

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
21 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, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon**

**ABSENT: Lazarine, Connor, Brittain, Grube.**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
  - March 2, 2018, Historic and Design Review Commission - 8:30 AM, Board Room, 1901 S Alamo
  - March 5, 2018, Viewshed Public Input Meeting - 6:00 PM, Board room, 1901 S Alamo
  - Legacy Business Program update
  - Discussion regarding HDRC Schedule of Meetings

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

NOTE: Commissioner Grube arrived at 3:12 PM.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-068 217 ROBINSON PLACE
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-084 E HUISACHE AT McCULLOUGH AVE
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-022 825 N ST MARY'S
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-077 229 NELSON AVE
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-075 315 ARMY
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-072 2119 N IH 35
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-082 111 DALLAS ST
- Item #11, Case No. 2017-045 1010 BURNET ST
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-081 511 MONUMENTAL
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-086 112 PARKVIEW DRIVE
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-2016 212 E ROSEWOOD
- Item #16, Case No. 2018-078 2126 W MISTLETOE
- Item #19, Case No. 2018-2024 512 N OLIVE ST
- Item #20, Case No. 2018-085 230 W MAGNOLIA

Items #3, #4, #8, #15, #17, and #18 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, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.**

**NAYS:**           None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**3.       HDRC NO. 22018-080**

**Applicant:**     Patrick Christensen

**Address:**      913 S FLORES ST/Dean Steel

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is seeking concurrence from the Historic and Design Review Commission of a zoning clarification that would remove the historic designation from the property at 931 S Flores.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant submitted a request for removal of historic designation at 931 S Flores (parcel includes 111 Merchants, 931, 915, 921 and 1003 S Flores). The property at 111 Merchants, included in the parcel at 931 S Flores was designated as a historic landmark by Ordinance 68210 on October 27, 1988.
- b. Consideration of removal of the landmark designation should only be considered when new and compelling evidence is presented and an evaluation of the property is completed. The request to remove designation is a serious one, and should only be considered in extreme circumstances.
- c. The applicant submitted information to city staff in July 2017 regarding a possible error in the City's GIS related to the location of a landmark designation for the "Granari Building." The applicant suggested that the historic designation should be applied to the property located at 831 S Flores rather than 931 S Flores, and requested clarification on which properties were significant. Upon review, staff found that the designation in question was made by Ordinance 68210 in 1988. There appears to have been an error in the legal description recorded in Ordinance 68210 causing the designation for the Granieri House, located at 831 S Flores, to be incorrectly applied to a portion of the adjacent parcel at 931 S Flores. Staff believes the intent of the ordinance was to designate the Granieri House, and that the designation of any portion of the parcel of 931 S Flores is an error.
- d. In consideration of the removal of the landmark designation of 931 S Flores and the impact to any potential historic resources, Staff conducted an evaluation of the site to determine eligibility. The evaluation completed and noted in findings (e), (f) and (g), show that the property is not eligible for landmark designation.
- e. **SITE CONTEXT** –The property at 931 S Flores is the campus of Dean Steel, and consists of five separate, permanent structures. These industrial buildings of various sizes have dates of construction ranging from the 1930s through 2014. The family-owned sheet metal manufacturing company has operated at this location since the 1940s, but the family has been in the sheet metal business in San Antonio since the late nineteenth century. The buildings on the campus represent the growth of the company over many decades. The advent of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas (MKT) railroad in 1884, intersecting with South Flores Street just below South Alamo, brought new freight service to the merchants in this area. By the turn of the century, the streetscape of this section of South Flores began to evolve from its residential nature into a commercial/industrial corridor. By the 1930s, a spur of the MKT brought freight cars into the property, crossing Transfer Alley and running parallel to Merchants Alley. Several firms made use of the property in the early twentieth century, including San Antonio Wholesale Grocery (later Bird-Thomas), Merchants Transfer & Storage Co., and Albert Dean's Sheet Metal Works. A restaurant and small filling station were built just east of the Sheet Metal Works, facing S Flores. Dean Steel acquired

this property, demolished the structures, and constructed large additions to the warehouse called building 1 in the 1960s and 1970s. Over time, the company purchased the adjacent properties to the south and expanded their operations to incorporate buildings 2, 3, and 4.

f. ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT –

- The manufacturing floor (**building 1**) has a large L-shaped footprint, and spans the full length of the lot from S Flores to San Pedro Creek. Exterior materials include Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU), brick, and stucco. The structure that is closest to S Flores has louvered windows, stucco siding, and several windows that have been filled in. The section of the building that is closest to San Pedro Creek is a brick building with louvered windows that are primarily on the second story. Portions of this structure date to the 1930s, and several subsequent additions were constructed in the 1960s and 1970s.
- The small warehouse (**building 2**) has a square footprint with a flat roof and stucco siding. There are three attached canopies/carports on the west, north and east sides. The building has a single bay door and pedestrian door on the east elevation, and two windows on the north elevation. Based on historic aerials, this warehouse was built circa 1963.
- The shipping building (**building 3**) has a large rectangular footprint with a flat roof with a short parapet. It is constructed of CMU blocks and wood interior framing. The sides of the building have bay doors and several doors that have been filled in. The façade that faces S Flores has fixed windows and a minimally Art Moderne styled entrance with shallow curved awning and decorative light sconces flanking the entrance. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, this shipping building was built circa 1946.
- The small corner structure (**building 4**) has a small square footprint with a flat roof and stucco siding. It exhibits subtle features that indicate Art Moderne architecture such as horizontal grooves on the upper wall and curved corners. There are fixed windows along the curved wall on the north elevation, and three fixed windows on the east elevation. Based on the city directory, the building was constructed circa 1936.
- The modern warehouse (**building 5**) is a metal framed building with a rectangular footprint and a side gabled roof. It has large bay doors on the east and north elevation. This structure was built in 2014.

g. EVALUATION – In accordance with the UDC Sec. 35-607, criteria for designation, staff conducted an assessment on the property to evaluate its eligibility for landmark designation. In order to be eligible for landmark designation, the property would need to meet three of the sixteen criteria listed in UDC Section 35-607. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined it was consistent with # criteria from UDC sec. 35-607.

- **(11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States;** for its association with Dean Steel, a long-established local manufacturing firm located in the warehouse district along S Flores.

h. This property is currently zoned RIO-7D. Removal of the landmark designation would not affect the requirement for review of new construction or modifications.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends concurrence that the application of the historic zoning overlay to 931 S Flores was in error and that the property is not eligible for landmark designation based on findings c-g.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon

**NAYS:** None.

**RECUSALS:** Guarino.

#### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **4. HDRC NO. 2018-039**

**Applicant:** Laura Alfaro, Nate Manfred/French & Michigan

**Address:** 150 CROFTON

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a front ADA ramp.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 150 Crofton was constructed circa 1895 in the Folk Victorian style and is found on the 1904 Sanborn Map. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct an ADA ramp on the front façade of the historic structure. Staff performed a site visit on February 5, 2018, and found that porch elements could be removed in whole sections to accommodate the ramp.
- b. HISTORIC ELEMENTS – The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.A.i notes for applicants to minimize damage to the historic character and materials of the building while complying with all aspects of accessibility requirements. The applicant has noted that the section of front porch railing that is to be removed will be hung beneath the front porch to be kept dry and above the ground to minimize damage.
- c. LOCATION – The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.ii. notes that the preferred location for ramps on residential structures is on the side or rear of the structure. The applicant has noted that due to site constraints, including driveway location and rear yard space, the front yard is the most feasible location for a ramp. The applicant has also noted this location to ease access into the structure from vehicles.
- d. DESIGN – The applicant has noted materials that are to be complementary of the historic structure, including wood balusters. Additionally, the ramp will be painted to match the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. SCREENING – The front yard currently features landscaping materials that include small ornamental plants and some shrubbery. Staff finds that the installation of additional landscaping items would further screen the proposed ramp.
- f. RAMP – While the rear yard or rear yards are the most appropriate location for a ramp per the Guidelines, staff finds that when no longer needed by the current residents, the ramp can be removed and the historic structure can be returned to its previous configuration.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through f with the stipulation that the ramp be removed and the front porch returned to its original configuration when no longer needed by the current residents.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve with staff stipulations.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**RECUSALS:** Guarino.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2018-067**

**Applicant:** James Ed Carleton

**Address:** 427 ADAMS ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for to:

1. Construct a two story rear addition.
2. Remove a second story side window opening.
3. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the rear, accessory structure.
4. Remove a first level, side door opening.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 427 Adams was constructed circa 1915 in the Craftsman style and features two stories in height and a façade of stuccoed masonry. The structure features a porte-cochere on its southern façade. This structure first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map.
- b. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature two stories in height and a footprint of approximately 315 square feet. The applicant has noted that the second floor will feature approximately 128 square feet in size. 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 application documents, the proposed addition will feature a height that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure, will feature an appropriate roof form and will be inset from the walls of the primary historic structure. The proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the proposed rear addition features an overall footprint and height that are subordinate to that of the primary historic structure and are not a departure from the historic context of the district.
- d. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include a stucco façade, a standing seam metal roof and wood casement windows. Staff finds that the stucco finish should match that of the primary historic structure. The standing seam metal roof should feature seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width and a crimped ridge seam. While inconsistent with the Guidelines, staff finds the proposed bronze colored roof to be appropriate given the color of the existing roof.

- e. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – As noted in finding d, the applicant has proposed wood casement windows; however, at this time the applicant has not provided specifics of the proposed windows. Generally, staff finds the installation of windows that match the profile of those found in the historic structure, one over one, to be most appropriate. The proposed wood windows should feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- f. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, the proposed addition is appropriate for the style of the primary historic structure and consistent with the Guidelines. Prior to returning for final approval, the applicant should provide additional information regarding window profiles and exterior elevations of each side of the proposed structure.
- g. **WINDOW REMOVAL** – To the immediate rear of the side porte cochere, the applicant has proposed to infill an existing window opening. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window and door openings should be preserved. The applicant’s proposed window removal is not consistent with the Guidelines; however, given its location and low visibility due to the existing porte cochere, staff finds that its removal may be appropriate if the existing window is repaired and installed in the proposed addition.
- h. **DOOR REMOVAL** – Beneath the porte cochere the applicant has proposed to remove an existing door opening. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window and door openings should be preserved. The applicant’s proposed door removal is inconsistent with the Guidelines. This door, serving as a historic side entrance location contributes significantly to the architectural integrity of the structure and the historic use of the porte cochere.
- i. **MAINTENANCE** – The applicant has noted repairs to both the historic structure and a historic accessory structure including stucco repair, gutter and downspout replacement and painting of the wood fascia and trim. The proposed scopes of work are to be completed in kind.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through g and i with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed standing seam metal roof features seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, panels that are 18 to 21 inches in height and a crimped ridge seam.
- ii. That the proposed stucco finish matches that of the primary historic structure.
- iii. That one over one wood windows be installed that feature specifications noted in finding e.
- iv. That elevations of each of the addition’s facades be submitted when returning for final approval.
- v. That the removed wood window be salvaged and installed in the proposed addition.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, door removal based on finding h.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon

**NAYS:** None.

**RECUSALS:** Guarino.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**8. HDRC NO. 2018-069**

**Applicant:** Rene Garza/ZH Downtown Development Company, LLC

**Address:** 210 S Alamo St (Hemisfair Park)

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a 14-story mixed use hotel building, approximately 230,000 square feet.
2. Construct an eight (8) story mixed-use office building.
3. Construct a two (2) story mixed-use market building.
4. Construct a two (2) level underground parking garage.

**FINDINGS:**

General Findings:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of four components within the redevelopment of Hemisfair Park.
- b. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the construction of a fourteen story, mixed use hotel structure of approximately 230,000 square feet to feature 200 hotel and retail functions; an eight story, mixed-use office structure of approximately 200,000 square feet featuring office and retail functions; a two story, mixed-use market structure of approximately 16,000 square feet featuring retail and hospitality functions and a two level, underground parking garage of approximately 200,000 square feet.
- c. **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.
- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 31, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted the appropriateness of the proposed design and asked questions regarding potential materials.
- e. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided design diagrams noting the various points of pedestrian access to and from the site as well as access to various park aspects. This is consistent with the UDC.
- f. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. **ENTRANCE ORIENTATION** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has oriented primary

- building entrances for the proposed hotel tower toward the street as well as pedestrian oriented access points within the site. The proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the UDC.
- 1b. 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 a façade that introduces elements which are designed toward a human scale. These elements include balcony railings and recessed façade elements responding to floor heights. This is consistent with the UDC.
  - 1c. 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 applicant has provided a diagram noting the proposed height of the hotel structure in comparison to heights of existing structures downtown. The proposed height will be comparable to that of the Hilton Palacio del Rio. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
  - 1d. MATERIALS – The applicant has not specified specific materials at this time; however, has noted that limestone and other masonry materials will be used throughout the structure’s base. Staff finds the use of limestone appropriate and complementary of the historic architecture found on many repurposed houses in Hemisfair Park. The UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
  - 1e. 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 a building cap that features an alternate height and façade rhythm than that of the other building floors. The proposed architectural cap is consistent with the UDC.
  - 1f. 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. The applicant has proposed a curved design that provides reduced width from various views as well as preserves views to and from the park of existing landmarks.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. ENTRANCE ORIENTATION – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has proposed multiple entrances that relate to Hemisfair Park as well as entrances that relate to S Alamo. This is consistent with the UDC.
- 2b. 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 an overall height and façade arrangement that promotes

human scale on many levels, including at the base, above the base and at the roof height. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

- 2c. **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 proposed new construction is comparable in height and massing to many structures located in the vicinity and is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2d. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has not specified specific materials at this time; however, has noted that limestone and other masonry materials will be used throughout the structure’s base as well a metal and wood materials throughout the upper levels. Staff finds the use of limestone appropriate and complementary of the historic architecture found on many repurposed houses in Hemisfair Park. The UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

Findings related to request item #3:

- 3a. **ENTRANCE ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed a two story, mixed use market to be located between the proposed hotel and office structures. The proposed market is situated in a location that promotes pedestrian access across the site. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673.
- 3b. **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 not only façade arrangement, but also entrance orientation and breezeways to promote a human scale. This is consistent with the UDC.
- 3c. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has not specified specific materials at this time; however, has noted that limestone and other masonry materials will be used throughout the structure’s base. Staff finds the use of limestone appropriate and complementary of the historic architecture found on many repurposed houses in Hemisfair Park. The UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

Findings related to request item #4:

- 4a. **AUTOMOBILE ACCESS & PARKING** – The applicant has proposed automobile parking in the form of subgrade parking to feature two levels and approximately 200,000 square feet. The applicant has noted that the garage will be used for public parking and will meet the parking needs of the all through other project components. The proposed parking location is consistent with UDC Section 35-672.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through 4a with the following stipulations:

- i. That when submitting for final approval the applicant provide staff with information regarding final material selections.
- ii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way at both S Alamo and within Hemisfair Park.
- iii. ARCHAEOLOGY- The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Rosemary Kowalski, Brian Dillard (who signed up to speak, but left), Meredith Cooper, Adam Gates, Luis Miguel Martinez, and Curtis Bowers spoke in support. Maria Torres, Sofia Torres, Ron Rocha, Chief Two Bears, and Gilbert Martinez spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. 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 2,000 square feet on the vacant lot at 1021 N Palmetto, located on the eastern boundary of the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is located at the intersection of N Palmetto and Burleson 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:
  - i. **That the applicant reduces the floor plate height to reduce the overall height of the structure as noted in finding g;** this stipulation has been met in the current submittal.
  - ii. **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 partially been addressed in the current submittal.
  - iii. **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 been partially addressed in the current submittal.
- 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;** this stipulation has partially been met in the current submittal.
  - 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. The current submission contains several inconsistencies between plans and elevations that must be resolved in order for consideration for final approval;** this stipulation been met in the current submittal.
  - vi. **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 been partially 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 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. As noted in finding b, the applicant received conceptual approval from the HDRC on December 20, 2017. The applicant met again with the Design Review Committee on February 14, 2018, to present designs submitted for final approval. The DRC suggested extending the roof element above the terrace door to span more of the width of the rear roofline to create a more proportionate and appropriate detail. The DRC suggested incorporating a gutter system that effectively diverts water from the drip edge this element would create. The suggestion to extend the first floor front façade to meet the front edge of the porch was discussed and encouraged, and the DRC proposed specific modifications to the left elevation to ensure the window proportions and placement were compliant with the Guidelines. The DRC suggested adding a third column on the front porch to frame the doorway, and noted that the front door as drawn was more Midcentury and a more appropriate door should be selected for this particular new construction project. The final landscaping plan was also briefly discussed and the applicant was reminded that all intended new landscaping should be indicated on the final site plan.

- 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: FRONT PORCH** – The applicant has proposed a front porch 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 porch will feature a shed roof form and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds that the general porch roof form is consistent, but finds that the first floor mass on the west side of the front façade should be extended towards the streetscape to match the location of the front porch columns. This will create a truer porch condition and result in a continuous shed porch roofline that extends the width of the front façade. Staff finds that the porch is appropriate with these modifications incorporated. The applicant is required to submit final measured drawings that illustrate these changes.
- g. **ENTRANCES: FRONT PORCH COLUMNS** – The applicant has proposed to install two square wooden columns on the front porch. Based on the submitted drawings, the posts will be 6 by 6 inches in width. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new architectural details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found within the district are inappropriate. Staff finds the posts generally consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that another column should be installed to break up the long porch roof span, which is more consistent with historic precedents. Staff finds a column that frames the front door to be appropriate in terms of location.
- h. **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'-7" to the tallest point of the ridgeline, not including the foundation. The height is generally consistent with the two-story structures nearby and the applicant has reduced the floor plates and modified the steepness of the roof pitch as compared to previous iterations. Staff finds the proposal consistent for the location of the lot.
- i. **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 1 ½ feet. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent.
- j. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a gable roof form and a habitable flat rooftop terrace on the rear elevation. 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 proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that the applicant should extend the roof element above the terrace door to span more of the width of the rear roofline to create a more proportionate and appropriate detail.

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.

- k. **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. Additionally, all paired windows feature a ganged condition. 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.
- l. **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.
- m. **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.
- n. **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 and the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- o. **DOORS** – The applicant has proposed to install two doors on the structure. One will be located at the front entrance and a set of French doors will be installed at the rear entrance. The rear entrance doors feature a simple design and profile with one lite each. The front door, as drawn, indicates a three panel style that is more akin to Midcentury Modern architecture and design. Staff finds that the front door design should feature two or four lites that relate more closely to the Craftsman-inspired architecture of the proposal.
- p. **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.
- q. **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 and screening them from the public right-of-way.
- r. **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 Burleson, which the applicant will utilize for a rear driveway. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- s. **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.
- t. **WALKWAYS** – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete walkway off Palmetto to meet the proposed front door. Another walkway will be installed to connect the rear porch to the rear concrete driveway. Poured concrete walkways are historically common in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the locations, materials, and dimensions of the walkways consistent.
- u. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to retain several existing trees on the site per the indicated site plan. The applicant is required to coordinate with the City Arborist’s office to ensure the proposed new construction will not impact any significant or heritage trees. Additionally, the applicant has verbally stated their intent for installing additional appropriate small trees and shrubbery in the front yard. The applicant is required to submit a landscaping plan

that indicates all of these elements to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Liz Franklin spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garcia to postpone to the next HDRC meeting.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2018-074**

**Applicant:** Bryan and Corey Wioldman

**Address:** 502 E MULBERRY AVE

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Repair existing windows as needed.
2. Construct a two story, rear accessory structure.
3. Perform site work including the installation of rear yard parking.
4. Demolish a rear accessory structure.
5. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 502 E Mulberry was constructed circa 1925, features traditional architectural elements and is located within the Monte Vista Historic District. The structure currently features an enclosed two story porch on its east façade, wrought iron front porch columns and non-original siding covering the original wood siding. At this time, the applicant has proposed the construction of a rear addition, the demolition of a rear accessory structure, site work, window repair and Historic Tax Certification.
- b. WINDOW REPAIR – The historic structure currently features both wood and steel casement windows. The applicant has noted repair of the existing windows. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii.
- c. REAR ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a rear addition that features a footprint of approximately 814 square feet, an overall height of 26’ – 1”. The applicant has proposed to locate the addition at the rear of the property, has proposed a rear facing gabled roof, similar to the historic structure’s side facing gable and has been set back from the primary historic structure to minimize visual impact from the street. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that features a footprint of approximately 814 square feet and an overall height of 26’ –

1". The Guidelines note that additions should be subordinate to the principal façade, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot, should not double the existing building footprint on the lot and should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. The proposed footprint is approximately 300 square feet smaller than that of the historic structure and the proposed addition's ridge line is 4' – 4" shorter than that of the historic structure. Staff finds this appropriate. Additionally, the existing lot size features approximately 9,580 square feet. Staff finds the addition of a footprint of approximately 814 square feet appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials for the addition that includes vertical and horizontally oriented Hardie siding, vinyl windows, an asphalt shingle roof and a wood staircase. Staff finds that all Hardie siding should feature a smooth finish. Horizontal siding used on the first floor should feature an exposure of four (4) inches. Vertical board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide. Staff finds wood stairs and the proposed asphalt shingle roofing appropriate and consistent with examples found in the district.
- f. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install one over one, vinyl windows. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, the proposed addition is appropriate for the style of the primary historic structure. Staff finds that the proposed fenestration patterns and trim details to be appropriate.
- h. **SITE WORK** – The applicant has noted the installation of six rear yard parking locations. Per the site survey, the existing driveway width is 13' – 5", which connects to an existing concrete driveway in the rear yard. Staff finds the location of proposed parking to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i. While the proposed parking location is appropriate, the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i. notes that large impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they do not historically exist. Staff finds the installation of gravel, decomposed granite or another pervious surface is appropriate. Concrete should not be installed to cover the majority of the rear yard.
- i. **SITE WORK MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted landscaping installations on the north side of the property include a gravel sidewalk and low growth plantings. Staff finds this appropriate.
- j. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE DEMOLITION** – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only. The accessory structure would not be replaced with a new structure. The proposed rear addition does not encroach into the footprint of the existing addition; however, the proposed rear yard parking is partially in the location of the existing accessory structure.
- k. **CONTRIBUTING STATUS** – The applicant submitted an application for non-contributing status on January 23, 2018. The structure was determined to be contributing. The structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, noted as an automobile garage. Staff performed a site visit on February 9, 2018, to evaluate the condition of the property. While the structure has fallen into disrepair, it is contributing to the district.
- l. **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. The applicant has provided a report from a structural engineer noting an inadequate structural design for the existing structure. The report notes the entire structure would need to be replaced to become structurally sound. Additionally, the applicant has submitted documentation noting that the reconstruction of this structure would cost approximately \$24,000.

- m. **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.
- n. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for repair work to the historic structure at 502 E Mulberry. Scopes of work include interior renovations; mechanical, electrical and plumbing upgrades; wood window repair and foundation repair. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. – 3. Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3, wood window repair, the construction of an addition and site work with the following stipulations.
  - i. That all Hardie siding feature a smooth finish. Horizontal siding used on the first floor should feature an exposure of four (4) inches. Vertical board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide as noted in finding e.
  - ii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening as noted in finding f.
  - iii. That a pervious material be installed at the rear yard parking locations.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of item #4 with the stipulation that existing materials be salvaged for future use on site.
- 5. Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification as submitted.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Lori Logan, Floyd Daigle, James Thurwalker, Chris Romstod, Cee Winkler, Tony Garcia (with Felipe Sandoval yielding time to Mr. Garcia), Paul Kinneson (with Maria Sandoval yielding time to Mr. Kinneson), and Gilbert Martinez spoke in opposition.

NOTE: Commissioner Connor arrived at 4:38 PM.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garza to deny.

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

**NAYS:** None.

## **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **21. HDRC NO. 2018-007**

**Applicant:** David Bogle, R.A., AIA/SYNCRO Architecture Studio

**Address:** 527 E HUISACHE AVE

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition to measure approximately 1507 square feet.
2. Construct a new front porch with an ADA accessible ramp to measure approximately 459 square feet in footprint.
3. Relocate an existing window on the west elevation and install new fenestration.
4. Install new fiber cement siding on the existing structure where required.
5. Install a walkway and landscaping buffer in the front yard.
6. Install a new sidewalk to match the existing sidewalk configuration and materiality in the district.
7. Extend the existing concrete ribbon driveway through the site to the rear alley.
8. Install new hardscaping in the rear of the lot to accommodate four parking spaces, an accessible parking space and drop off area, and accessible route. The hardscaping will include a mixture of impervious poured concrete and pervious gravel.
9. Install a rear curb cut off the existing alleyway.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 527 E Huisache is a 1-story duplex constructed in the 1950s. The structure does not appear on a 1951 Sanborn Map. The home features simplified Craftsman and Midcentury Modern influences, including a low-sloped gable roof with overhanging eaves and window screens with geometric proportions. The home is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista 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.
- c. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant presented a different proposal to the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on October 4, 2017. The request was denied. The applicant modified their proposal and met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on October 24, 2017. The discussion focused primarily on a design for a new front porch addition. The applicant presented various conceptual options, of which one the DRC found most favorable. The design retained the existing shed awnings over the two front doors and incorporated a wider and deeper shed awning to create a true front porch condition. The applicant met with the DRC again on January 10, 2018, to consider a full HDRC application for conceptual approval. The DRC recommended reducing the number of columns on the new front porch awning to reduce the visual impact and establish a more consistent rhythm. Regarding the front yard hardscaping and parking proposal, the DRC requested a calculation of impervious cover versus grass/landscaping for the January 17, 2018, hearing. They also recommended retaining the existing curb cut at 10 feet instead of widening it to accommodate additional cover. The DRC recommended exploring design solutions that pushed the front parking to the rear of the lot, beyond the existing footprint of the historic structure. Comments included that the current configuration creates a “street” condition through the site and is inconsistent with the development pattern of the block. The DRC also expressed concern about the feasibility of the grading of the proposed front parking

condition. The application was denied at the January 17, 2018, hearing. The applicant submitted an updated design proposal for consideration at the February 21, 2018, hearing. The applicant met with the DRC on February 14, 2018. The DRC inquired about the footprint of the addition relative to the existing structure, how many employees would be parking at the facility at one time, and how the existing alleyway will serve as a functional commercial access for cars. The DRC suggested that the applicant clarify the condition of the alleyway in their exhibits. The DRC also commented on the extension of the existing ribbon driveway through the site to the alley, which is not a condition found in the vicinity within the district. The DRC discussed the front yard proposal and suggested that the applicant forgo the installation of a retaining wall and seek to retain the berm detailing of the existing yard and double walkway. The DRC also suggested that any new landscaping also be minimal and compatible with the existing streetscape condition. The DRC also discussed the detailing of the new porch and suggested that it be similar to the existing two porch overhangs, as these elements contain a bulk of the Midcentury detailing that makes the property unique.

Findings for the primary structure, items #1 through #3:

- d. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double or exceed the size of the primary structure. The proposed addition approximately doubles the size of the primary structure, which measures a total of 1507 square feet. This is 82 feet less than the existing structure, which is a total of 1589 square feet as indicated on the submitted drawings. However, the historic structure has a small footprint relative to other historic homes in the area, including historic 1-story homes on nearby Kings Ct and E Mulberry. In terms of total lot coverage, homes on E Huisache and E Mulberry feature additions that are nearly double the size of the existing structure, or contain rear accessory structures that feature a footprint close to that of the historic home. Additionally, both the east and west elevations of the proposed addition are set back from the historic structure, with the east elevation set back significantly. Staff recommends approval based on the context-specific considerations of the lot and the district.
- e. **ROOF** – The existing rear elevation of the historic primary structure features a gable roof. The proposed addition features a single gable, is 1-story in height, and is slightly shorter than the existing structure's roofline. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to install a new composition shingle roof on the addition to match the existing composition shingle roof on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL** – The proposed addition will require the removal of two existing casement windows and two aluminum sliding glass doors on the rear of the facade. The applicant has proposed to reuse the two casement windows on the rear addition, which is appropriate. The applicant is also proposing to relocate an existing casement window, remove an existing door, and modify an existing small opening on the west elevation. The Historic Design Guidelines state that existing original openings should be preserved on the historic structure. Staff finds that the removal of the door and small opening is acceptable, but finds that the original casement window should remain in place. The existing location of the two casement windows on the west elevation mirrors that of the east elevation and is evidence of the original duplex function and design of the historic structure.
- h. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed door and window proportions on the rear addition that are generally consistent with proportions on the primary structure and those

found within the district. However, the size, configuration, and material are not definitively indicated in the application.

- i. **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The existing structure features asbestos lap siding with a wide exposed profile of approximately 12 inches. The applicant has proposed to remove the siding on the rear, west, and east elevations and install lap fiber cement siding on both the existing structure and the addition. The applicant has proposed to retain the asbestos siding on the front elevation if the new construction does not require its removal due to impact. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate and finds that smooth boards and an exposure of no more than 8 inches should be used.
- j. **TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW** – The proposed addition will be inset on the west façade from the historic structure by approximately two feet. On the east façade, the structure will be inset by approximately 10 feet. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The proposal meets this Guideline.
- k. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not indicated the location of new mechanical equipment in the submitted drawings, but has stated that they will be located on the east façade of the rear addition towards the back of the lot. The applicant is responsible for providing this information, including screening method, on all appropriate documents for final approval.
- l. **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 keeps with the Craftsman and Midcentury Modern influences of the historic home without detracting from its significance. Staff finds the proposed addition’s architectural details generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. **FRONT PORCH** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch. The front façade currently contains two small shed awnings above each door, which will be preserved. The proposal will add a new shed awning that spans between the two existing awnings. The new awning will extend approximately double the width of the existing awnings to engage the streetscape and create a true covered porch condition. The proposal also includes extending the concrete porch decking towards the street for a total footprint of 459 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements, including stairs and related elements, should be simple and not distract from the historic character of the building and should be architecturally appropriate for the home. Historic examples on the block that contain wide porches incorporate alternate roof forms, such as a simple shed or hip, or exhibit roof proportions that mimic the primary gable. Additionally, because the existing structure is set back from the front façades of its neighbors, the extended footprint of the porch will not protrude past neighboring historic structures. Staff finds the porch and footprint to be conceptually consistent.
- n. **FRONT ADA RAMP** – The applicant has proposed to install a new ADA accessible ramp on the front façade of the existing structure. The ramp will be covered by the proposed porch and will be located on the eastern edge of the structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the preferred location of new ramps on a residential structure is at the side or rear of the building when convenient for the user. However, the applicant has modified the ramp’s design from their previous submissions to create a ramp that is light in its design and minimally intrusive from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.

Findings for site elements, items #4 and #5:

- o. **DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing concrete ribbon driveway through the lot to connect to the rear alley. The driveway will create a through-site condition. No modifications to the width or configuration of the ribbons or the existing curb cut and apron are proposed. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the historic alignment, configuration, and width of driveways should be preserved. The predominant development

pattern is a front driveway that terminates at a rear accessory structure. In some cases, alley access is provided to rear accessory structures. There is no precedent in the neighboring blocks of E Husiache and E Mulberry for the driveway to extend through the site. Staff does not find the proposal appropriate.

- p. FRONT WALKWAY MODIFICATIONS AND LANDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed front yard modifications to accommodate a new accessible front walkway. The proposal includes modifying the steps of the eastern walkway, the installation of a new walkway, and a landscaping. The proposed modifications are minimal and retain the existing berm condition that is a character defining feature of the site. The proposal also retains a majority of the two existing concrete walkways leading to the existing front doors, which is also character defining and indicative of the structure’s historic use as a duplex. Staff finds the front yard modifications appropriate.
- q. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed to install a new concrete sidewalk in the front yard of the property. A sidewalk does not presently exist. The sidewalk will match the existing sidewalk on the adjacent property in terms of width, configuration, and concrete aggregate and coloration as closely as possible. Staff finds the proposal appropriate for the site based on existing context within the district.
- r. REAR HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to install a rear hardscaping to accommodate parking, an accessible walkway, and an ADA accessible drop-off area. The hardscaping will be a combination of pervious (gravel) and impervious (concrete) coverage. The impervious concrete will connect to the proposed extended ribbon driveway and create an ADA accessible parking space with a drop of zone, located adjacent to the rear alley. The concrete will extend from this parking area to create an accessible walkway to the rear entrance of the proposed new addition. The pervious gravel will be located to the west of the proposed new addition and will create space for three parked cars. An additional gravel space will be added east of the concrete ADA parking space. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, off street parking should be located at the side or rear of a structure whenever possible. There is also evidence of existing parking pads along the alley. Staff finds that the concept of a rear parking area is generally consistent with the Guidelines, but the rear hardscaping as proposed, when coupled with the proposed addition’s impervious cover, removes a significant portion of the rear landscape. While some properties on E Huisache, Kings Ct, and E Mulberry feature extensive hardscaping in the rear of the lot, the predominant development pattern is a rear yard with a majority grass or trees and other plantings with rear accessory structures or additions. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the amount of hardscaping due to the additional impervious changes proposed to the lot.
- s. REAR CURB CUT – The applicant has proposed to install a new rear curb cut and apron to provide access to the rear parking pads. While the submitted site plan does not indicate the dimension of the width of the curb cut, it appears to extend from the eastern edge of the lot to approximately eight feet from the western edge of the lot. This totals approximately 75% of the width of the rear lot line. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new curb cuts should not be introduced where historically found. If introduced, they should be consistent with historic curb cuts in the district. There is evidence of curb cuts that are wider than ten feet along the rear alley, but there is no precedent for a rear curb cut that extends nearly the full width of the lot to provide direct access to parking pads. Staff finds that applicant should explore ways to reduce this width.
- t. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. The applicant is required to provide this information for final approval, to include grading information, specific hardscaping locations and dimensions, and the location and species of all plants.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

1. That the applicant retains the location of the existing casement window on the west elevation as noted in finding g.

2. That the applicant reduces the length of the ribbon driveway extension to be more consistent with development patterns in the district as noted in finding o.
3. That the applicant reduces the amount of hardscaping in the rear of the lot as noted in findings r and s.
4. That the applicant reduces the rear curb cut width to be more consistent with the development pattern of the alleyway and the neighborhood as noted in finding s.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Floyd Daigle, James Thurwalker, Cee Winkler, Tony Garcia (Felipe Sandoval yielded time to Mr. Garcia), Paul Kinneson (Maria A. Sandoval yielded time to Mr. Kinneson), and Josie DeLeon spoke in opposition. Matthew Scott spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia.

**NAYS:** Fish, Laffoon.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

NOTE: Commissioner Garza left at 4:30.

**22. HDRC NO. 2017-630**

**Applicant:** Richard & Susan Theis

**Address:** 429 DEVINE ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 429 Devine Street to feature a footprint of approximately 2,500 square feet.
2. Construct a detached accessory structure to feature a footprint of approximately 600 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a one story, single family residential structure to feature a footprint of approximately 2,500 square feet. This request was heard at the December 20, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This case was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 9, 2018, where committee members primarily asked questions regarding various design features. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on February 13, 2018, where committee members noted the appropriateness of many aspects of the design; however, noted concern regarding the proposed driveway/parking location, the unbroken side elevation and the proposed foundation height.
- c. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant

- has noted per application documents that the proposed new construction will feature a setback that is greater than those found historically on the block. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. 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 entrance toward Devine Street. This is consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that a door that is more consistent with those found historically in the district should be used at the front porch rather than an entrance gate.
  - e. PORCH MASSING – Historic structures throughout the Lavaca Historic District feature front façade massing with recessed front porches. The applicant has proposed front façade and porch massing which include a front protruding bay that aligns with the front porch and a recessed front wall plane, comparable to those found historically in the district. Staff finds the proposed porch massing to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the side gable should be shifted toward the front porch to align at the rear of the front porch.
  - 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. The proposed massing is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
  - g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has noted a foundation height of four (4) inches. Foundation heights found historically throughout the district commonly feature heights of two or more feet. Staff finds that the applicant should include a foundation height comparable to those found predominantly in the district and on Devine Street.
  - h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include an intersection front and side gable and a series of side facing gables. These roof forms are found throughout the district and are consistent with the Guidelines.
  - i. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are comparable in size and arrangement to those found historically in the district. Staff finds the proposed fenestration patterns to be generally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the proposed street facing windows beneath the front gable should be centered under the gable.
  - j. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. While the applicant has proposed an overall footprint that is large for the lot, the applicant has proposed interior courtyards with permeable paving and an overall form that is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
  - k. MATERIALS – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, a standing seam metal roof and aluminum windows. Staff finds that the proposed siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure to relate to historic siding profiles found throughout the district. 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.
  - l. MATERIALS – Regarding windows, the applicant has proposed aluminum windows. Generally, staff finds the proposed aluminum windows to be appropriate given the contemporary architectural detailing of the proposed new construction. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the

installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Details on each should be submitted to staff for review.

- m. 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. As noted in finding e, the proposed wall at the rear of the front porch presents an architectural massing that is inconsistent with that found historically in the district. Staff recommends the proposed side gable that starts to the rear of the courtyard be shifted forward to the rear of the front porch.
- n. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT –Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment.
- o. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a single vehicle parking location utilizing the existing curb cut and a proposed shallow driveway. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.ii., off street parking areas should not be added within the front yard setback as to not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape. Staff finds the installation of a driveway to be appropriate; however, the driveway should follow the historic example found on the block and extend along the side of the proposed new construction rather than stop at the front of the proposed new construction. The applicant has proposed driveway materials to incorporate the driveway into the proposed landscaping and to reduce the visual impact of its location.
- p. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – At the rear of the lot, the applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to feature a total size of approximately 600 square feet. Generally, staff finds the location, massing and proposed materials appropriate; however, the accessory structure should feature materials specifications consistent with those noted in findings k and l.
- q. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted landscaping to include native grasses, concrete pavers and flowering/fruit trees. Generally, the proposed landscaping materials are appropriate and consistent with the guidelines.
- r. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed a front yard sidewalk to lead from the sidewalk at the public right of way to the front door. The proposed sidewalk should feature a width consistent with those found historically in the district; typically three to four feet in width.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed footprint, massing and materials based on findings a through r with the following stipulations

- i. That the applicant should include a foundation height comparable to those found predominantly in the district and on Devine Street as noted in finding g.
- ii. That a door that is more consistent with those found historically in the district be used at the front porch rather than an entrance gate as noted in finding d.
- iii. That the proposed street facing windows beneath the front gable should be centered under the gable as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the proposed side gable that starts to the rear of the courtyard be shifted forward to the rear of the front porch as noted in finding m.
- v. That 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 and that the proposed wood siding feature an exposure of four (4) inches.
- vi. That the window specifications noted in finding l be adhered to.
- vii. That the applicant incorporate façade breaks or separation on the west façade, which currently features one continuous wall plane with only fenestration.
- viii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view at the public right of way and that the front yard sidewalk not exceed four (4) feet in width.

- ix. That the proposed front yard driveway/parking location extend along the side of the proposed new construction rather than stop in the front yard.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve conceptual approval with staff stipulations 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-9, with the additional stipulation regarding the continuous walkway to the front door and inclusion of a ribbon drive instead of the current drive design.

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

**NAYS:** Kamal, Garcia.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Garcia, 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