

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
16 May 2018**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:05 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, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Laffoon

**ABSENT:** Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Brittain, Garcia

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-213 901 E HOUSTON (TAX CERTIFICATION)
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-226 901 E HOUSTON (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #3, Case No. 2017-495 711 BROADWAY
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-222 619 BARBE
- Item #6, Case No. 2017-204 611 N OLIVE
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-197 800 E GUENTHER
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-208 802 NOLAN
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-209 856 GEMBLER
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-216 1115 BURNET
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-221 802 MATAGORDA
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-223 206 W LULLWOOD
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-211 428 DEVINE
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-228 114 E RISCHE

Items #5, #13, and #16 were pulled for citizens to be heard.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**5. HDRC NO. 2018-199**

**Applicant:** Seth Teel/Somos Real Estate

**Address:** 819 DAWSON

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property at 819 Dawson.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property located at 819 Dawson Street, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. The applicant has performed scopes of work that are consistent with issued Certificates of Appropriateness which includes foundation repair, window replacement, structural repairs, painting and interior improvements including electrical, mechanical and plumbing.
- c. The requirements for Historic Tax Verification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs and an itemized list of costs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Evelyn Brown spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**13. HDRC NO. 2018-194**

**Applicant:** Nadav Givoni, Eiyel Aviel & 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. 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. The applicant has noted that the repair of the accessory structure would be significantly higher than the cost to demolish the structure. The applicant has provided an engineer’s letter to staff assessing the hazardous state and poor performance of the structure, as well as a stamped architect’s letter noting the cost for reconstruction of a structurally sound accessory structure.
- 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. 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. The applicant has provided photographs and exhibits that demonstrate that the structure is in a state of disrepair, including severe differential settlement and buckling of vertical support elements. The structure would require substantial stabilization and partial reconstruction per the professional letters provided. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to the deterioration of original materials and structural failure over time.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition of the rear accessory structure based on findings a through e with the following stipulation:

- i. 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:** Patti Zaiontz and Tony Garcia spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2018-189**

**Applicant:** Eduardo Martinez

**Address:** 815 N HACKBERRY ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the rear accessory structure at 815 N Hackberry.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 815 N Hackberry was constructed circa 1920 and features Folk Victorian architectural elements including brackets under the roof eaves, spindle or fretwork and both a front and side gabled roof. The primary historic structure and rear accessory structure first appear on the 1951 Sanborn map. A previous structure with a much smaller footprint was located at this location on the 1912 Sanborn map.
- b. DEMOLITION – At this time, the applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historic development pattern within a historic district.
- c. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – As noted in finding a, the structure is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map and features a footprint that is generally consistent with the footprint presently found on site. Staff performed a site visit on April 23, 2018, and found the structure to be in disrepair; however, 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. The applicant has noted that the repair of the accessory structure would be significantly higher than the cost to demolish the structure. The applicant has provided a cost estimate to OHP staff noting the cost for reconstruction of a structurally sound accessory structure and an engineer's letter noting a poor structural condition and an inadequate foundation.
- e. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to the substantial deterioration of original materials.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition of the rear accessory structure with the stipulation that materials that have not deteriorated be salvaged and stored on site.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Evelyn Brown spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Fish to postpone because the applicant was not present.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2018-218**

**Applicant:** Ricardo Turrubiates/Terramark TX

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

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a two story, single family residential structure at 725 Hays.
2. Construct a two story, single family residential structure at 729 Hays.
3. Construct a two story, single family residential structure at 901 N Pine.

**FINDINGS:**

General Findings:

- a. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 13, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted a concern regarding lack of fenestration and the small windows on side elevations. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on May 8, 2018. At that meeting, the commissioners noted that a clad wood window was most appropriate for new construction. The commissioners were noted that the proposed setbacks were appropriate and were comfortable with the proposed modifications to the porch designs.
- b. CONTEXT – This block of Hays Street is relatively intact featuring both Victorian and Craftsman style structures. Two, two story, four square structures exist on the north side of the street.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of one, two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 725 Hays.
- 1b. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has noted that setbacks on this block of Hays consist of 29, 31, 31.6, 36.5 and 36.7 feet. The applicant has proposed a setback of 31' – 6", which per the application documents is matching or greater than three of the existing structures on the block. Generally, staff finds the proposed setbacks to be appropriate.
- 1c. 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.
- 1d. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of Hays features two, two story

historic structure on the north side of the block. Generally, the proposed scale and massing is appropriate.

- 1e. 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 provided elevations that note a foundation height of approximately 14 inches. Neighboring structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. Generally, the proposed foundation height is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 1f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has modified the previously proposed roof form to feature a hipped roof. The newly proposed roof form will not feature a rear profile that is larger in massing than that of the front roof profile. Staff finds the newly proposed roof form to be appropriate.
- 1g. 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 modified previously proposed window openings to include a full sash window on each façade rather than a combination of fixed and sash windows. Staff finds the proposed windows to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should explore the installation of a window to the right of the front door.
- 1h. 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.
- 1i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include horizontal composition siding and an asphalt shingle roof. The applicant has proposed siding profiles of both four and six inches. While staff finds a four inch exposure to be most appropriate, a six inch exposure may be appropriate. All composition should feature a smooth finish.
- 1j. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed vinyl windows to feature a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. Staff finds the proposed window material to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Per the Guidelines, an aluminum-clad wood window is most appropriate in terms of depth and appearance. 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.
- 1k. WINDOW TRIM – The applicant has noted the installation of window trim to include 2x4 and 2x6 dimensional lumber. This trim detail has been used by the applicant previously.
- 1l. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a porch featuring a depth of approximately 8’ – 5” with wood columns feature brick bases. Wood columns featuring brick bases are found a multiple houses on this block of Hays. The proposed wood columns will feature eight inch square dimensions. The proposed brick bases and brick wall will feature heights of approximately 4 feet and 3 feet. Staff finds this to be appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has updated the proposed porch design to include a full width porch.
- 1m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has addressed many of staff’s previous concerns regarding architectural details. The applicant should ensure that all double windows are separated by a horizontal mullion of at least six inches in width.
- 1n. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway to the right of the proposed new construction, matching the historic driveway locations on the block. Staff finds the use of concrete appropriate. Driveway widths should not exceed ten (10) feet in width per the Guidelines for Site Elements.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of one, two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 729 Hays.

- 2b. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has noted that setbacks on this block of Hays consist of 29, 31, 31.6, 36.5 and 36.7 feet. The applicant has proposed a setback of 31' – 6", which per the application documents is matching or greater than three of the existing structures on the block. Generally, staff finds the proposed setbacks to be appropriate.
- 2c. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The proposed entrance is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2d. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of Hays features two, two story historic structure on the north side of the block. Generally, the proposed scale and massing is appropriate.
- 2e. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. The applicant has provided elevations that note a foundation height of approximately one foot to 2.5 feet. Neighboring structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. Generally, the proposed foundation height is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2f. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has modified the previously proposed roof form to feature a front facing gabled roof and hipped roof. The newly proposed roof form will not feature a rear profile that is larger in massing than that of the front roof profile. Staff finds the newly proposed roof form to be appropriate.
- 2g. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has modified previously proposed window openings to include full sash windows on each façade rather than a combination of fixed and sash windows. Staff finds the proposed windows to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should explore the installation of a window to the right of the front door.
- 2h. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- 2i. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include an asphalt shingle roof, board and batten siding and horizontal composition siding to feature an exposure of six inches. The board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide. While staff finds a four inch exposure to be most appropriate, a six inch exposure may be appropriate. All composition should feature a smooth finish.
- 2j. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed vinyl windows to feature a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. Staff finds the proposed window material to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Per the Guidelines, an aluminum-clad wood window is most appropriate in terms of depth and appearance. 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. **WINDOW TRIM** – The applicant has noted the installation of window trim to include 2x4 and 2x6 dimensional lumber. This trim detail has been used by the applicant previously.

- 2k. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a front porch with a depth of approximately 8’ – 0”. Staff finds the proposed depth and eight inch square columns appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has increased the width of the proposed front porch to span the entire front façade.
- 2l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has addressed many of staff’s previous concerns regarding architectural details. The applicant should ensure that all double windows are separated by a horizontal mullion of at least six inches in width.
- 2m. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway to the right of the proposed new construction, matching the historic driveway locations on the block. Staff finds the use of concrete appropriate. Driveway widths should not exceed ten (10) feet in width per the Guidelines for Site Elements.

Findings related to request item #3:

- 3a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of one, two story residential structure on the vacant lot at 901 N Pine.
- 3b. 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 proposed new construction is a corner lot. The applicant has proposed a setback of 34’ – 7”, which is comparable to those found historically on this block of N Pine; however, the side setback proposed on Hays Street is only 25’ – 2”. While this matches the side setback of the historic structure across N Pine, it is less than the front setback of both proposed and existing structures that front Hays. Staff finds this proposed side setback to be inappropriate.
- 3c. 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.
- 3d. 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 N Pine features all single story structure; however, two story structures exist in the immediate vicinity on the 800 block of N Pine as well as the 700 block of Hays. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate.
- 3e. 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 provided elevations that note a foundation height of approximately one foot to 2.5 feet. Neighboring structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. Generally, the proposed foundation height is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 3f. ROOF FORM –The applicant has proposed a roof form to include a hipped roof with a rear roof form that features a half hipped, half gabled roof. At the rear, the applicant has proposed a compound roof to feature both a dipped and gabled roof, resulting in an increased roof height from what is featured on the front of the structure. Staff finds that the rear roof form should either feature a hip or gable that has a height consistent with that found on the front of the structure. This would also match roof forms found historically on the block.
- 3g. 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 modified previously proposed window openings to include full sash windows on each façade rather than a combination of fixed and sash windows. Staff finds the proposed windows to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should explore the installation of a window to the right of the front door.

- 3h. 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.
- 3i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include horizontal composition siding and an asphalt shingle roof. The applicant has proposed siding profiles of both four and six inches. While staff finds a four inch exposure to be most appropriate, a six inch exposure may be appropriate. All composition should feature a smooth finish.
- 3j. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed vinyl windows to feature a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. Staff finds the proposed window material to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Per the Guidelines, an aluminum-clad wood window is most appropriate in terms of depth and appearance. 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.
- 3k. WINDOW TRIM – The applicant has noted the installation of window trim to include 2x4 and 2x6 dimensional lumber. This trim detail has been used by the applicant previously.
- 3l. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a front porch with a depth of 8’ – 0”. Additionally, the applicant has proposed brick and wood columns. Generally staff finds the proposed porch depth and column design appropriate; however, staff finds that a full width porch would be most appropriate to relate to the historic, two story Craftsman houses in the immediate vicinity.
- 3m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in findings 3f, 3g and 3l, staff finds that the proposed roof form should be modified to not feature a compound roof at the rear, the additional fenestration should be added, that windows on the front façade should feature sashes and that the proposed front porch should span the width of the house. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant should ensure that all double windows are separated by a horizontal mullion of at least six inches in width.
- 3n. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has modified the previously proposed double width driveway to now feature a width comparable to those found historically in the district. Staff finds the proposed concrete to be appropriate. Driveway widths should not exceed ten (10) feet in width per the Guidelines for Site Elements.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. Staff recommends approval based on findings 1a through 1n with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant explore the installation of a window to the right of the front door as noted in finding 1g.
  - ii. That all composition siding feature a smooth finish and that the applicant provide staff with historic examples of siding with six inch exposures in the immediate area to ensure that an appropriate profile and detail is proposed as noted in finding 1i.
  - iii. That the proposed windows be aluminum-clad wood windows and follow staff’s specifications. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
  - iv. That all double windows are separated by wood mullions featuring at least six inches in width as noted in finding 1m.

- v. That the proposed concrete driveway does not exceed ten (10) feet in width as noted in finding 1n.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2 based on findings 2a through 2n with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant explore the installation of a window to the right of the front door as noted in finding 2g.
  - ii. That all composition siding feature a smooth finish and that the applicant provide staff with historic examples of siding with six inch exposures in the immediate area to ensure that an appropriate profile and detail is proposed as noted in finding 2i.
  - iii. That the proposed windows be aluminum-clad wood windows and follow staff's specifications. White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
  - iv. That all double windows are separated by mullions featuring at least six inches in width as noted in finding 2m.
  - v. That the proposed concrete driveway does not exceed ten (10) feet in width as noted in finding 2n.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3 based on findings 3a through 3n with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant explore the installation of a window to the right of the front door as noted in finding 2g.
  - ii. That all composition siding feature a smooth finish and that the applicant provide staff with historic examples of siding with six inch exposures in the immediate area to ensure that an appropriate profile and detail is proposed as noted in finding 2i.
  - iii. That the proposed windows be aluminum-clad wood windows and follow staff's specifications. White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
  - iv. That all double windows are separated by mullions featuring at least six inches in width as noted in finding 2m.
  - v. That the proposed concrete driveway does not exceed ten (10) feet in width as noted in finding 2n.
  - vi. That the side setback on Hays Street be increased as noted in finding 3b.
  - vii. That the current roof form be modified to more closely relate to the design updates found on the request items noted in #1 and #2 as noted in finding 3f.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Fish to approve with staff stipulations #4 and #5 and stipulation #2 approved as submitted.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** Grube.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **18. HDRC NO. 2018-227**

**Applicant:** Ricardo Turrubiates/Terramark TX

**Address:** 255 BRAHAN BLVD

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for two, single family residential structure to be located at the corner of Brahan Boulevard and Haywood Avenue in the Westfort Historic District. As currently proposed, two structures are to address Brahan.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for two, single family residential structure to be located at the corner of Brahan Boulevard and Haywood Avenue in the Westfort Historic District. As currently proposed, two structures are to address Brahan.
- 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. **CASE HISTORY** – A request for the approval of four, single family residential structures was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on April 18, 2018, where the commission denied the request for conceptual approval. That request featured two structures addressing Brahan and two structures addressing Haywood. At this time, the applicant has removed the structures on Haywood from the request and is only requesting approval of the proposed new construction on Brahan. Staff finds it most appropriate that all proposed structures are reviewed concurrently, rather than separately. The Design Review Committee reviewed this request on May 8, 2018. At that meeting, commissioners noted that the setbacks and spacing between the houses should be increased and detached garages would be more appropriate. One commissioner noted that attached garages might be appropriate if not visible from the street.
- d. **SITE PLAN** – The applicant has provided a site plan that notes the construction of two, two story residential structures. Two structures are proposed to be constructed on each lot. The applicant has noted one curb cut on Haywood Avenue that is to provide vehicular access to the rear of the lot.
- e. **SETBACKS (BRAHAN)** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., the front facades of new construction should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Where a variety of setbacks exist, the median setback of buildings should be used. The surrounding structures, many of which are not historic, feature varying setbacks. The applicant has provided a diagram noting the existing setbacks on this block of Brahan which include setbacks of 44', 57', 34' and 43'. East of Haywood Avenue, houses feature setbacks of 46', 32', 42', 39' and 60'. The applicant has proposed setbacks on Brahan Blvd of approximately 38'. Staff finds that a setback that is more consistent with the contributing properties on the block (45') would be more appropriate. An

increased setback on Brahan would likely reduce the feasibility of constructing houses on the rear lot (on Haywood).

- f. **BUILDING SPACING** – The applicant has proposed building spacing of 10’ – 0” between the proposed structures. Building on this block of Brahan feature predominately open yards with building spacing ranging from 10 to 59 feet historically. A minimum building spacing of 25 feet would be more appropriate. Additionally, staff finds that detached garages are more typical of the historic development pattern in the area and should be implemented.
- g. **SITE DESIGN** – The applicant has provided a conceptual site plan noting the locations of driveways, walkways, existing trees, proposed trees, fencing and open space. The applicant is proposing to avoid the addition of curb cuts on Brahan by providing vehicular access from Haywood and the rear alley. This is consistent with the historic development pattern of the block. Generally the proposed locations and design of site elements are appropriate.
- h. **WALKWAYS** – The applicant has proposed sidewalks to extend between the proposed new construction’s front porches to the sidewalks at the public right of way. Staff finds that the profile and width of the proposed sidewalks and walkways should match those found historically in the district.
- i. **DRIVEWAYS** – The applicant has noted the installation of a driveway with access to the lot from Haywood and a driveway with access to the lot from the rear alley. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B. notes that new driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. Additionally, the Guidelines note that new curbcuts and driveways should not be added where they did not previously exist. While not historically found in the district, staff finds the proposed curbcut and driveway on Haywood appropriate; however, the initial approach should to exceed ten (10) feet in width.
- j. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – At this time the applicant has provided staff with elevations noting proposed height, massing and architectural details. The applicant has provided two main conceptual designs, Craftsman and Tudor. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to develop the proposed design to include architecturally appropriate proportions, façade arrangement and materials for future review by the HDRC.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant increase the proposed setbacks from Brahan to be a minimum of 45 feet based on finding e.
- ii. A minimum spacing of 25 feet between the proposed homes should be maintained based on finding f.
- iii. That detached parking be incorporated instead of rear-loading attached garages based on finding f.
- iv. That the applicant develop sidewalks, walkways, and driveways to match those found historically in the district based on findings h and i.

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

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** Guarino, Fish.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

## 19. HDRC NO. 2018-225

**Applicant:** Edward Hernandez/Open Studio Architecture

**Address:** 115 BROADWAY

### REQUEST:

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

1. Refinish an existing projecting sign with white paint and tenant graphics.
2. Paint letters on the front architrave to closely match historic signage in location, size, and typography.
3. Install two marquee letter board cabinets on the southeast corner of the structure.
4. Install a flag pole above the front cornice.

### FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 115 Broadway is a locally designated historic landmark with the common name Lockwood Bank. The 3-story structure was constructed in 1918 in the Neoclassical style. The front façade features a dominant central entryway, four two-story fluted Doric pilasters, and four carved wreaths located above the pilasters in the frieze. The building was designated on October 27, 1988 as part of a comprehensive ordinance that landmarked nearly 1,100 structures in San Antonio.
- b. **PROJECTING SIGNAGE** – The applicant has proposed to refinish an existing projecting sign. The sign cabinet, which is currently yellow, will be painted white to match the existing temporary signage panel, which is slightly less wide than the cabinet. The cabinet dimensions are approximately 8 feet by 5 feet, which totals to approximately 40 square feet of signage area on each side, totaling 80 square feet. While this exceeds the maximum 50 square footage requirement, the refinishing of an existing sign is appropriate. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- c. **PAINTED SIGNAGE** – The applicant has proposed to paint the tenant name, “Sam Maverick Spirits,” on the architrave of the front façade in black serif lettering. According to submitted documents, the lettering will measure approximately 3 feet tall and 16 feet wide, including the spaces between letters, totaling 48 square feet overall. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new signage should be based on evidence of historic signs. Signs should be designed to respect and respond to the character and/or period of the area in which they are being placed. Signs should identify the tenant without creating visual clutter or distracting from building features and the vicinity of the built environment. Though the signage, in conjunction with the projecting signage, exceeds the overall square footage amount advised in the Guidelines, the proposed signage location, design, and size is derived closely from historic photographs and is appropriate for the structure.
- d. **MARQUEE SIGNAGE** – The applicant has proposed to install two marquee sign cabinets on the southeast corner of the building. The cabinets will feature rotating specials and information in white letters. Each cabinet measures 18 inches by 24 inches and their placement is based on historic photographs of the building, which originally featured metal plaques in the same general location. While staff finds the location appropriate overall, the material and signage type differ from historic evidence. Additionally, due to the amount of signage introduced by the refacing of the projecting sign and the new painted signage on the front architrave, the marquee signs contribute additional square footage that greatly exceeds the allowable amount as outlined in the Guidelines. Staff does not find the proposal appropriate due to the inconsistencies with historic precedents and the overall square footage of signage proposed.

- e. FLAG POLE – The applicant has proposed to install a flag pole above the front cornice. The flag pole will be on the central axis and project towards the street. There is archival evidence of a flag pole in the same location. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and eligible for administrative approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the refinishing of the projecting sign based on finding b with the stipulation that the applicant submits dimensions and a paint specification to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the painted signage based on finding c with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant calculates the square footage of the letters only to accurately reflect the additional square footage to be added to the building.
- ii. That the applicant submits a paint specification that is appropriate for historic masonry to staff for review and approval.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the marquee signs based on finding d.

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

- i. That the applicant submits details on how the signs will be affixed to the historic masonry.
- ii. That the cabinets feature rotating white lettering only. Flyers, advertisements, and other graphic materials are not permitted.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the flag pole installation based on finding e.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2018-224**

**Applicant:** Nate Manfred/French & Michigan

**Address:** 230 W LYNWOOD

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. Replace the existing concrete driveway apron with brick pavers to match the driveway.
- 2. Replace a portion of the concrete sidewalk with brick pavers to match the driveway.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 230 W Lynwood is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1938 in the Colonial Revival style. The home was designed by architect Fred Gaubatz and constructed by builder C. L. Browning. The home is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The property also contains a 2-story rear accessory structure, formerly a carriage house, also constructed circa 1938. The structure is contributing to the district. The property also contains a 1-story cabana constructed more recently.
- b. DRIVEWAY APRON – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing concrete driveway apron with gray cement pavers to match the driveway cement pavers. The width and configuration of the apron will be retained. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, replacement driveway elements should feature materials that are similar to those found on site. In the Monte Vista Historic District, driveways and driveway aprons with pavers are evident, particularly on Lynwood, Elsmere, and Kings Hwy. Based on the context of the district, staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- c. SIDEWALK – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing concrete sidewalk that runs the width of the driveway for 230 W Lynwood with cement pavers to match the driveway. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic paving should be maintained or replaced in-kind in the public right-of-way. Staff does not find the removal of the concrete sidewalk appropriate due to the disruption of the continuity of the sidewalk.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the driveway apron replacement based on finding b.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the concrete sidewalk replacement based on finding c. Staff recommends that this portion of the sidewalk remain concrete and be replaced in-kind if necessary with concrete to match the existing color, aggregate mix, width, and configuration.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with staff stipulations item #1 and deny item #2.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**21. HDRC NO. 2018-199**

**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. A 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. A 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:** Evelyn Brown spoke in opposition

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve with staff stipulations items #1, 2, 4, 5, and deny item #3. Commissioners added that site plantings should include ground cover.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2018-212**

**Applicant:** Emilio Ruvalcaba

**Address:** 616 NOLAN

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace damaged wood decking on the front porch floor with concrete.

2. Widen the existing front concrete walkway.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 616 Nolan was constructed circa 1906 in the Folk Victorian style. The one-story single family structure features shingled hipped and gabled roofs, a dormer, and a wraparound porch with ionic wood columns, traditional wood railing, decking, and steps.
- b. On a site visit conducted on April 19, 2018, staff found that the wood deck and steps have been replaced with poured concrete and the walkway has been replaced with a wider configuration prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- c. PORCH – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete deck and steps to replace the wood deck and steps. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii notes that replacement should be in-kind or compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. Staff finds that the concrete replacement is not consistent with the Guidelines and that applicant should return the porch and its steps to their original construction material and configuration.
- d. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing concrete walkway width from the three feet in width to five feet in width that expands to approximately ten feet in width as it approaches the front porch. The Guidelines for Sidewalks and Walkways 5.A.iii note that alterations to width and alignment should only be considered to preserve a historic tree. Staff finds that the proposal is inconsistent with the Guidelines and the walkway should be returned to its original configuration.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the modifications to the front porch, steps, and walkway. Staff recommends that the applicant return the features to their original material and form.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to deny item #1 and approve with staff stipulations item #2.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Grube, Kamal.

**NAYS:** Bustamante, Laffoon.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2018-206**

**Applicant:** Cynthia McBride Snell

**Address:** 215 BARRERA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new front yard fence featuring metal-frame cattle panel with a driveway gate.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 215 Barrera was constructed circa 1913 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure is a one-story, single-family residential structure featuring a traditional L-plan, crossed gabled roofs, a covered porch with wood columns and railing. The structure is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District and is individual designated as the Fritz Weingartz House historic site.
- b. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a cattle panel fence to span the width of the property, including a gate spanning 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 Barrera and within the Lavaca Historic District. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.i., privacy fences should be set back from the front façade to reduce their visual prominence. Staff finds that the fence should turn at the driveway to meet the corner of the structure, rather than spanning across the driveway as proposed. Staff finds that the driveway gate, if included, should be set back behind the front façade plane of the structure.
- 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 metal-frame cattle panel picket fence is not appropriate for the Folk Victorian style of the home. Staff finds that a wood picket, wrought iron, or wood-framed cattle panel fence would be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on finding b and c with the following stipulations:

- i. The cattle panel fence should feature wood framing with metal wire.
- ii. The fence should turn at the driveway to meet at the corner of the structure, as opposed to spanning across the driveway in the front.
- iii. The driveway gate should be located behind the front façade plane of the structure or removed from the design.
- iv. That no portion of the fence exceed four feet in height.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Fish to approve with staff stipulations #1 and #4.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Lafoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2018-220**

**Applicant:** Imelda Cervantes

**Address:** 1027 N MESQUITE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 7ft wrought iron fence in front yard with driveway gate.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property at 1027 N Mesquite initiated the installation of a 7 foot tall wrought iron fence in the front yard to replace the existing chain-link fence prior the approval. An administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on May 3, 2018 to: *Replace the existing, chain link fence with a new, wrought iron fence. The wrought iron fence is not to exceed four (4) feet in height at any location. The fence is to turn at driveway to meet at the corner of the house rather than spanning across the driveway. Gate installation is to occur at or behind the front façade plane of the house.*
- b. AMENDMENT – The applicant is request to amend the existing approval to allow up to 7-foot tall fencing in the front yard and a driveway gate spanning in the front of the property rather than set behind the front façade plane of the structure. Staff finds the request is inconsistent with the Guidelines for New Fences 5.B.iii and 5.C.i. staff finds that the administrative approval should be adhered to.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of a 7 foot tall front yard fence or the front yard driveway gate based on finding b. The previous administrative approval of a front yard fence with no portion exceeding 4 feet in height and the driveway gate set behind the front façade plane of the home must be adhered to.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve the front yard gate but deny the request for additional height. Gate should be no taller than 4 feet.

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

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2018-207**

**Applicant:** Jenny Hernandez

**Address:** 410 N OLIVE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 410 N Olive.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 410 N Olive. The applicant has proposed for the structure to feature one story in height.
- 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. **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. At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding setbacks to staff at this time. The applicant is responsible for providing an appropriate setback prior to receiving conceptual approval.
- d. **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.
- e. **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 on N Olive features one story structures. The proposed massing of one story is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **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 specified foundation heights at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines.
- g. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include both hipped and gabled roofs. These forms are found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **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 sizes and locations comparable to those found historically in the district. Double windows should feature a mullion of at least six inches between openings. A transom window should be featured above the front entrance door.
- i. **WINDOW BAY (Fenestration)**– The applicant has proposed a window bay to feature a total of four windows. Double windows will be featured at the center of the bay, a detail that is not found historically throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds that a single window, centered under the gable should be installed.
- j. **FRONT FAÇADE MASSING** – The applicant has proposed front façade massing that includes a window bay that is covered by a gabled roof which features the same façade plane as the structure’s primary roof (hipped). The historic profile of a window bay includes an extension beyond the profile and massing of the structure’s primary roof and porch. Staff finds that the primary wall of the structure should be shifted toward the rear to produce a true “L-plan”, rather than feature a window bay that shares a wall plane with both the porch and front façade of the house.
- k. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials to include composite siding, a composition shingle roof and aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds the proposed materials to be

appropriate; however, the proposed composite siding should feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish.

- l. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed Pella aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds the proposed windows to be 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. Additionally, staff finds that a one over one window would be most appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- m. **ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN** – Generally, the proposed new construction features an architectural form that is appropriate in scale and massing for the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Modifications should be made to the proposed fenestration pattern for the proposed window bay on the front façade and front façade massing as noted in findings i and j.
- n. **DRIVEWAY** – The applicant has proposed to install a driveway that will lead into the front façade of the proposed new construction, resulting in a driveway that is the depth of the front yard as well as front yard parking. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A. notes that the historic pattern of driveways found in the district should be followed. Additionally, The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. notes that off street parking is to be located at the rear or side of the primary structure. The proposed driveway and parking locations are not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval based on findings a through n. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to receiving conceptual approval.

- i. That the applicant provide information regarding an appropriate setback as noted in finding c.
- ii. That the applicant provide information regarding an appropriate foundation height as noted in finding f.
- iii. That the ensure that double windows feature a mullion of at least six inches between openings and that a transom window should be featured above the front entrance door as noted in finding h.
- iv. That the proposed window bay feature three windows with the middle window being centered under the gable as noted in finding i.
- v. That the primary entrance wall of the structure should be shifted toward the rear to produce a true “L-plan” with a protruding front bay rather than a window bay that shares a wall plane with both the porch and front façade of the house as noted in finding j.
- vi. That the proposed aluminum clad wood windows follow the specifications outlined in finding l
- vii. That the proposed composite siding s feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish as noted in finding k.
- viii. That the proposed driveway and front yard parking locations be eliminated as noted in finding n.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to postpone since the applicant was not present.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, 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 Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Bustamante to approve meeting minutes.

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

**NAYS: None.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante to adjourn.

**AYES: Guarino, Fish, 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 5:36 PM.

APPROVED

Michael Guarino  
Chair