

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
2 May 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 Chair Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon.

ABSENT: Brittain, Garcia.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - May is Preservation Month
 - Rehabber Club Work Day and Porch Repair Certification Course [Living Heritage Trades Academy] - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 1223 E Highland Blvd

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-180 410 DEVINE
- Item #3, Case No. 2018-179 514 N PINE
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-149 200 HASKIN
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-184 309 W AGARITA
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-192 210 W LYNWOOD
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-186 515 WILLOW
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-187 544 HAMMOND
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-193 221 CLAUDIA
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-191 1422 GRAYSON
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-188 217 CEDAR
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-202 606 E MARKET
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-155 915 S LAREDO
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-190 1910 E HOUSTON, 430 MONUMENTAL, 129
FLORENCE
- Item #21, Case No. 2018-158 109 ALAMO PLAZA

Item #2 was pulled for citizens to be heard. Items #15 and #21 were moved from individual to consent.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2018-160

Applicant: Harrison and Billie Jo Gutierrez

Address: 426 ADAMS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install front yard fencing to include a sidewalk gate. The gate and fence will be four (4) feet tall and steel.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 426 Adams was constructed circa 2015. The structure is a one-story, single family residential structure that features a stone and composite siding façade with an existing metal driveway gate set behind the front façade plane.
- b. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a metal fence to span the width of the property, turning at the driveway to meet at the corner of the structure rather than across the driveway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii, new front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that did not historically have them. While staff finds that a fence was not currently present on this property, fences are found on Adams and within the King William Historic District.
- c. FENCE DESIGN - According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., the design of the fence should respond to the design and materials of the primary historic structure or structures of a similar style in the neighborhood in relation to scale, transparency, and character. Staff finds that the proposed matching metal fence to the existing driveway fencing is appropriate for this structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on finding b and c with the stipulation that no portion of the fence exceed four feet in height.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Tracy Moon spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2018-195

Applicant: Peter French/Graystreet Partners

Address: 1603 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a nineteen (19) story, mixed-use structure at the corner of Broadway and Newell Avenue. The proposed new construction will feature ground floor retail, two levels of sub-grade parking, three levels of wrapped parking, four levels of office space, two levels of amenity space, eight levels of hospitality space and a mechanical penthouse.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a nineteen (19) story, mixed-use structure at the corner of Broadway and Newell Avenue. The proposed new construction will feature ground floor retail, two levels of sub-grade parking, three levels of wrapped parking, four levels of office space, two levels of amenity space, eight levels of hospitality space and a mechanical penthouse.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **PREVIOUS REVIEW** – This request was originally heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on March 21, 2018, where it was withdrawn by the applicant.
- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 13, 2018, where committee members noted that additional context should be provided, that more landscaping should be added at the corner of Broadway and Newell, that the proposed garage entrance should not look like a garage entrance and that more information and graphics were needed for the proposed side elevations.
- e. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on April 10, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that there was no general concerns; however, they asked questions regarding the garage positioning and entrance location on Broadway.
- f. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed a third time by the Design Review Committee on April 11, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that the site felt auto-centric, that the proposed height overwhelms the surrounding structures, that the brick portion of the structure was appropriately scaled, that the glass portion of the tower be further divided and noted that the Broadway elevation should be separated.
- g. **EXISTING STRUCTURE** – The site currently features an existing, two story structure constructed circa 1918. The structure was constructed for the Thomson Electric Company and was used by the company until the early 1970's under a different name. The structure has undergone many modifications since its construction and is out of context from its construction. Staff has performed a review of the proposed demolition and has determined that the structure is not eligible for historic designation.
- h. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed pedestrian walkways and plaza throughout the property which included connections to the sidewalks located at the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.
- i. **CURB CUTS** – The RIO design objectives outlined in the UDC include the creation of a “positive pedestrian experience” at the street edge. Standards related to curb cuts and interference with pedestrian traffic are also provided. The applicant has proposed two curb cuts on Broadway and one curb cut in a rear alley that feeds onto Avenue B. The UDC requires projects to limit curb cuts to two (2) on parking areas or structures facing only one (1) street, and one (1) for each additional street face. The project has access to Broadway Street, Avenue B, and a rear alley. If Broadway was the only accessible street for the development, then the proposed two curb cuts would be allowable. Given that there are other opportunities for vehicular access to the site, staff finds that curb cuts on Broadway, where there is a focus on providing pedestrian-friendly

environment, should be limited to only one. The intent of the upcoming bond project for Broadway is to promote pedestrian and bicycle activity along Broadway. Minimizing the number of driveways (conflict points) would be important to enhance the pedestrian/cycling environment. In addition to HDRC approval of the site plan, the applicant is responsible for coordinating with TCI regarding allowable curb cuts and obtaining all required permits. In an early review, TCI staff has further recommended that the curb cut closest to Newell be completely eliminated, and that the overall development focus on a singular entry from Avenue B.

