

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

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 8:30 AM, 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, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

ABSENT: Lazarine, Connor, Brittain.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in support of Item #14.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-313 307 DWYER/410 S MAIN
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-310 420 BROADWAY (LIGHT BUILDING)
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-207 410 N OLIVE ST
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-312 129 E CAROLINA
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-315 208 SHERMAN
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-300 958 E MISTLETOE
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-309 133 E CAROLINA
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-307 925 LAMAR (CERTIFICATION)
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-308 925 LAMAR (VERIFICATION)
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-305 214 MUNCEY
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-297 121 SAN ARTURO
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-273 1120 E CROCKETT
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-304 1603 S HACKBERRY
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-288 230 CACTUS
- Item #16, Case No. 2018-319 3101 BROADWAY

Item #3 was pulled for citizens to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

3. HDRC NO. 2018-254

Applicant: Tobias Stapleton

Address: 205 OSTROM

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the primary historic structure.
2. Construct a rear, two story addition and perform exterior modifications to the primary historic structure.
3. 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 a Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitation, the construction of a two story, 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. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed a third time by the Design Review Committee on June 26, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that the reduced heights were appropriate and that the design was appropriate.
- d. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – This project received conceptual approval at the June 6, 2018, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant provide information regarding new windows when returning for final approval. **The applicant has submitted information regarding new, wood windows.**
 - ii. That shed roofs or small traditionally detailed awnings could be added above doors on the proposed addition. **The applicant has submitted construction documents noting this addition.**
 - iii. That an up-to-date site plan be provided which demonstrates tree preservation on the site. **The applicant has submitted a site plan noting the location of existing trees.**
 - 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. **The applicant has coordinated with OHP archaeologists regarding archaeology requirements.**

- v. That the overall height of the proposed addition be reduced. **The applicant has noted that the proposed addition's roof has been reduced by a total of 2' – 7".**
 - vi. That stabilization of the historic structure begin. **The applicant has not begun stabilization efforts at this time.**
- e. 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.
 - f. 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. While the proposed roof form is consistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that an increase roof pitch would be more consistent with those found on neighboring historic structures.
 - g. 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.
 - h. 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.
 - i. 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. The applicant has added small awnings above entrances to provide additional façade depth.
 - j. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, refurbished wood windows and an asphalt shingle roof. Generally, the proposed materials are appropriate. The applicant has provided information regarding the proposed wood windows. Staff finds the profile of the proposed windows to be consistent with those found on the historic structure.
 - k. WINDOW MATERIALS – As noted in finding i, the applicant has provided staff with specifications of the proposed new windows. In addition to this, the applicant has noted the repair of historic windows.
 - l. 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. The applicant has decreased the overall height of the accessory to 24' – 2". Staff finds the proposed accessory structure appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
 - m. 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.
 - n. 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 approval based on findings a through m with the following stipulations:

- i. That foundation and roof repair for the historic structure be completed within sixty (60) days of the approval date. Failure to meet this stipulation will result in the revocation of the issued Certificate of appropriateness.
- ii. ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations may be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation 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: Jim Cullum (Roy Schweers yielded his time), Mimi Quintanilla (George Nash and David Schmidt yielded their time), Christopher Green (Kim Wood yielded her time), Raleigh Wood, and Lawrence DeMartino (Fred Gonzales yielded his time) spoke in opposition.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

17. HDRC NO. 2018-303

Applicant: Peter French/Gray Street Partners

Address: 420 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Perform exterior modifications to the Print Building, located at the rear (east) of the property at 420 Broadway. Modifications to the Print Building include the removal of the existing façade.
2. Construct a two level, rooftop addition to the Print Building.
3. Construct a vertical connector addition to connect the Light Building to the Print Building.
4. Construct one level of sub-grade parking beneath the existing Print Building.

This application only includes modifications to the Print Building and the construction of a vertical connector. Amendments to the previously approved design of the Light Building are being reviewed under a separate application, by a separate applicant.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure commonly known as the Print Building at 420 Broadway was constructed circa 1969. The structure has been connected to the historic Light Building by a sky bridge since its construction. The applicant has proposed to remove the sky bridge and construct a connector addition to connect the Print Building to the Light Building as well as perform exterior modifications to the Print Building. The east elevation is relatively void of fenestration; however, the north and south elevations feature fenestration that covers most of the façade. The entire parcel at 420 Broadway is a locally designated historic landmark and is located within the River Improvement Overlay, District 2. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, the original façade on both the west and south facades was removed.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 26, 2018. At that meeting committee members noted that the proposed

modifications were consistent with RIO design standards; however, given that the property is a designated historic landmark, modifications must also comply with the Historic Design Guidelines.

- d. CONNECTOR ADDITION – At the rear of the Light Building, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing sky bridge and construct a vertical connector to join the Light Building to the Print Building. Per the Guidelines for Additions, additions to non-residential structures should be located at the rear of the historic structure, should not lessen the historic character of the historic building when viewed from the public right of way, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the principal façade and should be subordinate in height to the primary historic structure. While the proposed connector addition features a height that exceeds that of the Light Building, staff finds that the overall design given its setbacks from the historic facades and simplified design may be appropriate.
- e. CONNECTOR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed materials that include a translucent channel glass system, a glazed aluminum curtain wall system and aluminum and glass railings. Staff finds that through the use of translucent, non-masonry materials, the connector addition is appropriate.
- f. PRINT BUILDING MODIFICATIONS – The Print Building currently features a tan brick façade with fenestration patterns framed by cast stone. The proposed modifications to the exterior of the structure would result in the removal of the structure’s currently fenestration pattern, brick and façade arrangement. The UDC Section 35-676 notes that every reasonable effort shall be made to adapt the property in a manner which requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, object, or site and its environment. The UDC also notes that the distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, object, or site and its environment, shall not be destroyed. Per the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A., character defining features of structures zoned historic should be preserved. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features shall be avoided. Staff finds that the proposed façade modifications remove the distinguishing original qualities and character of the building and are not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and the UDC.
- g. PRINT BUILDING MODIFICATIONS – As noted in finding f, character defining features should be preserved. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i. notes that new features should not be introduced that alter or destroy the historic building character, such as such as adding inappropriate materials; altering the size or shape of windows, doors, bulkheads, and transom openings; or altering the façade from commercial to residential. Staff finds that the proposed modifications are inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- h. PRINT BUILDING ADDITION – The applicant has proposed an addition of two levels to the rooftop of the Print Building. The UDC Section 35-676 notes that new additions shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building or structure would be unimpaired. Staff finds that the proposed addition’s massing and overall form are appropriate; however, the addition should feature an overall form and design that complements to existing architectural features of the building. Currently, the addition’s design is consistent with the proposed modifications, which are not consistent with the UDC.
- i. SUB-GRADE PARKING – The applicant has proposed one level of subgrade parking. Automobiles will access the site from N Alamo and enter the sub-grade parking on the east side of the structure. Staff finds the proposed parking to be appropriate provided it does not negatively impact the existing façade.
- j. ARCHAEOLOGY- The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District and is a designated Local Historic Landmark. A review of historic archival maps shows structures within the project area as early as 1873. Furthermore, an 1848 property survey map identifies ditches, possibly associated with the nearby Acequia del Alamo or Navarro Acequia, within the modern property. Thus, the project area may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore,

archaeological investigations are required. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of item #1, exterior modifications to the Print Building based on findings f and g. Staff recommends that the applicant adhere to the UDC and modify the structure within the existing design.
2. Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of item #2, the proposed rooftop addition based on finding h. Staff finds that an addition may be appropriate; however, the addition should feature an overall form and design that complements to existing architectural features of the building. Currently, the addition's design is consistent with the proposed modifications, which are not consistent with the UDC.
3. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #3, the proposed connector addition based on findings d and e with the noted stipulation below.
4. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #4, the construction of underground parking provided it does not negatively impact the existing facade with the noted stipulation below.

Staff finds the existing façade of the Print Building to hold architectural integrity as an example of the Mid-Century Modern style. Should the Historic and Design Review Commission find the proposed modifications to be inappropriate, staff recommends the original façade be reconstructed as it existed prior to demolition. Additional façade openings originally existed on the N Alamo façade and could be restored to allow for additional fenestration.

Stipulation: ARCHAEOLOGY- Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Adam Reed spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Grube to refer the application to the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2018-302

Applicant: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio

Address: 918 MASON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Replace the existing wooden front porch columns with new composite columns to match the existing in design and profile.
2. Replace four existing one over one wood windows on the first floor east elevation with new wood windows to match existing.
3. Replace the existing wooden rear stair and deck with a new metal stair and deck with a modified layout and design.
4. Construct a balcony above the existing 1-story front porch.
5. Replace the existing front porch concrete slab with a new wooden deck.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 918 Mason St is a 2-story multifamily structure constructed in approximately 1920 with Neoclassical and Craftsman influences. The structure is located on corner lot at the intersection of Mason St and Rogers Ave and features a primary hipped roof with composition shingles, a front porch supported by wood Tuscan columns, and original wood windows. The structure was originally designed as a single-family home and has had several modifications over the years, including a front and rear addition, as indicated by Sanborn Maps. The structure is contributing to the Government Hill Historic District.
- b. **PORCH COLUMNS: EXISTING CONDITION** – The applicant has noted that the existing, historic porch columns have been previously modified, which has caused irreparable damage. Some columns had their rotted bases removed and temporarily stabilized with tiles or other incompatible materials, which has caused erosion, water infiltration, expansion, and separation of materials. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii. notes that columns should be replaced with columns that are compatible in scale, massing and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions and finish, when repair is not possible.
- c. **PORCH COLUMN REPLACEMENT** – At this time, the applicant has proposed to install replicas of the columns that are made of fiberglass or another composite material. The applicant has provided a drawing of the new columns which note appropriate scale, massing and details. However, a specification sheet or brochure has not yet been provided. Staff does not find the installation of fiberglass columns to be consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding b. Staff recommends the applicant first attempt to locate original columns to install. If this is not possible, staff finds that the proposed composite columns may be appropriate.
- d. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace four original one over one wood windows on the first floor of the east façade 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. The applicant has provided substantial evidence that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Additionally, staff conducted a site visit on June 25, 2018, to examine the exterior conditions of the windows. Staff finds that the windows have been poorly maintained and repaired with improper materials and techniques. Several windows feature separating joints and severely deteriorated lower rails. Staff finds replacement of these four windows acceptable with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- e. **REAR STAIR AND DECK: DESIGN MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing rear wooden porch stair and deck and install a new metal porch stair and deck in a modified design. The existing stairway is not original to the property and is exhibiting signs of disrepair. The proposed new stairway will have a smaller footprint than the existing, limiting its impact on the rear and side elevations of the structure, which are visible from the public right-of-way on Rogers Ave. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, replacement porch elements should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent, but finds that the metal grille railing detail is not

consistent with the design of the historic structure. Staff finds that a railing detail similar to the proposed front balcony railing as detailed in finding h would be more appropriate.

- f. **REAR STAIR AND DECK: MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to construct the new rear stairway with metal. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, when replacement is necessary, replace in-kind when possible or with balusters that match the originals in terms of materials, spacing, profile, dimension, finish, and height of the railing. While the existing wooden stairway is not original, staff finds wood to be most appropriate for the age and style of the historic structure.
- g. **NEW BALCONY** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new balcony above the front 1-story porch. The balcony railings will be constructed with wood as indicated in the submitted drawings. Presently, there is no balcony railing in this location. A second story door leads onto the front porch roof. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, replacement porch elements should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds that the proposed balcony railings will not detract from the significance of the structure and finds that the design and material of the railing is consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **FRONT PORCH SLAB REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing concrete front porch decking and stairs and install new wooden decking and stairs in the same location. The existing stairs and decking are constructed of concrete and are in a state of disrepair due to cracking and settling. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, original concrete porch floors and stairs should be preserved. Based on the construction date and style of the home, the front porch was most likely originally wood. The existing concrete slab is not original and is not a significant or characteristic architectural feature. Staff finds the replacement acceptable given these property-specific considerations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of composite replacement columns based on findings b and c. Staff recommends that the applicant first attempt to locate historic, wood replacement columns.

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

- i. 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 recommends approval of the new rear staircase and deck based on findings e and f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the staircase and deck be constructed of wood and feature a baluster design and profile that is more consistent with the proposed balcony railing. The applicant is required to submit updated documents to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the balcony railing based on finding g.

Item 5, Staff recommends approval of the porch decking modifications based on finding h.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve item #1 where columns, caps, and bases match the predominate existing style; approve #2 with staff stipulations; and approve items #3, 4, and 5 as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2018-

Applicant: Mark Thomas

Address: 722 LAMAR ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a front yard fence.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 722 Lamar was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on a 1912 Sanborn map. The structure currently features faux stone façade and a primary side-gabled roof with a front-facing gabled roof over a concrete porch. The structure is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence to span the width of the front yard and turning at the driveway to meet the corner of the structure. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii, new front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that did not historically have them. While the house at the corner of the Lamar and N Pine features a traditional wrought iron fence and the school property across the street features commercial wrought iron fence, none of the five homes that address the 700 block of Lamar feature front yard fencing. On the adjacent 600 and 800 blocks of Lamar, only 1 of 18 houses feature a wrought iron fence, while the rest feature nonconforming chain link fences or no fence at all. Staff finds the a new fence at 722 Lamar is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- c. FENCE DESIGN - According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., the design of the fence should respond to the design and materials of the primary historic structure or structures of a similar style in the neighborhood in relation to scale, transparency, and character. Staff finds that the proposed wrought iron fence is found within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and relates to the architectural features of the structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b.

If the HDRC approves of front yard fencing, staff recommends approval of the wrought iron design featuring a height no taller than 4 ft and to feature no front driveway gate.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Barbara Garcia spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve with the staff stipulation that the fence not exceed 4' in height.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: Kamal.

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2018-320

Applicant: Elisa Madrid

Address: 209 MADISON ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace two original four over four wood windows with new fixed wood windows.
2. Demolish a contributing rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 209 Madison is a 2-story single family home constructed in approximately 1870 in the Folk Victorian style. The home features a symmetrical 1-story front porch with gingerbread detailing on the square wood posts, floor to ceiling six over six wood windows, several cream brick chimneys, and a second story near the rear of the structure, which is unusual for the style. The home is contributing to the King William Historic District. The property also features a 1-story rear accessory structure constructed in approximately 1870. Overall, the structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – On a site visit conducted by OHP staff on June 25, 2018, the applicant noted that two rear four over four wood windows were replaced with fixed wood windows prior to obtaining approval. The applicant also indicated that three out of the four sashes remained on site. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, historic windows should be preserved. Windows should only be replaced if deemed deteriorated beyond repair by OHP staff for the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC). Replacement windows should match the original in terms of size, proportion, configuration, inset, and detailing. The replacement windows do not match the original wood windows, and based on the photographs taken by OHP staff of the remaining sashes, the windows are not deteriorated beyond repair and can be restored and reinstalled. Staff does not find the window replacement consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. DEMOLITION – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only. There are not replacement plans proposed at this time. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historical development pattern within a historic district.
- d. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – The rear accessory structure was deemed to be contributing by staff in June 2018. The structure is a one story, three-bay structure constructed in approximately the same period as the primary structure. The structure appears on the 1896 and 1904 Sanborn Maps in the general location and footprint. The structure is wood with woodlap siding and a composition shingle roof. The materials are similar to those found on the primary structure. The structure is exhibiting signs of deterioration and structural failure due to neglected repair and maintenance. The woodlap siding is rotting and separating near the base of the structure and the

roofline is warped. While staff finds that the structure is deteriorating, the structure is still contributing to the district.

- e. **UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP** – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614, no certificate shall be issued for demolition of a historic landmark unless the applicant provides sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission of unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant. In the case of a historic landmark, if an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information regarding loss of significance. In order for unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. In the submitted application, the applicant has indicated that the structure no longer serves a purpose and poses a safety hazard due to its condition. However, the applicant has not yet attempted to collect reasonable costs for repair and restoration. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) has not been met based on the documentation provided.
- f. **LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE** –In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff finds that additional evidence for loss of significance has not been provided and that UDC Section 35-614(c) has not been met.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on finding b. Staff recommends that the original sashes that remain on site be reinstalled.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the demolition based on findings c through f. Sufficient documentation meeting the requirements for unreasonable economic hardship or loss of significance as outlined in UDC Sections 35-614(b) and 35-614(c) has not yet been provided.

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

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve items #1 and 2 with the stipulations that original window sashes and panes of glass remain onsite for future reuse and that materials from the carport are salvaged and remain onsite for future reuse in the structure that replaces the carport.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2018-318

Applicant: Cristina Maria Rohrs

Address: 2620 N MAIN AVE

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a low perimeter wall in the front and side yard of the property. The wall will be constructed of stone and measure approximately 2 feet in height with 3 foot tall posts.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2620 N Main Ave is a 2-story multifamily structure constructed in 1909 in the Neoclassical style. The structure sits on a corner lot at the intersection of N Main Ave and E Magnolia Ave. The home features a full-height front porch with fluted Corinthian columns, a broken transom light front door configuration, and prominent front and side-facing dormers with wide trim. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **NEW WALL: HEIGHT AND LOCATION** - The applicant has proposed to install a low perimeter wall constructed of brick masonry. The wall will measure approximately 24” in height with 34” tall decorative posts. The wall will front the existing sidewalk fronting N Main Ave and E Magnolia Ave and terminate at the rear and south property line. The wall is requested for aesthetic reasons and will not function as a retaining wall for a slope or grade change. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale and location. In the blocks surrounding the property, there are no properties with low, non-retaining perimeter walls on E Magnolia or N Main. A low perimeter wall in the front yard of a property on E Magnolia and at the intersection of N Main and E Huisache both retain ground elements. Staff does not find low perimeter walls to be historically common or characteristic of the district. Staff does not find the height and location consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. **NEW WALL: MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to construct the new fence out of brick masonry. Historic low retaining walls are typically constructed of stone; however, perimeter walls with no supportive element are historically uncommon. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garza to postpone the case to 18 July 2018 because the applicant was not present.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2018-321

Applicant: Todd Romano

Address: 118 E HOLLYWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a side and rear vertical wood privacy fence measuring 8 feet in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 118 E Hollywood Ave is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1930 in the Colonial Revival style. The home features several elements reflective of the Tudor style, including a symmetrical façade, side gable configuration with three dormers, and a prominent entry flanked by pilasters. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new eight foot tall vertical wood plank privacy fence along the side and rear alley property lines. The fence was installed prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness and a permit from the Development Services Department.
- b. LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the privacy fence on both the side lot lines and along the rear alley frontage. The fence on the east side property line will align with the front façade of the historic structure. Presently, a low wrought iron fence extends from the front façade to the east property line. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, privacy fences should not be located in the front yard. The Guidelines also stipulate that fences should not be installed where they were not historically used. Privacy fences and walls are characteristic of the Monte Vista Historic District, including along the unnamed alley. Staff finds that privacy fencing in the rear of the property is consistent, but finds that the fencing should be set back from the façade of the primary structure to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. HEIGHT – The proposed fence is to be approximately eight feet in height. According to the UDC, privacy fences in residential settings should be no taller than six feet unless it meets a requirement outlined in section 35- 514(c)(2). According to City of San Antonio Zoning staff, this particular property is allowed an 8’ privacy fence along the rear alley without exception; however, the fence should be a maximum of 6’ alongside property lines. Historic Design Guidelines state that fences should be consistent with the height found on the property, in the vicinity of the property, and with those found in the historic district. Staff finds the privacy fence proposal on the rear lot line consistent with the Guidelines and UDC based on the specific conditions of the property, but finds that the fence height on the side property lines should be reduced to 6’ to comply with the Guidelines and the UDC.
- d. MATERIALITY – According to the Guidelines, fences should be constructed of materials similar to fencing used historically in the district. In the Monte Vista Historic District, privacy fences and walls are commonly a reflection of the particular design style of the primary structure, and fences and screens made of unstained wood, stained wood, stucco, brick, stone, and other materials are common considering the eclectic styles found within the district. The applicant has proposed treated cedar planks installed vertically. Staff finds the proposal acceptable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the privacy fence installation based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduces the height to six feet along both side property lines as noted in finding c.
- ii. That the applicant obtains a permit from the Development Services Department.
- iii. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Paul Kinnison spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2018-325

Applicant: Justin Abt

Address: 538 QUITMAN ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to wrap four existing stucco front porch columns with cedar. The wrapping will feature simple paneled detailing.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 538 Quitman St is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1935 in the Craftsman style. The home has been heavily modified over the years, and features non-original metal windows, non-original stucco siding, and columns clad with stucco. Despite these changes, the structure retains several original elements that are characteristic of the Craftsman style, including a primary front gable configuration, gable vent, and gable bracketing. The home is contributing to the Government Hill Historic District.
- b. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to wrap the existing stucco-clad porch columns with thin sheets of wood coated with a cedar stain. The wrapping will feature a simple paneled detailing. The existing stucco-clad columns will be retained beneath. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, added or reconstructed porch elements should be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. If no architectural evidence of added elements exist, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. While staff finds that panel detailing generally appropriate for the Craftsman architecture of the structure, staff finds that the material, color, thickness, and detailing inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the porch column modifications based on findings a through b. Staff recommends that the applicant consider alternatives that are more consistent with the original design and materials and of the house. Appropriate changes may be eligible for administrative approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 32018-251

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/Guiseppe) 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.
- l. 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 BY APPLICANT

25. 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 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.
- g. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION** – An American Foursquare form with Craftsman influence, the structure has a rectangular footprint with a hipped composition shingle roof and original 1 1/2" 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 BY APPLICANT

Approval of the Historic and Design Review Commission Meeting minutes from 20 June 2018.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Bustamante, Grube, 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 11:35 AM.

APPROVED

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Guarino', written in a cursive style.

Michael Guarino
Chair