driveway. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- q) **DRIVEWAY: MATERIAL** - According to Guideline 5.B.i, driveways similar in material found in the district should be used. Concrete driveways are characteristic of the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the material consistent with the Guidelines.
- r) **WALKWAY** – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete walkway off Palmetto to meet the proposed front door. Poured concrete walkways are historically common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.
- s) **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not yet provided a comprehensive landscaping plan. The applicant is required to provide this for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend final approval based on findings a through s. There is insufficient documentation regarding façade materials, dimensions of façade details, window inset and configuration, and landscaping. The applicant should fully address each of the following remaining stipulations from conceptual approval before resubmitting for final approval:

- i. That the applicant reduces the floor plate height to reduce the overall height of the structure where feasible as noted in finding g.

- ii. That the applicant removes the proposed chimney roof element and proposes an alternative solution for access to the rooftop terrace as noted in findings g and i.
- iii. That the applicant designs the front and rear porches that respond to each other and share similar design elements. The applicant must submit all porch details, including column dimensions and roof overhang depth, for consideration for final approval.
- iv. That the applicant proposes windows on the left elevation that feature proportions and configurations that are more consistent with historic window patterns in the district as noted in finding j. Staff finds one over one windows to be appropriate and encourages the applicant to carry the window pattern of the three other elevations over to the left elevation for consistency. All windows on the structure should feature architecturally appropriate inset, trim, and sill detail. The applicant should incorporate a true ganged condition for paired windows as noted in finding j.
- v. That the applicant submits final drawings and material specifications that are comprehensive, accurate, and meet the 80% complete construction document requirement for final approval.
- vi. That the applicant submits a comprehensive hardscaping and landscaping plan for final approval that indicates all mechanical equipment and screening methods, if applicable.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT TO 21 FEBRUARY 2018.

33. HDRC NO. 2018-003

Applicant: Benito Polendo

Address: 1201 N ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Construct an addition to measure approximately 950 square feet. The addition will enclose an existing gas station service bay and include a rooftop mechanical screen.
2. Remove and relocate an existing low wall on the north edge of the property.
3. Perform hardscaping and landscaping modifications to accommodate an outdoor seating area, two parking spaces, a drive-thru lane, and waste management.

FINDINGS:

- a) The primary structure located at 1201 N St Mary's is a 1-story commercial structure constructed in 1940 with Spanish Eclectic and Mission style elements. The structure was originally a convenience store and gas station and retains its character-defining canopy structure angled towards the intersection of N St Mary's and Brooklyn Ave. The structure features a primarily stucco façade with a painted brick base. Raised diamond detailing adorns the top third of the structure, and many are currently painted in vibrant colors. The applicant is requesting approval to renovate the existing structure to be used as a coffee shop. The proposal includes fenestration modifications, an addition, and site modifications.
- b) The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on January 10, 2018. The DRC discussion focused on the addition design and detailing. The DRC recommended reducing the height of the addition where feasible to match the roofline of the existing structure at a minimum. The DRC also recommended exploring ways to modify the west elevation facing Brooklyn Ave through the use of detailing, materiality, and footprint. Recommendations included thinning out the roof edge to create a thinner profile; removing the wing walls and wall fronting the canopy; reducing the footprint and bringing the wall in to clearly establish a recessed footprint from the primary structure; and removing the cement plaster overhang shading detail for a treatment that differentiates the addition from the primary structure.
- c) **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the primary structure. The existing structure measures approximately 1,110 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should not double the size of the primary structure and should be subordinate to the existing structure. The proposed addition measures 900 square feet. This approximately doubles the size of the primary structure. However, the historic structure has a small footprint, and the location of the

addition incorporates the existing service bay canopy. Staff finds the footprint generally acceptable given the specific design considerations of the structure, but finds that the west wall parapet detailing should distinguish itself from the historic structure in terms of materiality, height, and detailing. Currently, the proposal incorporates the same façade material and elevated diamond detailing to mimic the existing structure. Staff finds that the material and detail treatment of this addition should be distinguished as new to the historic fabric of the site. The overall height of the addition should also be reduced in order to avoid damage and concealment of the original decorative portions of the canopy.

- d) **ROOF** – The historic structure features a flat roof with a raised parapet. The proposed addition also features a flat roof with parapet detailing. The proposed height matches that of the existing structure. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. The addition should be subordinate to the primary structure and should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds that the roof’s mimicry of the historic structure in terms of its material treatment and parapet detailing is not consistent with the Guidelines regarding distinguishing additions as new. Staff finds that eliminating the parapet or proposing an alternative roof form would be more consistent with the Guidelines.
- e) **ROOF MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to install a flat roof with raised parapet on the addition to match the existing flat roof and parapet detail on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that overall efforts to differentiate the addition from the historic structure should be made. Staff also finds that the applicant should explore ways to make the west façade more transparent overall to allow for the visibility of the service bay canopy on this elevation.
- f) **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The proposed addition will remove the existing windows facing the corner of Brooklyn and N St Mary’s and will open up the former garage door bays. These bays will be incorporated into the new addition and will be part of the interior conditioned space. New primary entrances will be added on the addition. Additionally, a new window will be added on the west façade to accommodate a drive-thru service station. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.
- g) **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed door and window proportions on the existing structure and addition that are generally consistent with proportions on the primary structure.
- h) **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The existing structure features stucco siding. The applicant has proposed to refinish the existing structure with new cement plaster siding. The addition will incorporate this cement plaster detailing above new metal storefront windows and doors. The addition on the west side will also feature a new metal shading screen directly above the storefront windows. Staff finds that the use of storefront glazing and a metal canopy is generally appropriate to distinguish the original structure from the addition in terms of materiality and transparency, but finds the use of cement plaster above the storefront should be reconsidered. Due to the placement and high visibility of the proposed addition, staff finds that an alternative material would be more appropriate and help the addition to appear subordinate to the original canopy and service bays. As noted in finding c, the overall height of the addition should also be reduced in order to avoid damage and concealment of the original decorative portions of the canopy. As noted in finding d, staff finds that eliminating the parapet or proposing an alternative roof form would be more consistent with the Guidelines.
- i) **TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW** – As noted in finding h, the addition will incorporate cement plaster detailing above storefront windows and doors. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, additions should provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms through materials and design details. Staff finds that the proposal as submitted does not clearly distinguish the addition from the historic structure. A change in materials would be more consistent with the guidelines.
- j) **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The proposal includes a new mechanical equipment screen near the center of the addition’s roof. The screen will be set back from the primary façade by approximately eight feet. The screen will be several feet in height and be the tallest element of the structure. The screen features the same concrete plaster finish and parapet detailing as the rest of the proposal. While the screening approach is generally consistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that the applicant should make every effort to reduce the height of the screen to minimize its prominence as a building feature.
- k) **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition incorporates similar architectural detailing as the existing structure; however, the treatment of the addition obscures character defining features of the structure.
- l) **HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing hardscaping to accommodate two parking spaces north of the existing service bay and a drive-thru internal driveway. The driveway will

measure twelve feet in width with an entrance off N St Mary's and an exit off Brooklyn Ave. The parking will serve as handicap spaces and a service drop-off area. Additional required parking will be leased from the adjacent parking lot. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate for the historic service and commercial nature of the site.

- m) **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to install landscaping on the corner of N St Mary's and Brooklyn Ave. Staff has not yet seen a comprehensive proposal. The applicant is required to provide this information prior to receiving final approval.
- n) **OUTDOOR SEATING** – The applicant has proposed a new outdoor seating area at the corner of N St Mary's and Brooklyn Ave. The seating area will be located just below the terminating point of the existing service bay canopy. The proposal includes cement tiles in decorative patterns. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent.
- o) **SITE EQUIPMENT SCREENING** – The applicant has provided screening details for the trash receptacles, which are located at the rear of the lot. Staff finds the location and screening method generally appropriate for the site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- 1. That the applicant reduces the overall height of the addition in order to avoid damage and concealment of the original decorative portions of the canopy as noted in findings c and h.
- 2. That the applicant eliminates the parapet detailing on the addition or proposes an alternative roof form as noted in findings d and h.
- 3. That the applicant utilizes a more transparent material and design approach to the addition, particularly the west elevation, to avoid obscuring the character defining features of the historic structure as noted in findings c, d, h, and k.
- 4. That the applicant reduces the height of the rooftop mechanical screen where feasible as noted in finding j. The applicant should also consider concentrating the mechanical systems on the existing historic structure's roof to help reduce the impact of the addition on the west façade.
- 5. That the applicant submits a comprehensive landscaping plan if they wish to be considered for final approval as noted in finding m.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

34. HDRC NO. 2018-061

Applicant: Guadalupe Francois

Address: 705 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to install a metal gazebo with wood clad columns.

FINDINGS:

- a) The vacant lot located at 705 N Pine Street is located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Recently, the Historic and Design Review Commission has reviewed fencing installations for this lot that were

proposed in accordance with fencing on the adjacent lot, 817 Nolan, which features the primary historic structure of the conjoined lots.

- b) GAZEBO – At the December 20, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission meeting, the request to install a metal gazebo was denied. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install a metal gazebo with wood clad columns.
- c) GAZEBO – The applicant has proposed to install a prefabricated, metal gazebo on the vacant lot at 705 N Pine, the lot at the corner of N Pine and Nolan. The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that new accessory structures should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. Staff does not find the use of metal to be appropriate for the proposed structure. Metal is not a building material found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Additionally, staff finds the installation of a gazebo on a primary corner in the Dignowity Hill Historic District where a prominent historic structure once stood to be inconsistent with the historic development pattern in the district.
- d) GAZEBO – While the gazebo’s metal columns have been proposed to be clad in wood, the primary material of the structure is metal, a construction material that is not found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC NO. 2017-588

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

Address: 814 BURNETT ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for 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) At the December 6, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received conceptual approval of structures 1, 3 and 4 with staff’s stipulations. Structure 2 was approved as submitted.
- c) LOT COVERAGE – Many lots in the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature a primary residential structure that fronts a primary street with one or more accessory structures toward the rear of the site. The applicant has proposed to locate two of the two story units on the lots at the rear of the lots adjacent to

Burnet Street with a composition similar to that of a primary historic structure with a rear accessory structure.

- d) **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. Per the applicant’s proposed site plan, two of the residential structures are to address Burnet with setbacks of 15 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 applicant has noted a setback of 25’ – 8” and 26’ – 2” for units 1 and 2 from the street. The other three historic structures that front Burleson on this block feature setbacks of 23’ – 5”, 27’ – 6” and a minimal setback of approximately 2 feet.
- e) **ENTRANCES** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrances toward Burnet. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f) **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. These two lots are located across Burnet from a two story historic structure and to the immediate west of a two story historic structure. Staff finds heights of two stories for units 1 and 2, 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 to be appropriate.
- g) **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has noted overall widths for units 1 and 2 are 36’ – 0” and 39’ – 0”; this measurement not only includes footprints, but also roof measurements. The applicant has noted that adjacent historic structures that front Burleson feature width of 40’ – 11”, 31’ – 4” and 44’ – 10”. Staff finds the width of the proposed new construction to be appropriate.
- h) **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. Neighboring historic structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. The applicant has proposed foundation heights of two feet for each unit. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i) **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for unit 1 to feature a side gabled roof, unit 2 to feature both 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, but with an opposite orientation. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate and 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. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has proposed window openings that are more consistent with those found historically throughout the district; however, staff finds the use of half windows on the ground level fronting the street to be inappropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install full height windows at these locations.
- 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. The applicant has proposed JELDWENT W-2500 wood, double hung windows. 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.
- l) **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 or low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. The low profile ridge cap is to be approved by staff and inspected on site prior to installation.

- m) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (PORCHES)– The applicant has proposed for each structure to have covered porches which are currently 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.
- n) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS –Folk Victorian structures rely heavily on the relationship between front protruding window bays, side gables and inset porches. The front facing gable should extend to the top of the cross ridge line to present equal heights for both portions of the L plan. This has not been accomplished in unit 1. Additionally, porches on Folk Victorian structures are recessed behind the massing of protruding bays. As proposed, the applicant has proposed a porch that extends forward from the massing of the new construction. This is not architecturally appropriate. The front bay and gable should extend to the front of the porch massing.
- o) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (FENESTRATION) – The structure proposed on lot 21 features a structure where most of the street facing façade lacks ground level fenestration. Staff finds that the front door should be shifted from the corner and additional fenestration added in the form of full size windows.
- 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) SIDEWALKS – The applicant has noted the installation of a front yard sidewalk for units 1 and 2. The proposed sidewalks should relate to those found historically in the district in terms of location, width and material and should be centered on the front porch of units 1 and 2.
- r) DRIVEWAY – On both the east and west sides of the lots, the applicant has proposed to install driveways to feature nine (9) feet in width. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that driveways should relate to historic driveways in the district and should not exceed (10) feet in width. The proposed driveways are consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds the installation of two separate driveways located consistently with the pattern within the district is appropriate.
- s) PARKING – The applicant has noted that each structure is to have designated parking, either in the form of a covered carport or in the form of open air parking. Staff finds the proposed parking locations to be appropriate.
- t) LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted the location of trees and driveways on the site plan. Additional information specific to plant species and landscaping materials should be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- u) MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted that mechanical equipment will be located in locations adjacent to each structure and will be screened from view. The applicant is to submit screening elements to staff for review and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of units 1 through 4 based on findings a through t with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed wood windows for all proposed structures follow the window installation specifications outlined in finding k.
- ii. That the structure proposed on lot 21 features additional ground level fenestration and a front door that is removed from the building corner. Windows on all structures, including those located on the dormers, must comply with stipulations regarding window size, proportion, and detail.
- iii. That the proposed Hardi siding feature a smooth finish along with an exposure of four inches for the. 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. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted to staff for review and approval and inspection on site prior to installation.
- iv. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way and that screening elements be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- v. That all half windows on the ground floors are revised to be full height, one over one wood windows.
- vi. That all porches feature increased depth. The proposed depths of three and four feet are insufficient and architecturally inappropriate.
- vii. That the structure proposed on lot 19 feature a front bay and gable that protrude further in order to meet to the front of the front porch massing.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Fish to approve with stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Laffoon

NAYS: Lazarine, Kamal

THE MOTION CARRIED

36. HDRC NO. 2017-653

Applicant: Peggy Brimhall/Figurd

Address: 808 E CARSON

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, two story, multi-family residential structures on the vacant lot at 808 E Carson.

FINDINGS:

- a) The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, two story, multi-family residential structures on the vacant lot at 808 E Carson. This lot is located within the Government Hill Historic District. This case was first heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on December 20, 2017, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.
- b) **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – 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) **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** –
- d) **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed setbacks as well as orientations that are consistent with the historic examples found throughout the district and the Guidelines.
- 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 architectural elements for both structures that signal entrances; however, formal entrance massing and doors have not been proposed to front either E Carson, for the northern structure or Colita Street, for the southern structure.
- f) **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This structure of E Carson features seven residential structures, three of which feature two stories in height. While there are examples of historic structures nearby that feature multiple stories in height, the proposed three stories is inappropriate in the surrounding context. The proposed massing features solid wall planes at locations where historic structures feature voids for porches.
- g) **SCALE & MASS** – While the applicant has modified the general design of the rear unit, staff finds that the rear (southern) unit should be reduced in overall massing to present itself subordinate to the structure that fronts E Carson. This would follow the pattern of large massing for primary structures and subordinate massing for accessory structures. A reduction in height and footprint would be appropriate.
- h) **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation= and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has not provided specifics for foundation heights at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines.

- i) **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include gabled and hipped roofs. Generally, these proposed roof form are appropriate and are found historically throughout the Government Hill Historic District; however, the applicant has also proposed roof forms which resemble mansard roofs, a form not found within the district. Staff finds that the proposed roof forms should more closely relate to hipped roofs.
- 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. Generally, the applicant has proposed fenestration that features an overall size consistent with that found on historic structures throughout the district.
- k) **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- l) **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include both vertical and horizontal Hardi siding and standing seam metal roofs. Staff finds that the proposed standing seam metal roofs 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. 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.
- m) **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed structures that generally feature massing that is appropriate for this block; however, various architectural details should be addressed prior to receiving conceptual approval, such as recessed porch massing, ground level fenestration and façade depth. The applicant has proposed an architectural form features forms and profiles found commonly in the historic, Folk Victorian style; specifically, porches on Folk Victorian structures are recessed behind the massing of protruding bays. This should be addressed by the applicant prior to receiving conceptual approval.
- n) **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (PORCHES)** – The proposed new construction does not feature porch massing, a primary architectural element of Folk Victorian architecture. Staff finds this to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- o) **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS / PARKING LOCATIONS** – The applicant has proposed for the driveways to pass through each structure and for parking to be located on the ground level of both structures. Staff suggests that the applicant study interior courtyard parking which could potentially lead to a reduction in massing and the incorporation of additional ground level fenestration.
- p) **LANDSCAPING** – At this time, the applicant has not submitted a landscaping plan. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements when producing landscaping documents.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through p. Staff finds that the applicant should address inconsistencies with the Guidelines (scale, massing, ratio of solids to voids, and porch elements) prior to receiving conceptual approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Denise Homer, Patti Zaiantz, Marlene Hawkins, Rose M. Hill, and Marie Stuart (who yielded her time to Ms. Hill) spoke in opposition.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

37. HDRC NO. 2018-066

Applicant: Fernando Morales/Candid Rogers Architect, LLC

Address: 407 CEDAR ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the historic structure including roof replacement, painting, wood siding repair, column repair and porch modifications.
2. Remove an existing, rear addition and construct a new addition to feature 712 square feet.

3. Reconstruct an existing, deteriorated rear accessory structure.
4. Install a rear yard deck, swimming pool, resurface the existing driveway and install new fencing.

FINDINGS:

- a) The historic structure at 407 Cedar was constructed circa 1905 in the Folk Victorian style and features a front facing gabled roof, a wraparound porch and a brick chimney. The structure currently features a rear addition that was constructed circa 1955. This rear addition is not found on the 1951 Sanborn Map.
- b) REHABILITATIVE ITEMS – The applicant has proposed to install a new standing seam metal roof, repair existing wood siding, paint the historic structure repair porch columns and install a wood porch and porch decking over the existing concrete porch. The existing concrete porch is significantly lower than that the original wood porch. Staff finds each of the proposed scopes of work to be appropriate. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. The proposed new porch deck is to feature decking that features a historic profile.
- c) EXISTING ADDITION – The existing rear addition was constructed circa 1955 and is not found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. Staff performed a site visit on January 29, 2018, and found that the rear addition features many architectural elements that are not in keeping with the historic structure, specifically exposed rafter tails and the addition's roof form.
- d) REAR ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature approximately 712 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. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a rear addition that is to feature a ridgeline that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure's, feature an east facing shed roof and feature vertical 1x6 siding to differentiate it from the primary historic structure. Staff finds neither the proposed roof form nor the proposed siding material to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- e) SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that features a footprint and height that is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds the proposed roof to be inappropriate for a historic structure featuring gabled and hipped roofs.
- f) MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include 1x6 cedar, ship-lap siding and a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has not specified window materials at this time. Staff finds the use of a standing seam metal roof to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed wood siding should be horizontally oriented and feature an exposure similar to that of the primary historic structure's siding. The proposed standing seam metal roof should match the specifications noted in finding b for the replacement of the historic structure's roof.
- g) WINDOW MATERIALS – As noted in finding f, the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood or aluminum clad wood windows. 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.
- h) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding i, the proposed shed roof is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a rear facing gabled or hipped roof would be appropriate. A contemporary design could be featured. Staff finds that horizontal wood siding that matches the profile of that of the primary historic structure appropriate.
- i) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (FENESTRATION) – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are not found historically in the King William Historic District. Staff does not find the proposed fenestration to be consistent with the Guidelines; however, the proposed window fenestration will not be visible from the public right of way.
- j) ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the rear, accessory structure to match its existing profile. Staff finds the proposed reconstruction of the rear accessory structure to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a

standard galvalume finish. The applicant is to submit the proposed new garage door to staff for review and approval. Staff recommends a wood door.

- k) **SITE ELEMENTS** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear deck, install a rear yard swimming pool, resurface the existing driveway and install new fencing. The driveway will be resurfaced with gravel, a wood privacy fence will be installed at the side bay of the historic structure and a three foot tall wood fence will be installed on the side of the property. Staff finds the proposed site elements, per the site plan, appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item #1, rehabilitation of the historic structure based on finding b with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- ii. That the proposed new porch deck is to feature decking that features a historic profile.

Staff recommends approval of item #2, construction of a rear addition based on findings d through i with the following stipulations:

- i. That a roof form that is consistent with the Guidelines and that of the primary historic structure (hipped or gabled) be installed.
- ii. That horizontal siding that features an exposure similar to that of the primary historic structure be installed on the addition.

Staff recommends approval of item #3, the reconstruction of the rear accessory structure with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- ii. That a wood garage door be installed.

Staff recommends approval of item #4 as submitted.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Margaret Leeds spoke in opposition to stipulation #2.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Larazine to approve items #1, 3, and 4 with staff stipulations and approve items #2 and 4 as submitted.

AYES: Fish, Lazarine, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

RECUSALS: Guarino.

THE MOTION CARRIED

38. HDRC NO. 2018-034

Applicant: Ryan McWharter/LUSH Greenscape Design

Address: 121 BUFORD

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Amend an administrative approval to allow a fence height of six feet, past the plane of the front façade.
- 2. Removal of the sidewalk at the public right of way and to install black basalt gravel paving.
- 3. Removal of natural lawn in the front and side yards and to install decomposed granite and low-ground cover.
- 4. Install concrete pavers.
- 5. Install a steel planter below front façade windows.

6. Install a steel planter adjacent to the front porch and steps.
7. Install a concrete planter with a steel skirt.
8. Install a two foot tall gabion wall with a 6-inch tall steel planter.
9. Install a six foot tall masonry solar screen with three, 6-inch tall planters.

FINDINGS:

- a) The structure at 121 Buford was constructed circa 1920 in the minimal traditional architectural style. The structure is a single-story, single-family residential home that features a clipped gable roof, a front porch with two entry doors, and double-hung wood windows. All of the following requests have been installed or initiated prior to approval.
- b) FENCE – The applicant received administrative approval to install a privacy fence, featuring metal posts, and horizontal cedar planks to feature six feet in height in the rear and four feet in height past the rear plane of the front porch. The applicant has proposed a height beyond rear plane of the front porch of six feet in height to the public right of way. The applicant has failed to adhere to the administratively approved fence plan and has previously constructed a six foot tall fence in the front yard. Staff finds this request is inconsistent with Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., 2.C.i and ii.
- c) PARKING – The applicant has removed the sidewalk and portions of natural lawn and installed black basalt gravel to create a parking area in the front yard. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B and 5.C. every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material when the original sidewalk is deteriorated beyond repair; new driveways should feature a similar configuration in materials, width, and design to that historic found on the site; applicants should avoid new curb cuts where not historically found and applicants should replace curbing in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds this request is not consistent with the aforementioned Guidelines. Staff also finds that the installation is a negative impact to Buford Alley by interrupting the public right-of-way sidewalk in lieu of private parking.
- d) XERISCAPE – The applicant has removed the natural lawn in the front and side yards and has begun the installation of decomposed granite and plantings. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.ii and iii, historic lawns should never be reduced by more than 50%; and applicants should select native and/or xeric plants that thrive in local conditions and reduce water usage. Staff finds that the applicant has reduced the natural lawn far beyond 50% and that the proposed amount of plantings and ground cover is not yet sufficient to justify the xeriscaping requesting.
- e) CONCRETE PAVERS – The applicant has installed concrete pavers in the front yard prior to approval. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i, large pavers, asphalt, and impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they are not historically found. Staff finds that the request is inconsistent with the Guidelines and that the simple concrete walkway to the front porch should be restored after the removal of concrete pavers.
- f) STEEL PLANTER (BELOW WINDOW) – The applicant has installed a steel planter (68” long, 12” deep, 26” tall) prior to approval. The planter is located below the front façade window. Staff finds that the proposed massing and material of the planter is inconsistent with Guidelines for Site Elements 1.A.iii. The height of this planter should feature wood construction instead of steel and be reduced to match the height of the planter requested in finding g.
- g) STEEL PLANTER (BY PORCH)- The applicant has installed a steel planter (80” long, 32” deep, 16” tall) prior to approval. The planter is located adjacent to the front porch and steps. Staff finds that the proposed material of the planter is inconsistent with Guidelines 1.A.iii. The planter should feature wood construction instead of steel.
- h) CONCRETE PLANTER – The applicant has proposed to install a low-ground concrete planter with a steel skirt (30” long, 30” deep, 6” tall). The applicant has not begun this installation as of February 2, 2018. Staff finds that the proposed material of the planter is consistent with Guideline 1.A.iii. The planter should feature wood construction instead of concrete and steel
- i) GABION WALL/ROCK PLANTER– The applicant has installed a gabion wall prior to approval. The gabion wall features a steel cage filled with river rock (20’4” long, 36” deep, 24” tall) and is topped with a steel planter (19’4” long, 24” deep, 6” tall). The planter is proposed to feature black bamboo which will add up to 6 feet in height per the illustrations. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i, new walls should appear similar to those used historic within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character and that the design should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Staff finds that there is absolutely no historic precedent on Buford Alley and its immediate neighboring blocks, nor the

Dignowity Hill Historic District, nor the minimal traditional architecture style that calls for the installation of a gabion wall nor bamboo plantings that would screen a majority of the front façade.

- j) **MASONRY WALL/SOLAR SCREEN** – The applicant has installed a solar screen prior to approval. The solar screen (10’ wide, 6’ tall) features two perforated masonry panels between three CMU columns topped with 6” steel planters. The planters are proposed to feature giant hesperaloe which will add up to 2 feet per the illustrations. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i, new walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character and that the design should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure, (2.B.iii) new walls are limited to four feet in height in the front yard, and (3.B.iv) concrete masonry units and concrete blocks are expressly prohibited construction materials for new fences and walls. Staff finds that there is no historic precedent on Buford Alley, within the Dignowity Hill Historic District or associated with the structure’s architecture style to support this installation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed to amend the previously issued administrative Certificate of Appropriateness to allow 6-foot tall fencing beyond the rear plane of front porch. The approved design should be adhered to.
2. Staff does not recommend approval the removal of sidewalk and natural lawn for the installation of black basalt gravel parking. The gravel should be removed and the concrete sidewalk should be restored.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of the wholesale removal of natural lawn for the installation of decomposed granite and plantings as proposed. Staff recommends that portions of natural lawn should be reintroduced to the site or that additional low-ground plantings be installed, if the HDRC conceptually approves of the xeriscaping.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of the concrete pavers. Staff recommends their immediate removal followed by the reinstallation of a simple walkway from the sidewalk to the porch as historically found on the site.
5. Staff does not recommend the installation of the steel planter beneath the window as proposed. Staff recommends the applicant resubmit a planter design that features wood construction and a reduced height.
6. Staff does not recommend the installation of a steel planter adjacent to the porch and steps as proposed. Staff recommends the applicant resubmit a planter design that features wood construction.
7. Staff does not recommend the installation of the low-ground concrete planter with a steel skirt. Staff recommends the applicant resubmit a planter design that features wood construction.
8. Staff does not recommend the installation of a gabion wall that features bamboo plantings. Staff recommends the gabion wall be removed. The applicant may submit to staff a front yard fence design that is consistent with the Guidelines.
9. Staff does not recommend the installation of a solar screen as proposed. Staff recommends the solar screen be removed. The applicant may resubmit to staff a front yard fence design that is consistent with the Guidelines.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Lulu Francois spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Connor Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Vice Chair Bustamante to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

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 7:00 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair