

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
17 January 2018**

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

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

ABSENT: Garza, Brittain, Kamal, Garcia

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - Viewsheds public input meeting – Monday, January 29, 6-8 PM at AIA San Antonio – 1344 S Flores

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-027 Establish the Legacy Business Program and the World Heritage Area Legacy Business Grant Pilot Program
- Item #2, Case No. 2017-550 213 SWEET
- Item #3, Case No. 2017-623 925 LAMAR ST
- Item #4, Case No. 2017-657 600 NAVARRO ST
- Item #5, Case No. 2017-658 200 W JONES AVE
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-001 537 E CRAIG PLACE
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-005 318 SADIE ST
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-008 733 E WOODLAWN
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-011 504 KING WILLIAM
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-012 923 E CROCKETT ST
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-016 1146 S ALAMO ST
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-017 630 MISSION ST
- Item #13, Case No.2018-002 13203 BLANCO RD/PHIL HARDBERGER PARK
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-022 825 N ST MARYS
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-021 611 HEMISFAIR BLVD
- Item #16, Case No. 2018-025 2125 W MISTLETOE
- Item #17, Case No. 2018-004 102 ALDER
- Item #18, Case No. 2018-019 1714 S ST MARYS

Items #1, #2, and #8 were pulled for citizens to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

RECUSALS: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2018-027

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation
World Heritage Office

Address: Establish the Legacy Business Program and the World Heritage Area Legacy Business Grant Pilot Program

REQUEST:

Applicant is requesting approval of the proposed Office of Historic Preservation Legacy Business Program and the World Heritage Area Legacy Business Grant Pilot Program.

FINDINGS:

The Office of Historic Preservation and World Heritage Office have collaborated on several work plan tasks and most recently have been working to develop programs to recognize, support and provide tools to legacy businesses.

World Heritage designation for the five San Antonio Missions will increase visitation and tourism spending, promote the history and culture of San Antonio, and create jobs and small business opportunities. In order to prepare for this increased activity and to maximize benefits, input from the community was used to prepare the World Heritage Work Plan. The World Heritage Office is responsible for implementing, coordinating and managing this work plan, which identifies specific tasks and deliverables for the following categories: management and oversight, infrastructure, wayfinding, transportation, beautification, economic development, land use, and marketing and outreach.

The Office of Historic Preservation will launch a city-wide Legacy Business Program as part of the ScoutSA initiative. The program will acknowledge long-lived San Antonio businesses as an important historic asset to the city and work to preserve the city's Legacy Businesses through a registry and campaigns that identify, promote, and markets the businesses. To qualify for the registry, businesses must be 20 years or older and contribute to the history, culture, and authentic identity of San Antonio. In return for acknowledgement as a Legacy Business, businesses will agree to perpetuate the business, its historic name and the historic service it provides. In addition to being listed online and in print and receiving a window decal, registered businesses will receive marketing and promotion opportunities. The Legacy Business Registry is open to businesses city-wide and will be administered by the Office of Historic Preservation.

Legacy Businesses listed on the registry that are located in the World Heritage Area, specifically within the World Heritage Buffer Zone or a two mile radius of Missions Concepcion, San Jose, San Juan and Espada will be eligible for a pilot program administered through the World Heritage Office. The World Heritage Area Legacy Business Grant Pilot Program will provide eligible businesses with façade, signage, parking lot and landscape improvement matching grants, opportunities for low interest building interior infrastructure improvement loans and access to capacity building programs geared towards sustaining and growing their businesses. Additionally, businesses through partner agencies will receive special recognition on the World Heritage mobile responsive website (www.worldheritagesa.com) which connects visitors to area businesses, as well as the benefits mentioned previously to being included as part of the city-wide registry.

World Heritage designation can be a catalyst for socio-economic for South Central San Antonio, if leverage effectively. The greatest impact will come from increased visitation and tourism spending. In order to benefit from this increase in visitation, the need to preserve legacy businesses by identifying, promoting and providing financial and capacity building assistance was identified as a critical component of the World Heritage Work Plan.

Funding for the World Heritage Area Legacy Business Grant Pilot Program is available from the ICIF Fund.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Brady Alexander spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

2. HDRC NO. 2017-550

Applicant: Sylvia Trevino

Address: 213 SWEET

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a two story, rear addition to the historic structure located at 213 Sweet Street in the Nathan Historic District.
2. Demolish an existing, rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 213 Sweet Street was constructed circa 1910 and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features Folk Victorian architectural elements including a side gabled roof and a shallow hipped porch roof. The applicant has proposed to construct a two story, rear addition to feature a footprint of 503 square feet. The historic structure features a footprint of 738 square feet.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This case was originally heard at the November 15, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. At that meeting, the DRC noted that there was no concern regarding the proposed rear addition.
- c. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The lot at 213 Sweet features a rear accessory structure, which in its current location matches the location of an accessory structure found on the 1952 Sanborn Map. The applicant has proposed to demolish this rear structure. The structure features materials that are historic to the district such as wood board and batten siding and an original standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the structure to be contributing to the site and does not recommend approval of its removal.
- d. 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 width that is subordinate to that of the historic structure and insets on both sides. As noted in finding a, the rear addition is to feature two stories with an overall height that exceeds that of the historic structure by approximately five (5) feet.
- e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof facing Sweet Street, complementary of that of the historic structure’s porch and a rear gabled roof facing the rear alley. Staff finds the overall proportion and form of both roof forms to be architecturally appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines 1.A.
- f. TRANSITION – The Guidelines note that all additions should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed transitions that include insets from the wall planes of the historic structure and variations in siding materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- g. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that features a footprint that is 68 percent of the footprint of the historic structure and features two stories whereas the historic structure only features one. While the proposed footprint and height are not consistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that application documents provided by the applicant such as perspectives note that the proposed addition will not necessarily overwhelm the historic structure. The applicant has updated the proposed design to feature a clear separation between the roof structure of the primary historic structure and the massing of the proposed addition. Staff finds this appropriate.

- h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include a standing seam metal roof, fiber cement lap siding, fiber cement shingle siding, fiberglass doors, and two over two windows of which a material has not been specified. The proposed siding should feature a smooth finish and a four inch profile. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a galvalume finish.
- i. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant at this time has not specified window materials. 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.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings b through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That the fiber cement siding feature a smooth finish and a four inch profile and that the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a galvalume finish.
- ii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- iii. That every attempt be made to preserve the historic accessory in place. If the HDRC approves its removal, then the materials should be salvaged and reused where possible.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiantz (SACS) spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Vice Chair Bustamante to approve.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

8. HDRC NO. 2018-008

Applicant: Jim Poteet, FAIA/Poteet Architects, LP

Address: 733 E WOODLAWN

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a one car yellow pine carport and board and batten storage structure at the rear of the property. The footprint of the enclosed structure will measure approximately 145 square feet.
2. Install a concrete pad in front of the proposed carport structure to measure approximately 400 square feet.
3. Widen the existing 7’-0” wide solid concrete driveway by 1 foot to match the new 8’-0” wide approach. No changes to the existing ribbon driveway towards the rear of the property are proposed at this time.
4. Install a new 4’-0” wide concrete walkway from the driveway to the front porch.

5. Construct a 7'-6" tall wooden fence between the carport and the existing historic structure. The fence is proposed to be located 16'-6" from the east property line.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 733 E Woodlawn is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1930 in the Craftsman style. The structure features a cross gable configuration with wide overhanging eaves, asymmetrical front porch with decorative brackets, and several paired one over one wood windows. The home is a contributing structure to the River Road Historic District.
- b. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new accessory structure at the northeast corner of the lot. The footprint of the enclosed shed structure will measure 10'-11" by 13'-5" for a total coverage of approximately 145 square feet. The footprint of the open trellis structure measures 20'-2 ½" by 13'-5". The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan, visually subordinate to the primary structure, and similar to historic patterns in the district. The location of the proposed structure is reflective of the historic development pattern of the district and the structure is visually subordinate to the primary house. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – Guidelines 5.B.i and 5.B.ii for new construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation and setbacks common in the district. Staff finds the setbacks and orientation consistent with the development pattern of the district; however, the structure has a setback of approximately 3 feet from the side property line as indicated by the submitted drawings. The applicant may be required to obtain a variance.
- d. SCALE – The proposed accessory structure is 1-story in height. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Staff finds a 1-story structure consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. WINDOWS AND DOORS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines and OHP Window Policy Document, openings in new construction should use traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. The applicant has proposed door openings that are consistent with the proportions and configurations found in the district. The applicant has indicated has not yet indicated a material for the doors. Staff finds the proposal appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- f. ROOF FORM – The proposed accessory structure will utilize a shed roof form and sheet metal as a material. Shed roof forms are not uncommon for rear accessory structures in the River Road Historic District, and several historic accessory structures feature metal roofs. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- g. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to use board and batten siding on the storage structure and treated wood columns and joists. Staff finds this proposal generally consistent and appropriate.
- h. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Guidelines, 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. Modern materials should be implemented in a way that does not distract from the historic structure. The board and batten materiality of the storage shed component are modern interpretations of traditional envelope detailing. The columns are 6x6" with 3x6" joists, which are appropriate dimensions. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. REAR CONCRETE PAD – The applicant has proposed to install a new concrete car pad in front of the proposed carport structure. The pad will measure 20'-2 ½" by 13'-5" for a total square footage of approximately 400 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, changes in topography resulting from new elements, like driveways and walkways, should be minimized through appropriate siting and design. New site elements should work with, rather than change, character-defining topography when possible. The proposed concrete pad is located towards the rear of the property and does not significantly remove existing groundcover. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to widen the existing 7'-0" solid concrete driveway to a width of 8'-0". The applicant has stated that this added foot will be added to match the width of the new apron. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, historic driveways were traditionally no wider than 10'-0". The proposal does not affect the existing ribbons towards the rear of the lot. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. NEW WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a new concrete walkway to measure 4'-0" in width. The walkway will connect the driveway to the existing front porch pad. The width matches that of the existing concrete walkway leading from the porch to the sidewalk. The new walkway does not alter

character-defining topography and does not adversely alter the streetscape. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

1. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install a 7’-6” tall fence with gates approximately 16’-6” off the northeast property line. The fence will be constructed of horizontal treated wood boards. The fence will not be located on a property line and will be internal to the lot. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given the location on the property. The applicant should coordinate review with the Zoning department to ensure that the fencing complies with any permitting regulations.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the new rear accessory structure, hardscaping, and fencing based on findings a through m with the following stipulations:

- i. That the board and batten siding features boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- ii. That the applicant installs wood doors to comply with the Historic Design Guidelines. A final product specification must be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- iii. That the applicant complies with all setback requirements as required by Zoning and obtains a variance from the Board of Adjustment, if applicable.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Steve Scobe spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2017-656

Applicant: Suzan Lambillotte

Address: 511 MISSION ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove the existing front concrete walkway and install brick pavers.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 511 Mission Street was constructed circa 1915 and features traditional architectural elements including front and side gabled roofs, a double height brick chimney and extended rafter ends. At this time, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing, concrete front yard sidewalk and install pavers in a herringbone pattern. A number of other site modifications have been previously approved administratively. These items include the installation of numerous planting beds with native plants, xeric walkways, paver edging and paver borders for front yard planting areas.
- b. SIDEWALK MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, concrete front yard sidewalk and replace with pavers in a herringbone pattern, modifying both the materials and profile of the existing walkway. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.i. historic sidewalks and walkways should be repaired and retained in place. The applicant’s proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on finding b. Staff recommends the existing, concrete sidewalk be retained in place.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

RECUSALS: Guarino.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Lazarine left meeting after Item #19 was heard.

20. HDRC NO. 2018-006

Applicant: Albert Encinia

Address: 16 LEDGE LANE

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a new carport with a footprint measuring approximately 300 square feet.
2. Install a new concrete driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 16 Ledge Lane is 1-story single family home constructed in 1940 in the Colonial Revival style. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a carport at the southwestern edge of the property. The overall footprint of the structure is approximately 25’-0” by 12’-0” for a total of 300 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – The applicant has proposed to orient the new accessory structure at an angle towards the street. Guidelines 5.B.i and 5.B.ii for new construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation and setbacks common in the district. While this lot features an irregular shape, staff generally finds the proposal for orientation consistent with the Guidelines. The rear setback also appears to be consistent with historic precedents in the Monte Vista Historic District, but the drawings indicate the setbacks as approximate. The applicant is responsible for complying with all zoning setback standards and filing for a variance with the Board of Adjustment if applicable.
- d. SCALE AND MASS – The applicant has proposed a 1-story carport with a hipped roof. However, the submitted documents do not indicate a definitive height and are void of any dimensions. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings and rear accessory structures. Generally, staff finds the concept of a 1-story carport appropriate for the site. However, final documents with dimensions are required.
- e. ROOF – The proposed carport will feature a hipped roof form with composition shingles to match the primary historic structure. Staff finds this proposal conceptually appropriate.
- f. MATERIALS – The proposed carport structure will feature six simple wood posts according to the submitted documents. Staff finds the proposal conceptually appropriate, but there is no information regarding the width, color, or finish of the posts.
- g. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, new buildings in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Architectural details should also not

visually compete with the historic structure. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines, but requires additional documentation to make a final assessment.

- h. **NEW DRIVEWAY** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new concrete driveway that will branch off from an existing concrete driveway and pad. The new driveway will angle towards the southwestern edge of the property. The proposed width is twelve feet. The location appears to cut through several existing trees, which are not indicated on the site plan. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, changes in topography resulting from new elements, like driveways, should be minimized through appropriate siting and design. New site elements should work with, rather than change, character-defining topography when possible. New driveways should also follow historic precedents. This street is unique relative to many others in the Monte Vista Historic District, as it features a steep slope and driveway aprons that are significantly wider than 10 feet in width. The lot is also irregularly shaped. The driveway addition will not bring the total impervious coverage of the lot to over 50%. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given these site and context-specific considerations.

RECOMMENDATION:

Sufficient documentation for final approval has not been provided to staff at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits final drawings that indicate all dimensions to staff for review and approval. Drawings should include a floor plan, elevations, and roof plan. Dimensions should include the height, width, and length of the structure, as well as the width and height of the proposed structural columns.
- ii. That the applicant submits final material specifications for staff review and approval. Specifications should include the wooden post color and finish.
- iii. That the applicant consults with the City Arborist’s office regarding any trees that may be removed for the driveway. If any of the trees are identified as heritage, they must be retained and a modified proposal must be submitted for review and approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

21. HDRC NO. 2018-009

Applicant: Michael Casas

Address: 314 W HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace approximately 27 existing wood windows with new Renewal by Andersen composite wood fiber and PVC polymer windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 314 W Huisache Ave is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1930 in the Colonial Revival style with Tudor influences. The home features a brick façade with cream colored mortar joints, a side gable configuration with two front gables, an arched entryway with cast stone keystones, and ganged one over one wood windows. The home is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace approximately 27 existing one over one wood windows with new one over one composite wood fiber and PVC polymer windows.
- b. **EXISTING WINDOWS: CONDITON** – The applicant provided several photographs of the existing windows taken from both inside and outside the home. Many of the windows feature exterior wood screens which have helped protect the window assemblies from ample sun exposure and other environmental factors. The applicant has noted that some of the windows are not operable, have broken or missing pulley cords, and are drafty. Based on the photographic evidence provided, staff finds that the windows are in good condition and are fully repairable.
- c. **EXISTING WINDOWS: ENERGY EFFICIENCY** – The applicant has expressed concern to staff regarding the need to improve the energy efficiency of the house. However, in most cases, windows only

account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a house. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. The original windows feature single-pane glass which is subject to radiant heat transfer. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows, and thermal shades. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. In most cases, windows may also be retrofitted with new glass. In general, staff encourages the repair of historic wood windows. A wood window that is maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan and cannot be repaired once they fail.

- d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. As noted in finding b, staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood windows in place. If there are assemblies that are deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant must submit evidence to that effect to staff in the form of a window schedule and photographs. If an assembly is deemed deteriorated beyond repair by staff, staff recommends that new windows meet the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs double-hung, one-over-one wood windows to match the existing configuration as closely as possible. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. The final specification should be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2018-020

Applicant: Gasper Rivera/Poma Properties, LLC

Address: 1839 E HOUSTON ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work including wood siding repair, painting, the removal security bars, roof replacement and foundation repair.
2. Install a new Hardi board foundation skirting.
3. Replace the existing concrete porch steps with wood porch steps.
4. Repair existing wood windows and replace windows in kind that are beyond repair.
5. Install new porch columns.
6. Remove the existing fencing on site and construct a new rear privacy fence.

7. Install a driveway at the rear of the historic structure on Goodloe Alley.
8. Remove an original front porch door opening.
9. Construct a rear addition with a side deck.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 1839 E Houston was constructed circa 1920 and features Folk Victorian architectural elements. The historic structure features a front facing gabled roof, a protruding window bay and decorative cedar shingles on the protruding window bay. At this time, the applicant has proposed exterior modifications, rehabilitation and the construction of a rear addition.
- b. REHABILITATION – The applicant has proposed to perform rehabilitative scopes of work that include siding restoration, the removal of existing window security bars, replace the existing shingle roof, foundation repair and painting. The proposed rehabilitative scopes of work are proposed to be done in kind. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. FOUNDATION SKIRTING – The historic structure currently features foundation skirting that consists of plywood. The applicant has proposed to replace this non-original skirting with Hardi skirting. Per the construction documents, the applicant has not proposed a specific profile for the skirting. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.i., replacement skirting should match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. Staff finds that the skirting should feature an exposure that matches that of the historic siding of the historic structure.
- d. STEP REPLACEMENT – The existing front porch steps are concrete and are not original to the historic structure. The applicant has proposed to remove these steps and construct wood steps in their place. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance 7.B.v. replacement porch elements should be based on the architecture style of the structure. A 1994 survey photo notes steps that feature the approximate width proposed by the applicant. Staff finds this step installation appropriate.
- e. WINDOW REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to repair all existing wood windows. Where wood windows are beyond repair, the applicant has proposed to replace with JELD-WEN wood windows. Staff finds that the applicant should make every attempt to restore all existing wood windows; particularly those with decorative patterns including the existing transom window. Prior to any window replacement, the applicant must identify windows that are beyond repair. The applicant should complete the wood window survey and original window/replacement window comparison sheets found in the Window Policy Document, included in staff's exhibits. All replacement wood windows should match the profile and installation of original windows.
- f. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to install new wood replacement columns; however, has not provided specifics to the design of the columns. A 1994 survey photo notes round Tuscan order columns. Staff finds that wood, Tuscan order columns should be installed to be comparable to those shown in previous photos.
- g. FRONT DOOR REMOVAL – This historic structure features both a street facing and side yard facing front door. The applicant has proposed to remove the street facing door and install a window opening in its place. Two front doors is vernacular to San Antonio, particularly the Folk Victorian style. Staff finds that both openings should be preserved from the exterior to appear as doors.
- h. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing front yard fencing and construct a wood privacy fence. The proposed privacy fence is to be set back from the front facades of the historic structure. Staff finds the proposed fencing appropriate; however, the fence shall not exceed six (6) feet in height at any location.
- i. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a driveway at the rear of the historic structure to feature access to Goodloe Alley at the location of an existing, informal driveway. Staff finds this location appropriate; however, the width should not exceed ten (10) feet per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i.
- j. ADDITION – At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature approximately 340 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a rear addition that is to feature a ridge line that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure's, feature an east facing shed roof and feature board and batten siding to differentiate it from the primary historic structure. Staff finds neither the proposed roof form nor the proposed siding material to be consistent with the Guidelines.

- k. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that features a footprint and height that is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds the proposed roof to be inappropriate for a historic structure featuring gabled and hipped roofs.
- l. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include a shingled roof, board and batten siding, JELD-WEN wood windows, a wood deck and a Craftsman 6 lited stained mahogany door. Staff finds the proposed roofing material for the rear addition to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the use of board and batten siding is not appropriate. The installation of a Craftsman style door with a shelf is not appropriate for an addition to a Folk Victorian historic structure.
- m. WINDOWS – As noted in finding k, the applicant has proposed JELD-WEN wood windows. The proposed wood windows should feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding i, the proposed shed roof is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a rear facing gabled or hipped roof would be appropriate. Staff finds that horizontal wood siding that matches the profile of that of the primary historic structure as well as a transition between the historic structure and rear addition should be incorporated.
- o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (FENESTRATION) – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature window openings that feature tradition proportions as well as those that feature contemporary proportions. Staff finds that all window opening should relate to those of the primary historic structure, as noted in the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i.
- p. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The applicant has not requested Historic Tax Certification at this time. Staff encourages the applicant to explore the local tax exemption for substantial rehabilitation which provides a ten year tax incentive.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1.-3. Staff recommends approval of item #1 through #3 based on findings b through d with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant repair all items in kind to match the original.
 - ii. That the foundation skirting featuring an exposure to match that of the siding of the historic structure.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the repair of all existing wood windows based on finding e. Prior to any window replacement, the applicant must identify windows that are beyond repair. The applicant should complete the wood window survey and original window/replacement window comparison sheets found in the Window Policy Document, included in staff’s exhibits. All replacement wood windows should match the profile and installation of original windows.
- 6. Staff recommends approval of item #5, the installation of new porch columns with the stipulation that the columns be of the Tuscan order and be comparable to those found in the 1994 survey photo.
- 7. Staff recommends approval of item #6, fencing, with the stipulation that the privacy fence not exceed six (6) feet in height at any location.
- 8. Staff recommends approval of item #7, driveway installation, with the stipulation that the driveway not exceed ten (10) feet in width. Concrete, gravel or decomposed granite is appropriate.
- 9. Staff does not recommend approval of item #8, the removal of the street facing front door based on finding g. Staff recommends the door be preserved as it exists.
- 10. Staff does not recommend approval of item #9, the construction of a rear addition. Staff recommends the applicant address inconsistencies in the design as noted in findings j, l, n and o.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve items #1-8 with staff stipulations and to refer item #9 to DRC.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2017-552

Applicant: Janos Varga

Address: 211 NELSON AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing wood and aluminum windows with new vinyl windows.
2. Construct a rear addition to feature 424 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 211 Nelson was constructed circa 1930 and features craftsman architectural elements. The structure is contributing to the Knob Hill Historic District. At this time, the applicant has proposed to replace the existing windows and construct a rear addition.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace eleven total windows with new, vinyl windows. The windows are currently a mix of aluminum windows and original wood windows. Per application photos, some of the existing wood windows are in extreme disrepair and are missing elements; however, some wood windows appear to be in repairable condition. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.ii. historic windows should be preserved.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT - Prior to any window replacement, the applicant must identify windows that are beyond repair. The applicant should complete the wood window survey and original window/replacement window comparison sheets found in the Window Policy Document, included in staff's exhibits. All replacement wood windows should match the profile, material and installation of original windows.
- d. REAR ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed the addition in a manner where it will be located at the rear of the primary historic structure. The applicant has noted that the rear addition's roof will feature a rear gable and tie in to the primary historic structure's side gable. Generally, staff find this appropriate; however, inaccuracies in the provided construction documents prevent staff from recommending approval at this time.
- e. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed siding to match that of the primary historic structure, vinyl windows and an asphalt shingle roof. Staff finds the proposed siding and roofing materials to be appropriate; however, the applicant should install wood windows to match those of the primary historic structure in profile, installation and material.
- f. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding c, the applicant's construction document do not accurately represent current site conditions. The proposed rear addition should feature a transition between the primary historic structure and the proposed addition. This can be accomplished through a wall inset of vertical trim piece.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, wood window replacement based on findings b and c. The applicant should complete the wood window survey and original window/replacement window comparison sheets found in the Window Policy Document, included in staff's exhibits. All replacement wood windows should match the profile, material and installation of original windows.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the construction of a rear addition based on findings d through f. While staff finds the construction of a rear addition to be appropriate at this location, inaccuracies in the construction documents should be addressed prior to receiving a recommendation for approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

24. HDRC NO. 2018-024

Applicant: Christopher Gill/CGRE LTC CO

Address: 116 BUFORD

REQUEST:

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

1. Amend the previously approved front porch columns.
2. Amend the previously approved front porch decorative elements including spindle work.
3. Amend the previously approved rear addition's fenestration pattern and massing to include roof form and the construction of a side deck.
4. Install front yard fencing.
5. Install a decomposed granite and concrete paver walkway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 116 Buford Alley was constructed circa 1920 and features Folk Victorian elements including a front and side gabled roof and spindled wall columns.
- b. At the March 1, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received approval to install new spindled porch columns, perform rehabilitative scopes of work, construct a rear addition to feature approximately 600 square feet and receive Historic Tax Certification with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant install a vertical trim piece to separate the primary historic structure from the addition.
 - ii. That the applicant provide corrected construction documents to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness that include the correct dimensions, locations and detailing for all proposed scopes of work.
 - iii. That the applicant repair and preserve all existing original materials including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements.
- c. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to amend the design of previously installed items and the constructed rear addition.
- d. **PORCH COLUMNS** – The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new wood, spindled columns that were to match the existing half wall columns that remained on the historic structure. The profile of the columns that were installed feature an architecturally inappropriate width and are not consistent with those approved by the HDRC. Staff finds that columns that are consistent with the profile of those approved by the HDRC should be installed.
- e. **SPINDLE WORK** – The applicant has installed square elements to mimic Victorian spindle work found on many Folk Victorian and Queen Anne historic structure. Staff does not find this installation to be appropriate. Staff finds that architecturally appropriate spindle work be installed to match that found in a 1994 survey photo, included in the staff exhibits.
- f. **REAR ADDITION** – The rear addition was constructed inconsistently with the previously approved design. Window and door openings, roof form, a side deck and door canopy have been identified as being

inconsistent with the previously approved design. Generally, the constructed addition, including roof form and window and door locations is appropriate. Staff finds that the side deck should feature wood or Hardi skirting. Metal foundation skirting is not an appropriate foundation skirting material for the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

- g. FENCING – The applicant has proposed front yard fencing prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The front yard fence features four by four wood fence posts with wide horizontal pickets. This is not an appropriate front yard fence for the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the fence should be removed.
- h. WALKWAY – The applicant has installed a front yard walkway consisting of decomposed granite and concrete pavers. The historic pattern on Buford as well as throughout the Dinowity Hill Historic District is for the installation of concrete walkways. Staff does not find the installed walkway to be appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines for Site ELEMENTS 5.a.ii.
- i. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – This property will not be eligible for Historic Tax Verification until the above noted request items are corrected per staff’s recommendation or receive approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the amendment to the previously approved front porch columns based on finding d. Staff recommends the installed columns be removed and columns that match the profile of the original wall column be installed.
- 2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the installation of architecturally inappropriate decorative porch elements based on finding e. Staff recommends the applicant install porch elements that are consistent with those historically found on the house, noted in the 1994 survey photo in staff’s exhibits.
- 3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, modifications to the rear addition with the following stipulation:
 - i. That wood or Hardi foundation skirting be installed on the side deck.
- 4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the installation of a front yard fence based on finding g. Staff finds that the fence should be removed. The applicant may return to the HDRC with an appropriate fencing proposal.
- 5. Staff recommends the decomposed granite and concrete paver walkway be replaced with a concrete walkway not to exceed three feet in width based on finding h.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny items #1, 2, and 4, and approve items #3 and 5 with staff stipulations.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2018-023

Applicant: Christopher Gill/CGRE LTD CO

Address: 121 BUFORD

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Demolish an original brick chimney.
- 2. Amend the previously approved rear addition to include changes in fenestration patterns, roof form, siding profile and the construction of a side porch.
- 3. Install front yard fencing.

4. Install a decomposed granite and concrete paver walkway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 121 Buford Alley was constructed circa 1930 and feature traditional architectural elements including a recessed front porch, a side gabled roof and small Craftsman elements including roof brackets and exposed rafter tails.
- b. At the March 1, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant received approval to rehabilitate the historic structure including repair to wood windows and architectural elements, construct a rear addition of approximately 500 square feet and received Historic Tax Certification with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant install wood windows and wood doors throughout the addition. The wood windows should feature a profile that matches those of the primary historic structure.
 - ii. That the applicant repair and preserve all existing original materials including wood siding, wood trim, wood windows, wood doors and any other original architectural elements.
- c. CHIMNEY DEMOLITION – The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of an original brick chimney. The applicant has noted that the chimney collapsed during foundation repair. Neither a Certificate of Appropriateness nor a permit from Development Services Department was issued for foundation repair. Staff finds that the chimney should be reconstructed per photos.
- d. REAR ADDITION – The rear addition was constructed inconsistently with the previously approved design. Window and door openings, roof form, a side deck and door canopy and siding installation have been identified as being inconsistent with the previously approved design.
- e. REAR ADDITION – Staff generally finds the constructed window and door openings to be appropriate as well as the constructed roof form. On the east façade of the addition, the applicant has constructed a side porch deck and door canopy, neither of which was included in the previously approved design. Generally, staff finds these installations appropriate; however, the applicant has installed a metal foundation skirting. Staff finds that the side deck should feature wood or Hardi skirting. Metal foundation skirting is not an appropriate foundation skirting material for the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- f. REAR ADDITION SIDING – The previously approved construction documents noted the rear addition featuring wood siding to match the profile of that of the primary historic structure. The applicant has installed wood siding that features an exposure that is nearly triple that of the primary historic structure’s siding. Staff finds this inappropriate.
- g. FENCING –The applicant has proposed front yard fencing prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. The front yard fence features four by four wood fence posts with wide horizontal pickets. This is not an appropriate front yard fence for the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that the fence should be removed.
- h. WALKWAY – The applicant has installed a front yard walkway consisting of decomposed granite and concrete pavers. The historic pattern on Buford as well as throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District is for the installation of concrete walkways. A photo from March 2011 notes the original front walkway of concrete. Staff does not find the installed walkway to be appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines for Site ELEMENTS 5.a.ii.
- i. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – This property will not be eligible for Historic Tax Verification until the above noted request items are corrected per staff’s recommendation or receive approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the demolition of an original brick chimney based on finding c. Staff recommends the applicant reconstruct the chimney per photos.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, amendments to the rear addition, based on findings d through f with the following stipulations:
 - i. That wood or Hardi foundation skirting be installed on the side deck.
 - ii. That the installed HVAC unit be screened with shrubbery or another screening element.
 - iii. That wood siding that matches the profile of that found on the historic structure is installed.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the front yard fence based on finding j. Staff recommends that the fence be removed. The applicant may return to the HDRC with an appropriate fencing proposal.

4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the front yard sidewalk based on finding g. Staff recommends the decomposed granite and concrete paver walkway be replaced with a concrete walkway not to exceed three feet in width based on finding h.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2018-026

Applicant: Christopher Gill/CGRE LTD CO

Address: 1830 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Amend the previously approved rear addition's fenestration pattern and massing to include roof form and the construction of a hot water heater closer.
2. Install two, architecturally inappropriate windows.
3. Install a front door and address numbers.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 1830 N Pine was constructed circa 1925 and features traditional architectural elements with Craftsman influence. The applicant received a Historic and Design Review Commission Certificate of Appropriateness at the December 21, 2016, HDRC hearing for the rehabilitation of the historic structure and the construction of a rear addition with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed windows for the addition.
 - ii. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed new doors.
 - iii. That the applicant retain the original architectural elements including both front porch doors, the existing front porch columns, the flared foundation skirting, the original windows and that the existing wood siding be repaired.
- b. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to amend the design of the previously constructed addition as well as retain the inappropriate windows.
- c. **WINDOWS** – The applicant has installed two windows into the historic structure that do not feature appropriate sashes, meeting rails, frames or profiles. The windows are composed of 2x4 dimensional lumber, wood trim and glass. The applicant has proposed to retain these two elements. Staff finds the installed elements to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that salvaged wood windows that feature an appropriate profile and operable sashes should be installed.
- d. **REAR ADDITION** – The rear addition was constructed inconsistently with the previously approved design. Window and door openings, roof form and a hot water heater closet have been identified as being inconsistent with the previously approved design. While inconsistent with the previously approved design, staff finds these elements to be generally appropriate.
- e. **FRONT DOOR & ADDRESS NUMBERS** – The applicant has installed a front door and address numbers without approval. While the address numbers are atypical with those found historically in the district, staff finds the installation of both elements to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition as constructed based on finding d.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of the installed inappropriate windows based on finding c. Staff recommends that salvaged wood windows that feature an appropriate profile and operable sashes should be installed.
3. Staff recommends approval of the installed door and address numbers based on finding e.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve items #1 and 3 and deny item #2.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2017-513

Applicant: Ariela Anelli

Address: 1830 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 1830 N Pine.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 1830 N Pine, located within the Government Hill Historic District.
- b. Scopes of work have been completed including wood siding repair, porch repair, wood window repair, roof repair and foundation repair; however, scopes of work were completed that were not consistent with prior Certificates of Appropriateness including the construction of a rear addition, front door installation and the installation of two inappropriate windows.
- c. With the approval of the previously non-compliant work, the property would become eligible to receive Historic Tax Verification. The request for approval of the non-compliant work is listed on the Historic and Design Review Commission Agenda for January 17, 2018.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Verification based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the two inappropriate windows are replaced with salvaged wood windows and that the rear addition, front door and front address letters receive approval from the Commission.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2018-006

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

Address: 527 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition.
2. Construct a new front porch with an ADA accessible ramp.
3. Modify the existing fenestration.
4. Widen the existing curb cut to accommodate a new driveway.
5. Install one parking space in the front yard.
6. Install a retaining wall, walkway, and landscaping buffer in the front yard.
7. Install a new sidewalk to match the existing sidewalk configuration and materiality in the district.
8. Install a concrete pad in the rear of the lot to accommodate four parking spaces.

FINDINGS:

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

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

- d. MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The proposed addition approximately doubles the size of the primary structure, which measures a total of 1593 square feet. However, the historic structure has a small footprint relative to other historic homes in the area. Historic homes designed in the Craftsman style feature larger footprints in Monte Vista. Additionally, both the east and west elevations are set back from the historic structure, with the east elevation set back significantly. Staff recommends approval based on the context-specific considerations of the lot and the district.
- e. ROOF – The existing rear elevation of the historic primary structure features a gable roof. The proposed addition features a single gable, is 1-story in height, and is slightly shorter than the existing structure’s roofline. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof

- pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. ROOF MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install a new composition shingle roof on the addition to match the existing composition shingle roof on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
 - g. WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL – The proposed addition will require the removal of two existing casement windows and two aluminum sliding glass doors. The applicant is also proposing to remove three existing windows and one door on the west elevation and install a new window. Guideline 3.C.i in the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions encourages the salvage and reuse of historic materials, where possible, including those that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition. Staff recommends that the applicant provides photographs of the condition of the windows to be removed to staff to determine the feasibility of their restoration.
 - h. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS – The applicant has proposed door and window proportions on the rear addition that are generally consistent with proportions on the primary structure and those found within the district. However, the size, configuration, and material are not definitively indicated in the application.
 - i. MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The existing structure features vinyl lap siding with a wide exposed profile of approximately 12 inches. The applicant has proposed to remove these siding and install lap fiber cement siding on both the existing structure and the addition. Vinyl is a prohibited material in historic districts. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate, but finds that smooth boards and an exposure of no more than 8 inches should be used.
 - j. TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW – The proposed addition will be inset on the west façade from the historic structure by approximately two feet. On the east façade, the structure will be inset by approximately 10 feet. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The proposal meets this Guideline.
 - k. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has not indicated the location of new mechanical equipment in the submitted drawings, but has stated that they will be located on the east façade of the rear addition towards the back of the lot. The applicant is responsible for providing this information, including screening method, on all appropriate documents for final approval.
 - l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition keeps with the Craftsman style of the historic home without detracting from its significance. Staff finds the proposed addition's architectural details generally consistent with the Guidelines.
 - m. FRONT PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch. The front façade currently contains two small shed awnings above each door, which will be preserved. The proposal will add a new shed awning that spans between the two existing awnings. The new awning will extend approximately double the width of the existing awnings to engage the streetscape and create a true covered porch condition. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements, including stairs and related elements, should be simple and not distract from the historic character of the building and should be architecturally appropriate for the home. Historic examples on the block that contain wide porches incorporate alternate roof forms, such as a simple shed or hip, or exhibit roof proportions that mimic the primary gable. Staff finds the porch to be conceptually consistent.
 - n. FRONT ADA RAMP – The applicant has proposed to install a new ADA accessible ramp on the front façade of the existing structure. The ramp will be covered by the proposed porch and will be located on the eastern edge of the structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the preferred location of new ramps on a residential structure is at the side or rear of the building when convenient for the user. Staff finds that the location as presented is not appropriate for the historic structure or the existing streetscape.

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

- o. FRONT PARKING PAD – The applicant has proposed to install a new parking pad in the front yard of the property. The parking is intended to provide a drop off space for residents or visitors as well as a greater ease of access to a new ADA-accessible entrance. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, offstreet parking areas within the front yard setback should be avoided as to not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape. Off-street parking areas should be designed to be accessed from alleys or secondary streets rather than principal streets wherever possible. Additionally, the preferred location of new

ramps or accessible entrances is at the side or rear of the building. New entrances should be as visually unobtrusive as possible, especially if visible from the public right-of-way. Grade changes should be minor if required. The existing context of the designated part of E Huisache is primarily single family homes with side driveways and parking on the side or rear. The proposal is a significant departure from the character of the streetscape. Additionally, there is alley access from the rear of the lot. Staff does not find the proposed front parking solution consistent with the Guidelines and finds that the applicant should explore alternative solutions that utilize the rear alley or relocate the ADA accessible parking spot towards the rear of the lot.

- p. CURB CUT AND DRIVEWAY EXPANSION – The applicant has proposed to widen the existing ribbon driveway curb cut to accommodate a wider driveway. The driveway will provide access to the proposed front parking pad. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic driveways were typically no larger than 10 feet in width. The Guidelines also state that new curb cuts should not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape and should follow the driveway development pattern that characterizes the street and the district. The proposed curb cut and driveway modifications are a significant departure from residential front yard configurations in the Monte Vista Historic District. There is no evidence of a curb cut of the proposed width in the district. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- q. RETAINING WALL, WALKWAY, AND LANDSCAPING – The front yard modifications for the proposed parking pad will require a retaining wall. The proposal also includes a front walkway and a landscape buffer. While retaining walls are historically present on this portion of E Huisache due to the slope of the street, staff has not seen an existing and proposed section or alternative information that demonstrates how much the height of the existing landscaping will be modified, nor how the proposed grading will affect the streetscape or drainage of neighboring properties. Staff has also not seen an elevation or similar document that conveys how tall the proposed landscaping buffer will be or how effectively the proposed buffer would conceal a parked car from the public right-of-way.
- r. REAR PARKING PAD – The applicant has proposed to install a rear concrete parking pad to accommodate four cars. The parking pad will be directly adjacent to the existing alley and will extend to the existing ribbon driveway. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, off street parking should be located at the side or rear of a structure whenever possible. There is also evidence of existing parking pads along the alley. Staff finds that the concept of a rear parking pad is generally consistent with the Guidelines, but has not yet seen a percentage of impervious cover that will be introduced to the lot. The applicant should make every effort to install the least amount of concrete cover allowable due to the additional impervious changes proposed to the lot.
- s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. The applicant is required to provide this information for final approval, to include grading information, specific hardscaping locations and dimensions, and the location and species of all plants.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. That the applicant provides contextual drawings, including a neighborhood site plan and elevations, renderings, and/or sections that indicate the proposal's relationship and effect on surrounding structures. These drawings should, at a minimum, demonstrate the following: how any proposed landscaping and hardscaping will affect the existing condition of the grade and how said modifications will relate to the existing grade of neighboring properties; and how the proposed addition and rear site modifications relate to the development context of the neighborhood.
2. That the applicant provides calculations of impervious cover introduced to the lot as noted in findings o and p and reduces impervious hardscaping or considers pervious cover where feasible.
3. That the applicant explores ways to utilize the existing ribbon driveway or rear alley to lead to an accessible entrance on the side of the home in lieu of the proposed front yard parking configuration as indicated in findings n, o, and p.
4. That the applicant explores ways to relocate the proposed ADA ramp from the front façade to the side of the structure as noted in finding n.
5. That the applicant retains the existing curb cut width as noted in finding p.
6. That the applicant provides addition information on the material, configuration, and condition of the existing windows. The applicant should seek to retain the existing fenestration and explore ways to salvage and integrate the two rear windows to be removed in the new addition as noted in finding g.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Floyd Daigle, Rosemarie Courchesne, Patti Zaiantz (SACS), Cee Winkler, Felipe Sandoval, James Thurwalker, Josephine DeLeon, Antonio Garcia, Paul Kinnison, and Frank Garcia (who yielded his time to Kinnison) spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2018-003

Applicant: Benito Polendo

Address: 1201 N ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

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

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 1201 N St Mary's is a 1-story commercial structure constructed in 1940 with Spanish Eclectic and Mission style elements. The structure was originally a convenience store and gas station and retains its character-defining canopy structure angled towards the intersection of N St Mary's and Brooklyn Ave. The structure features a primarily stucco façade with a painted brick base. Raised diamond detailing adorns the top third of the structure, and many are currently painted in vibrant colors. The applicant is requesting approval to renovate the existing structure to be used as a coffee shop. The proposal includes fenestration modifications, an addition, and site modifications.
- b. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on January 10, 2018. The DRC discussion focused on the addition design and detailing. The DRC recommended reducing the height of the addition where feasible to match the roofline of the existing structure at a minimum. The DRC also recommended exploring ways to modify the west elevation facing Brooklyn Ave through the use of detailing, materiality, and footprint. Recommendations included thinning out the roof edge to create a thinner profile; removing the wing walls and wall fronting the canopy; reducing the footprint and bringing the wall in to clearly establish a recessed footprint from the primary structure; and removing the cement plaster overhang shading detail for a treatment that differentiates the addition from the primary structure.
- c. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the primary structure. The existing structure measures approximately 1,110 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should not double the size of the primary structure and should be subordinate to the existing structure. The proposed addition measures 950 square feet. This approximately doubles the size of the primary structure. However, the historic structure has a small footprint, and the location of the addition incorporates the existing service bay canopy. Staff finds the massing generally acceptable given the specific design considerations of the structure, but finds that the angular wall on the southwestern edge of the existing canopy is inappropriate and conceals a character defining feature of the historic structure. Staff also finds that the west wall should be recessed from the existing historic structure to clearly define the addition as new and subordinate to the historic fabric of the site.

- d. **ROOF** – The historic structure features a flat roof with a raised parapet. The proposed addition also features a flat roof with parapet detailing. The proposed height is approximately 30” taller than the existing structure. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. The addition should be subordinate to the primary structure and should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the roof form consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that the height should be subordinate to the existing structure.
- e. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to install a flat roof with raised parapet on the addition to match the existing flat roof and parapet detail on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that overall efforts to differentiate the addition from the historic structure should be made. Staff also finds that the applicant should explore ways to make the west façade more transparent overall to allow for the visibility of the service bay canopy on this elevation.
- f. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The proposed addition will remove the existing windows facing the corner of Brooklyn and N St Mary’s and will open up the former garage door bays. These bays will be incorporated into the new addition and will be part of the interior conditioned space. New primary entrances will be added on the addition. Additionally, a new window will be added on the west façade to accommodate a drivethru service station. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.
- g. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed door and window proportions on the existing structure and addition that are generally consistent with proportions on the primary structure.
- h. **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The existing structure features stucco siding. The applicant has proposed to refinish the existing structure with new cement plaster siding. The addition will incorporate this cement plaster detailing above the storefront windows and doors. Staff finds the use of storefront glazing is appropriate to distinguish the original structure from the addition in terms of materiality and transparency, but finds the use of cement plaster above the storefront inconsistent as submitted. The height of this opaque material conceals the service bay, which is a character defining feature. This portion of the addition also features two solid wing walls and a plaster canopy element to shade the façade. Staff finds that the amount of this material should be reduced on the addition.
- i. **TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW** – As noted in finding h, the addition will incorporate cement plaster detailing above storefront windows and doors. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, additions should provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms through materials and design details. Staff finds that the proposal as submitted does not clearly distinguish the addition from the historic structure.
- j. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The proposal includes a new mechanical equipment screen near the center of the addition’s roof. The screen will be set back from the primary façade by approximately eight feet. The screen will be several feet in height and be the tallest element of the structure. The screen features the same concrete plaster finish and parapet detailing as the rest of the proposal. While the screening approach is generally consistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that the applicant should make every effort to reduce the height of the screen to minimize its prominence as a building feature. Staff has also not seen a line of sight study that illustrates the screen’s impact from the public right-of-way.
- k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition incorporates similar architectural detailing as the existing structure; however, the treatment of the addition obscures character defining features of the structure.
- l. **HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing hardscaping to accommodate two parking spaces north of the existing service bay and a drive-thru internal driveway. The driveway will measure twelve feet in width with an entrance off N St Mary’s and an exit off Brooklyn Ave. The parking will serve as handicap spaces and a service drop-off area. Additional required parking will be leased from the adjacent parking lot. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate for the historic service and commercial nature of the site.
- m. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to install landscaping on the corner of N St Mary’s and Brooklyn Ave. Staff has not yet seen a comprehensive proposal. The applicant is required to provide this information prior to receiving final approval.
- n. **OUTDOOR SEATING** – The applicant has proposed a new outdoor seating area at the corner of N St Mary’s and Brooklyn Ave. The seating area will be located just below the terminating point of the existing service bay canopy. The proposal includes cement tiles in decorative patterns. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent.

- o. EQUIPMENT SCREENING – The applicant has provided screening details for the trash receptacles, which are located at the rear of the lot. Staff finds the location and screening method generally appropriate for the site.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on findings a through o. Staff encourages the applicant to incorporate the following changes prior to returning to the HDRC for approval:

1. That the applicant reduces the height of the proposed addition to be subordinate to the existing structure as noted in finding d.
2. That the applicant retains the entirety of the canopy structure and the raised diamond detailing on all elevations.
3. That the applicant utilizes a more transparent design approach to the elevation to avoid obscuring the character defining features of the historic structure as noted in findings e, i, and k.
4. That the applicant removes the wing walls and canopy overhang from the south elevation and recesses the west wall from the existing structure as noted in findings c and h.
5. That the applicant reduces the height of the rooftop mechanical screen where feasible and provides a line of sight study that illustrates its visibility from the street as noted in finding j.
6. That the applicant submits a comprehensive landscaping plan if they wish to be considered for final approval as noted in finding m.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

POSTPONED TO 7 FEBRUARY 2018.

30. HDRC NO. 2018-018

Applicant: Russell Williams, RA/Overland Partners

Address: 104 N ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a terrace overlook on the north façade to feature a total of 1,307 square feet.
2. Construct an egress stair on the north façade to be connected to the terrace overlook to provide vertical circulation to and from the structure's rooftop.
3. Construct a rooftop addition to feature an overall height of approximately thirty (30) feet to feature a one story glass addition with a sculptural canopy on top.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 104 N St Mary's, commonly known as the Aztec Theater was constructed in 1926 and features a brick façade with stone and decorative moldings. The structure currently features fire escapes on the north façade, a marquee canopy on N St Mary's Street and a prominent blade sign at the corner of N St Mary's and E Commerce. At this time, the applicant has proposed a redevelopment of the structure to feature a hotel and entertainment venue.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 12, 2017, where committee members noted that the overlook terrace should feature a separation from River Walk elements and that the general massing and location of the rooftop addition was appropriate. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on January 9, 2018, where committee members noted concerns regarding concerns over the option to include signage on the proposed egress stair.
- c. OVERLOOK TERRACE – Above W Crockett Street along the north façade of the structure, the applicant has proposed to construct an overlook terrace that will extend from the historic structure across W Crockett Street to the existing Aztec sculpture at the public right of way on the San Antonio River Walk side W Crockett. The applicant has noted that the overlook will be recessed to meet the sculpture. The applicant has also proposed to raise the existing sculpture to the height of the overlook terrace, 14' – 10" above street

level. The applicant has proposed materials that include metal railings and concrete for the overlook terrace.

- d. FIRE ESCAPE REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing fire escape staircase on the westernmost portion of the north façade. This fire escape is proposed to be replaced with a new egress stair.
- e. EGRESS STAIR – At the location of the existing fire escape, the applicant has proposed to construct a new egress stair that will connect to the proposed overlook terrace. The proposed stair will feature materials that include a metal structure and metal guardrails. Generally, the profile of the proposed egress stair to be similar to that of the existing fire escape.
- f. EGRESS STAIR SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed an option to clad the egress stair which includes a replication of the historic blade sign at the corner of N St Mary’s and E Commerce. Staff finds that the proposed egress stair should feature a profile and materials that are simplified as to not detract from the historic structure or the nature of the adjacent San Antonio River Walk.
- g. ROOFTOP ADDITION – At the top of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rooftop addition that is to feature a total of approximately thirty (30) feet in height. A one story glass addition will feature 17’ – 9” in height while a canopy structure will feature approximately 12’ – 3”. Per the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block and should be located to minimize visual impact from the public right of way. Staff finds that the proposed addition’s location appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines regarding location.
- h. ROOFTOP ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 2.B.i. notes that the height of a rooftop addition should not be more than forty (40) percent of the original height of the structure. The applicant’s proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the applicant should explore ways to reduce the overall massing of the addition, potentially through a reduction in massing of the proposed canopy structure.
- i. ROOFTOP ADDITION – In regards to materials and architectural details, the applicant has proposed materials to consist of a glass curtain wall system, metal guardrails and a metal canopy structure atop of the single height glass addition. Generally, the proposed materials are light in appearance in comparison to the historic structure’s masonry walls and will present themselves subordinate to the historic structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed egress stair feature simplified architectural elements including that do not include elements such as signage or polluting lighting that will negatively impact the historic structure, the pedestrian atmosphere at W Crockett or the pedestrian atmosphere at the River Walk level.
- ii. That the explore ways to reduce the overall massing and visual impact of the proposed addition. Staff finds that a reduction in the overall massing of the proposed canopy structure may reduce the height and visual impact of the proposed addition.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz (SACS) spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2017-577

Applicant: Mary Radicke on behalf of the Westfort Alliance Neighborhood Association

Address:

214 ARMY
218 ARMY
220 ARMY
221 ARMY
226 ARMY
230 ARMY
235 ARMY
237 ARMY
238 ARMY
239 ARMY
240 ARMY
242 ARMY
247 ARMY
262 ARMY
302 ARMY
305 ARMY
306 ARMY
309 ARMY
315 ARMY
316 ARMY
319 ARMY
320 ARMY
327 ARMY
330 ARMY
331 ARMY
335 ARMY
336 ARMY
337 ARMY
338 ARMY
339 ARMY
341 ARMY
343 ARMY
223 BRAHAN BLVD
225 BRAHAN BLVD
227 BRAHAN BLVD
231 BRAHAN BLVD
239 BRAHAN BLVD
251 BRAHAN BLVD
255 BRAHAN BLVD
259 BRAHAN BLVD
301 BRAHAN BLVD
302 BRAHAN BLVD
305 BRAHAN BLVD
306 BRAHAN BLVD
310 BRAHAN BLVD
311 BRAHAN BLVD
312 BRAHAN BLVD
315 BRAHAN BLVD
316 BRAHAN BLVD
318 BRAHAN BLVD
320 BRAHAN BLVD

321 BRAHAN BLVD
322 BRAHAN BLVD
324 BRAHAN BLVD
326 BRAHAN BLVD
330 BRAHAN BLVD
333 BRAHAN BLVD
337 BRAHAN BLVD
345 BRAHAN BLVD
353 BRAHAN BLVD
359 BRAHAN BLVD
363 BRAHAN BLVD
367 BRAHAN BLVD
210 HAYWOOD AVE
214 HAYWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting approval for a historic designation of the Westfort Historic District and a recommendation for approval to the Zoning Commission and to the City Council. The proposed district includes the 200 and 300 block of Army between Broadway and Pine, and the 200 block Brahan on the north between Broadway and Pine, and the 300 block of Brahan between Haywood and Pine. It contains 60 parcels total, found to be contributing to the character of the proposed district.

FINDINGS:

- a. The request for historic district designation was submitted by a property owner within the proposed boundary on March 23, 2017, on behalf of the Westfort Alliance Neighborhood Association.
- b. The proposed district was platted in 1909 by E.H. Cunningham and J.Kirkpatrick. The area includes an eclectic mix of styles, including Tudor, craftsman, prairie, Spanish eclectic, folk Victorian, post-war midcentury apartments and neoclassical homes. The development pattern and neighborhood location reflect the proliferation of housing stock after WWII abutting Fort Sam Houston to the east. UDC Section 35-607 (a) states that historic districts must meet at least three of the designation criteria. The proposed Westfort Historic District meets criteria 3, 8, 10 and 11. All structures included in the proposed boundary are contributing.
- c. **BACKGROUND** -- The applicant is requesting approval for historic district designation for the Westfort Historic District and a recommendation for approval to the Zoning Commission and to the City Council for Historic zoning designation.
 - The proposed district will include the 200 and 300 block of Army between Broadway and Pine, and the 200 block Brahan on the north between Broadway and Pine, and the 300 block of Brahan between Haywood and Pine. It contains 60 non-municipal parcels total. All 60 properties are contributing to the proposed district.
 - Prior to receiving the request for district designation, OHP staff was invited by residents to attend five neighborhood meetings held on 7/18/2016, 8/7/2016, 8/14/2016, 8/23/2016, and 9/14/2016, to provide information regarding historic designation and the design review processes.
 - A public informational meeting for proposed historic district as held on April 11, 2017, for property owners within the boundary. 17 property owners were present at this meeting.
 - On October 17, 2018, OHP gave an additional presentation describing the designation and design review process at the Westfort Neighborhood Alliance Association (WANA) quarterly meeting. Over 20 residents of WANA were in attendance
 - On October 19, 2017, the staff of the Office of Historic Preservation received and verified 31 return notices of 51% of the property owners within the proposed boundary that are in support of the designation. In accordance with the UDC, staff has forwarded the application to the HDRC for review.
 - The decision to seek historic district designation was in response to concerns from the residents regarding recent demolitions and increased development activities.

- The proposed boundary is located within the Westfort Neighborhood Conservation District-9 (NCD). The NCD was designated by the City Council October 2011. Per UDC 35-335, the City Council aims to preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate the value of these residential neighborhoods or commercial districts through the establishment of Neighborhood Conservation Districts. NCDs are established in areas that possess distinctive character-defining features.
- d. SITE CONTEXT – The proposed historic district lies north of the west end of Fort Sam Houston and north of downtown San Antonio. There are curbed sidewalks, large lots with deep setbacks and a large landscaped median along Brahan Boulevard.
- e. HISTORIC CONTEXT - The proposed historic district consists of portions of two subdivision plats, Army Terrace and Narcissa Place, both platted in 1909. John H Kirkpatrick Company was the owner and developer of Army Terrace Plat. Narcissa Place was platted by E.H. Cunningham. Both subdivisions attracted prominent residents in the 1910s including Sunken Gardens architect, C.T. Boelhauwe; Frack Scobey, director of the U.S. Mint and Gutzon Borglum, American artist and the sculptor of the Mount Rushmore National Monument.
- f. ARCHITECTURAL ASSESSMENT – The housing stock is largely reflective of the early 20th century trend which promoted varied styles within neighborhoods. The architectural styles in Westfort range from Folk Victorian, Craftsman, Prairie, Colonial revival, Tudor revival, to Spanish eclectic with a couple of mid-century apartment buildings.
- g. EVALUATION - As referenced in the applicable citations, Westfort Historic District meets UDC criterion [35-607 (b)3], [35-607 (b)8], [35-607 (b)10], [35-607 (b)11], for a finding of historic significance in the process of seeking designation as a local historic district. In order to be eligible for a historic district, at least two properties must meet at least three of the criteria; Westfort Historic District meets four.
 - (3) Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the community, county, state, or nation; for its association with key figures associated with local and national landmarks and key institutions.
 - (8) Its historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship; Westfort is an eclectic neighborhood architecturally speaking with a mix of styles and types. The eclectic styles reflect the chronology of the neighborhood’s development. Houses and apartment buildings are located in this area with styles including Folk Victorian, New Formalism, Midcentury modern, Craftsman, Prairie, Colonial revival, Tudor revival, and Spanish eclectic. Primary materials found include stucco, wood, wood shingle, and brick. All structures within the proposed district are within the period of significance and contribute to the neighborhood. There are only two vacant lots, otherwise the neighborhood is intact.
 - (10) Its character as an established and geographically definable neighborhood, united by culture, architectural style or physical plan and development; The Westfort Neighborhood was established adjacent and partially encircled by Fort Sam Houston. The proposed district boundary is part of 2 subdivisions both platted in 1909. The neighborhood includes similar setbacks, large lots, a wide landscaped median, and a grand streetscape on this rise overlooking the city.
 - (11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States; The Westfort Neighborhood has been home to many prominent citizens, including C.T. Boelhauwe, architect of the State Bank and Trade building and the Sunken Gardens Theatre, Gutzon Borglum, sculptor of Mount Rushmore, and more. The Westfort Neighborhood was established with a need for multi-family homes and apartment buildings being adjacent to Fort Sam Houston.
- h. If the HDRC concurs that the proposed district meets criteria and is eligible for designation and recommends the historic district designation for the Westfort Historic District, then their recommendation shall be submitted to the zoning commission. Once the zoning commission makes their recommendation, it will be submitted to the city council. The city council shall review and shall approve or deny the proposed historic district.
- i. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners shall follow the historic and design review process before permits can be issued, until a final resolution from City Council. Written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) must be obtained for any exterior work.
- j. Historic districts possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City. The City offers a tax incentive for all residential properties occupied by the property owner at the

time of the designation. The incentive is a 20% tax exemption on City taxes for 10 years provided the owner remains in the property.

- k. The City also offers a Substantial Rehabilitation tax incentive. After substantial rehabilitation of a historic property, the property owners may choose one of two tax incentives, including having the city property taxes frozen for 10 years at the pre-rehabilitation value, or paying no city property taxes for the first five years, and for the next five years, city property taxes are assessed at the value that is 50% of the postrehabilitation assessed value.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval for designation of the Westfort Historic District and a recommendation for approval to the Zoning Commission and to the City Council based on findings a through g.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz (SACS), Denise Stallcup, Charles Stallcup, Julie Gibson, Joseph Bravo, Marilyn Mitton, Al Wall, Carolyn Peterson (who yielded her time to Bravo), and Gilbert Piette spoke in support. John Williams and Mark Sullivan spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Vice Chair Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Bustamante, Fish, Connor, Grube, 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 6:45 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair