

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
6 June 2018**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:04 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, Fetzer, Laffoon**

**ABSENT: Connor, Bustamante, Brittain, Grube, Kamal**

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-189 815 N HACKBERRY
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-266 S ALAMO ST FROM PEREIDA ST TO CESAR CHAVEZ BLVD
- Item #3, Case No. 2018-214 110 E HOUSTON
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-238 233 MADISON
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-247 7110 BASIN
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-272 1305 E HOUSTON
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-270 802 N PINE
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-241 924 DAWSON (TAX CERTIFICATION)
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-242 924 DAWSON (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-230 321 BRAHAN
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-236 108 MEDINA
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-237 624 LEIGH
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-243 503 NOLAN, 507 NOLAN
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-246 311 BARRERA
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-255 257 BUSTILLOS
- Item #17, Case No. 2018-257 610 BARBE
- Item #18, Case No. 2018-260 418 E MULBERRY
- Item #19, Case No. 2018-262 403 GILLESPIE
- Item #20, Case No. 2018-267 714 N PINE
- Item #21, Case No. 2018-268 436 DEVINE
- Item #22, Case No. 2018-003 1201 N ST MARYS

Items #16 and #23 were pulled for citizens to be heard.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

Note: Commissioner Kamal arrived at 3:11 PM.

**16. HDRC NO. 2017-254**

**Applicant:** Tobias Stapleton

**Address:** 205 OSTROM

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a rear, two story addition and perform exterior modifications to the primary historic structure.
2. Construct a rear, two story, accessory structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 205 Ostrom was constructed circa 1935 and is located within the River Road Historic District. The structure features architectural elements that are indicative of the Minimal Traditional Style that can be found in the district. The house features many of its original materials including wood siding and wood windows. However, modifications to the form of the historic structure have resulted in the removal and enclosing of the front porch, which now presents itself as a screened porch. Despite these modifications, staff finds the house to be a contributing resource within the River Road Historic District due to its construction date and architectural style. At this time, the applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a rear addition and a two story, rear accessory structure.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 3, 2018, where committee members noted that fenestration on the second story should be comparable to that on the first floor, that the roof form of the original structure should remain as is, that windows should feature profiles that match those found in the district, and that additional fenestration details should be provided. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on May 23, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that the updates met previous committee recommendations and that trees should be shown on the site plan. The applicant made changes based on the feedback, including location and detailing of windows and architectural details.
- c. ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has sited the proposed addition at the rear of the primary historic structure and has proposed a width that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure.
- d. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature side gabled roofs, consistent with the roof form found on the historic structure and throughout the district. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. TRANSITION – The Guidelines note that all additions should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed transitions that include insets from the wall planes of the historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.

- f. **SCALE, MASS & FORM** – Regarding scale, mass and form, the applicant has proposed an addition that features two stories in height. While the primary historic structure on the lot features one story in height, the applicant has positioned the proposed addition toward the rear of the lot away from the block face of adjacent streets. Staff finds that the proposed height will not interrupt the block face or perceived massing found along adjacent blocks. The applicant has provided a line of sign diagram providing sight references from various points in front of the primary historic structure.
- g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, the proposed addition features architectural details that are consistent with those of the original structure which was constructed in the Minimal Traditional style. To provide additional façade depth, staff finds that shed roofs or small traditionally detailed awnings could be added above doors on the proposed addition which would be consistent with the style of the house.
- h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, refurbished wood windows and an asphalt shingle roof. Generally, the proposed materials are appropriate. When returning for final approval, the applicant should provide specifics regarding siding material and windows.
- i. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted the use of repaired windows. Regarding new windows, Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- j. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – To the west of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a two story, rear accessory structure. The proposed accessory structure feature an overall profile and massing that is subordinate to the proposed addition, features appropriately detailed garage doors and features architectural detailing that’s consistent with the historic examples found throughout the River Road Historic District. Staff finds the proposed accessory structure appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. **DRIVEWAYS** – The applicant has proposed to introduce one new curb cut on the property to exist with an existing curb cut that is located on Ostrom Drive. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that historic profiles are to be used for the creation of curb cuts and that typical driveway widths are to be used, typically no wider than ten feet in historic districts; however, there are examples in the immediate area of curb cut and driveway widths that are wider than ten feet in width. Staff finds that the proposed driveway location is appropriate.
- l. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia crossing the property. Therefore, Archaeological investigations may be required.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through l with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide additional information regarding new windows when returning for final approval. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently

within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

- ii. That shed roofs or small traditionally detailed awnings could be added above doors on the proposed addition.
- iii. That an up-to-date site plan be provided which demonstrates tree preservation on the site.
- iv. **ARCHAEOLOGY-** An archaeological investigation is required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Lawrence DeMartino, Christopher Green, Mimi Quintanilla (David Schmidt yielded his time), Jim Cullum (Sylvia Guzman yielded her time), Myfe Moore, Barbara Witte-Holl, Gemma Kennedy, Raleigh Wood (Darla Piner and Fred Gonzalez yielded their time) spoke in opposition.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**NAYS:** Garza, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2018-265**

**Applicant:** Ryan Conway

**Address:** 819 AUGUSTA, 726 MCCULLOUGH, 723 BROOKLYN AVE, 516 DALLAS ST, 727 BROOKLYN AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 5-story multifamily structure on the lots bounded by Dallas St, McCullough Ave, Augusta St, and Brooklyn Ave.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a 5-story multifamily development on the parcels bounded by Augusta St, McCullough Ave, Brooklyn Ave, and Dallas St. Currently, the block is divided into several parcels. The block is undergoing the replatting process.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee (DRC) on January 23, 2018. At the time, only a site plan was presented, along with some inspiration images of similar structures in San Antonio and elsewhere that contained design elements or approaches related to the proposed new construction. The DRC was favorable of the general direction and found a 5-story structure to be appropriate based on the current context of the block and the surrounding vicinity. The DRC

stressed the importance of landscaping and pedestrian scale, and encouraged the applicant to incorporate pedestrian-scaled design details such as porches and projecting balconies.

- d. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed to incorporate pedestrian walkways and small pedestrian plazas throughout the site, particularly along Broadway. This is consistent with the UDC
- e. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – The applicant has proposed curb cuts on McCullough Ave and Brooklyn St. Though the submitted drawings do not indicate the width of the curb cut on Brooklyn St, it appears to feature a total width of thirty-six (36) feet or more to facilitate vehicular access into and from the proposed parking structure. While the proposed curb cut width may exceed that allowed by UDC Section 35-673(1), staff finds that this width is appropriate given the volume of traffic that will enter and exit the garage and the fact that the applicant has broken up the width with the proposed median.
- f. PARKING GARAGE – The proposed complex will feature an enclosed parking garage. The garage will be accessed via McCullough Ave and Brooklyn St. On the Dallas St side, the garage will not be visible due to residences and retail spaces occupying the public elevation. Generally, the proposed development is consistent with the provisions of the UDC Section 35-672 in regards to pedestrian circulation and automobile access and parking. Staff finds that careful consideration should be paid to the garage elevations, particularly on Brooklyn Ave, and that a comprehensive screening method should be proposed for final approval to conceal parked cars from the right-of-way. Staff also finds that a fully wrapped condition is most consistent with the UDC.
- g. 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. Staff finds the applicant’s proposed locations of pedestrian access which are located along Brooklyn Ave, McCullough Ave, Dallas St, and Augusta are appropriate. At the street level, the applicant has proposed to incorporate outdoor balconies, seating space, and low plantings. This is consistent with the UDC.
- h. LANDSCAPING – The UDC Section 35-673(3) provides information regarding landscape design. The applicant has provided a site plan noting the locations of fountains, outdoor gardens, outdoor plaza and seating areas and a green wall. Staff finds the proposed locations of landscaping elements appropriate; however, the applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan at the time of final approval.
- i. STREET FURNISHINGS – Street furnishings throughout the RIO are to be constructed of high quality materials that complementary to the tradition and craftsmanship of the River Walk. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(i) in regards to street furnishings.
- j. LIGHTING DESIGN – Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project’s design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. This applicant is to provide a lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.
- k. MECHANICAL 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 to comply with this section of the UDC and provide information to staff regarding the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.
- l. 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 proposed human scaled elements that include human scaled horizontal bandings, human scaled openings and human scaled materials such as brick. Additionally, the UDC states that primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Staff finds that the proposal generally meets this guideline for distinguishing pedestrian entrances, but finds that the building form and design should be more prominent at the intersection of McCullough and Augusta to clearly indicate the primary elevation of the overall complex.

- m. **BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, the maximum height of new construction in RIO-2 is ten stories and 120 feet. The proposed height and scale is allowable under RIO, however, new construction should still relate to its surrounding neighborhood context. While single-story homes are located in the immediate vicinity, the proposed scale is generally compatible with the neighborhood which contains a diversity of scale and other full-block buildings. The proposed parking garage access faces parking field that is used by Central Catholic High School.
- n. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant has proposed materials that include buff colored and dark brown brick veneer, stucco, and fiber cement siding. These materials are consistent with the UDC.
- o. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, buildings should have a distinctive base, middle, and 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 terminating caps on all facades. The base of the building could be further articulated through architectural details, material choices, and façade projections as noted in the UDC.
- p. **WINDOWS** – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. For window openings that are not included within a curtain wall system, an inset of at least two to three inches within each wall is required. The applicant has proposed bronze colored windows for the cream brick portions of the structure and cream colored windows for the darker brick portions of the building, which staffs finds appropriate. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- q. **SIGNAGE** – The proposal does not include signage at this time. The applicant is responsible for submitting a comprehensive signage plan for the complex as part of the application for final approval or as a separate request for HDRC review.
- r. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and includes a designated Local Historic Landmark. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia, a Spanish Colonial water feature, crossing the property. In addition, the Claudius King House, a designated Local Historic Landmark and Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (marker #2952) is located within the property. Subsurface deposits associated with this dwelling, including the building foundation, privies, and trash pits, are likely extant and shall be archaeologically documented. Thus, an archaeological investigation is required. State law requires a 60 day notice to the Texas Historical Commission prior to modifying the historical or architectural integrity of a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant explores ways to define the design of the structure at the intersection of McCullough and Augusta to create a more prominent primary corner façade condition as noted in finding k.
- ii. That the applicant incorporates a screening or a wrapped condition that is consistent with the UDC for the parking garage facades as noted in finding e.
- iii. That the applicant provides a detailed landscaping plan for final approval.
- iv. That the applicant screens all mechanical equipment from view and indicates mechanical equipment locations on their plans for final approval.
- v. That the applicant explores varying materials at the ground level to establish a building base consistent with the UDC.
- vi. That the applicant provides a final window specification for final approval. The windows must be inset at least two to three inches within walls.
- vii. ARCHAEOLOGY- An archaeological investigation is required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- viii. The request may not receive final approval unless final approval and permitting of the relocation of the Claudius King House at 819 Augusta and the Nesbitt House at 723 Brooklyn have been granted and all stipulations regarding the relocations have been met and implemented. This includes all state and federal requirements for the property including a mandatory 60-day notification period with the Texas Historical Commission.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2018-256**

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

**Address:** 139 E COMMERCE ST, 141 E COMMERCE ST, 106 RIVER WALK, 143 E COMMERCE ST, 145 E COMMERCE ST, 147 E COMMERCE ST, 149 E COMMERCE ST, 151 E COMMERCE ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the structures addressed as 139 and 141 E Commerce. These structures are individually designated historic landmarks; however, they do not feature a common name.
2. Construct a seventeen story, residential structure to feature both street and river retail space.

**FINDINGS:**

General findings:

- 1a. PREVIOUS APPROVALS – A request for the demolition of the structures located at 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149 and 151 E Commerce Street and 106 River Walk received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission at the April 20, 2016, HDRC hearing. At that time, conceptual approval for a ten level mixed-use structure was also issued. Since that time, the design of the proposed new construction has changed.
- 1b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was initially reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 27, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted concerns regarding the reuse of stone from the historic wall, notes that the paseo should remain small and intimate and that the mechanics of the proposed garage door is important in regards to the potential impact on pedestrians. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on April 24, 2018, where committee members noted that the paseo and massing were appropriate, that remnants of the existing wall should be included in the new design and notes that the patio and river façade details were important to the appropriateness of the new design. The request was reviewed a third time on May 23. Commissioners present clearly stated that additional sections of stone wall should be retained and that the treatment of the garage entry needed to be carefully explored further.
- 1c. RIVER WALK TREE – In addition to the existing stone walls, there is an existing fig tree that is growing from within the lower exterior stone wall at 145 E Commerce. The UDC Section 35-680(a) specifically states that the removal of or damage to heritage trees at the top of the river bank or along the River Walk is prohibited except where the tree is damaged due to disease, age or physical condition and must be removed. The HDRC may grant approval of the removal of the tree with a recommendation from the city arborist. In addition to a recommendation from the city arborist, the HDRC may take into consideration unusual or compelling circumstances. Staff finds that every attempt should be made to salvage and retain this unique tree on the site in a similar location that is visible from the River Walk.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1d. The structure at 139 and 141 E Commerce is zoned Historic Significant. According to a 1982 survey which led to the designation of the properties, the storefront facades facing Commerce Street are not original or of historic significance. This is evidenced by a historic photograph of the buildings that is included in the exhibits. Instead, it is believed that the stone walls on the River side of the property are remnants of much older buildings and are of historic significance.
- 1e. UDC Section 35-680 refers to the demolition of historic features along the River Walk as well as those throughout the River Improvement Overlay. This section specifically notes that the demolition of architectural features, artwork, furniture and other items that are products of Robert Hugman, the WPA, CCC, National Youth Administration and those dating back to the Spanish Colonial times constitutes an irreplaceable loss. At the River Walk level, 139 and 141 E Commerce feature a wall of approximately five feet in height that has been determined to predate the Hugman features of the River Walk. A pre Hugman era photograph notes an existing stone foundation, potentially incorporated into the stone wall currently at the site. Every attempt should be made to retain this historic building fabric which contributes to the unique authenticity of the River Walk. The Hugmanera walkway as indicated on the original Hugman plans must be protected and preserved throughout construction.
- 1f. The loss of a historic landmark constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

*A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*

[The applicant claims that without the demolition of 139 and 141 E Commerce, the owner would not be able to develop an economically viable project at this location. The applicant has noted that multiple attempts to adapt the property while maintaining the existing structures were determined to be non-feasible due to existing structural conditions and limitations. A June 2014 summary of the fair market value of the structures and property at 139 through 151 E Commerce and 106 River Walk was determined to be \$3,290,000. In 2014, the total assessed value was \$1,400,060. The applicant has provided an income and expense statement for both 2014 and 2015 for each of the properties in the request, including 139 and 141 E Commerce. Income for 139 and 141 in 2014 and 2015 totaled. \$27,564. It should be noted that 141 E Commerce was vacant during both years. Total income for 139 through 151 E Commerce and 106 River Walk totaled \$183,578.40 in 2014 and 178,418.40 in 2015. Net income after taxes and expenses was \$54,848.78 in 2015 and minus \$11,720.25 in 2015.]

*B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*

[The applicant has noted that each both 139 and 141 in addition to the other addressed structures have fallen into disrepair and are in need of renovation to maintain their integrity and value with consideration to increased assessed values and property taxes. On February 12, 2012, the restoration of the river level façade as well as other modifications to create a new restaurant space was conceptually approved by the Historic and Design Review, however, the applicant found that the expense to execute the design could not produce a reasonable return on the investment. The applicant has noted that other studies to determine an alternative use for the property which would maintain the existing structures were found to be non-feasible.]

*C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.*

[The applicant has not actively marketed the site to potential purchasers, however, as previously noted alternative proposals that would have adaptively reused the existing structures have been studied and proposed. Additionally, the applicant has noted that a loss of structural and architectural integrity has occurred and that superficial maintenance modifications have occurred to the rear facades which includes measures to prevent the façade from collapsing, the removal of original foundation materials, the removal of original brick and stone work, the removal of many original windows and doors as well as the creation of a new stucco façade covering much of not only 139 and 141 E Commerce, but the other addresses as well.]

- 1g. Staff finds that the legitimate claim for economic hardship found by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the April 20, 2016, HDRC hearing still holds validity. While there is little to no architectural significance on the E Commerce façade of 139 through 151 E Commerce, there are significant irreplaceable elements, notably the existing stone wall, that is a remnant of a previous porch as well as a significant, historic tree. Staff finds that the applicant should make every effort to preserve the existing stone elements that should be used throughout the new construction in a manner in which they are presented as part of the fabric of the River Walk as they are now. The applicant has noted through updated construction documents the selective reuse of these walls.
- 1h. If the HDRC finds that the claim for an economic hardship has been thoroughly substantiated in the application and at the public hearing and that the conditions of UDC 35-614 which would

warrant demolition apply, a recommendation for approval of the request for demolition will not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A permit will not be issued until replacement plans for the new construction are approved and all applicable fees are collected. The UDC states that permits for demolition and new construction shall be issued simultaneously if the requirements for new construction are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

- 1i. In regards to the documentation of the demolition of any historic landmark, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-614 prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 1j. 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.
- 1k. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed connections to the pedestrian paths and public right of way at both the River Walk and street levels and has proposed a paseo to connect pedestrian traffic at E Commerce Street to the River Walk below. Per submitted site plans, the flow of traffic at the River Walk level will not be impeded by proposed design changes. The applicant’s proposal is consistent with the UDC.
- 1l. ARCHITECTURAL FOCAL POINT – According to the UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), properties that appear to be the terminus at the end of the street or at a prominent curve in the river shall incorporate into their design an architectural feature that will provide a focal point at the end of the view. Given the unique location of this property immediately adjacent to the flood gate, near the intersection of E Commerce and the flood channel as well as being near the reconnection of the San Antonio River with the flood channel, various focal points exists. The applicant has noted that the proposed height, creation of a tower, variation of roof shape, change of color or materials from adjacent structures, articulated building corners and projecting balconies produce architectural focal points. This is consistent with the UDC.
- 1m. SOLAR ACCESS – The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study noting the proposed development’s shadow on the San Antonio River for both the summer and winter solstices, however, the Drury Plaza Hotel at 154 E Commerce casts an existing shadow that entirely covers the site during the winter solstice. The applicant’s proposal is consistent with the UDC.
- 1n. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed one curb cut to be located on E Commerce to facilitate vehicular access to the site. At this time, the applicant has not noted the total width of the proposed curb cut. Given the confines of the site, the only possible access point is from Commerce. In general, vehicle access across downtown sidewalks should be avoided and staff recommends that the applicant pursue alternatives to onsite parking such as leased parking opportunities nearby. If parking is approved on-site, staff finds that the applicant should take every precaution to minimize negative impacts to pedestrian traffic. Staff finds that the applicant should provide information on the anticipated volume of vehicular traffic accessing the site as well as diagrams addressing proposed steps to mitigate the queuing of automobiles that may impede on the public right of way. Special paving or signaling may be considered to provide visual cues to pedestrians. Additionally, coordination with and approval by Transportation and Capital Improvements is required to ensure the traffic flow on Commerce is not impeded.
- 1o. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – The applicant has noted the inclusion of an automated parking system. The applicant has proposed a garage screening that is integral to the design of the structure. Additional information is needed to fully understand the street-level condition of the

garage screening and operation, visible light behind the perforated screen, and general impact to the streetscape.

- 1p. **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. As previously noted, the applicant has created an open air pedestrian route through the site provided access to and from the River Walk level and the street level at E Commerce. Staff finds that in addition to the proposed outdoor commercial, dining and patio space, the applicant’s proposed pedestrian access route as well as its proposed materials are consistent with the UDC. Additionally, pedestrian entrances have been well defined, per the UDC.
- 1q. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(e) regarding landscape design, a variety in landscape design must be provided with no more than seventy-five (75) percent of the landscape materials, including plants being the same as those on adjacent properties. Additionally, according to the UDC Section 35-674(f), indigenous, non-invasive plant species and tropical plant species are permitted. The applicant has provided conceptual documents that include some information regarding landscape design. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC in regards to landscape design. A detailed landscaping plan should be submitted when an application for final approval is submitted.
- 1r. **STREET FURNISHINGS** – The applicant has provided a site plan which notes the use of patio and site furniture at the River Walk level. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(g) and (i).
- 1s. **SITE AND ARCHITECTURAL LIGHTING** – The applicant has noted that a lighting plan will be submitted for future consideration. A detailed lighting plan for both site and architectural elements should be submitted when an application for final approval is submitted that is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(j).
- 1t. **RIVER WALK PATH** – The UDC Section 35-673(l)(3)(A) addresses access to the public pathway along the river. The applicant has proposed to include dining areas at the River Walk level, therefore a clearly defined from the site onto the public right of way must be included into the design with either an architectural or landscape element. The applicant has proposed reuse of historic stone as well as landscaping elements to meet this requirement.
- 1u. **MECHANICAL 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.
- 1v. **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 included a human scale within the proposed new construction through the use of human scaled setbacks, mullion spacing, awnings, materials and balcony railings.
- 1w. **BUILDING MASSING** – The applicant has proposed building massing and a tower shape that narrow in width as they approach the river. Staff finds this appropriate a measure that will allow additional light to the River Walk all while reducing the perceived massing the proposed new construction at the River Walk level.
- 1x. **BUILDING HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. Section 35-674(c)(3) states that

building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. This structure is in immediate proximity of structures that feature significant height, primarily, the Drury Plaza Hotel. Staff finds the applicant's proposed height of approximately 196 feet appropriate.

- 1y. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. However according to 35-674(d)(2)(B), glass curtain wall panels are allowed in RIO-3 as long as the river and street levels comply with 35-674(d)(1). The applicant has proposed materials that include honed or smooth faced limestone, exposed, site cast concrete, glazing and glass curtain wall systems, folded mesh screening, wood storefronts and soffits, a bronze entry gate to the automated parking garage and folded mesh cladding. At the street and river levels, the applicant has proposed curtain wall systems that are to feature wood to be incorporated into both the storefronts and soffits. Additionally, at the river level, the applicant has proposed to incorporate stone and limestone. Staff finds that the street and river level treatments are generally consistent with the UDC, however, there is concern with amount of exposed perforated metal screening for the parking level that is visible from the River Walk. As submitted, staff does not find this to be a compatible material for the River Walk area and is potentially an inadequate screening method for the parking. More information is needed to fully assess the appropriateness of the material selection and screening method.
- 1z. **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 separated the building into three distinct sections including a base, a separate midsection featuring a modified footprint and massing and a cap which features overhands and shading and screening structure on the roof top. Additionally, the applicant has including modulating features to the proposed curtain wall system. The proposal is consistent with the UDC.
- 1aa. **COMMERCE STREET FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed a street level façade that features portions that are recessed from the existing street wall. The applicant has noted that these recessions are to form a hierarchy between entrance types. Staff finds that that the street façade's storefront system should be aligned with adjacent setbacks, particularly in locations of pedestrian entrances, to preserve the continuity of the street wall. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed garage entrance should be recessed as to not be as prominent as pedestrian entrances at this location and found historically on this block.
- 1bb. **CANOPY DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed canopies on both the river and street facades, each of which are designed in a manner that is complementary of the design and consistent with the UDC. Staff finds that the canopy on the street side be extended across the full façade to bring the ground level down to a more human scale consistent with the UDC.
- 1cc. **ARCHAEOLOGY** –The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District, is adjacent to the
- 1dd. San Antonio River, and is within the Spanish Colonial Potrero area. In addition, a review of historic archival maps shows structures within or adjacent to the project area as early as 1767. Furthermore, previously recorded archaeological site 41BX483 is in close proximity to the

property. Therefore, an archaeological investigation is required prior to any ground-disturbing activity.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through a through e, 1a through 1f, and 2a through 2s with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide a detailed landscaping, street furnishing, site lighting and architectural lighting plan as noted in findings 2h, 2i and 2 prior to returning for final approval.
- ii. That the applicant provide information regarding the screening of all service and mechanical equipment as noted in finding 2l.
- iii. That the applicant continue to develop the paseo, River Walk and street levels to incorporate more historic stone including a taller portion of the wall along the River Walk. The applicant should substantially increase the amount of historic wall that will be retained and incorporate taller portions into the design.
- iv. That the applicant make every attempt to salvage and replant the existing fig tree located in the stone wall on the River side of the property. The tree should be replanted in a similar location that readily visible from the River Walk. The applicant is responsible for coordinating and documenting these efforts with the City arborist and implementing any mitigation if recommended by the HDRC.
- v. That the proposed recessed pedestrian entrance on the E Commerce façade be modified to not be recessed, but rather align with the adjacent historic structures to provide continuity within the street wall.
- vi. That a ground-level canopy be extended across the entirety of the E Commerce façade to bring the project down to a pedestrian scale and provide shade.
- vii. That the applicant make every attempt to reduce pedestrian conflicts with the proposed automated parking system. The parking load should be reduced by securing off-site parking, and special paving or other visual cues should be implemented. Additional information should be provided to fully understand the operation of the garage and potential queuing on the pedestrian sidewalk. Additionally, the garage entrance should be recessed as to not be shown as prominently as the E Commerce façade and pedestrian entrances.
- viii. That the additional information regarding the proposed perforated metal screening be provided prior to a request for final approval in order to fully understand compatibility with the UDC and lighting and visibility of the parking area at night. Alternative materials or treatment of the parking area on the River side of the property should be considered.
- ix. An archaeological investigation is required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2018-190**

**Applicant:** L. Shannon O'Malley

**Address:** 1910 E HOUSTON ST  
430 N MONUMENTAL  
129 FLORENCE ALLEY

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct four, two story, single-family residential structures on the vacant lots bounded by N Monumental, E Houston and Florence Alley. The lots included are numbered 40, 41, 47 and 48.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct four, two story, single-family residential structures on the vacant lots bounded by N Monumental, E Houston and Florence Alley. The lots included in this request are numbered 40, 41, 47 and 48.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval of the construction of the proposed units on lots 40, 41, 47 and 48 at the May 2, 2018, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the applicant ensure that foundation heights are consistent with the Guidelines and within one foot of those found historically in the vicinity of the proposed new construction. **The applicant has noted that**
  - ii. **foundation heights will be at least one (1) foot in height.** ii. That proposed fixed windows feature sashes and that additional fenestration be added to facades that are currently void of fenestration. **The applicant has revised construction documents to note the installation of additional fenestration and sash windows.**
  - iii. That all composite siding feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish. Standing seam metal roofs 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. If a ridge cap is to be used, it shall be presented to staff at the time of final approval and should be minimal in profile with a height of less than two inches. **The applicant has noted that installation of composite siding with a six (6) inch reveal.**
  - iv. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed. has not noted window materials. Staff recommends the installation of wood or aluminum clad wood windows. White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. **The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum clad wood windows.**
  - v. That column details be submitted to staff when returning for final approval. **The applicant has provided a column detail to staff.**
  - vi. That gable returns/soffit boxes be eliminated. **The applicant has revised construction documents to note this change.**
  - vii. That the proposed new construction on lot 48 feature a transom window above the proposed front door and a window or door on both levels one and two where the wraparound porch terminates. The proposed new construction on lot 47 should feature a smaller window

adjacent to the front door, or a centered door with side lites and a transom window. All transom windows should feature divided lites. **The applicant has revised construction documents to note these changes.**

- c. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has provided a site plan noting the proposed new construction in context with existing structures on the block. Per this document, the applicant has proposed setbacks that are greater than those of structures currently existing on E Houston, N Monumental and Florence Alley. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Lots 40 and 48 feature structures that front both E Houston, but feature secondary facades that address N Monumental and Florence Alley. The applicant has proposed entrances to address E Houston. Lots 41 and 47 only address N Monumental and Florence Alley and feature primary entrances that address each of these streets. Generally the proposed entrance orientation is 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. In the immediate vicinity there are commercial structures featuring varying massing and footprints and single story residential structures. The proposed new construction is to feature two stories in height, footprints of approximately 1,000 square feet. The applicant has noted floor heights of 9’ – 0”. Staff finds the proposed scale and mass to be appropriate.
- 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 provided elevations that note a foundation height of approximately 1 (one) foot. Structures in the vicinity feature foundation heights that are between one and two feet in height. The proposed height of one foot is appropriate.
- g. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature gabled roofs and/or hipped roofs. Both of the proposed roof forms are found historically within the 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 and door openings that generally are consistent in proportion to those found historically in the district.
- i. **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 applicant has proposed new construction that features a building to lot ratio that is higher than that recommended by the Guidelines; however, this pattern is found historically in the immediate vicinity, specifically on N Monumental. Staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has noted materials that include either wood or composite siding and shingle or standing seam metal roofs. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate with the Guidelines for New Construction. Siding should feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish. Standing seam metal roofs 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. If a ridge cap is to be used, it shall be presented to staff at the time of final approval and should be minimal in profile with a height of less than two inches. The applicant has noted siding with an exposure of six inches. The applicant should submit details to staff regarding this exposure and historic

examples in the immediate vicinity of six inch exposures. Board and batten siding should feature boards that are 12 inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½” wide.

- k. **PORCH DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed for the proposed structures that front E Houston to have wrap around porches to address both street fronts. Staff finds this to be appropriate. Additionally, staff finds the proposed porch massing of each structure generally appropriate. Each porch features recessed massing and a porch structure that is integrated into the overall massing of the structure. Columns should feature a dimension of at least six inches square and should feature capital and base trim. The applicant has submitted a column detail noting 6 x 6 columns with both column and base trim.
- l. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, the proposed architectural details are in keeping with the Guidelines and architectural elements found historically in the district. While the applicant has added fenestration to each unit, staff finds that the inclusion of additional fenestration would be appropriate.
- m. **COVERED PARKING** – At the rear of the proposed new construction, the applicant has proposed covered parking consisting of simple shed roofs. Staff finds the proposed location and massing of the proposed covered parking to be appropriate. The proposed new construction on lots 48 and 40, which front E Houston feature covered parking in the form of a porte-cochere.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant submit details to staff regarding this exposure and historic examples in the immediate vicinity of six inch exposures.
- ii. That the applicant submit information regarding the proposed windows including materials and product information. 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.
- iii. That Standing seam metal roofs 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. If a ridge cap is to be used, it shall be presented to staff at the time of final approval and should be minimal in profile with a height of less than two inches.
- iv. That the applicant ensure that all windows feature sashes that are equal in height and that wood mullions of at least six inches in width separate all grouped windows.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2018-271**

**Applicant:** Chris Gill/CGRE LTD 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. Paint the structure to match closely to the color of the brick.
4. Enclose four existing door openings with wood siding.
5. Install a standing seam metal roof with a large profile ridge cap.
6. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 504 Austin was constructed circa 1905 and originally was the location of the residence and business of Charles Spohn, Sr., a baker. The structure features a brick façade with a hipped roof and a rear two story addition. The primary structure features an ornamental brick parapet and entrance which extends toward Austin Street past the front façade of the single story structure.
- b. **PREVIOUS APPROVALS** – On June 23, 2015, the applicant received on Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness for roof repair, window repair and the installation of wood doors. The applicant received approval at the December 6, 2017, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing to install a flat roof on the rear historic structure to include rooftop decking and railings, exterior lighting and wood windows within the existing openings. The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on February 23, 2018, for the installation of a bronze anodized aluminum storefront system and aluminum clad wood windows. Since the issuance of these Certificates of Appropriateness, work has been performed in violation. Most recently, the applicant received a COA for the installation of two over two aluminum clad wood windows on April 30, 2018.
- c. **CASE HISTORY**– 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. This request was heard again by the HDRC on May 2, 2018, where it was withdrawn by the applicant.
- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – On May 8, 2018, this request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee. At that meeting, committee members noted that the construction documents presented at that time were insufficient, asked questions regarding the proposed decking and waterproofing, were not concerned about the infill material of the doors (wood), noted that the materials (wood or stucco) should be consistent throughout the project, that brick should be painted a color similar to the original and that transom windows should remain with glass above infilled doors.
- e. **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 a wood siding. Per the Guidelines for Additions 2.A., new additions should be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should be sited at the side or rear of the primary historic structure, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the primary historic structure’s principal façade and should feature a transition to distinguish it from historic structure. Staff finds the proposed massing and roof form to be appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a side inset from the wall plane

of the historic structure. While the footprint and massing of the proposed addition are appropriate; staff finds that stucco would be more comparable to the historic structure's brick exterior.

- f. 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 wood siding exterior. Generally, staff finds the proposed addition to be appropriate; however, staff finds that stucco would be more comparable to the historic structure's brick exterior.
- g. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted materials that include metal railing, a standing seam metal roof and wood siding. Staff recommends stucco exteriors for both additions to relate to the masonry façade of the historic structure.
- 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. ROOFING – A standing seam metal roof was installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness in April 2018. A large profile ridge cap was installed, which is inappropriate and inconsistent with the historic profile. Staff finds that a crimped ridge seam should be installed.
- k. 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. At this time, unapproved work and work inconsistent with previous approvals (addition form, roof deck profile, roofing). Staff does not recommend approval of Historic Tax Certification until items are corrected or receive approval from the HDRC.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 with the following stipulations:

- i. That both additions feature stucco exteriors rather than the proposed wood siding.
- ii. That the existing doors are infilled with stucco and that wood transom windows remain with clear glass installed.
- iii. That the proposed paint color to tan to relate as closely as possible to the original color of the tan brick.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #5, the installation of a standing seam metal roof with a large profile ridge cap. Staff recommends that a crimped ridge seam be installed.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #6, Historic Tax Certification, until items are corrected or receive approval from the HDRC.

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

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve items #1-4 with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:**           **None.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

A second motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Garza to deny items #5-6.

**AYES:**           **Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.**

**NAYS:**           **None.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**27.     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 request was initially heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on May 2, 2018, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the DRC on May 9, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted concerns regarding the lack of fenestration on the front façade, noted that roofing materials should be consistent, recommended modifications to the plan to accommodate parking on the side of the structure and noted that fenestration on the first and second floors should interact.
- 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. 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.

- 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 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.
- 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 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.
- g. 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. Staff finds that the proposed street facing roof form should be modified to feature a front facing gable, a form that is found consistently on front facades throughout the Lavaca Historic District.
- 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 provided updates to the previous design. While many windows feature profiles consistent with those found historically in the district, the front façade features small, fixed windows, which are not historically found in the district. Additionally, double windows should be separated by a wood mullion rather than siding or abutting window trim.
- i. 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.
- j. 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).
- k. 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.
- l. 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.

- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in findings g, h, and l, 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.
- n. SOLAR PANELS – The applicant has noted the installation of twenty-four (24) solar panels at the rear of the proposed new construction. Staff finds the proposed location to be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings g, h and l. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to a recommendation for approval:

- i. 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 g.
- ii. That the applicant address the small, fixed windows proposed on the front façade where typically, one over one windows are located as noted in finding h. All windows grouped in groups of two should be separated by a mullion.
- iii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed as noted in finding k. 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 the proposed, front loaded carport and curved driveway be modified to not result in front yard parking as noted in finding l. The propose driveway should be straight and feature no more than ten (10) feet in width to match those found historically in the district.
- v. 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.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Fetzer to approve as submitted with staff stipulations related to item #3 and will additional roof stipulations.

**AYES:** Kamal, Fetzer.

**NAYS:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Laffoon.

**THE MOTION FAILED**

A second motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve with stipulations items #1 and #3, the additional roof stipulation, and the stipulation to remove the parapet.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:**           None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**28.     HDRC NO. 2018-234**

**Applicant:**     Michael Perez

**Address:**      1126 E CROCKETT ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 2-story single family home and a 1-story rear carport on the vacant lot located at 1126 E Crockett St.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story single family structure and a 1-story rear carport on the vacant lot at 1126 E Crockett, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The lot is mid-block and is flanked to east and west by 1-story single family structures. The lot features a downward slope from N Pine St to N Olive St.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on May 23, 2018. The DRC found the setback to be appropriate for the existing context on the block and the established setback pattern. The DRC requested that the applicant produce a street section or elevation that indicated the heights of the surrounding structures in context to determine the visual impact of a 2-story structure on the block. The DRC noted the presence of the slope of the street and the ubiquity of 2-story single family structures in the district. The DRC found the foundation height appropriate and also indicated the precedent for the footprint and width of the structure on the immediate block.
- d. **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. On the southern edge of E Crockett as bounded by N Olive St and N Pine St, the approximate setbacks from the street are 34.60 feet, 34.74 feet, 33.32 feet, 54.47 feet, and 25.10 feet. The applicant has proposed a setback of 36.70 feet. Based on Sanborn Maps, the setback of the former 1-story structure that previously occupied the site was closely aligned with 1102 – 1116 E Crockett, which average approximately 34 feet from the street. The structure located at 1120 E Crockett features over a 54 foot setback, which was historically an aberration for the block based on Sanborn Maps. While the proposed setback for the new structure is closer to the street than 1120 E Crockett, it will be the second deepest on the block. Staff finds the proposed setback appropriate based on historic and existing context of the block.
- e. **ORIENTATION & ENTRANCES** – The applicant has proposed to orient both the primary structure and the rear carport towards E Crockett. The historic development pattern of the block features primary and accessory structures that face E Crockett with driveways running along the side of primary structures to provide access to rear garages. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade should be oriented to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. Staff finds the orientation to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed a 2-story primary structure. Per the submitted elevations, the ridgeline of the structure is 27'-8 1/16" on the eastern edge of the structure, not including the foundation height, which appears to be approximately 1'-0", bringing the overall

height to approximately 29'-0". 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. This block of E Crockett is characterized exclusively by 1-story single family homes. However, the change in grade from N Pine to the east towards N Olive to the west results in the 1-story structures at the intersection of N Pine and E Crockett to be higher in elevation. Staff finds that this elevation change may result in an opportunity for a structure taller than 1-story to be appropriate within the context of the block. Because the proposed structure is two stories, the width contributes to its overall perception of mass on the site and should relate closely to the existing structures on the block. Overall, staff finds that reducing the plate height of both levels to bring the total height of the structure closer to 1.5 stories would be more appropriate given the context of the block. Staff also finds that the overall width of the street-facing facade should be reduced to be more consistent with the development pattern of the block.

- g. **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 property features a downward slope from east to west. While definitive dimension are not indicated on the drawings, the foundation for the primary structure increases from approximately 1 foot on the eastern edge of the property to nearly 4.5 feet on the western edge of the property to account for this grade change. Staff finds the foundation height consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the block.
- h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a primary hipped roof form . The front unit also contains a front gable. These roof forms are found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District as well as this block of E Crockett. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **PORCH** – The applicant has proposed a 1-story, asymmetrical, wraparound front porch. The porch will extend towards the street on the front façade and wrap around to the western edge of the structure. Though dimensions are not indicated on the drawings, the porch will feature a depth of approximately 6 feet with a total square footage of approximately 293 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, and new structures and design elements should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. The proposed porch pulls from traditional Craftsman-style language, as evidenced by the location and form, exposed rafter tails, tapered columns, and brick bases. The proposed tapered columns are simple in design relative to historic Craftsman architecture. However, staff finds that the beam edges should feature a traditional rectangle profile. Staff also requires that the proposed brick be submitted for final approval, including color, size, and finish, to evaluate its appropriateness.
- 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 aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds this proposal to be generally appropriate.
- 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. Based on the submitted site plan, the proposal appears to be generally consistent with this Guideline, but staff has not received a calculation. Staff requires this information for final approval.

- 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 the east the primary structure and will be concealed by privacy fencing. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to incorporate various new plantings as indicated the submitted landscaping plan. The plan includes a majority lawn area in the front and back yard with crushed granite and river gravel surrounding the primary structure and the southwestern edge of the carport. The proposal features several new low shrubbery and drought-resistant plantings, along with two new Monterrey Oak trees in the front yard. Staff finds the proposal conceptually appropriate and requires a finalized plan with a definitive species list and color and size selection for any crushed granite or rock for final review and approval.
- q. **DRIVEWAY** – The applicant has proposed to install a new concrete ribbon driveway on the west side of the structure. The driveway will terminate at the rear carport entrance. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, driveways in historic districts are typically 10 feet in width maximum. The width is not indicated on the drawings but appears conceptually appropriate. The applicant should include all dimensions for hardscaping for final approval.
- r. **HARDSCAPING** – In addition to the driveway, the applicant has also proposed a new 36” wide concrete walkway leading to the front porch of the structure. Another 36” wide concrete walkway will run parallel to the previous walkway and connect with the ribbon drive. Due to the grade change, the walkway running east-west will have two sets of stairs. The applicant has also proposed a 36” wide concrete walkway at the rear of the structure connecting the carport to the rear porch staircase. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant reduces the overall width of the primary structure as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the applicant reduces the overall height of the primary structure to be more in line with 1.5 stories as noted in finding f.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**29. 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. The applicant has proposed a setback of ten (10) feet, noting that this matches neighboring historic structures on this block of N Olive.
- 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 noted a foundation height of two feet. This is consistent 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 three windows, with one window centered under the gable. This is appropriate.
- 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. While the applicant has modified this from previous submittals, staff finds that the proposed front façade depth is not consistent with historic examples found in the district.

- 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..
- n. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a driveway that will be located on the north side of the lot and to the north of the proposed new construction. Staff finds the proposed location to be appropriate.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the proposed aluminum clad wood windows follow the specifications outlined in finding l
- ii. That the proposed composite siding feature an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish as noted in finding k.
- iii. That the proposed windows adhere to the following 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. Additionally, staff finds that a one over one window would be most appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- iv. 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 as noted in finding j.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:**           **None.**

## **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **30.     HDRC NO. 2018-264**

**Applicant:**     Patrick Christensen

**Address:**     819 AUGUSTA

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate the historic structure located at 819 Augusta to the vacant lot located at 810 Augusta.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure located at 819 Augusta was originally a 1-story single family home. The home was constructed in 1880 by noted architect Alfred Giles. The structure was built by English-born physician C.E.R. King (1839-1919), who came to America in 1851 and was a Confederate Army surgeon during the Civil War. Decedents of King resided at the home until 1929, when the Junior League of San Antonio purchased it for use as a tea room and meeting place. According to the San Antonio Historic Resources Survey of 1982, the structure features a modified L-plan with front and side projecting bays, a cross gable standing seam metal roof, and random ashlar masonry with cut quoins on the front corners. The rest of the front façade is symmetrical with three bays, 4 over 4 floor-length windows, and an off-center double door comprised of three panels. The home also features a front bay window with a dentil frieze and corbelled chimneys. The structure was noted as having exceptional significance at the time of the survey. The structure features a non-contributing modern addition to the rear. The home was listed as a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark in 1973. That same year, a decision was made to undertake a significant restoration and expansion of the property for the Junior League. The project was completed in 1976. The property was locally designated on October 27, 1988. Despite this addition, the home retains a high degree of architectural integrity of design and workmanship, and is one of the oldest surviving residences identified in the area.
- b. The applicant received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on December 6, 2017. The approval carried the stipulation that the applicant submit a detailed site plan and plans for the proposed relocation, which has been fulfilled in this submittal.
- c. **HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE** – According to a December 1987 assessment provided by a member of the City Council Historic Sites and Structures Task Force, the home’s significance was noted by the following: properties that are part of a group; contributing property in a district or cluster; notable example of architecture; archaeological site important to local social and ethnic groups; related structure representing standards and tastes of a specific segment of the community; contributes to the historic character of scene, reinforcing the value of more resources in the area; and establishes neighborhood identity.
- d. **RELOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to relocate the structure to a lot across the street addressed 810 Augusta. The lot currently serves as surface parking. The applicant has noted in their application that the decision to relocate the structure stems from its inability to be incorporated into a future development of the site, which will negatively affect the context of the structure. Proposed development plans have been provided for conceptual approval for HDRC consideration on June 6, 2018.

- e. According to UDC Sec. 35-613, the following considerations should guide the recommendation to relocate the building:
1. **The historic character and aesthetic interest the building, structure or object contributes to its present setting;** the original context of the structure was a residential neighborhood. This context has largely been lost over the years, especially on the immediate block. However, the structure is one of the few remaining examples of late 1800s residential architecture that retains a high degree of architectural integrity. The home is also an archetypal example of Victorian limestone residential architecture in San Antonio.
  2. **Whether there are definite plans for the area to be vacated and what the effect of those plans on the**
  3. **character of the surrounding area will be;** the applicant has provided future plans to develop the property and its surrounding lots, four of five which contain surface parking. The proposed development is to be a large five-story multifamily project. Despite changes in its context over the years, including the 1976 noncontributing addition and increase in surrounding surface parking, the structure retained a high degree of significance when surveyed in 1987. There are also many examples, several within the city, of projects that have incorporated an existing structure into a large-scale development.
  4. **Whether the building, structure, or object can be moved without significant damage to its physical integrity;** the proposed structure has occupied the same site since its original construction in 1888. The materiality, weight, and construction method of the structure make it a significant burden to move.
  5. **Whether the proposed relocation area is compatible with the historical and archaeological character of the building, object, or structure;** the proposed relocation area is in the direct vicinity of the existing location. The proposed lot is currently surface parking, surrounded to the east by additional surface parking, to the south by large footprint commercial structures, and to the west by two historic structures. The proposed location is nearby and would place it next to two historic structures of a similar era of significance. However, it removes the structure from its original location dating to 1880. Its placement also will not substantially increase the likelihood of its continued preservation, and the structure may face a similar request as the area continues to change.
- f. **ARCHAEOLOGY-** The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and includes a designated Local Historic Landmark. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia, a Spanish Colonial water feature, crossing the property. In addition, the Claudius King House, a designated Local Historic Landmark and Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (marker #2952) is located within the property. Subsurface deposits associated with this dwelling, including the building foundation, privies, and trash pits, are likely extant and shall be archaeologically documented. Thus, an archaeological investigation is required. State law requires a 60 day notice to the Texas Historical Commission prior to modifying the historical or architectural integrity of a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The historic context of the structure has generally been lost and the house may be a good candidate for relocation within an appropriate context in accordance with the UDC. The applicant has provided documentation that illustrates a comprehensive plan for the final treatment of the structure in its new location, including landscaping, hardscaping, bicycle parking, and the relationship of the remaining parking lot to the historic structure.

If the HDRC recommends approval based on the evidence presented, then staff recommends that the following stipulations be met prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness:

- i. That the applicant provides a comprehensive foundation plan for the new site, including civil or geotechnical engineering drawings that clearly illustrate how the historic structure will be supported.
- ii. That the applicant provides elevation drawings and detailed architectural detail drawings that indicate the final relocation condition of the structure, including the front porch and foundation treatment.
- iii. That the new property be designated through a historic zoning overlay.
- iv. ARCHAEOLOGY- An archaeological investigation is required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- v. That the applicant fulfills all state and federal requirements for the property including a mandatory 60-day notification period with the Texas Historical Commission.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**31. HDRC NO. 2018-263**

**Applicant:** Tiffany Dumond/Nook Rehab

**Address:** 415 DONALDSON AVE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to limewash two brick arches on the front façade of the primary structure, totaling approximately 50 bricks.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 415 Donaldson Ave is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1930 in the Tudor Revival style. The home features a buff beige brick façade, a steeply pitched cross gable roof, and a prominent front brick chimney. The home is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. The applicant is requesting approval to limewash two brick arches on the front façade. The limewashing will span approximately 50 bricks, which form the base of the two arches. The brick façade is currently unpainted. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, painting or coating historically unpainted surfaces should be avoided, unless the material is severely deteriorated. The existing brick is in good shape and does not require stabilization.
- c. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, historically unpainted brick should not be painted. Brick structures built prior to the 1870s were largely constructed of handmade bricks, which were generally softer, more porous, and weaker than bricks made at the

turn of the 20th century. These handmade bricks were frequently painted or coated because the strength of the brick was insufficient without a coating for stabilization. However, as machine-made bricks became the norm during the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, bricks became inherently stronger and did not require paint or coatings for protection and strength. These bricks commonly featured harder “dress” surfaces, which were meant to face the exterior of the structure and remain unpainted. 415 Donaldson was constructed in the 1930s and was historically unpainted. Painting historically unpainted brick on structures of this area, including limewashing, can lead to trapped water in the porous material, eventually destroying the brick due to the damaging effects of water infiltration and freeze-thaw cycles. Unpainted brick of this era is inherently high strength and low-maintenance on its own. Once these structures are painted or limewashed, consistent recoating is required to maintain the aesthetics of the brick. A limewash coating typically fails within 5-7 years, often quicker on bricks with harder, less porous dress surfaces.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT**

**32. HDRC NO. 2018-203**

**Applicant:** Andrew Rosenthal

**Address:** 236 FURR DR

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install wood shake shingles on the front gable of the primary structure.
2. Modify the shape and dimensions of the trim detail surrounding the window on the front gable of the primary structure.
3. Install fabric awnings above the windows on the front façade of the primary structure.
4. Install a wooden wheelchair ramp to provide access to the front door of the rear accessory structure.
5. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 236 Furr Dr is a 1-story single family home designed in the Tudor Revival style. The home features several elements of the architectural style, including a dominant steeply-pitched front gable, prominent patterned brick chimney, and decorative detailing on the front door. The home has been modified over the years, including a front addition and the installation of asbestos siding over the original woodlap siding. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification.
- b. **SITE VISIT** – Staff conducted a site visit as required by the verification process on May 14, 2018. At that time, staff noticed several inconsistencies with the exterior scope that was approved when the applicant submitted for Tax Certification and rehabilitation in August 2017, including the installation of wood shake siding, a modified wood frame surrounding the gable window on the front façade, fabric awnings, and a wheelchair ramp leading to the entry of the rear accessory

structure. Staff requested additional information on these items in order to bring the property into compliance and meet the requirements for the historic tax incentive.