- j. CURB CUTS – The applicant has not provided the width of any proposed curb cuts at this time; however, the UDC states that curb cuts in RIO should not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width. The applicant must demonstrate compliance with this requirement in future applications to the HDRC.
- k. PARKING GARAGE – The applicant has noted two levels of subgrade parking and three levels of parking above grade that are to be wrapped by architectural elements to include glass curtain wall systems, brick and screening elements. This is consistent with the UDC.
- l. SITE PARKING – The applicant has noted that a lease agreement is pending with the Texas Department of Transportation regarding parking beneath US Highway 281. Staff also finds that the applicant should address parking challenges with surrounding property owners to ensure that the project is adequately parked.
- m. SITE DESIGN – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Per the application documents, the applicant has provided plaza adjacent to the public right of way and landscaping locations. Additionally, the applicant has provided walkway connections to right of way sidewalks.
- n. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed landscaping buffers throughout the site and has provided renderings noting various landscaping locations and materials. When returning for final approval, the applicant should submit a complete landscaping plan noting materials and their proposed locations.
- o. MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- p. BUILDING SCALE – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has incorporated elements into the design to provide a human scale included pedestrian scaled storefronts along Broadway, pedestrian entrance canopies on the Broadway façade, recessed balcony openings with human scaled elements and mullion fins on the glass curtain walls of the tower separated into heights that equate two stories. Additionally, the applicant has separated the proposed building massing both horizontally and vertically and has included a number of outdoor terraces.
- q. BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT – The UDC regulates building height within the River Improvement Overlay Districts. The property recently received a “Development Node” designation which allows a building height that is 50% taller than the normal standard. In RIO-2, this allows for a building that is 15 stories or 180 feet. The current proposed height of the building is 250 feet (top of mechanical penthouse), approximately 40% taller than what allowed by code. Staff finds that the applicant should explore an overall height that aligns more closely

with the newly established height regulation of 180 feet. The applicant is responsible for obtaining a variance for any additional height from the Board of Adjustment.

- r. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include brick, glazing and a glass curtain wall system. The proposed materials are consistent with the UDC.
- s. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed a distinctive base that features massing and materials comparable to structures found in the immediate area. The midsection of the proposed tower features a glass curtain wall system with reduced massing. In regards to a building cap, the applicant has proposed a building cap to include both a curtain wall and a setback mechanical screen. Staff finds the proposed building cap to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the applicant reduce the number of curb cuts on Broadway to only one based on finding i and make attempts to eliminate curb cuts on Broadway altogether. The driveway closest to Newell should be eliminated.
- ii. Curb cuts may not exceed 25 feet in width. Changes in paving materials, limiting the flare of the driveway apron at the street, and inclusion of landscaped medians in double-lane driveways should be implemented at pedestrian conflict points to contribute to a safe and walkable environment based on finding j. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with TCI regarding allowable curb cuts and obtaining all required permits.
- iii. That the applicant must address parking challenges with surrounding property owners and submit a comprehensive parking plan prior to final approval.

As part of the request for variance process, the Historic and Design Review Commission may make a recommendation regarding building height to the Board of Adjustment.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Sophie Torres, Brad Kaufmann, Jef Snyder, and Diana Keller spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2017-544

Applicant: Robert Moritz/DHR Architects

Address: 313 E LOCUST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct two, 2-story duplex structures on the vacant lot located at 313 E Locust.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct two, 2-story buildings on the vacant lot at 313 E Locust, located within the Tobin Hill Historic District. The lot is flanked by a historic 2-story single family home designed in the Queen Anne style to the east, a parking lot and 2-story office complex to the west, and a residential alley to the north. The lot is located a distance of approximately one lot from the intersection of E Locust and McCullough Ave. This stretch of E Locust is characterized by historic 1-story and 2-story single family homes, designed primarily in the Queen Anne and Craftsman styles; historic 2-story multifamily homes with larger footprints; two 2-story apartment complexes, one of which is non-contributing to the district; and a non-contributing convenience store at the corner of E Locust and McCullough. Additionally, the corner of E Locust and Paschal features a modern infill development containing four 2-story townhomes, each oriented towards Paschal St.
- b. The applicant received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on November 15, 2017. The approval carried the following stipulations:
 1. That the applicant increases the setback of the front unit to be more consistent with the adjacent 2-story historic structure as noted in finding e; **this stipulation has not been met.**
 2. That the applicant eliminates at least one of the car stalls in each of the front units to reduce the overall length, massing, and footprint of the structure as noted in findings e, g, and l; **this stipulation has been met.**
 3. That the applicant modifies the proposed entryway configurations to be more consistent with transoms and side lites found on historic precedents in the district as noted in finding j; **this stipulation has not been fully met.**
 4. That the applicant lowers the hipped porch projects on the public alley elevation of the rear unit as noted in finding m; **this stipulation has been met.**
 5. That the applicant submits a comprehensive landscaping plan for final approval. The landscaping plan should indicate all setbacks with dimensions, all locations and dimensions of proposed hardscaping, and the locations and species of plants. The applicant should indicate all mechanical equipment on the site plans and/or elevations for final approval; **this stipulation has been met.**
 6. That the applicant installs one-over-one wood windows or aluminum clad wood windows as noted in finding k. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening; **this stipulation has not been met.**
- c. CASE HISTORY – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on June 28, 2017. Prior to the meeting, the applicant’s proposal included four total units – three 3-story units and one 2.5-story unit – oriented back-to-back on the lot, with one 3-story unit located directly adjacent to the E Locust right-of-way. At the DRC meeting, the applicant shared a revised site plan that included two 3-story units facing E Locust, and two 3-story units located in the rear of

the property, all facing the direction of E Locust. This was the proposal that the DRC reviewed and discussed. The DRC noted that the proposal was a departure from the traditional development pattern of the district, which does not feature two single-family homes in the front of the lot with two single family homes of the same height in the rear of the lot. The DRC also wanted more clarification on how the alley condition would be treated. The DRC suggested exploring a more traditional configuration of having two taller single family homes oriented towards E Locust, and shorter single family homes in the rear of the lot that took on the massing, form, and appearance of a rear accessory structure. Tall single family homes with shorter rear accessory structures, or rear accessory dwelling units, are historically common in the Tobin Hill Historic District. The applicant withdrew their previous design at the July 19, 2017, HDRC hearing. The applicant submitted a new design for the November 15, 2017, HDRC hearing and received conceptual approval.

- d. **CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – Of the historic structures on the immediate block of E Locust, bounded by McCullough to the west and Paschal to the east, one house is 2-stories in height, and the remainder are 1-story. Continuing east, on the block of E Locust bounded by Paschal and Gillespie, the historic homes are predominantly 2-stories in height. Of the historic structures on the immediate block of E Locust, bounded by McCullough to the west and Paschal to the east, one house is 2-stories in height, and the remainder are 1-story. Continuing east, on the block of E Locust bounded by Paschal and Gillespie, the historic homes are predominantly 2-stories in height. Additionally, each of these structures is architecturally unique from one another, which creates diversity and character along the streetscape.
- e. **SETBACKS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. This block of E Locust contains historic structures that feature front yard setbacks of approximately 20-35 feet. Based on the submitted documentation, the neighboring historic structure to the east has a front setback of 32.11 feet. The historic 1-story structure two lots down has a setback of approximately 18.24 feet. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately 28.27 feet. While the proposed setback is greater than the median between those of the historic structures that exist on the same block of E Locust, its placement would be approximately seven feet closer to the sidewalk than the historic structure immediately adjacent to the east. Staff finds that the setback should be increased to be compatible with the immediate context of the block.
- f. **ORIENTATION & ENTRANCES** – The applicant has proposed for the primary of the two units to face E Locust, and the rear unit to be oriented towards the interior of the lot, towards the direction of E Locust. The pedestrian entry of the front unit will be accessed from the south on E Locust. The pedestrian entry of the rear unit will be accessed from the south from an interior courtyard and driveway. The historic development pattern of the rear alley contains rear garages and parking spaces oriented towards the alley. Both of the two units contains rearloading attached garages on the first floor, each of which are accessed from the rear alleyway to the north. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade should be oriented to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. Typically, historic entrances are oriented towards the primary street. This is true for this particular block of E Locust. Staff finds the orientation to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed two 2-story units. One will be located along the street frontage of E Locust and one will be located at the rear of the property, directly adjacent to an existing alley. Per the submitted elevations, the ridgeline of the front 2-story unit is 31’-6 ¾”. The ridgeline of the rear unit is 28’-10 ¾”. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Per the submitted elevations, the applicant has indicated that the 2-story historic structure directly to the east is approximately 35’-

4" in height. The rear 2-story structure does not overwhelm existing alleyway structures in terms of height.

- h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Throughout this block, the foundation heights of primary historic structures are between two and three feet. The elevations for the front unit indicated a foundation height of approximately 2'-2" (26 inches). Staff finds that the front unit has a foundation height consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof form for both the front and rear unit. The front unit also contains a front gable. These roof forms are found throughout the Tobin Hill Historic District as well as this block of E Locust. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window, as compared to nearby historic facades, should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed several window and door openings that generally feature sizes that are found on historic structures. However, the entry doors feature transom and side lite configurations that are not found historically in the district. Staff finds that the configuration should be modified to more closely match those rooted in historic precedents.
- k. WINDOW & DOOR MATERIALS – The applicant proposed to install Milgard vinyl windows and doors. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows and wood doors would be the most appropriate per the OHP Window Policy Document.
- l. LOT COVERAGE – New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The applicant has proposed to locate two units – one with a footprint of 2,905 square feet and one with a footprint of 1,230 square feet – on a lot featuring approximately 9,130 square feet. The proposed lot coverage is approximately 45.3%, which is generally consistent with the Guidelines. However, based on findings e and g, staff finds that the depth of the proposed carports should be reduced to eliminate overall mass.
- m. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite wood siding, standing seam metal roofs, and simple wood columns and railings. Staff finds siding and roofing materials to be generally consistent with the Guidelines and compatible for new construction in the district. Staff finds that the siding should feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four inches.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The proposed front unit features a second story gable, front entry door transoms and side lites, and simple square columns with a capital and base. The rear unit features ganged windows, bracketed eaves, and simplified columns. Staff finds these architectural details to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- o. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has indicated mechanical equipment on the submitted site and landscaping plan. The ground AC units are located to west of the front duplex and to the west and east of the rear duplex and are concealed by landscaping. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided staff with a landscaping plan at this time that indicates new trees, shrubbery, and low plants. However, a species list has not yet been submitted. Staff requires this information.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Frederica Kushner spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

17. HDRC NO. 2018-181

Applicant: Lulu Francois

Address: 817 NOLAN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a concrete driveway to feature a width of fourteen (14) feet in width.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a concrete driveway on the lot at 817 Nolan to feature a width of fourteen (14) feet. At the March 1, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, a straight driveway was proposed and staff recommended a width not to exceed ten (10) feet. At the December 17, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the applicant requested a curved driveway to feature a width of fourteen (14) feet to taper to ten (10) feet. The HDRC approved the proposed driveway with the stipulation that the applicant submit a detailed site plan noting the exact dimensions and angle of the proposed tapered driveway and that the driveway be straight.
- b. DRIVEWAY – The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i. notes that new driveways should feature a similar configuration, including materials, width and design as those found historically in the district. The Guidelines note that historic driveways are typically no wider than ten (10) feet in width. This block of Nolan currently features seven driveways, five of which are concrete, one is gravel ribbon strips and one is informal grass and dirt. Per GIS measurements, each driveway measures approximately 9.5 to 10.5 feet in width.
- c. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a driveway to feature fourteen (14) feet in width. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a driveway that is ten (10) feet in width to be consistent with the historic development pattern in the district and the Guidelines to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends a driveway be installed that does not exceed ten (10) feet in width.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT.

18. HDRC NO. 2018-200

Applicant: David Bolton Travis Linares

Address: 119 GORMAN ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing, wrought iron porch columns with new wood columns.
2. Install exposed rafter tails on the porch roof.
3. Install front porch railings and install wood decking on top of the existing front porch.
4. Install a new front porch door. (This item has been approved administratively with an appropriate door)
5. Install a set of French doors in an existing, rear addition.
6. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 195 square feet.
7. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 119 Gorman was constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman style and is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The structure features exposed rafter tails, existing rear additions and both gabled and hipped roofs.
- b. PREVIOUS APPROVALS – The applicant has received Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness for approval to remove existing carports, fencing, two non-contributing accessory structures and a rear patio cover. Regarding repairs and modifications, the applicant has received Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness for the installation of front and rear yard fencing, the removal of an existing asphalt shingled roof and the installation of a standing seam metal roof and repairs to an existing, rear accessory structure.
- c. UNAPPROVED WORK – Staff performed a site visit on April 23, 2018, where staff found that the original brick chimney had been removed without a Certificate of Appropriateness and that modifications to the rear accessory structure were occurring including the removal of wood windows for vinyl windows. The removed wood windows appear to be non-original to the structure; however, staff does not find the vinyl replacement appropriate. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed in the rear accessory structure and that the demolished brick chimney should be reconstructed prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed rear addition.
- d. PORCH (COLUMN REPLACEMENT) – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing four, wrought iron porch columns with new wood, Craftsman style columns. The applicant has proposed tapered columns, commonly found on Craftsman structures; however, staff finds that a proposed square column would be more appropriate given the overall small size of the porch. Tapered columns are commonly found on Craftsman structures with substantially larger front porches.
- e. PORCH (RAFTER TAILS) – The applicant has proposed to install faux rafter tails on the front porch header. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations notes that new elements should be added to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Additionally, elements should not be added that create a false sense of history. The proposed faux rafter tails are not found historically at this location on a historic structure and are not consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. PORCH (RAILINGS) – The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations notes that new porch elements should be added to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of

the building. Staff finds the installation of simple, square porch railings to be appropriate; however, the proposed railing should feature both a top and bottom rail. Balusters should not extend to the porch decking. The applicant is to submit a detail to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- g. PORCH (DECKING) – The historic structure currently features a concrete porch. The applicant has proposed to install wood decking on top of the existing concrete porch and steps. Staff finds this appropriate; however, the proposed porch decking should run perpendicular to the front façade of the house and not be wider than approximately three (3) inches in width.
- h. PORCH (DOOR) – The applicant has proposed to install a new porch door that features a contemporary design. The proposed door is not consistent with the architectural style of the historic structure. Staff finds that the applicant should install a Craftsman style door to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. (This item has been approved administratively with an appropriate door.)
- i. EXISTING ADDITION (DOORS) – The applicant has proposed to install French doors into an existing, nonoriginal addition constructed circa 1960. Given their location at the rear of the existing addition, not visible from the public right of way, staff finds this proposal to be appropriate.
- j. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature approximately 195 square feet. The applicant has proposed a roof form to match that found on the existing addition, wood siding to match that found on the existing addition and a matching foundation height. Staff finds the proposed massing and roof form to be appropriate.
- k. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to install a window on the rear façade to feature a total width of approximately eight feet and a height of approximately ten inches. While this profile is not found historically in the district, staff finds that it's location at the rear of the structure is appropriate.
- l. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification; however, has not provided staff with an itemized list of expected costs nor a timeline for completion. Staff finds that the property is eligible for Historic Tax Certification.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the installation of porch columns with the stipulation that the applicant install square wood columns to be six inches square and feature capital and base trim. The final column design should be submitted to staff for review and approval.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the installation of rafter tails.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the installation of porch railings and decking with the following stipulations
 - i. That the proposed railing should feature both a top and bottom rail. Balusters should not extend to the porch decking.
 - ii. That the proposed porch decking should run perpendicular to the front façade of the house and not be wider than approximately three (3) inches in width.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the installation of a contemporary front door. (This item has been approved administratively with an appropriate door.)
5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, the installation of French doors in the existing addition.
6. Staff recommend approval of item #6, the construction of a rear addition with the stipulation that all siding match that of the original structure and that the roof match that of the existing addition's
7. Staff recommends the applicant obtain all necessary approvals and submit an itemized list of costs and timeline for completion prior to receiving Historic Tax Certification.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve items 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7 with staff stipulations. Item #2 was withdrawn by the applicant, and item #4 was approved administratively.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2018-182

Applicant: Veronica Montemayor

Address: 632 LEIGH ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a two story, single family residential structure at 6332 Leigh Street, located within the Lavaca Historic District.
2. Install solar panels at the rear of the proposed new construction.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construction a two story, single family residential structure at 632 Leigh Street, located within the Lavaca Historic District. Only the southern block face of Leigh Street is included within the Lavaca Historic District. This block features
- b. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. Historic structures and new construction of this bloc of Leigh feature angled orientations toward Leigh at which setbacks vary. Contemporary structures are located on each side of the proposed new construction and feature setbacks of approximately thirteen (13) feet at the least and approximately twenty-five (25) feet at the greatest due to their angled orientation. The applicant has proposed a setback of seventeen (17) feet. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to match the angled orientation of the existing historic and contemporary structures found on the block.
- c. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The proposed entrance is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of Leigh Street features approximately fifteen existing primary structures. Many of the existing structures are not historic in age, feature a contemporary design and two stories in massing. On each side of the proposed new construction, contemporary, two story structures exist. The applicant has proposed an overall height of approximately 28 feet. Staff finds the proposed massing to be appropriate.

- e. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has not noted specific foundation heights at this time; however, per the submitted elevations, the proposed foundation heights do not appear to be consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include shed, gabled and hipped roofs. The Guidelines for New Construction note that roof forms that are found historically in the district should be used. While the proposed forms are found historically in the district, they are not found in with the profile currently proposed. The proposed inward sloping shed roof on the front façade is inconsistent with forms found historically in the district. Staff finds that this form should be modified to feature a front facing gable, a form that is found consistently on front facades throughout the Lavaca Historic District.
- g. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed window openings that feature profiles that are not found historically in the district, including windows that feature a profile to match the proposed shed roof slope. Staff finds that window openings that feature proportions comparable to those found historically in the district should be used. The windows proposed on the rear elevation are comparable to those found historically in the district and should be implemented throughout the design. Additionally, double windows should be separated by a wood mullion rather than siding or abutting window trim.
- h. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include stucco, cedar siding and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate; however, the cedar siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish (silver).
- j. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of double pane, vinyl windows. Staff recommends the installation of wood or aluminum clad wood windows. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- k. CARPORT & DRIVEWAY LOCATION – The development pattern along Leigh includes side yard parking in driveways located on both the east and west sides of the primary structure. The applicant has proposed a curved driveway which terminates at the front façade of the proposed new construction, resulting in front yard parking and a carport on the front façade. This is not consistent with the development pattern found along the block. Additionally, front loading garages and front yard parking are not found historically within the Lavaca Historic District. Staff finds that the proposed parking location should be modified to be located in the side yard.
- l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in findings f, g and k, the proposed roof forms, window openings and fenestration patterns and carport/parking locations should be modified to become consistent with the development pattern found in the district. Additionally, the proposed new construction features an overall form that is very contemporary in nature. While this block

features many houses that feature non-traditional architectural forms, staff finds these to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.

- m. SOLAR PANELS – The applicant has noted the installation of twenty-four (24) solar panels at the rear of the proposed new construction; however, has not specified the exact location or mounting pitch. Staff finds the installation of solar panels at the rear where not visible from the public right of way to be appropriate. The applicant is to provide a roof plan of the proposed locations of all solar panels to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness for their installation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through m. Staff recommends the following items be addressed per staff’s findings prior to a recommendation for final approval.

- i. That the applicant comply with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii. and propose a foundation height that is comparable to those found historically on the block. The applicant is to provide an updated construction documents to staff noting foundation heights that are at least one (1) foot in height as noted in e.
- ii. That the applicant modify the proposed front shed roof to a roof form that is consistent with those found historically on the block, such as a front facing gabled roof as noted in finding f.
- iii. That the proposed window openings be consistent in size and profile with those proposed on the rear façade as noted in finding g. All windows grouped in groups of two should be separated by a mullion.
- iv. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed as noted in finding j. 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.
- v. That the proposed, front loaded carport and curved driveway be modified to not result in front yard parking as noted in finding k. The propose driveway should be straight and feature no more than ten (10) feet in width to match those found historically in the district.
- vi. That the proposed contemporary architectural forms be modified to accommodate traditional elements that are found throughout the district such as a front facing gabled roof.
- vii. That a roof plan be submitted to staff noting the location of the proposed solar panels as noted in finding m.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Connor to refer case to DRC.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2018-156

Applicant: Chris Gill/CGRE LTC CO

Address: 504 AUSTIN ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear addition on an existing concrete foundation.
2. Construct a rooftop addition to provide access to the rooftop deck. A stairway will terminate within the proposed addition.
3. Amend previously approved fixed windows to install either one over one or two over two windows.
4. Paint the structure to match closely to the color of the brick.
5. Receive Historic Tax Certification.
6. Enclose four existing door openings with wood siding.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 504 Austin was constructed circa 1905 and originally was the location of the residence and business of Charles Spohn, Sr., a baker. The structure features a brick façade with a hipped roof and a rear two story addition. The primary structure features an ornamental brick parapet and entrance which extends toward Austin Street past the front façade of the single story structure.
- b. PREVIOUS APPROVALS – On June 23, 2015, the applicant received on Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness for roof repair, window repair and the installation of wood doors. The applicant received approval at the December 6, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing to install a flat roof on the rear historic structure to include rooftop decking and railings, exterior lighting and wood windows within the existing openings. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on February 23, 2018, for the installation of a bronze anodized aluminum storefront system and aluminum clad wood windows. Since the issuance of these Certificates of Appropriateness, work has been performed in violation.
- c. A request for the construction of a rear addition, rooftop addition, painting and Historic Tax Certification was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on March 21, 2018, where it was denied.
- d. REAR ADDITION – At the rear of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature one story in height, a shed roof and stucco exterior. Per the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should be sited at the side or rear of the primary historic structure, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the primary historic structure’s principal façade and should feature a transition to distinguish it from historic structure. Staff finds the proposed massing and roof form to be appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a side inset from the wall plane of the historic structure.
- e. ROOFTOP ADDITION – The applicant has proposed a rooftop addition to provide access to the roof top. The applicant has noted a standing seam metal roof and stucco exterior. Generally, staff finds the proposed addition to be appropriate.
- f. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials to include a stucco finish and a standing seam metal roof. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Ridge caps are not to be installed. The proposed stucco should feature a color that matches that found throughout the structure.
- g. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum clad wood windows; however, is requesting to amend the previously approved fixed windows for divided lite windows. The historic structure currently features remains of both one over one and two over

two wood windows. The applicant has noted matching the one over one window profile. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. as well as the matching of a two over two profile. White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

- h. PAINTING – The applicant has proposed to paint the existing structure to cover existing graffiti and various nonoriginal paint colors that have been applied to the structure to cover graffiti. Staff finds the painting of this structure given its existing condition if appropriate. Tan colored paint should be used to relate to the original brick color.
- i. INFILLING OF DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed to infill four existing door and transom window openings with wood siding on both the north and south facades. The original doors are no longer on site; however, the door headers and transom framing are still in place. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A. notes that existing window and door openings should be preserved. Staff finds that infilling the door openings to be appropriate only if the openings are infilled with stucco with a recession noting the location of the existing openings and that the transom openings are preserved and glass is installed.
- j. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for repair work to the historic structure at 504 Austin. Scopes of work include interior renovations; mechanical, electrical and plumbing upgrades; masonry repair and roofing. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submit final window specifications to staff for approval. White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- ii. That the roofing material be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation. Standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- iii. That the proposed paint color to tan to relate as closely as possible to the original color of the tan brick.
- iv. That the four door openings that are proposed to be infilled to infilled with stucco rather than wood siding and that the transom openings are preserved and glass is installed. The existing door header heights should remain as they originally were.
- v. That inconsistencies in current scopes of work related to storefront systems, roof decking, exterior modifications and roofing be corrected to match all previous approvals in regards to materials, architectural profiles and details.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

22. HDRC NO. 2018-185

Applicant: Charles Ramon

Address: 119 E MAGNOLIA AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace all existing wood windows and empty openings on the primary and accessory structures with new aluminum-clad wood windows to match the existing in size, proportion, configuration, inset, and detail.
2. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 119 E Magnolia is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1917 by builder A.G. Dugger. The home was designed in the Neoclassical style and features several of the style's characteristic architectural elements, including a façade dominated by a curved full-height porch with Corinthian columns, a second story balcony on the front façade, and an elaborate doorway surrounded by sidelights and a half elliptical transom. The house is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **EXISTING WINDOWS: CONDITION** – In a previously-approved application for final approval for a comprehensive restoration of the primary and accessory structures, a representative for the applicant provided a window schedule indicating which windows were to be restored and replaced. A majority of the existing windows were identified as to be restored based on their existing condition. Windows that were missing significant portions of material or missing completely were to be replaced in-kind with new wood windows by Marvin. The applicant is currently requesting to replace all of the existing wood windows with new aluminum clad wood windows. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic wood windows should be preserved. There are several window configurations on this structure that are character defining, including tripanel casement windows with transoms and thin divided lites, six over one double hung windows, six over one double hung windows, and more. Staff finds that the proposal to repair and restore a significant portion of existing windows and replace significantly deteriorated windows or missing windows with new wood windows, approved by the HDRC on April 4, 2018, to be appropriate. Staff does not find the new proposal to replace all windows with new aluminum-clad wood windows to be appropriate.
- c. **EXISTING WINDOWS: OCCUPANT CONCERNS** – The applicant has requested to replace all of the existing wood windows with new aluminum-clad wood windows due to the large number of existing windows, the scale of the project, and the desire to have consistency throughout the home. Staff has observed that several of the existing windows are in need of refitting in the frames and repair to alleviate open gaps resulting in air and noise infiltration. However, with repair, refinishing, and rehangng, these issues can be mitigated without full window replacement. Historic structures naturally settle and shift slightly over time, and the window openings and sashes have settled with the surrounding structure. Regular maintenance and repair of the windows is a standard basis of care for ensuring these openings are functional and any weatherization issues are addressed. Staff finds that in conjunction with repair and rehangng, the installation of weather stripping along the window frames and a rubber or foam gasket at the window sills would greatly mitigate air infiltration. 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. In most cases, windows may also be retrofitted with new glass. Interior storm windows are available that can be custom fitted to openings and, in many cases, are more effective in minimizing heat transfer than new windows. 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, including new wood windows, have a much shorter lifespan and the sash frames typically cannot be repaired once they fail.

- d. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION: SCOPE** – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification. The scope of work for this project is significant and comprehensive, including brick cleaning and repointing, roof replacement, restoration and replacement of columns, construction of a porte-cochere, door restoration and replacement, and a complete interior remodel to include electrical, HVAC, plumbing, drywall, and fixtures.
- e. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION: CONDITION** – Staff conducted a site visit on January 31, 2018, to examine the exterior conditions of the property. Staff commends the applicant for undertaking the structure’s rehabilitation.
- f. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION: REQUIREMENTS** – The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the original request to restore existing wood windows and replace in-kind as approved by the HDRC on April 4, 2018, be upheld.

If the HDRC approves this request, staff recommends that the following stipulation apply:

- i. That the applicant submits a final window specification for the proposed aluminum-clad wood windows to staff for review and approval. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on findings d through f.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Garza to deny Item #1 and approve Item #2.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2018-194

Applicant: Nadav Givoni, Eiyel Avbiel & Devin Tahuahua

Address: 226 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the contributing rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 226 E Huisache is a 2-story single family home constructed in approximately 1925 in the Colonial Revival style. The home features a stucco façade, arched entryway detailing with decorative bracketing, six over six wood window screens, and a prominent front chimney. The home is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The property also features a rear accessory structure constructed in approximately 1925. Overall, the structure is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. **DEMOLITION** – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only. There are not replacement plans proposed at this time. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historical development pattern within a historic district.
- c. **CONTRIBUTING STATUS** – The rear accessory structure was deemed to be contributing by staff in April 2018. The structure is a one story, three-bay auto structure constructed in approximately the same period as the primary structure. The structure appears on the 1911-1951 Sanborn Map in the same location, footprint, and configuration. The Sanborn Map indicates its original use as a garage. The structure is wood with woodlap siding and a composition shingle roof. The structure is exhibiting signs of deterioration and structural failure due to neglected repair and maintenance. The woodlap siding is rotting and separating near the base of the structure and the roofline is warped. While staff finds that the structure is deteriorating, the structure is still contributing to the district.
- d. **UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP** – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614, no certificate shall be issued for demolition of a historic landmark unless the applicant provides sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission of unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant. In the case of a historic landmark, if an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information regarding loss of significance. In order for unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. In the submitted application, the applicant has indicated that the structure no longer serves a purpose and poses a safety hazard due to its condition. However, the applicant has not yet attempted to collect reasonable costs for repair and restoration. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) has not been met based on the documentation provided.
- e. **LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE** – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff finds that additional evidence for loss of significance has not been provided and that UDC Section 35-614(c) has not been met.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition based on findings a through e. Sufficient documentation meeting the requirements for unreasonable economic hardship or loss of significance as outlined in UDC Sections 35-614(b) and 35- 614(c) has not yet been provided.

If the HDRC approves the demolition request, staff recommends that the following stipulation apply:

- ii. That materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding be salvaged and stored for use on site in future construction.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT TO 16 MAY 2018

24. HDRC NO. 2018-162

Applicant: Troy Turner/Max Developers Inc

Address: 714 SHERMAN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a one story, single family residential structure to feature 300 square feet on the vacant lot at 714 Sherman.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a single story, single-family residential structure on the vacant lot at 714 Sherman.
- b. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has provided a setback that per application documents is greater than those found historically on the block. Additionally, the applicant provided a site plan that indicates that the driveway will enter the center of the lot with the structure flanking at the southwest corner. Staff finds that the current site plan inconsistent with the pattern of the block and neighborhood regarding setbacks and orientation.
- c. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The proposed entrance is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of Sherman features six (6) one-story historic structures on the south side of the block. Staff finds the currently proposed scale and massing, to include width and depth to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structures' foundation and floor heights. The applicant has not noted an exact foundation height for the proposed new construction. Staff finds that the foundation height should be consistent with the Guidelines. Neighboring structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet.
- f. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a roof form featuring a shed roof sloped upward toward the front facade. Historic structures on this site feature hipped or gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be inconsistent with the pattern of this block and the Dignowity Hill Historic District for primary residential properties.
- g. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic

facades should be incorporated into new construction. The proposed design features a large square picture window on the front elevation, a one-over-one window on the left elevation, no windows on the right elevation, and sliding window above a square picture window on the rear elevation. Staff finds the square picture windows, the stacked windows, and the large spans of blank walls inconsistent with fenestration patterns found historically in the district.

- h. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed new construction is not more than fifty percent of the size of the total lot area.
- i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, a standing seam metal roof, and aluminum windows. Generally, the proposed materials are appropriate. Wood siding should feature a four inch exposure. The proposed roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- j. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum windows. Staff finds the proposed window materials appropriate. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The proposed new construction features inconsistencies with the historic development pattern found on this block of Sherman including building width, roof form, fenestration patterns and porch massing.
- l. SITE ELEMENTS – The applicant has not provided measured drawings or a site plan for landscaping and site elements with the exception of the proposed driveway. The proposed driveway’s location is inconsistent with those found historically on the block. The applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan as well as a site plan that notes an appropriate driveway width and location.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b through l. Staff recommends that the applicant revise the proposed new construction to address the inconsistencies noted in the above findings.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

25. HDRC NO. 2018-196

Applicant: Chris Williams

Address: 121 BUFORD

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Install a steel planter with wood trim below a front façade window (68” long × 12” wide × 26” tall).
- 2. Install a steel planter with wood trim adjacent to the front porch steps (80” long × 32” wide × 16” tall).

3. Install two (2) wood planters adjacent to the public right-of-way (36" wide × 24" tall – 20' and 10' long segments).
4. Replace the natural lawn with decomposed granite, low ground plantings, and concrete pavers.
5. Install a crushed granite walkway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 121 Buford was constructed circa 1920 in the Craftsman architectural style. The structure is a single-story, single-family residential structure that features a clipped gable roof, a front porch with two entry doors, and double-hung wood windows. Prior to site work without approval, the property's front yard once featured natural lawn, portions of chain-link fencing, and a concrete walkway meeting the sidewalk at the public right-of-way.
- b. VIOLATIONS – In January 2018, site work was performed on the property prior to approval. Each of the following items were heard and denied by the HDRC on February 7, 2018:
 1. Amend an administrative approval to allow a fence height of six feet, past the plane of the front façade.
 2. Removal of the sidewalk at the public right of way and to install black basalt gravel paving.
 3. Removal of natural lawn in the front and side yards and to install decomposed granite and low-ground cover.
 4. Install concrete pavers.
 5. Install a steel planter below front façade windows.
 6. Install a steel planter adjacent to the front porch and steps.
 7. Install a two foot tall gabion wall with a 6-inch tall steel planter.
 8. Install a six foot tall masonry solar screen with three, 6-inch tall planters
- c. COMPLIANCE – The applicant has noted the reduction of height of the 6-foot tall fence past the front façade plane of the house to comply with the previous issued administrative approval for rear and side fencing (addressing violation #1). The applicant will also remove the black basalt gravel paving functioning as off-street parking and reinstall the sidewalk at the public right-of-way (addressing violation #2). These items will not require HDRC action.
- d. UPDATED DESIGN – The following items were submitted by the applicant in pursuit of compliance and require action from the HDRC.
- e. STEEL PLANTER WITH WOOD TRIM (BELOW WINDOW) – The applicant has proposed to install a steel planter with wood trim below the front facade window. The planter will feature a dimension of 68 inches in length, 12 inches in width and 26 inches in height. Staff finds that the proposed material of the planter is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 1.A.iii. An drawing or image of the planter design must be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness.
- f. STEEL PLANTER WITH WOOD TRIM (PORCH) – The applicant has proposing to install a steel planter with wood trim adjacent to the front porch. The planter will feature a dimension of 80 in length, 32 inches in width and × 16 in height. Staff finds that the proposed material of the planter is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 1.A.iii. An drawing or image of the planter design must be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness.
- g. WOOD PLANTERS BY PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY – The applicant has proposed to clad the existing rock and wire mesh planter (gabion wall) with wood to mimic the installation of a wood planter. The applicant has also proposed to remove the masonry solar screen to install a wood planter to match the proposed wood-clad gabion planter in dimension and design. The wood planters will feature a dimension of 36 inches in width, 24 inches in height and segments of 10 and 20 inches in length along the public right of way. The planters are intended to function as a buffer from the sidewalk and the front yard. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 1.A.iii. for New Elements and 2.B.i through v. The gabion wall and

masonry solar screen should be completely removed. The applicant may request to install a front yard fence design that is consistent with the Guidelines in height, design, and material.

- h. XERISCAPING – The applicant has proposed to install decomposed granite, concrete pavers, and low ground plantings where the site once featured natural lawn. Staff finds that proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements provided that more low ground and xeric plants be introduced to the original design to mitigate the wholesale removal of natural lawn.
- i. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a crushed granite walkway between the sidewalk and the front porch. The walkway originally featured poured concrete before it was replaced with decomposed granite and rectangular concrete pavers. While a crushed granite walkway would be an improvement from the current walkway featuring concrete pavers in a contemporary manner, staff finds that a simple poured concrete walkway based on the photographic evidence is more consistent with the Guidelines which note that every effort should be made to match the existing sidewalk color and material.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items 1 and 2 based on findings e and f with the stipulations that a final drawing or image of the planter design be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 3, the wood planters adjacent to the public right of way, based on finding g. Staff recommends the total removal of the inappropriate installations.

Staff recommends approval of items 4 and 5 based on findings h and i with the stipulation that the walkway feature simple poured concrete and final site plan be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT TO 16 MAY 2018

26. HDRC NO. 2018-144

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Type of Work: Review and Recommendation of UDC Amendments relating to Viewshed Protection (Updated with revisions)

REQUEST:

With direction from the City Council Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee, the Office of Historic Preservation is requesting review and recommendation of amendments to Chapter 35 (Unified Development Code) of the City Code relating to viewshed protection and the establishment of Viewshed Protection Districts.

FINDINGS:

- a. District 7 Councilwoman Ana E. Sandoval and District 2 Councilman William “Cruz” Shaw have submitted a City Council Resolution to initiate the process to consider additional San Antonio landmarks for viewshed protection and to enable the establishment of potential Viewshed Protection Districts. The CCR also directs OHP staff to study additional views and vistas of historic places, landmarks, and cultural resources for consideration for viewshed protection.

- b. The current provisions of the UDC limit the types and opportunities for viewshed protection. For instance, the provisions do not currently allow for more than one view to be protected from a single site. The UDC also does not consider natural views and requires that protected sites be buildings with a “front door”. Other structures, such as bridges or public art pieces, are not currently considered.
- c. The proposed amendments (provided in the exhibits for this request) address the following:
 - a. Updates and clarifications to the original 2003 ordinance
 - b. Eligibility requirements that establish where and when a new viewshed protection district may be established
 - c. Criteria for the objective evaluation of proposed viewshed protection districts
- d. Viewshed Protection Districts function as a zoning overlay. With a district in place, individual projects within the district are reviewed for conformance with any imposed height restrictions as part of the development review process. Any amendments to the designation criteria would not automatically result in a new district or associated regulations for the listed sites. With direction from Council, staff would further explore the best approaches for each site and work with the public to propose and adopt any new zoning districts. The HDRC will be included in the future adoption process for new districts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed UDC amendments.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of the 18 April 2018 Historic and Design Review Commission Meeting minutes.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve meeting minutes.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor to adjourn.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:29 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair