

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
21 March 2018**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:15 PM, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.
- The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Bustamante, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Bustamante, Vice Chair; Fish; Lazarine; Connor; Grube; Laffoon**

**ABSENT: Guarino, Chair; Garza; Brittain; Kamal; Garcia**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
  - Wood Window Workshop and Certification Course, March 30 and 31, 1100 - 1200 E Highland Blvd
  - Rehabarama - Saturday, April 7 - 1100 - 1200 E Highland Blvd

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

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

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item #1, Case No. 2018-002  | 13203 BLANCO RD 8400 NW MILITARY HWY/PHIL HARDBERGER PARK |
| • Item #2, Case No. 2018-120  | 1606 E PYRON  |
| • Item #4, Case No. 2018-112  | 1704 SAN FERNANDO   |
| • Item #6, Case No. 2018-105  | 2131 W GRAMERCY PLACE                                     |
| • Item #8                     | 253 THORAIN   |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2018-103 | 1615 E HOUSTON ST – TAX CERTIFIATION                      |
| • Item #11, Case No. 2018-122 | 1615 E HOUSTON ST – TAX VERIFICATION                      |
| • Item #14, Case No. 2018-106 | 437 DEVINE ST   |
| • Item #15, Case No. 2018-107 | 1128 VIRGINIA BLVD  |
| • Item #16, Case No. 2018-115 | 327 CEDAR ST  |
| • Item #17, Case No. 2018-109 | 210 N FLORES ST   |
| • Item #18, Case No. 2018-124 | 355 E KINGS HWY   |
| • Item #19, Case No. 2018-126 | 417 E EVERGREEN   |
| • Item #20, Case No. 2018-113 | 718 DAWSON ST   |
| • Item #22, Case No. 2018-121 | 526 E MYRTLE 528 E MYRTLE                                 |
| • Item #23, Case No. 2018-127 | 403 E MYRTLE  |
| • Item #24, Case No. 2018-111 | 407 DEVINE ST   |
| • Item #33, Case No. 2018-110 | 117 HERMINE   |

Items #3, #7, #9, #12, #13, and 21 were pulled for citizens to be heard or by applicant.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. HDRC NO. 2018-096**

**Applicant:** Bryan Wildman

**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. A request at this property was reviewed at the February 21, 2018, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where it was denied by the commission.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the DRC on February 27, 2018, where committee members noted that the proposed form and massing of the rear structure was appropriate in context with the primary historic structure, that the footprint appeared to be appropriate for the size of the primary historic structure and lot, noted concerns regarding the proposed height, suggested that the footprint be shifted on the lot, that driveway and parking screening may be appropriate and that the proposed window form was appropriate.
- d. PROJECT UPDATES – The applicant has modified elements of the proposed new construction to include a shift in location of the structure away from the west property line to be equally located between the east and west property lines and has reduced the height of the proposed new construction by 4’ – 2” to an overall height of 21’ – 11”.
- e. 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.
- f. 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 and an overall height of 21’ – 11”. 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.

- g. **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 21' - 11". 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 8' - 6" 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.
- h. **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. The applicant has agreed to these standards.
- i. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install one over one, wood 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.
- j. **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.
- k. **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 and then to a rear alley. The applicant has noted that pervious paving materials will be used to parking locations.
- l. **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.
- m. **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. The applicant has noted that salvageable materials from the rear accessory structure would be incorporated into the proposed new construction and the connector between the primary historic structure and the proposed addition.
- n. **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.
- o. **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.

- p. **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.
- q. **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:**

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

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz, Lori Logan, Tony Garcia (Cee Winkler yielded her time to Mr. Garcia), and Paul Kinnison (Frank M. Garcia and L.C. Powell yielded their time to Mr. Kinneson) spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny as submitted.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**5. HDRC NO. 2017-328**

**Applicant:** City Council Resolution

**Address:** RIO GRANDE ST BOUNDED BY LARRY ST AND RANGER ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to change the street name of Rio Grande Street to Mel Waiters Way. The proposed portion of the street is bounded to the north by Larry Street and the south by Ranger Street.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to change the name of Rio Grande Street, bordered roughly by Larry Street and Martin Luther King Drive, to Mel Waiters Way. Rio Grande Street is located on San Antonio's Eastside in the Arena District neighborhood. The street is not a primary arterial, but connects directly to Commerce Street, which is a key thoroughfare in the area. It is located in the City's original thirty-six square mile boundary, but not in a historic district. The street is one of San Antonio's oldest, with an established date sometime prior to 1884, which was the year it was renamed to Rio Grande. No evidence has been found that defines the historic significance of the name Rio Grande to this specific street location.
- b. The street's proposed name change to Mel Waiters Way is culturally appropriate. Mel Waiters, a prominent Southern soul blues singer, was born on the East Side of San Antonio in 1956. He was raised in the East Terrace Courts off of Rio Grande St, worshipped at Jacobs Chapel United Methodist Church, and graduated from Highlands High School. After releasing several notable tracks, he created a San Antonio based record label called Brittney Records, to which he signed several local and independent acts. He passed away on May 28, 2015. Waiters' contribution to music brings attention to both the community in which he grew up as well as to San Antonio.
- c. The applicant has met and complied with all street name change requirements as outlined in UDC Sections 6-674, 6-675, and 6-676.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Laura T. Mills and Pastor Andrew Wilson spoke in opposition; Porchia Waiters spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**7. HDRC NO. 2016-259**

**Applicant:** Peter French/Gray Street Partners

**Address:** 305 E HOUSTON ST, 311 E HOUSTON ST, 313 E HOUSTON ST, 315 E HOUSTON ST (Grant Building, Kress Building)

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform the following exterior modifications to the Kress Building. Many of the request items from conceptual approval have been modified or deleted from the scope of work.

1. Add a new mechanical enclosure above the existing mechanical penthouse.
2. Add a rooftop terrace and landscaping at existing level 5.
3. Add a door to the west side of the rooftop terrace patio at existing level 5.
4. Remove brick and add recessed windows on the east elevation.
5. Remove brick and add windows on the west elevation.

The applicant is also requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform the following exterior modifications to the Grant Building. Many of the request items from conceptual approval have been modified or deleted from the scope of work.

6. Add fenestration to the exiting mechanical penthouse.
7. Add a rooftop terrace to include a skylight and landscaping.
8. Replace the translucent glazing at the existing windows on the E Houston façade with clear glazing.

## **FINDINGS:**

### Findings related to the Kress Building:

- a. The Kress Building at 315 E Houston was constructed in 1938 in the Art Modern style. The structure currently features five levels with an open air patio on the fifth level and a mechanical penthouse on the roof level. The façade currently features fenestration on the north (Peacock Alley) façade and the south (E Houston Street) facades.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval on July 20, 2016, to perform a number of exterior modifications including the addition of a new mechanical penthouse, fenestration modifications, the addition of a canopy and the extension of existing stairs. Since that time, many items have been deleted from the proposed scope of work.
- c. FENESTRATION – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i., new façade elements that alter or destroy the historic character of a building’s facades should not be introduced. Additionally, alterations should not disrupt the rhythm of the commercial block. The applicant has proposed to remove the original brick façade and install a curtain wall system on the east facade, remove the original brick and add recessed windows on the west facade and the potentially add an access door to the fifth level balcony.
- d. FENESTRATION – The façade of the Kress Building is currently lacking fenestration on both the east and west elevations. Staff finds the addition of windows on these façade is appropriate. Per the construction documents, the curtain wall system on the east façade as well as the façade will be hung on the face of the structure and not recessed. Although this approach is unconventional, staff finds that modifications to non-primary facades or party walls that are completely avoid of ornamentation are consistent with the historic design guidelines.
- e. MECHANICAL PENTHOUSE SCREENING – The applicant previously proposed to construct a new mechanical penthouse on the roof of the existing mechanical penthouse; however, at this time, the applicant has noted that only mechanical screening will be installed on top of the penthouse to feature a height of approximately thirteen (13) feet in height. The proposed screening will be low-e-coated, silk-screen frit, insulating glass. Staff finds the proposed mechanical screen appropriate due to its location and proposed size.
- f. TERRACE & LANDSCAPING – Around the existing parapet walls, the applicant has proposed to incorporate a rooftop terrace and landscaping. Much of the proposed landscaping will be within the existing parapet walls. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.
- g. ROOF TERRACE DOOR – The applicant has noted the potential installation of a door at the fifth level door opening. Staff finds a proposal here appropriate; however, the door should feature a profile and material comparable to those found throughout the structure. The applicant is to submit the door and its location to staff for review and approval.

### Findings related to the Grant Building:

- h. The Grant Building at 305 E Houston was constructed in 1935 and features two levels of space with a mechanical penthouse positioned at the far north side of the roof. The structure currently features fenestration on the north and south facades.
- i. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval on July 20, 2016, to perform a number of exterior modifications including the construction of an addition above the

existing mechanical penthouse, the addition of fenestration above the existing mechanical penthouse, the addition of a rooftop terrace and modification to glazing. Since that time, many items have been deleted from the proposed scope of work.

- j. FENESTRATION – The applicant has proposed to install fenestration in the existing mechanical penthouse. Given that the penthouse is void of architectural detailing and due to it not being visible from the public right of way, staff finds this appropriate.
- k. FENESTRATION – On the E Houston façade, the applicant has proposed to remove the translucent glass in the existing casement windows and replace it with clear glass. Generally, staff finds this appropriate.
- l. ROOFTOP TERRACE/SKYLIGHTS – On the rooftop of the Grant Building, the applicant has proposed a terrace that includes wood decking on pressure treated wood, steel planter boxes, handrails and guardrails and a series of skylights to feature a total of five. The proposed skylights will range in height from 4’ – 6” to 8’ – 8” in height. Staff finds the proposed design and location of the skylights to be appropriate.

General findings:

- m. TAX INCENTIVES – At this time, the applicant has not submitted an application for Historic Tax Certification. Staff recommends that the applicant submit for Historic Tax Certification as well as consider pursuing the state historic tax credit or state and federal historic tax credits.
- n. ARCHAEOLOGY- The property is nearby the Alamo Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, the local Alamo Plaza Historic District, the general battlefield area for the Battle of the Alamo, and the San Antonio River. Furthermore, historic archival map research shows the alignment of the Navarro Acequia likely traversing the property. Therefore, archaeological investigations are recommended for all excavations.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. ARCHAEOLOGY-Archaeological investigations are recommended for all excavations. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**9. 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 Burlleson 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 stipulation has been met 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 been met 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 been partially met 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 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 been 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 been 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 Burlleson 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. 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. Staff finds the openings consistent.
- 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 find 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. Staff finds the proposal appropriate. 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant submits a final window specification for the proposed aluminum-clad wood windows to staff for review and approval. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- ii. That the applicant installs another column on the front porch to frame the front door as noted in finding g. Updated drawings must be submitted to staff that reflect this change.
- iii. That the applicant submits detail drawings for all proposed railings, including the front porch, rooftop terrace, and second story balcony. Drawings must include the dimensions and profiles of all railing and balustrade elements, detailed material specifications, and finish.
- iv. That the applicant installs a seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, and a crimped ridge seam.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

## **12. HDRC NO. 2017-431**

**Applicant:** Laurence Seiterle

**Address:** 1610 E HOUSTON ST, 1602 E HOUSTON ST

### **REQUEST:**

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

1. Perform exterior modifications to the existing structure including exterior modifications and the installation of storefront systems.
2. Install a canopy on the east façade of the existing structure.
3. Perform site work including the configuration of onsite parking and the installation of landscaped areas.
4. Install signage including wall signs and a monument sign on E Houston.
5. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The commercial structure at the corner of E Houston and N Hackberry was constructed circa 1950 and appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map as a burlap bag manufacturing facility. This lot also featured a Colored Mechanics School which was demolished for the construction of surface parking. The structure has undergone various façade modifications in its existence including the installation of a metal façade.
- b. This request received conceptual approval at the September 6, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
  - i. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted at the time of final approval along with detailed construction documents.
  - ii. That the proposed monument sign be eliminated as it is not consistent with a residential historic district.
  - iii. That a master signage plan be submitted at the time of final approval for the location and size of all tenant signage.
- c. **EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed exterior modifications that generally include the installation of façade openings on the E Houston (north) and east facades. The applicant has proposed aluminum storefront systems on these facades and the installation of windows. The N Hackberry facades will feature the removal of the existing aluminum façade and restoration of the existing brick. Staff finds that no character defining features will be removed or modified in the proposed alterations and finds the proposed alterations appropriate.
- d. **CANOPY INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to install an entrance canopy to span the length of the east façade to feature varying heights and be offset from the roofline of the existing structure. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii. notes that new canopies should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade. Generally, staff finds the proposed canopy to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **SITE WORK** – The existing site features surface parking with no existing buffers to buffer automobile parking from the sidewalk at the public right of way. The applicant has proposed to install landscape buffers along E Houston and at each property line. The applicant has also proposed to install a number of landscaping materials include low plantings, shrubs and small trees and large trees on the lot.
- f. **LANDSCAPING** – Regarding landscaping, the applicant has proposed to install benches, planters, concrete paving, low walls, decomposed granite paving, two live oaks, three cedar elms and numerous shrubs to buffer the parking lot from the eastern property line. Staff finds the proposed landscaping plan to be appropriate.

- g. **SIGNAGE** –The applicant has proposed to install six, 4x8 business signs on the west elevation (Hackberry) to be indirectly lit; six, 2x4 business sign on the east elevation, facing parking lot, to be indirectly lit; and a monument sign (4’ – 6” tall, 14’ long), to feature indirectly lit signage panels for each retail tenant. Generally, staff finds the proposed signage locations to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the Hackberry signage should be reduced to approximately (4x6) 24 square feet each.
- h. **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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #5 based on findings a through h with the stipulation that wall signage on N Hackberry be reduced to approximately twenty-four (24) square feet each.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2018-101**

**Applicant:** David Ramos

**Address:** 138 E HOLLYWOOD AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a second story addition.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 138 E Hollywood Ave is a 2-story single family home constructed circa 1925 and designed by architect Will N. Noonan in the Colonial Revival style. The home features a side gable configuration, brick first floor, and a prominent front entry framed by round Doric Columns with square capitals and a pedimented cornice. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the second story of the primary structure. The addition will be constructed atop an existing outdoor patio in the same footprint. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the side or rear of the property whenever possible and should not detract from or overwhelm the existing historic structure. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions

should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition utilizes an existing footprint. While the addition is located at the side of the structure and will be visible from the public right-of-way, staff finds the scale and mass of the addition appropriate for the existing 2-story structure in conjunction with the careful compatible treatment of its design.

- c. **NEW ROOF FORM** –The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. The applicant has proposed a gable facing east, which is appropriate for the style of the home. The roof also does not exceed the height of the existing primary ridgeline of the primary structure. Staff finds the proposed roof form consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **EXTENSION OF EXISTING FIRST STORY ROOFLINE** – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing first story roofline detail. The extension will match the existing eave detailing, dimensions, curvature, and shingles, but will require concealing the current roofline as designed. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be distinguished as new without distracting from the original structure or implying a sense of false historicism. For side or rear additions utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a recessed area at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds that the extension of the first story roofline, in conjunction with the proposed façade materials, roofline, and windows, results in a visual interpretation that the addition was originally part of the historic structure. Staff finds that the existing roofline should remain and should not be extended in order to provide a visual distinction between the historic structure and the addition.
- e. **EXISTING OPENINGS** – The proposed addition will require the covering of two existing wood doors. Guideline 3.C.i in the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions encourages the salvage and reuse of historic materials, where possible, that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition. Based on the submitted floor plan, these door openings will remain. Staff finds that the doors should be retained.
- f. **CHIMNEY** – The proposed addition will partially conceal an existing brick chimney. However, the chimney will be retained in the design. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- g. **NEW FENESTRATION** – The applicant has proposed to install new wood windows on the addition that match those existing on the historic structure in proportion, configuration, inset, design, and material. Staff finds the proposed fenestration generally consistent with the Guidelines, but has not yet received a window specification.
- h. **FAÇADE MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to incorporate textured stucco to match the color and finish of the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation, which help achieve a visual distinction between old and new elements.
- i. **TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW** –According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, side of 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. As noted in finding d, the addition as proposed does not meet this Guideline.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition based on findings a through i with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant retains the existing first story roofline detail and eliminates the proposed extension as noted in finding d. The applicant must submit updating drawings that reflect this design change to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submits a final window specification to staff for review and 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 applicant retains the two existing doors as noted in finding e.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with staff stipulations 2 and 3.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2018-116**

**Applicant:** Jason Moran

**Address:** 504 AUSTIN ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a rear addition on an existing concrete foundation
2. Construct a rooftop addition to provide access to the rooftop deck. A stairway will terminate within the proposed addition.
3. Paint the structure white.
4. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 504 Austin was constructed circa 1905 and originally was the location of the residence and business of Charles Spohn, Sr., a baker. The structure features a brick façade with a hipped roof and a rear two story addition. The primary structure features an ornamental brick parapet and entrance which extends toward Austin Street past the front façade of the single story structure.
- b. PREVIOUS APPROVALS – On June 23, 2015, the applicant received on Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness for roof repair, window repair and the installation of wood doors. The applicant received approval at the December 6, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing to install a flat roof on the rear historic structure to include rooftop decking and railings, exterior lighting and wood windows within the existing openings. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on February 23, 2018, for the installation of a bronze anodized aluminum storefront system and aluminum clad wood windows.
- c. REAR ADDITION – At the rear of the historic brick structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature one story in height, a shed roof and wood siding. Per the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should be sited at the side or rear of the primary historic structure, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the primary historic structure’s principal façade and should

feature a transition to distinguish it from historic structure. Staff finds the proposed massing and roof form to be appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a side inset from the wall plane of the historic structure.

- d. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding. At this time, the applicant has not specified window or roofing materials. Staff finds that the proposed windows should match those approved in the historic structure and should feature matching head and sill heights as well as matching widths and installation depths. Additionally, staff finds that stucco is more appropriate for the existing masonry façade than wood or composite siding.
- e. **ROOFTOP ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed a rooftop addition to provide access to the roof top. Staff finds that a stucco façade with a dark color to be appropriate.
- f. **PAINTING** – The applicant has proposed to paint the existing structure white to cover existing graffiti and various non-original paint colors that have been applied to the structure to cover graffiti. Staff finds the painting of this structure given its existing condition is appropriate; however, a tan color paint should be used to relate to the original brick color.
- g. **CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS** – The applicant has provided staff with a floor plan that features many inaccuracies. Complete construction documents that comply with all codes are to be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- h. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for repair work to the historic structure at 504 Austin. Scopes of work include interior renovations; mechanical, electrical and plumbing upgrades; masonry repair and roofing. 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. Staff recommends approval of item #1 and #2 based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the proposed windows should match those approved in the historic structure and should feature matching head and sill heights as well as matching widths and installation depths.
  - ii. That the roofing material be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Standing seam metal roofs 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.
  - iii. That the proposed wood or composite siding be removed and a stucco façade be installed.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of item #3, painting, with the stipulation that the paint color be tan to relate to the color of the original brick.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz and Lulu Francois spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2018-097**

**Applicant:** Peggy Brimhall

**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. A request was withdrawn by the applicant at the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 7, 2018. Since that time, the applicant has modified the proposed new construction.
- 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 February 27, 2018, where committee members noted that black gravel was inappropriate, that the proposed massing approach was much improved, that the proposed parking solution is appropriate, that the window profiles are appropriate and that there was no concern over the proposed roof decks.
- 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 has not been proposed. Staff finds that a porch or porch like elements should be incorporated.
- f. **SCALE & MASS (E Carson)** – 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 block 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 new construction features a total height of 32’ – 4” (E Carson structure). Staff finds the proposed height of the structure to address E Carson inconsistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, the proposed massing features solid wall planes at locations where historic structures feature voids for porches.
- g. **SCALE & MASS (Colita)** – The applicant has reduced the proposed massing of the rear unit that is to address Colita to feature an overall height of 22’ – 4”. The proposed rear structure’s massing is subordinate to that of the proposed primary structure and generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has 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. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the roof form to be raised over the head height of the proposed balconies forming a façade arrangement that is not common for structures in the district. Staff finds that the proposed roof form should originate lower on the second level's façade.
- k. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Generally, the applicant has proposed fenestration that features an overall size consistent with that found on historic structures throughout the district.
- l. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- m. 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.
- n. 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.
- o. 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. Additionally, in regards to porches, the adjacent structures on the lot feature porches that compromise a large portion of the structures ground level footprint and massing. Without the incorporation of porches, the proposed massing is inconsistent with that found in the district and on neighboring Folk Victorian Structures.
- p. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS / PARKING LOCATIONS – The applicant has proposed covered parking at the rear of each structure both on the ground floors and in a detached accessory structure. Generally, staff finds the proposed parking locations and parking structure appropriate.
- q. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided staff with a landscaping plan that notes proposed materials and their general locations as well as location of site elements. Staff finds the use of black gravel inappropriate. All driveways should feature profiles that match those found within the district including width and materials.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff find the overall site plan to be appropriate as well as the massing of the proposed rear structure on Colita Street; however, staff finds that the following items should be addressed prior to receiving conceptual approval:

- i. That porches or porch like elements should be incorporated as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the proposed roof height should be lowered as noted in findings f and j.
- iii. That porches should be included to be recessed behind protruding bays as noted in finding n.
- iv. That the applicant continue to develop materials with the specifications noted in finding m.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz, Rose Hill, Cindy Tower (Stephen Mazurek yielded his time to Ms. Tower), Marlene Hawkins, and Christina Reck-Guerra spoke in opposition. Julia Rosenfeld, Marie Stout, James Hetherington, Peter French, and Ernesto Alvarez Jr. spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2018-093**

**Applicant:** Steve Jaffe/IKE Smart City

**Address:** 114 COMMERCE ST – Multiple Locations

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to install interactive kiosks in multiple locations throughout the City of San Antonio. The applicant has proposed 25 total locations throughout the city limits including locations at San Antonio International Airport, at public parks, near Mission Concepcion and Mission San Jose and various locations downtown.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to install interactive kiosks in multiple locations throughout the City of San Antonio. The applicant has proposed 25 total locations throughout the city limits including locations at San Antonio International Airport at public parks, near Mission Concepcion and Mission San Jose and various locations downtown. Specific installation locations and details have not yet been developed and will be provided for consideration a future date.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 13, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that the proposed scale was note a concerns, that face branding was preferred over spine branding and asked questions regarding final design.
- c. DESIGN – The applicant has proposed three design variants; A, B, and C. Design variants A and B are to contain various detailing in both maroon and black colors. Design variant C is to feature stone cladding. The proposed kiosks are to feature COSA department logos, street names, IKE Smart City branding and a digital display board to feature various information and graphics including advertising. Of the materials provided for consideration, staff finds the use of stone cladding should be avoided for the downtown installations.
- d. HEIGHT AND SCALE – The proposed kiosks are to feature an overall height of approximately eight to ten feet, a width of approximately four feet and a thickness of approximately 16 inches. Staff finds that the proposed height is a departure from the height of typical furnishings found in the public right of way downtown. Staff finds that the overall height should be reduced to a scale that relates more to pedestrians.
- e. DOWNTOWN LOCATIONS – The proposed kiosks will be located within the public right of way at various locations including various downtown locations. Proposed downtown locations

include Houston at N St Mary's, Houston at N Presa, Houston at the Riverwalk, Houston at Alamo, Losoya at Commerce, Commerce at the Riverwalk, Commerce at Main Plaza, Commerce at the Spanish Governor's Palace, Commerce at San Pedro Creek, Commerce at San Rosa, Commerce at Frio and Frio at Buena Vista. Kiosks will also be located at the Henry B Gonzales Convention Center.

- f. MISSION LOCATIONS – Kiosks have been proposed to be located at both Mission Concepcion and Mission San Jose. Staff finds that kiosks should not be located in a manner which are not seen immediately from the front of the Missions.
- g. AIRPORT & PARK LOCATIONS – Kiosks located at public parks are to be located and designed in a manner that does not impede on existing park uses or access.
- h. ARCHAEOLOGY- The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

In general, staff recommends that the locations of the proposed kiosks balance the goals of this innovative program with maintaining the historic character and ambiance of Downtown Streets. In particular, visual impacts on Houston Street and other sensitive areas should be minimized. With approval of the kiosk design and preliminary locations by HDRC, staff will review each individual installation for impacts to historic resources.

Staff recommends that kiosk #5 be reconsidered to avoid impacts to nearby historic resources on Houston Street, that kiosk #8 be relocated away from the Houston Street Bridge, and that kiosk #9 be relocated outside of Alamo Plaza.

Staff also recommends that the following conditions apply to all installations:

- i. That every effort be made to minimize visual impacts from the River Walk or river right-of-way.
- ii. That no individual installation damage or obscure historic fabric such as bridges, unique sidewalk features, or architectural elements.
- iii. That no individual installation detracts from the primary entrance of view to a significant historic building or resource.
- iv. That a clear pedestrian path of 72" be maintained around each installation. Instances where this cannot be met should be coordinated with the Disability Access Office.
- v. That the use of stone be eliminated from the proposed kiosks and that their height be reduced to no more than seven feet.
- vi. ARCHAEOLOGY- The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- vii. That all locations make every attempt to group closely with existing street amenities and furnishings such as B Cycle stations.

Staff will also incorporate any additional stipulations or recommendation by the HDRC in these reviews.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff stipulations 1-4, 6-7.

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

**NAYS:** None.

## **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **27. HDRC NO. 2018-102**

**Applicant:** Peter French/Gray Street Partners

**Address:** 1603 BROADWAY

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 20 story, mixed-use tower at the corner of Broadway and Newell Avenue. The tower will include ground floor retail, two levels of underground parking, three levels of wrapped garage parking, four levels of office space, an amenity floor, ten levels of hospitality space and an enclosed mechanical penthouse. The proposed tower will feature 260 feet in height.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 20 story, mixed-use tower at the corner of Broadway and Newell Avenue. The tower will include ground floor retail, two levels of underground parking, three levels of wrapped garage parking, four levels of office space, an amenity floor, ten levels of hospitality space and an enclosed mechanical penthouse.
- 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 March 13, 2018, where committee members noted that additional context should be provided, that more landscaping should be added at the corner of Broadway and Newell, that the proposed garage entrance should not look like a garage entrance and that more information and graphics were needed for the proposed side elevations.
- d. **EXISTING STRUCTURE** – The site currently features an existing, two story structure constructed circa 1918. The structure was constructed for the Thomson Electric Company and was used by the company until the early 1970's under a different name. The structure has undergone many modifications since its construction and is out of context from its construction. Staff has performed a review of the proposed demolition and has determined that the structure is not eligible for historic designation.
- 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. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed to pedestrian walkways and plazas throughout the property which includes connections to the sidewalks located at the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.
- f. **AUTOMOBILE PARKING** – The applicant has proposed two curb cuts on Broadway and one curb cut on Avenue B. The applicant has not noted an overall width for the proposed curb cuts; however, the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1) notes that curb cuts should be limited to two on structures facing only one street and one for each additional street face. Additionally, curb cuts should not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width. Staff finds that an emphasis should be placed on pedestrian circulation and that the garage entrance on Broadway should be relocated to Avenue B.
- g. **PARKING GARAGE** – The applicant has noted two levels of subgrade parking and three levels of parking above grade that are to be wrapped by architectural elements to include glass curtain wall systems, brick and screening elements. This is consistent with the UDC.

- h. **SITE DESIGN** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Per the application documents, the applicant has provided a plaza adjacent to the public right of way near proposed street level retail space. The applicant has provided connections to adjacent sidewalks at the right of way; however, should further develop pedestrian crossings at each garage entrance to reduce the vehicular impact on pedestrian traffic.
- i. **LANDSCAPING** – Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed landscaping buffers between Broadway and Newell and the pedestrian sidewalks on site. This is consistent with the UDC; however, the applicant is to submit a detailed landscaping plan when returning to the HDRC for final approval.
- j. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- k. **BUILDING SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has incorporated elements into the design to provide a human scale including pedestrian scaled storefronts along Broadway and has incorporated recessed balcony openings with human scaled elements such as balcony railings. Additionally, the applicant has separated the proposed building massing both horizontally and vertically and has included a number of outdoor terraces.
- l. **BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, the maximum height of new construction in RIO-2 is ten stories and 120 feet. The applicant has proposed a total height of approximately 260 feet. While the southern tower’s height exceeds that allowed by the UDC, staff finds that given the structure’s distance from the San Antonio River, no harmful shadows will result from its construction. Additionally, there are structures in the immediate vicinity and located at the Pearl that provide the precedent for structures of multiple levels in height. Staff finds that the Broadway corridor is an appropriate corridor for additional height. The applicant is responsible for obtaining a variance for the proposed height from the Board of Adjustment.
- m. **MATERIALS** – Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed materials that include brick and a glass curtain wall system. The proposed materials are consistent with the UDC.
- n. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed a distinctive base that features massing and materials comparable to structures found in the immediate area. The midsection of the proposed tower features a glass curtain wall system with reduced massing. The applicant has proposed a cap noted by a change in glass curtain wall panel sizes; however, staff finds that the applicant should further develop the proposed cap.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant continue to develop the site design including landscaping and pedestrian circulation to reduce vehicular impact on pedestrians.
- ii. That curb cut on both Broadway and Avenue B not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width and that the garage entrance be relocated to Avenue B.
- iii. That the applicant continue to develop the proposed building cap to feature a more distinctive design.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Jonathan Carel spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

Commissioner Lazarine referred applicant to committee.

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**28. HDRC NO. 2018-118**

**Applicant:** Ricardo Turrubiates/Terramark

**Address:** 725 HAYS ST, 729 HAY ST, 901 N PINE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting the following:

1. Conceptual approval for the master site plan for construction of three, two story structure to be located on the vacant lots at 725 and 729 Hays as well as 901 N Pine.
2. A Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of one, two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 729 Hays.

**FINDINGS:**

General findings:

- a. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 13, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted a concern regarding lack of fenestration and the small windows on side elevations.
- b. CONTEXT – This block of Hays Street is relatively intact featuring both Victorian and Craftsman style structures. Two, two story, four square structures exist on the north side of the street.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the master site plan for construction of three, two story structure to be located on the vacant lots at 725 and 729 Hays as well as 901 N Pine.
- 1b. 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.
- 1c. SITE PLAN – The applicant has provided a site plan that notes the construction of three, two story residential structure at the corner of Hays and N Pine. One structure is proposed to be constructed on each vacant lot. Each proposed structure is to feature a curb cut on the property with a driveway.
- 1d. SETBACKS – The applicant has proposed setbacks for each of the three structures that are approximately 25', 29, and 27' in depth. The proposed setback for 729 Hays is deeper than those found historically on the block and is appropriate; however, the proposed setbacks for 725 Hays

and 901 N Pine feature setbacks that are less than those found historically on the block. Staff finds that the proposed setbacks should be increased to be consistent with the Guidelines.

- 1e. **ORIENTATION** – As proposed, 725 and 729 Hays are orientated toward Hays with primary entrances being oriented toward Hays. The structure at the corner of N Pine and Hays, addressed to N Pine will feature a wraparound porch element and feature entrance doors oriented toward both N Pine and Hays. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate. Architectural elements will determine the ultimate appropriateness of the proposed orientation.
- 1f. **SITE DESIGN (DRIVEWAYS)** – The applicant has provided a conceptual site plan noting the locations of driveways, walkways, proposed trees, patios and porches and open space. The applicant has proposed driveways to be located on the west side of the proposed houses. The historic pattern found on this block is for driveway placement on the right side of the historic structures. The proposed driveway placement on Hays is not consistent with the Guidelines. On N Pine, the applicant has proposed a double width driveway, which is inconsistent with the width recommended by the Guidelines as well as the historic development pattern found on the block.
- 1g. **WALKWAYS** – The applicant has proposed sidewalks to extend between the proposed new construction's front porches to the sidewalks at the public right of way. Staff finds that the profile and width of the proposed sidewalks and walkways should match those found historically in the district.
- 1h. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – At this time, the applicant has not provided architectural information for the proposed new construction at 725 Hays and 901 N Pine.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of one, two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 729 Hays.
- 2b. **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 provided a setback that per application documents is greater than those found historically on the block and has proposed an orientation toward Hays. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2c. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The proposed entrance is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2d. **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 block of Hays features two, two story historic structure on the north side of the block. Generally, the proposed scale and massing is appropriate.
- 2e. **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 noted an exact foundation height for the proposed new construction. Staff finds that the foundation height should be consistent with the Guidelines. Neighboring structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet.
- 2f. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a roof form to include a hipped roof with a front protruding gable. A two story historic structure on this block features a similar roof form. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate
- 2g. **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 a number of

small, fixed windows as well as blank facades at and near the front elevation. Staff finds the lack of fenestration and small, fixed windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and the development pattern found in the district.

- 2h. 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.
- 2i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include staggered Hardie shake siding, board and batten siding, horizontal fiber cement siding with a six inch exposure and an asphalt shingle roof. Staff finds that a smooth finished siding 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.
- 2j. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time 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.
- 2k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding 2h, staff finds that additional window fenestration should be incorporated into the proposed structure. Additionally, more substantial porch massing should be introduced to further relate to the two story structures on the block that feature full width porches.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on findings 1a through 1h. Staff recommends the applicant increase the proposed setbacks to be greater than those found historically on the block and reorient the driveways to be located on the right (east) side of the proposed new construction to be consistent with the historic pattern found on the block.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on findings 2a through 2l. Staff recommends the applicant introduce additional fenestration, eliminate small, fixed windows on the front façade, introduce full width porches and adhere to materials and window specifications outlined in the findings.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**29. HDRC NO. 2017-098**

**Applicant:** Keller Henderson/Keller Henderson Interiors

**Address:** 200 MAIN PLAZA

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace existing windows which include a combination of wood, aluminum and steel frame windows with varying profiles and details with new Pella Architect Series – Double Hung Simulated, aluminum clad wood windows.

2. Remove a street level garage door and install three windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 200 Main Plaza was constructed circa 1915 and was designed by Leo Deilmann. Originally, the structure featured three levels and was the location of the San Antonio City Jail. A fourth level addition was later constructed and the building soon became known as the Legal Professional Building. The structure has seen modifications in years past including the removal of many original wood windows. At the March 15, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received approval to perform rehabilitative scopes of work that included cleaning, masonry repair, the removal of fire escape stairs, the construction of a one story, rooftop addition, enclosing existing window openings on the southern façade and the construction of an elevator on the southern façade.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – At this time the applicant has proposed to replace existing windows which include a combination of wood, aluminum and steel frame windows with varying profiles and details with new Pella Architect Series – Double Hung Simulated, aluminum clad wood windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. new windows should match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds the proposed windows to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace existing fixed and smaller profiled one over one windows in the basement level with fixed windows. Staff finds that all one over one windows should be replaced with one over one windows. Additionally, staff finds that 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.
- d. GARAGE DOOR REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing garage door on the north elevation and install three, one over one windows. Generally, staff finds this replacement to be in keeping with the Guidelines. The applicant has noted that the opening, masonry and cast stone surrounds will remain as is.
- e. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District, the Main and Military Plazas National Register of Historic Places District, and the Main and Military Plazas Local Historic District. Furthermore, the property is adjacent to the historic route of the San Antonio River and is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological site 41BX1752. A review of historic archival maps shows structures within or adjacent to the project area as early as 1767. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant preserve in place all historic decorative window grates on the historic structure.
- ii. That one over one windows be replaced with one over one windows rather than fixed windows on the street level.
- iii. That 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.

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

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**30. HDRC NO. 2018-104**

**Applicant:** Ricardo Turrubiates

**Address:** 255 BRAHAN BLVD

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for four, single family residential structures at the corner of Brahan Boulevard and Haywood Avenue, in the Westford Neighborhood. As proposed, two structures would address Brahan and two would address Haywood.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for four, single family residential structures at the corner of Brahan Boulevard and Haywood Avenue, in the Westford Neighborhood. As proposed, two structures would address Brahan and two would address Haywood. The lot is currently vacant.
- 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. **SITE PLAN** – The applicant has provided a site plan that notes the construction of four, two story residential structures. Two structures are proposed to be constructed on each lot. The applicant has noted one curb cut on Haywood Avenue as well as rear alley access to the site to provide vehicular access to the three remaining units.
- d. **SETBACKS (BRAHAN)** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new construction should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Where a variety of setbacks exist, the median setback of buildings should be used. The surrounding structures, many of which are not historic, feature varying setbacks. The applicant has provided a diagram noting the existing setbacks on this block of Brahan which include setbacks of 44’, 57’ 34’ and 43’. East of Haywood Avenue, houses feature setbacks of 46’, 32’, 42’, 39’ and 60’. The applicant has

proposed setbacks on Brahan Blvd of approximately 37'. Staff finds that a setbacks that is more consistent with the contributing properties on the block (45') would be more appropriate. An increased setback on Brahan would likely reduce the feasibility of constructing four houses on the site.

- e. **SETBACKS (HAYWOOD)** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new construction should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Where a variety of setbacks exist, the median setback of buildings should be used. The surrounding structures, many of which are not historic, feature varying setbacks. The applicant has noted setbacks on Haywood Avenue of 20' and 29' from the street within the historic district. The applicant has not indicated the proposed front setback for the buildings facing Haywood. Staff finds that a minimum setback of 20 feet from the street should be maintained along Haywood. The proposed house at the corner of Haywood and Brahan is generally consistent with the established setbacks on Haywood, however, the two proposed homes facing Haywood do not appear to be consistent with the established pattern.
- f. **BUILDING SPACING** – The applicant has not adequately assessed the appropriateness of the proposed building spacing. Houses on this block of Brahan feature predominately open yards with building spacing ranging from 10 to 59 feet historically. A minimum building spacing of 25 feet would be more appropriate. The applicant has not indicated building spacing between the two homes facing Brahan. The two homes facing Haywood feature a building spacing of approximately 5 feet which is not appropriate.
- g. **ORIENTATION** – As proposed, two homes are oriented to face Brahan, and another two homes are oriented to face Haywood. While two historic homes in the vicinity feature accessories that are accessed from Haywood, there is not an established pattern for primary residences facing Haywood.
- h. **SITE DESIGN** – The applicant has provided a conceptual site plan noting the locations of driveways, walkways, existing trees, proposed trees, fencing and open space. The applicant is proposing to avoid the addition of curb cuts on Brahan by providing vehicular access from Haywood and the rear alley. This is consistent with the historic development pattern of the block. Generally the proposed locations and design of site elements are appropriate.
- i. **WALKWAYS** – The applicant has proposed sidewalks to extend between the proposed new construction's front porches to the sidewalks at the public right of way. Staff finds that the profile and width of the proposed sidewalks and walkways should match those found historically in the district.
- j. **DRIVEWAYS** – The applicant has noted the installation of a driveway with access to the lot from Haywood and a driveway with access to the lot from the rear alley. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B. notes that new driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. Additionally, the Guidelines note that new curbcuts and driveways should not be added where they did not previously exist. While not historically found in the district, staff finds the proposed curbcut and driveway on Haywood appropriate; however, the initial approach should to exceed ten (10) feet in width.
- k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – At this time the applicant has provided staff with elevations noting proposed height, massing and architectural details. The applicant has provided two main conceptual design, Craftsman and Tudor. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to develop the proposed design to include architecturally appropriate proportions, façade arrangement and materials for future review by the HDRC.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the proposed site plan at this time. Staff recommends that the proposed site plan be revised to address the following:

- i. That the applicant dramatically increase the proposed setbacks from Brahan to be a minimum of 45 feet based on finding e.
- ii. A minimum setback of 20 feet from Haywood should be maintained in the proposal based on finding f.
- iii. A minimum spacing of 25 feet between the proposed homes should be maintained based on finding g.
- iv. With the recommended increased setbacks and building spacing, at least one of the homes facing Haywood should be eliminated from the proposal based on findings e through g. It would be most appropriate to eliminate both homes facing Haywood based on finding h.
- v. That the applicant develop sidewalks, walkways, and driveways to match those found historically in the district based on findings j and k.

Conceptual architectural designs are not approved at this time and will be submitted through a future application.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**31. HDRC NO. 2018-119**

**Applicant:** David Armendariz

**Address:** 120 CEDAR ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install solar panels on the roof of the primary historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 120 Cedar Street was constructed circa 1890 and features two stories in height, a stuccoed brick façade, five brick chimneys and both single and double height porches. This structure is first found on the 1896 Sanborn Map. The rear of this lot is adjacent to Bonham Elementary School.
- b. LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install forty (40) solar panels on the roof of the primary historic structure to be located on southern and western roof slopes. The applicant has proposed for the solar panels to be located in seven groupings. The Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i. notes that solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Staff finds the proposed placement of many of the grouping to be appropriate; however, two groupings that include a total of seven solar panels are located on front facing roof slopes and two groupings will be located on prominent roof slopes located in a forward position on side roofs. Additionally, a grouping of four panels is located above a side facing dormer high on the southern roof slope.
- c. LOCATION – Staff finds that the two groupings that are located on front facing roof slopes, the two groupings that are located on prominent roof slopes located in a forward position on side roofs and the grouping of four panels that is located above the side dormer should be relocated toward the rear of the structure. Additionally, staff finds that the grouping should be arranged in a manner to limit the overall number of groupings.

- d. PITCH – The applicant has not specified a proposed pitch for the panels; however, staff finds that the panels should be mounted flush with the roof to be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the groupings noted in finding b that are located in forward positions on the southern roof slope, those that are located on front facing roof slopes and the grouping of four panels above the southern dormer should be relocated to positions toward the rear of the structure to reduce visibility from the public right of way. Additionally, staff recommends that the grouping be arranged in a manner to limit the overall number of groupings.
- ii. That the proposed panels be mounted flush with the existing roof slopes and feature mounting equipment that is comparable in color and finish to the roof.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

**32. HDRC NO. 2017-484**

**Applicant:** Matthew Jones

**Address:** 1119 N PALMETTO

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Demolish the existing rear accessory structure.
2. Construct a new accessory structure at the rear of the property in the location of the existing structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 1119 N Palmetto was constructed circa 1920 in a minimal traditional style and first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. . The single-story structure has been subjected to many inappropriate modifications including window and door replacement, a large rear addition featuring sheet metal roofing and hardi-siding, a carport featuring corrugated metal siding and roof, a metal fence with a rolling gate, and a concrete-slab driveway.
- b. DEMOLITION OF PREVIOUS OUTBUIDLING – The previous accessory structure was located at the rear, southwest corner of the property and first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The one-story structure originally featured a standing seam metal roof and wood siding, similar to other accessory structures found within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff was not able to determine its condition or integrity prior to its demolition in late 2017.
- c. NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - In fall of 2017, a one-story rear accessory structure was demolished and replaced with a two-story structure featuring similar construction materials of hardi-siding and sheet metal roofing ITEM #32 prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- d. MASSING AND FORM – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i states that new garages and outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principle historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form. Staff finds that the two-story replacement of the one-story structure is not consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. **BUILDING SIZE** – The Guidelines for New Construction .5. B.ii states that new outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40 percent of the principal historic structure’s footprint. The proposed accessory structure features a footprint of approximately 360 square feet.
- f. **CHARACTER** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.iii states that new outbuildings 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 finds that the proposed horizontal hardi-siding and sheet metal does not relate to the original materials found on site.
- g. **WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.iv states that window and door openings are to be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings within the district or on the principal historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions. The proposed structure features a total of 3 windows (two on the side and one in the rear, all on the first floor) with an undisclosed configuration as well as a concealed barn door. Staff finds the existing window size similar to those of the primary structure’s double-hung windows. However, staff finds that the outbuilding overall lacks fenestration details similar to other accessory structures found in the district.
- h. **SETBACK AND ORIENTATION** – Staff finds that the structure has been appropriately setback from the rear and side property lines and oriented to face the street.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend the demolition of the previous one-story accessory structure based on finding b.

Staff does not recommend the construction of the new two-story structure based on findings c through g. Staff finds that the applicant should modify the request to become consistent with the Guidelines.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Lulu Francois spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to deny certificates of appropriateness.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

NOTE: Item #33 was moved to the consent agenda.

**34. HDRC NO. 2018-125**

**Applicant:** Andrew Wood/Go Smart Solar

**Address:** 407 E PARK AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 20-panel solar array on the south (front) facing side gable roof of 407 E Park Ave.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 407 E Park Ave is a 2-story single family structure constructed circa 1930 in the Colonial Revival style with Adam and Greek Revival influences. The home features a side gable configuration, two symmetrical brick chimneys, an asymmetrical 1-story porch with entablature, and a two-story wing with a porte-cochere and second story covered porch. The structure is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.
- b. LOCATION – The applicant is requesting approval to install 20 solar panels on the south, front facing side of the side gable roof. All 20 panels will be visible from the public right-of-way due to their placement. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i, solar collectors should be located on a side or rear roof pitch to the maximum extent possible. Staff does not find the proposed installation consistent with the Guidelines due to its high visibility from the public right-of-way.
- c. PITCH – The panels will be installed flush with the roof pitch. Staff finds the pitch consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant relocates the panels to the rear of the structure to significantly minimize the impact from the public right-of-way. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings reflecting these changes to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Lazarine to approve with staff stipulations. There was no second.

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

**AYES: Fish, Connor, Grube, Laffoon**

**NAYS: Lazarine, Bustamante**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- Approval of the February 21, 2018; March 2, 2018, and March 9, 2018, Historic and Design Review Commission Meeting minutes.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve meeting minutes.

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

**NAYS: None.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor to adjourn.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, 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 6:54 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino  
Chair