- c. **SIDING MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has requested approval for the installation of wood shake siding on the front gable. Previously, the structure was covered in non-original vinyl siding. The applicant stated that the siding installation was due to the discovery that only plywood existed beneath the vinyl siding in this area. Based on the Tudor Revival style of the home and other similar structures in the area, the gable likely featured vergeboarding or other gable detailing historically. Since there is no clear historic condition, installation of an alternative material, such as wood shake, is appropriate. However, the proposed proportions of the wood shake area is not consistent with what is typically found historically and must be corrected or receive approval from the HDRC in order for the property owner to participate in the tax incentive program.
- d. **WINDOW TRIM** – The applicant has requested approval for the modified framing of the window in the front gable. Prior to work occurring, the window frame featured a decorative profile that echoed the proportions and detailing of the front door. Presently, the window is framed by 2x6 boards. The applicant stated that the previous frame was removed due to its severe deterioration. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing windows and frames should be preserved. While the frame differs
- e. **AWNING INSTALLATION** – The applicant has requested approval for the fabric awning installation over the front windows. The awnings are a neutral beige color and were installed to provide shade and sun protection, per the applicant. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new awnings should be installed based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design of new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached. The applicant has provided several photographs of similar awnings in the district, including those installed on Tudor Revival homes. Staff finds the installation acceptable based on this context.
- f. **WHEELCHAIR RAMP** – The applicant has requested approval for a wooden wheelchair ramp. The ramp is located on the rear accessory structure and leads to its front entry. The ramp is visible from the public right-of-way. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new elements should be simple as to not detract from the historic character of the structure. Staff finds that the wooden ramp is appropriate for the style of the structure and does not detract from its significance.
- g. **HISTORIC TAX VERIFICATION: SCOPE** – Based on staff site visits, the scope of work has been completed. In addition to the items requested as part of this application, the scope included the removal of a non-original front addition, the removal of non-original vinyl siding, the installation of new wood siding, wood window repair, and a complete interior remodel including flooring, new kitchen and bathroom fixtures, electrical, plumbing, and drywall.
- h. **HISTORIC TAX VERIFICATION: REQUIREMENTS** – The applicant has met all requirements of the City’s tax verification process as described in Section 35-618 of the UDC and has furnished evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.
- i. **HISTORIC TAX VERIFICATION: INCENTIVE** – Approval of Tax Verification by the HDRC in 2018 means that the property owners will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive beginning in 2019.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval with the stipulation the area of the gable that includes the wood shake be reduced and that additional portions of matching wood siding be installed based on finding c.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the window trim modifications based on finding d.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the awning installation based on finding e.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the wheelchair ramp installation based on finding f.

Item 5, Staff does not recommend Historic Tax Verification at this time. Staff recommends that the siding detail be corrected or approved by the HDRC in order for the property owner to participate in the tax incentive program as noted in finding c.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve except item #5—applicant should coordinate frieze board/gable design with staff.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**33. HDRC NO. 2018-261**

**Applicant:** Bob King/Alamo Construction & Demolition

**Address:** 917 HAYS ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Remove an existing brick chimney.
2. Replace two existing aluminum windows with new one over one wood windows.
3. Replace eight existing original one over one wood windows with new wood one over one windows.
4. Relocate two window openings on the east façade approximately 6 inches.
5. Remove two windows on the east façade and install a horizontal window.
6. Relocate a window on the west façade.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 917 Hays is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1907 in the Folk Victorian style. The home features a primary hipped roof with a front gable, an asymmetrical front porch with a metal shed roof, and two brick chimneys.
- b. CHIMNEY REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing brick chimney. The chimney is located near the western rear of the 1-story structure. As noted by staff on a site visit conducted on May 29, 2018, the chimney has been removed without prior approval. The applicant has stated that the brick was salvaged and remains on site. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing roof vents should be preserved. Though the chimney is located towards the rear and is not the primary chimney on the structure, rear vents are characteristic of this style of home and period of construction and can be found on several historic structures on the block. The chimney is also original to the structure and visible from the public right-of-way. Staff does not find the chimney removal consistent with the Guidelines.

- c. **EXISTING WINDOWS: CONDITION** – Staff performed a site visit with the applicant on May 29, 2018. Two windows are non-original aluminum and eight are original one over one original wood windows. Many of the wood windows feature non-original aluminum exterior storm windows, primarily on the front and west facades, which are to be removed. While these storm windows are incompatible with the architecture of the home, they have helped protect the assemblies from ample sun exposure and other environmental factors. During the site visit, staff observed that some of the wood windows have broken glass, are missing pulley cords, and require rehanging and refinishing. However, overall, staff finds that the windows are in very good condition and are fully repairable.
- d. **NON-ORIGINAL WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace two non-original aluminum windows with new one over one wood windows. One window is located on the front façade and another on the east façade. The applicant has stated their intent to retain the existing window openings and match the configuration, proportion, profile, and inset as closely as possible. Staff finds the proposal appropriate for the historic structure with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- e. **WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace eight original one over one wood windows with new one over one new windows to match the existing in configuration, proportion, profile, and inset. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. As noted in finding c, staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **WINDOW RELOCATION AND NEW WINDOW** – The applicant has proposed to relocate two existing one over one wood windows on the west façade. The windows are located on either side of a brick fireplace. The applicant has requested to move the windows approximately 6 to 12 inches higher and a few inches closer to the fireplace. The applicant noted on a site visit that the relocation is required due to the construction of an interior wall that will intersect one of the windows, which has already been framed out. The second window is to be relocated to match the first. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to relocate a window on the west façade to another location on the west façade as indicated in the drawings, and eliminate two windows from the east façade and install a new rectangular window. The applicant made the same request at the December 6, 2017, HDRC hearing, but withdrew the item for consideration. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the location of historic door and window openings should be avoided. The existing openings are original to the historic structure and are many are visible from the public right-of-way. Staff does not find the relocation consistent with the Guidelines.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the chimney removal based on finding b. Staff recommends that the existing chimney be repaired. If not feasible, staff recommends that the portion of the chimney on the exterior be reconstructed from brick salvaged from its removal. The applicant is required to submit drawings for its reconstruction to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness for future work.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of the replacement of the non-original aluminum windows based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the windows be one over one configuration and do not feature faux divided lites.
- ii. That a final window manufacturer specification be submitted to staff for review and approval and meet the following stipulations: that meeting rails be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening. 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.

Item 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of original wood windows based on findings b and e. Staff recommends that the existing windows be repaired.

Items 4, and 5, Staff does not recommend approval of the window relocation based on findings c and f. Staff recommends that the openings be retained and that the existing windows be repaired.

Item 6, Staff does not recommend the installation of a new rectangular window based on finding e.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Garza to refer the case to the DRC.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

Note: Commissioner Lazarine left at 6:07 PM.

**34. HDRC NO. 2018-269**

**Applicant:** Executive Signs

**Address:** 126 MAIN PLAZA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install new signage to include:

1. One wall-mounted sign to face Main Plaza and measure approximately 23 square feet. The letters will be made of extruded aluminum, will be reverse lit, and will be individually mounted to the façade.
2. Two interior window signs to measure approximately 27 square feet each for 54 square feet total.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 126 Main Plaza is a 5-story commercial and residential structure constructed in approximately 1925. The structure is an individual local landmark known as the Ford Building and is contributing to the Main/Military Plaza Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to install new wall and window signage.
- b. WALL SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install new wall-mounted signage to face Main Plaza. The signage will measure approximately 23 square feet. The letters will be made of extruded aluminum, will be reverse lit, and will be individually mounted to the façade. The letters will read “LIQUORS on Main,” with “LIQUORS” measuring approximately 8.65 feet wide by 1.5 feet tall and “on Main” measuring approximately 3.63 feet wide by 1.14 feet tall at its tallest point. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, wall-mounted signage should be located on existing signboards or above commercial storefronts, be constructed of durable material appropriate for the building and district, and utilize indirect or reverse channel lettering.

Additionally, letter styles and sizes should complement the overall character of the building façade, and hard-to-read or overly intricate styles should be avoided. Staff finds the location, material, and lighting strategy to be appropriate, but finds that the “on Main” portion of the sign should be enlarged and the “LIQUORS” portion of the sign should be reduced to create a more uniform and condensed signage area. This will give equal weight to both text portions and also enhance the legibility of the “on Main” portion, which features an intricate script at a small scale.

- c. WINDOW SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install two opaque window signs as indicated on the submitted window photographs. The signs will measure approximately 27 square feet each for 54 square feet total. The sign area will be black with white text. The text itself will measure approximately 1/6 of the total requested area. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, covering more than 30 percent of a window with signage should be avoided. Additionally, window signs constructed of opaque materials that obscure views into and out of windows, either partially or completely, are not recommended. Staff finds that the use of a black background for a signage of this size is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the black background be removed and that the white lettering

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the wall signage based on finding b with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduces the “LIQUORS” sign area and increases the “on Main” sign area to that both portions have comparably equal visual weight as noted in finding b. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the window signage as proposed based on finding c. Staff recommends that the applicant removes the opaque black background to comply with the Historic Design Guidelines. If the applicant wishes to retain the proposed white lettering only as window decals, updated drawings may be submitted to staff for review and approval.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve the sign as submitted and approve item #2 with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**35. HDRC NO. 2018-250**

**Applicant:** Richard Hartman/Hartman Properties Inc.

**Address:** 2734 N ST MARYS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is seeking a Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation to remove historic designation from the property at 2734 N St. Mary's.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property owner of 2734 N St Mary’s submitted a request for removal of historic designation based on the loss of the primary structure that was completely destroyed by a fire in early 2000. In accordance with the UDC Sec 35- 606(g), the applicant must present new and compelling evidence that the property no longer meets the criteria for landmark designation. The applicant submitted photos of the site and the remaining accessory structure, which was built after the period of significance of the primary structure.
- b. **BACKGROUND –**
  - Known as the Rubiola Store built in 1885; the property was locally designated December 21, 1978 by Ordinance 50192.
  - The property was designated as a Registered Texas Historical Landmark in 1979. The landmark Rubiola Store structure was destroyed by fire in early 2000. The state designation was removed as result.
  - The Rubiola Store opened in 1885 by Italian immigrant, Joseph Rubiola, in the Rock Quarry District. The Rock Quarry District was the area west of the original rock quarry, along Quarry Road (now North Saint Mary’s Street) and the Upper Labor Ditch. The Rubiola Store was recognized as a fine example of storefront architecture of the late 19th century, and a symbol of the continuity in the neighborhood. The property was in the Rubiola family from 1885 to 1978, a large family that influenced the Rock Quarry District politically, through their buying power. The Rubiola family owned and operated the store, and leased the rear dwelling out.
  - The Layer Family owned the property previous to the Rubiola family. They worked the land as gardeners and stone masons. The transaction in 1885, when Mary Layer sold to Francisco Rubiola, included all improvements of houses and fences.
- c. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION -** A single accessory structure, built c. 1950, remains extant on the northern side of the parcel. The barn is a one and a half story side gable wood frame structure covered with corrugated metal siding and roofing and hinged swinging metal doors. The barn would have been set behind the storefront and dwelling.
- d. **EVALUATION -** In accordance with the UDC Sec. 35-606 (g), Removal of Designation, staff should evaluate the property according to the same criteria set forth by designation. In order to be eligible for landmark designation, the property would need to meet three of the sixteen criteria listed in UDC Section 35-607. If staff evaluated the property today, staff finds the existing accessory structure is not eligible for landmark designation as it does not meet three criteria. This accessory structure has reached 50 years of age, which places it in the age category for eligible landmark properties; however, it does not represent the history of the property or the development of this area and does not meet any required criteria.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff finds that there is new and compelling evidence and that the property no longer remains eligible for designation based on finding d. Staff supports the removal of the designation based on findings a through d.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Frederica Kushner spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to remove designation.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

## **THE MOTION CARRIED**

### **36. HDRC NO. 2018-252**

**Applicant:** Tobin Hill Community Association

**Address:** 824 E EUCLID AVE

#### **REQUEST:**

A request for review by the Historic and Design Review Commission regarding eligibility of the property located at 824 E Euclid for landmark designation.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. On April 10, 2018, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner of 824 E Euclid which is located in the Tobin Hill Community Association registered neighborhood. At the same time, the owner submitted a demolition request for three structures located on an adjacent lot which will be considered as a separate item. OHP Staff conducted research to determine eligibility and contacted the neighborhood association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. On May 3, 2018, a Request for Review of Historic Significance for 824 E Euclid was submitted to OHP by the Tobin Hill Community Association, the applicant in this case.
- c. On May 24, 2018, the Designation Advisory Group visited the property. The Designation Advisory Group visited the property on May 24, 2018. The group noted that the structure is in good structural condition; the home retains its original wood windows, original wood lap siding under added asbestos siding. Also noted the structure maintained a relationship to the context which included residential structures of similar style, scale and setback. Based on the site observations, the group was in support of the determination of eligibility.
- d. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- e. The property is in the Tobin Hill Community Association registered neighborhood, but outside the bounds of the Tobin Hill Historic District. The Tobin Hill area was surveyed in 2006 and 2007, which noted this property and its structures as within the period of significance and contributing to the area. The Tobin Hill Historic District was designated in two phases, in 2007 and 2008.
- f. The two-story structure at 824 E Euclid was built c. 1922, for R.T. and May Spence. It was subdivided into four apartment units in 1926. It is built in the American Foursquare form, which was popular from the mid-1890s to the 1930s as a vernacular form as a reaction against Victorian architecture and other ornate styles of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The form is seen predominantly at the beginning of the 20th century and provided more affordable housing for San Antonio's middle class.
- g. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION** – An American Foursquare form with Craftsman influence, the structure has a rectangular footprint with a hipped composition shingle roof and original 117 wood siding. It is a two story structure with an original full front porch characterized by original four (4) tapered wood columns each atop original large square brick piers. The original inset front porch is open on the sides and at the main entrance. The front elevation features an original

centrally oriented front entry door and is flanked by three original wood windows on either side. Original wood windows are separated by mullions, and similar wood windows are seen on the second story front elevation, creating a sense of symmetry. Original wood windows can be seen throughout the house, with the exception of non-original aluminum windows installed at the rear of the structure.

- h. **SITE CONTEXT** –It is located in the Tobin Hill neighborhood, but is not within the Tobin Hill Historic District. It shares qualities with other lots in the area such as a center walkway leading from the sidewalk to the front entrance, a ribbon driveway and similar qualities of materials, building forms and setbacks, forming a distinct neighborhood character. The structure is the only two-story structure on its side of block; there is a two-story structure across the street.
- i. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - North St. Mary’s Street, first called Rock Quarry Road and later Jones Avenue, slowly grew to become important commercial corridor for adjacent residential neighborhoods and flourished in the 1910s and 1920s. Jones was an engineer and businessman who owned the stone and gravel quarry located in today’s Sunken Gardens. This southern end of the Tobin Hill neighborhood developed in the early 1920s. Soon after its construction as a single family home, 824 E Euclid subdivided into four apartment units in 1926. Its American Foursquare form was popular from the mid-1890s to the 1930s. This vernacular form can be characterized as a reaction against Victorian architecture and other ornate styles of the late 19th century. The form is seen predominantly at the beginning of the 20th century and provided more affordable housing for San Antonio’s middle class. Examples of the American Foursquare plan are prevalent in the early suburbs, including Tobin Hill, Alta Vista, and Beacon Hill. While the most common style for this form is Prairie, in San Antonio one finds more Colonial Revival influenced foursquares. 824 E Euclid shares the Craftsman style of its neighbors, including another two story Craftsman foursquare just across the street, creating a cohesive architectural statement related to the development period of this neighborhood.
- j. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - 824 E Euclid represents the residential development of the southern edge of the Tobin Hill neighborhood. The historic fabric of this area just outside of the Tobin Hill Historic District is rapidly disappearing as new development along the Broadway and N St. Mary’s corridors intensifies.
- k. **EVALUATION** – In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b):
  - (5) **Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;** as an American Foursquare influenced by the Craftsman style
  - (12) **It is an important example of a particular architectural type or specimen;** the building's Craftsman style is uncommon and stands out from typical American Foursquare forms in San Antonio, which tend towards influences from the Colonial Revival style and Prairie style.
  - (13) **It bears an important and significant relationship to other distinctive structures, sites, or areas, either as an important collection of properties or architectural style or craftsmanship with few intrusions, or by contributing to the overall character of the area according to the plan based on architectural, historic or cultural motif;** the house at 824 E Euclid is set within a residential neighborhood with homes sharing similar qualities of materials, building forms and setbacks, forming a distinct neighborhood character.
- l. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission concurs eligibility of the property and makes a recommendation of approval for designation, interim design review requirements will be in place and the property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for

any exterior work. These interim requirements will remain in place until the City Council makes their final decision on the proposed zoning change or not longer than six months.

- m. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the request. Staff finds that the property at 824 E Euclid meets 3 of the 16 criteria for evaluation and is eligible for landmark designation based on findings c through h. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) determines the property is eligible, the HDRC will become the applicant and will request a resolution from City Council to initiate the designation process.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED**

**37. HDRC NO. 2018-251**

**Applicant:** Tobin Hill Community Association

**Address:** 1817 N ST MARYS (parcel includes 902,904 E Euclid and 1817 and 1827 N St Mary's)

**REQUEST:**

A request for review by the Historic and Design Review Commission regarding eligibility of the property located at 1817 N St Mary's (parcel includes 902, 904 E Euclid and 1817 and 1827 N St Mary's) for landmark designation.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. On April 10, 2018, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner for three of the four structures at 1817 N St Mary's which is located in the Tobin Hill Community Association registered neighborhood. The proposed demolition is for the three structures known as 902 & 904 E Euclid and 1817 N St Mary's. At the same time, the owner submitted a demolition request for one structure located on an adjacent lot which will be considered as a separate item. OHP Staff conducted research to determine eligibility and contacted the neighborhood association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. On May 3, 2018, a Request for Review of Historic Significance for 1817 N St Mary's (parcel includes 902, 904 E Euclid and 1817 and 1827 N St Mary's) was submitted to OHP by the Tobin Hill Community Association, the applicant in this case.
- c. On May 24, 2018, OHP Staff and the Designation Advisory Group conducted a site visit. The group noted that 902 E Euclid and 904 E Euclid are twins with exact form, style, and materials. Both are in good structural condition and retain their original materials: wood windows, original wood lap siding under added asbestos siding, and other materials such as trim and exposed rafters. 902 E Euclid and 904 E Euclid are in their original residential context, and the group noted these structures should be retained as they represent the original development pattern of that block. For 1827 N St. Mary's, the group observed the original material and form of the

corner brick commercial structure. For the residential structure addressed 1817 N St. Mary's, it was visible that the original materials were intact. It was also noted that the property has lost its residential context along N St. Mary's. Based on site observation, the group supported a determination of eligibility for the entire lot that includes 4 structures.

- d. The parcel is located in the Tobin Hill neighborhood, but is not within the Tobin Hill Historic District. The Tobin Hill area was surveyed in 2006 and 2007. The survey noted the property as being within the period of significance.
- e. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- f. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION –

902 E Euclid – residential

The structure is a single-story Craftsman with original exposed rafter tails, a double front gable, and a covered front porch. It has a rectangular footprint, an original standing seam metal roof on a cross gabled roof, and original 117 wood siding that is currently covered by non-original synthetic asbestos siding. There is an original side gabled front concrete porch with four (4) non-original wrought iron posts and concrete steps. Two front entry doors are boarded up. Original one over one wood windows are installed throughout the house, some with non-original aluminum screens. There are two original brick chimneys; one is located on the south elevation of the house that has been painted, and one is inset within the interior towards the rear.

904 E Euclid – residential

The structure is a twin for 902 E Euclid. This single-story Craftsman style structure with original exposed rafter tails, a double front gable, and a covered front porch. It has a rectangular footprint, an original standing seam metal roof on a cross gabled roof, and original 117 wood siding that is currently covered by non-original synthetic asbestos siding. There is an original side gabled front concrete porch with four (4) non-original wrought iron posts and concrete steps. Two front entry doors are boarded up. Original one over one wood windows are installed throughout the house, some with original decorative wood windows screens and some with non-original aluminum screens. An original brick chimney is located on the south elevation of the house that has been painted.

1827 N St. Mary's - commercial

The single story commercial brick structure is irregular shaped with two elevations that front the street. The building's placement addresses the street which is consistent with early 20th century pedestrian oriented development. It has an original flat roof with a tall parapet topped with a cornice and an original flat awning on the east elevation. There are five (5) windows on the east elevation, three of which are bricked over. The window to the left of the front door has an original transom window with four divided lights. There is also a storefront door on the east elevation with non-original wood screens. The north elevation features a painted sign advertising "A&G Boxing Team". There are two horizontal windows that are covered by an unknown material. There are two small additions located on the southern elevation.

1817 N St. Mary's – residential

The primary structure is a Craftsman style home with a rectangular footprint and an original front clipped gable. Original features include a standing seam metal roof and exposed rafter tails and brackets. It has a front gabled porch with three (3) original tapered wood columns each atop large wooden piers clad with non-original synthetic

asbestos shingles. The original inset front porch is open to the south and east side. Original one-over-one wood windows can be seen throughout the house. The siding is a combination of non-original synthetic asbestos shingles and original wood 117 siding underneath.

- g. **SITE CONTEXT** –The parcel is located at the southwest corner of E Euclid and N St Mary’s, a prominent corner on the N St Mary’s corridor, at a bend in the road which makes the commercial structure highly visible. This is a large parcel that holds four structures: three residential single family homes and one large corner commercial structure. The commercial structure sits at the southwest corner of the North Saint Mary’s and East Euclid intersection. There is another corner commercial structure at northwest corner of the same intersection, and two new construction commercial structures at the east corners.
- h. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - The structures at 1817 North Saint Mary’s represent the residential and commercial development of this area off the North Saint Mary’s commercial corridor. The surrounding residential neighborhood of Tobin Hill flourished as one of San Antonio’s early suburbs. The historic fabric of this area just outside of the Tobin Hill Historic District is rapidly disappearing as new development along the Broadway and Saint Mary’s corridors intensify. Already, the residential structure addressed 1817 N St Mary’s has lost its residential context as commercial developed off Highway 281.
- i. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - North St. Mary’s Street, first called Rock Quarry Road and later Jones Avenue, slowly grew to become important commercial corridor for adjacent residential neighborhoods and flourished in the 1910s and 1920s. This southern end of the Tobin Hill neighborhood developed in the early 1920s. Joe (also known as Joseph/Guiseppa) Di Carlo purchased the property at the corner of North St. Mary’s and East Euclid in 1921 from W.E. and Wanda Lowry, who lived on nearby Erie Ave. Joe Di Carlo, a prominent member of the Italian community in San Antonio, lived with his family at 651 N Main where he also operated a grocery store. Joe was a charter member of the Christopher Columbus Italian Society, and was honored as a special guest at the cornerstone laying celebration in 1927.
- j. **EVALUATION** – In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. Staff finds that all four structures are contributing structures to the neighborhood. Staff evaluated the property against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b):
  - (5) Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;** as good examples of Craftsman style residences and an early twentieth century one part block commercial structure.
  - (7) Its unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature;** located on a prominent corner on the southernmost edge of the Tobin Hill neighborhood, these structures provide definition of scale and context moving from the commercial corridor of North St. Mary’s Street into the residential portion of East Euclid.
  - (11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States;** the corner commercial structure represents the importance of the North St. Mary’s Street corridor to the Tobin Hill community, serving the neighborhood as a grocery store for over 40 years.
- k. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission concurs eligibility of the property and makes a recommendation of approval for designation, interim design review requirements will be in place and the property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work. These interim requirements will remain in place until the City Council makes their final decision on the proposed zoning change or not longer than six months.

1. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the request. Staff finds that the property at 1817 N St Mary's meets 3 of the 16 criteria for evaluation and is eligible for landmark designation, and that all four buildings are contributing, based on findings c through j. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) finds the property eligible, the HDRC will become the applicant and will request a resolution from the City Council to initiate the designation process.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED**

**38. HDRC NO. 2018-253**

**Applicant:** Office of Historic Preservation

**Address:** 705 E GRAYSON ST

**REQUEST:**

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property located at 705 E Grayson.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. On February 2, 2018, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner for the structure at 705 E Grayson which is located in the Downtown Residents Association registered neighborhood, and adjacent to the Government Hill Historic District. OHP Staff conducted research and contacted the Downtown Residents Association neighborhood association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- c. On May 24, 2018, the Designation Advisory Group visited the property. The group noted that the Colonial Revival architecture style of the home is demonstrated by the form and materials. They noted original window placement size and material were still present. The siding material is original to the house. The trim and porch pediment were found to be the original design. They noted that the structure and materials are in good condition and were well maintained. Based on the site observations, the group was in support of designation.
- d. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION** – This property has both a primary structure and an accessory structure.  
Primary Structure -- The two story primary structure has a rectangular footprint and a side-gabled original red standing seam metal roof. The front façade has eight symmetrical

windows; four on the first floor and four on the second floor. Four of the windows are original wood with six-over-six lights. The other four are vinyl with nine-over six lights. Each window has a pair of non-original wood shutters. The front of the house has an original Georgian triangular pediment entryway with a half-circle transom over the paneled door. Two side lights also flank the original front door. There is an original brick chimney on the west elevation and shutters on the front elevation, but none are original. There is an enclosed, single-story side porch on the east elevation, which is original to the structure. It has a shed roof and doorway covered by non-original shutters. There is a non-original rear addition with wood and vinyl windows and stucco siding primarily; the sides and front are clad with vinyl/synthetic siding. There is a second rear addition that is one-story, on the east side of the north elevation with shed roof, vinyl windows and big picture window. The rear of the structure has a non-original second floor covered landing that leads to two separate doors and is accessed by a metal staircase. The porches on the west side of the north elevation, and the stairs and second story porch on the north elevation are also non-original.

Accessory Structure -- The single story accessory structure has a hipped standing seam metal roof with a non-original attached carport on the west elevation. The attached carport has a mansard inspired roof with composition shingles and is supported by thin metal poles. The front façade has two original wood windows, each having four-over-four lights. The original footprint of the accessory is square, and the attached carport is rectangular. The structure is a secondary dwelling.

Smaller Accessory Structure – There is a third structure on site that is non-original to the site. The structure has a shed roof with corrugated metal roofing, wood shingle siding, and a variety of salvaged windows. The structure does not have a permanent foundation.

- e. **SITE CONTEXT** – The property is set back close to 75 feet from the front property line, which represents the historical development pattern of this side of the block at the time of construction. The neighboring homes across the street are built closer to the front property lines, between 10 and 20 feet, and were built c. 1911 and c. 1950. 705 E Grayson neighbors several single family two-story residences, both along the same side of the street and across the street. The two adjacent neighbors are mid-century apartment buildings set 10-20 feet from the front of the property. The sidewalk is concrete, connecting the sidewalk and front entrance in a straight line, though is not centered on the property. There is a narrow concrete driveway on the east of the house, with a retaining wall on the right. Other single family homes along the block also have a concrete driveway or a ribbon concrete driveway on the eastern side of the house.
- f. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** – Grayson Street divides Fort Sam Houston and the Government Hill neighborhood. After a large donation of land from the City of San Antonio to the War Department in the 1870s, construction began on the fort. The Government Hill neighborhood developed alongside the fort, providing convenient housing for the rapidly growing city served by mule-drawn street car as early as 1886. Along this main thoroughfare, wealthy citizens built large homes in the early twentieth century. Development of the 700 block began on the eastern end, which was closest to Fort Sam Houston, with two story homes featuring consistently deep setbacks exceeding 50 feet and prominent front porches. In 1916, Dr. Charles Craig Cade purchased the property from the widow Adelia Cresson. The Cresson family built several homes in this block, including 817, 819, and 825 E Grayson (all demolished). Dr. Cade served as a major in World War I. Dr. Cade's brothers William H. and James Robert were both doctors in San Antonio, where William served as the president of the Bexar County Medical Society. The Cade family also had a large farm near Converse where Dr. Cade cultivated cotton and corn and raised dairy cows.
- g. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - 705 E Grayson represents the residential development of this area just outside of Fort Sam Houston (local landmark, NRHD, NHL), established in the late 1870s. The surrounding residential neighborhood of Government Hill flourished as one of San Antonio's

early suburbs. The historic fabric of this area just outside of the Government Hill Historic District is rapidly disappearing as new development along the Broadway corridor intensifies.

- h. EVALUATION – In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b):

**(4) Its identification as the work of a master builder, designer, architect, or landscape architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the community, county, state, or nation;** as a structure designed by Lou Harrington, a prominent local architect who designed the Maverick Building, and Ed Steves & Sons, a prolific and well-known local builder who built the Steves Homestead and committed to many projects to improve San Antonio public infrastructure.

**(5) Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;** as Colonial Revival residential structure with character defining features including symmetrical façade, a small entry porch with triangular pediment, and one story side wing.

**(11) It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States;** as it represents the conclusion of this period of development of the residential neighborhood with close ties to Fort Sam Houston.

- i. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission concurs eligibility of the property and makes a recommendation of approval for designation, interim design review requirements will be in place and the property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work. These interim requirements will remain in place until the City Council makes their final decision on the proposed zoning change or not longer than six months.
- j. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed Finding of Historic Significance and that the Historic & Design Review Commission recommends approval for the designation of this property based on findings a through h.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz, Denise Homer, Rose Hill, and Marlene Hawkins spoke in support of designation.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Fetzer and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve the finding of historic significance.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Approval of the 2 May and 16 May 2018 Historic and Design Review Commission Meeting minutes.**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon..

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza to adjourn.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair