

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
1 August 2018**

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

ABSENT: Connor, Bustamante, Brittain, Grube.

- 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. 2018-326 454 S ST MARYS and E Nueva between Dwyer and S St Mary's across from Jack White Way
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-362 404 KING WILLIAM
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-363 126 E NUEVA
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-364 701 E PYRON AVE
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-353 1011 S MAIN AVE
- Item #7, Case No. 2018-372 270 PALO BLANCO
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-371 9214 ESPADA RD
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-374 W COPMMERCE ST BETWEEN ST MARY'S ST AND SANTA ROSA ST
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-368 2125 W MISTLETOE
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-358 1025 E CROCKETT ST (TAX CERTIFICATION)
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-359 1025 E CROCKETT (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-360 1150 S ALAMO ST (TAX CERTIFICATION)
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-359 1150 S ALAMO ST (TAX VERIFICATION)
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-316 2109 W MISTLETOE

Item #3 was pulled for citizens to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None.

RECUSALS: Garza (due to item #5).

THE MOTION CARRIED.

3. HDRC NO. 2018-365

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. This request was reviewed a fourth time by the Design Review Committee on July 24, 2018. At that meeting, commissioners noted that the updated construction documents were sufficient for final approval. Commissioners also asked that all meets and bounds be noted on the site plan.
- 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: Lawrence DeMartino (Roy Schweers yielded his time), Christopher Green, Jim Cullum Jr. (Sylvia Guzman yielded her time), and Raleigh Wood (Kim Wood yielded her time) spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Fetzer to deny the request.

AYES: Lazarine, Garza, Kamal, Fetzer, Laffoon.

NAYS: Guarino, Fish.

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2018-303

Applicant: Peter French/Gray Street Partners

Address: 420 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for 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 were approved by the HDRC on July 6, 2018, under a separate application.

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. 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.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on July 17, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that any new brick should be closer in color to the original, that more effort should be made to complement the existing materials on site, that as few modifications as possible should be made to the existing facades and that either the existing historic fabric and building form should be maintained. Committee members emphasized the structure’s contributing status.
- d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed a third time by the DRC on July 25, 2018. At that meeting commissioners noted the appropriateness of the Connector addition, noted that new facades should be sympathetic to the existing design and that the proposed brick should relate to the existing in color.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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 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.

- i. 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.
- j. 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.
- k. 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 Acequa 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 final approval of item #1, exterior modifications to the Print Building based on findings g and h. Staff recommends that the applicant adhere to the UDC and preserve original materials and design elements of the existing building or propose a design that is more in keeping with the construction period and design aesthetic of the Print building.
2. Staff does not recommend final approval of item #2, the proposed rooftop addition based on finding i. 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 final approval of item #3 the proposed connector addition based on findings e and f with the noted stipulations below.
 - i. 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. Construction documents for the connector addition must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and permits from Development Services Department.
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.
 - i. 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.

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.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

17. HDRC NO. 2018-283

Applicant: Ted Trautner/Max Developers Inc

Address: 714 SHERMAN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 300 square foot primary structure on the vacant lot at 714 Sherman. This request includes the installation of a concrete driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a single story, single-family residential structure on the vacant lot at 714 Sherman. The vacant lot is 6447 square feet in size (140ft deep by 45ft wide).
- b. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant attended a Design Review Committee meeting on May 9, 2018. Commissioners commented on the following details on the original proposal:
 - i. The setback and orientation condition should be similar to those found in the district: side-flanking driveway to off-centered primary structure rather than the proposed centered driveway.
 - ii. The roof form should be similar to those found in the district: hipped and gabled roofs rather than the proposed shed roof.
 - iii. Fenestration details should be similar to those found in the district: wood sashed windows.
 - iv. A measured and developed site plan with landscape details should be submitted 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 provided a setback that is consistent with the neighboring properties on each side of the lot; however, the applicant has proposed an overall orientation that is inconsistent with the Guidelines. This block of Sherman features two, historic shotgun structures. Staff finds that an appropriate orientation for the structure that includes the narrow façade addressing the street, incorporating a front porch, consistent with the neighboring shotgun structures.

- d. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. While the proposed entrance is oriented toward the primary street, staff finds the context and scale of the entrance to be inappropriate, as noted in finding c.
- 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 Sherman features six (6) one-story historic structures on the south side of the block. Staff finds the general scale and mass of the structure to be consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the smaller mass of the structure should be oriented toward the street to be comparable to the adjacent shotgun structures.
- 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 structures' foundation and floor heights. Neighboring structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. The proposed structure is to feature 20 inch skirting from grade. Staff finds that the proposed foundation and floor height is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a roof form featuring a primary gabled roof with a crossed gable and a shed roof over the porch. Historic structures within the district feature hipped or gabled roofs. Per findings c, d and e, staff finds that the proposed new construction should be comparable in scale and design to the neighboring shotgun structures. This would result in a front facing gabled roof with a shed porch roof.
- 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 proposed design features a total of three (3) one-over-one wood windows on the front and right side, and three (3) sliding windows on the rear and left side of the structure. Staff finds the one-overone and sliding windows appropriate.
- 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 proposed new construction is not more than fifty percent of the size of the total lot area.
- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding, a standing seam metal roof, and wood windows. Generally, the proposed materials are appropriate. Wood siding should feature a four inch exposure. The proposed roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- k. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install wood windows. Staff finds the proposed window materials appropriate. White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- l. **PORCH** – The applicant has proposed a porch that spans the entire width of the structure's widest façade. The adjacent shotgun structures feature the narrowest façade fronting the street with porches spanning the width of the street facing façade. Their porches inches shed porch roofs that commence at the top plate of the street facing wall plane. Staff finds that a front porch design that is comparable to those found on the adjacent shotgun houses should be incorporated into the design.
- m. **SITE ELEMENTS** – The applicant has submitted a site plan that includes a 9 ft wide driveway flanking the right side of the structure, a 3 ft wide walkway to the porch, and a predominantly

grass lawn with plantings surrounding the porch. Staff finds the site elements proposed are consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the new construction based on findings c, d, e, and l. Staff recommends the applicant modify the proposed design to be complementary of the adjacent shotgun structures.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Evelyn Brown and Barbara Garcia spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve with staff stipulations and the additional stipulation that the site plan be submitted to staff.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2018-328

Applicant: Genevie Ramirez/Build Modern

Address: 230 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove the existing, non-original stucco from each façade to expose the original wood siding.
2. Replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new standing seam metal roof.
3. Install a four (4) foot tall wrought iron fence in the front yard and side yards.
4. Construct an addition of approximately 150 square feet at the rear of the historic structure.
5. Replace the existing, wood windows with new, double hung wood windows.
6. Perform modifications to the existing porches on the west and south elevations to include modifications to form and material.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 230 Adams was constructed circa 1895 and is found on the 1896 Sanborn Map. The structure was originally constructed as a one story, single family residential structure with a wraparound porch. The structure existed in this form until circa 1950 when a second floor was added and the original structure and the wraparound front porch was removed.
- b. **STUCCO REMOVAL** – As noted in finding a, the original, one story structure did not feature a stucco façade. Evidence of the original siding exists on the first floor; however, one portions of the structure modified circa 1950, siding that matches that of the original 1896 is likely to not exist. Staff finds that the existing stucco should remain until accurate evidence of existing siding is obtained.
- c. **ROOFING** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, standing seam metal roof with a new standing seam metal roof. Staff finds this request to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed replacement roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. An

inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the installation of roofing materials to insure an inappropriate ridge cap is not installed.

- d. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install an aluminum fence to feature four (4) feet in height to be located parallel to the property line on both the Adams and Stieren sides of the property. The applicant has proposed a sidewalk gate and has proposed for the fence to stop at the driveway on Stieren. Staff finds the proposed fence on this block of Adams to be appropriate. The proposed fence should align with those featured on neighboring properties.
- e. REAR ADDITION – At the rear of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed construct an addition to replace an existing, rear porch., The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a shed roof to match that of the existing porch roof, two, one over one wood windows and wood siding. Staff finds the proposed addition to be appropriate; however, the siding material should be stucco to match that of the existing structure, per finding b.
- f. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The historic structure currently features historic, one over one wood windows. Many of the existing windows feature damage or are missing sashes. In some instances windows are completely missing. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that historic windows should be repaired. Staff performed a site visit on July 10, 2018, and found that many of the existing windows are in repairable condition. Staff has indicated these windows on elevation drawings located within the exhibits. Regarding window replacement, staff finds the proposed wood, one over one windows to be an appropriate replacement for windows that are deteriorated beyond repair.
- g. PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing porches and porch roofs by removing the existing plaster and stucco facades, columns and column pediments and installing brick pediments as well as opening the existing porch walls. Per the Guidelines, porches should be preserved as they exist. Reconstruction and modifications should only be performed if based on evidence of a previous design. Staff finds that the installation of new cedar columns and the proposed modifications including the removing of both roof and sidewall structure are inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the removal of the existing stucco façade based on finding Staff finds that the existing stucco should remain until accurate evidence of historical siding used throughout the building is provided.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the replacement of the exiting standing seam metal roof with the following stipulation:
 - i. That the proposed replacement roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. An inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the installation of roofing materials to insure an inappropriate ridge cap is not= installed.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the installation of a front and side yard fence based on finding d with the following stipulation:
 - i. That the proposed fence not exceed four (4) feet in height and that it align with neighboring fences.
4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the construction of a rear addition with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the proposed façade material be stucco to match as close to that of the historic structure as possible.
 - ii. That the proposed windows feature a depth that matches those found in the historic structure.
5. Staff recommends partial approval of item #5, window replacement, only where windows are non-repairable as noted by staff in the exhibits. Staff does not recommend approval of wholesale window replacement. The applicant may present additional information to staff regarding the

replacement of windows that are deteriorated beyond repair that were not accessible to staff during the site visit.

6. Staff does not recommend approval of item #6, porch modifications, based on finding g.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Fish to approve with staff stipulations 2, 3, 4, and 5 and with changes to stipulation 1 that the applicant match the repaired/restored siding under the stucco; stipulation 6 was denied.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2018-379

Applicant: Justin Abt

Address: 631 MUNCEY

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear addition of approximately 575 square feet.
2. Perform roofing modifications including the removal of the existing standing seam metal roof and the installation of an asphalt shingle roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 631 Muncey was constructed circa 1930 and features Craftsman style architectural elements including a front facing gabled roof. The structure is located at the corner of Muncey and Sherman within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the historic context of the block, should utilize a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof form that matches that of the historic structure and a vertical trim piece on each elevation to separate the addition from the historic structure.
- c. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof form that is comparable to that currently on the historic structure; a gabled roof in the front with a hipped roof in the rear. The applicant has proposed to tie into the existing structure’s roof and extend the new roof with a matching ridge height to the rear of the addition.
- d. TRANSITION – As noted in findings b and c, the applicant has proposed to construct the rear addition in the same wall plane as the historic house as well as use the same ridge line. The reduction of the proposed addition’s ridge height or an inset in wall plane would be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed vertical trim piece is sufficient in separating the addition from the historic structure.
- e. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding to match that of the existing structure, an asphalt shingle roof, and one over one windows. The structure currently

features a standing seam metal roof; however, Craftsman structures located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature both shingle and metal roofs. Staff finds the roof replacement to be appropriate.

- f. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has noted that aluminum windows that match those existing in the historic structure will be installed. 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.
- g. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed addition to be appropriate in massing and form. While the proposed addition is more than forty percent of the existing structure’s square footage, staff finds the proposed addition’s size appropriate for the size of the lot.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. 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.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Evelyn Brown spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Kamal and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve with staff stipulations and the additional stipulations that the applicant add a window to the left façade at Bath 2, the master bedroom, and the kitch and submit a sample of the roof material to staff.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2018-377

Applicant: Audrey Park/Comet Signs, LLC

Address: 2001 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install LED lights into the existing canopy of the fuel station.

FINDINGS:

- a. The gas station at 2001 Broadway is located within the River Improvement Overlay, District 1. The gas station is located at the corner of Broadway Street and E Josephine Street. To the immediate rear of the gas station is Avenue B and US HWY 281. Brackenridge Park is located approximately 400 feet north of the site. The San Antonio River is located approximately .25 miles west of the site.
- b. The UDC Section 35-678(k)(D) notes that the Historic Preservation Officer may impose additional restrictions on illumination to ensure that the character of signs are harmonious with the character of the structures on which they are to be placed and designated landmarks or districts in the area, provided that such restrictions are reasonably related to other conforming signs and conforming structures in the area, do not unreasonably restrict the amount of signage allowed by this section, and are in keeping with the intent of this section. Staff does not find a complete illumination of the canopy signage to be consistent with the design intent of the UDC's River Improvement Overlay standards. Staff finds that the illumination of individual signage panels is appropriate; however, the complete illumination of the canopy is not.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Fish to approve with the stipulation that canopy is illuminated only at the letters and logo.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2018-355

Applicant: Kris Sumantri

Address: 1103 N OLIVE ST

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Modify the existing fenestration.
- 2. Replace the existing siding.
- 3. Enclose the existing front porch to create a front addition.
- 4. Construct a new covered front porch.
- 5. Construct a new rear deck.
- 6. Install a cattle panel fence surrounding the property.
- 7. Install rear concrete hardscaping.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 1103 N Olive is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1980. A 1-story structure in a different configuration is present on the 1911-1924 Sanborn Map. The lot no longer features a primary structure in the 1911-1955 Sanborn Map. The existing structure is non-contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing fenestration. Modifications include the removal of one front window, an addition of a horizontal rectangular window in the rear, and a new pair of French doors leading to a proposed rear deck where sliding doors are currently located. Staff does not find the removal of the front window appropriate and finds that any new window openings should feature traditional profiles, proportions, configurations, and insets. Staff finds the installation of French doors appropriate.
- c. SIDING REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to remove the cement board siding and replace with new Hardie plank siding. Staff finds this to be appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- d. FRONT ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to enclose an existing front porch to create a front addition. The current porch is a simple shed roof with simple column supports. The existing porch deck is constructed of wood. In the submitted drawings, the applicant has proposed to capture this footprint and create interior conditioned space. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new additions or interior space should be located towards the rear of the property whenever possible. The enclosure of this porch area would also create a front setback that is greater than the neighboring historic structure, which would result in the addition being the dominant feature on the streetscape. Staff finds that modifications to the design and details of the current front porch may be appropriate, but finds that enclosing the porch to create a new front addition is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- e. NEW FRONT PORCH – The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch in front of the proposed addition as noted in finding d. The applicant has proposed a more traditional front gable porch with simple square columns. The footprint of the porch will extend towards the street by approximately 10 feet. The proposed columns are 10 inches in width. While staff finds the concept of front porch modifications generally appropriate as noted in finding d, the extension of the building footprint towards the street would significantly modify the front setback relationship with the neighboring historic structure and development pattern of historic structures in the vicinity as noted in finding d. Staff also finds that any proposed porch columns should not exceed 6 inches in width.
- f. REAR DECK – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear deck to measure approximately 200 square feet. The deck will be constructed of wood and feature a simple rail and baluster detail with steps leading to the backyard. Staff finds the size, location, and detailing appropriate for the structure.
- g. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing chain link fence with a new cattle panel style fence. The fence will measure 4 feet in height. Staff finds this to be appropriate based on the fences in the nearby area and in the district.
- h. HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to add additional concrete in the rear yard. The concrete will widen an existing driveway by approximately 100 square feet. The existing apron on the street frontage will remain. Staff finds this to be appropriate based on the location and the size of the lot relative to the hardscaping to be introduced.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That a window opening on the left side of the front façade be retained. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings to staff for review and approval.

- ii. That applicant proposes an alternative window size that is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines in lieu of the proposed rectangular window on the north façade.
- iii. That the applicant complies with the requirements of the window replacement proposal approved by the HDRC on July 18, 2018, and submits any updated window product information to staff.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval of siding replacement based on finding c with the stipulation that the reveal not exceed six inches and that the smooth side of the board be used.

Items 3 and 4, Staff does not recommend approval of the front addition and new front porch based on findings d and e. Staff finds that the applicant should refrain from creating conditioned interior space on the front of the structure and should relocate any additions to the rear. Staff also finds that any front porch design modifications should be made within the footprint of the existing front porch to maintain a consistent street setback as noted in finding e.

Item 5, Staff recommends approval of the rear deck based on finding f.

Item 6, Staff recommends approval of the fencing based on finding f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the fence be no taller than 4 feet in height. The 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.

Item 7, Staff recommends approval of the proposed hardscaping based on finding g.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Evelyn Brown spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Fish to refer the case to the Design Review Committee.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2018-367

Applicant: Ginger Johnson

Address: 9599 BRAUN RD

REQUEST:

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

1. Demolish two non-original additions.
2. Construct a side addition measuring approximately 580 square feet.
3. Construct a rear addition measuring approximately 315 square feet.
4. Infill the crawlspace void below the historic 1895 limestone structure with a new concrete slab.
5. Install a new wooden ADA ramp.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property addressed 9599 Braun Rd is the site of the Crenwelge/Braun Farm Complex, a locally designated landmark. The complex contains 14 buildings and structures, including a limestone farmhouse, several barn structures, several sheds, a stone wall, a smokehouse/root cellar, a cistern, a windmill, and two concrete troughs. The complex was constructed in three phases: 1895, 1900-1954, and 1954-1980. The first structure, a stone farmhouse, was constructed in 1895 by German immigrant Theodore Crenwelge. The farm originally consisted of 156 acres but has since been subdivided. The complex is significant for its visual reminder of German immigrants and farming practices in Central Texas and San Antonio. The applicant has proposed several modifications for the 1895 limestone farmhouse structure. No other modifications to additional buildings or site elements are proposed as part of this application.
- b. **DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ADDITIONS** – The limestone farmhouse structure features three non-original additions constructed between 1900 - 1970. The additions are constructed of vertical wide plank wood siding with battens and simple shed roofs with standing seam metal. As of March 2017, when staff performed a site walkthrough with the applicant, the additions were in a state of disrepair. Staff finds their removal appropriate based on their non-contributing nature. As of February 2018, the additions were removed without prior approval or permits.
- c. **NEW ADDITIONS: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct two additions in the same general location of the previous non-contributing additions. The side addition will total approximately 560 square feet, which is slightly larger than the previous side addition, and will be set back from the front façade of the limestone structure by approximately 10 feet. The rear addition will occupy the same space as the previous non-original rear enclosed porch and will utilize the concrete pad. The side addition will feature a slightly lower height than the primary limestone structure and the rear addition will tie into the existing standing seam metal roof. While staff finds the general massing and location of the rear addition to be appropriate, staff finds that the side addition obscures a significant amount of the side elevation of the historic limestone structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located to the rear whenever possible. There is ample space behind the structure to construct an addition. Staff finds that the proposed side addition should be relocated to the rear of the historic building to be more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
- d. **NEW ADDITIONS: ROOF** – The new side addition will feature a side gable roof with a pitch that matches the side gable of the limestone structure. The rear addition will feature a simple shed roof, similar to the previous non-original porch. The roofing will be standing seam metal to tie into the existing limestone structure's roof. Staff finds the general design approach for the roof configurations, as well as the material, to be appropriate, but finds that the side addition should be relocated to the rear as noted in finding c.
- e. **NEW ADDITIONS: WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed to install several window and door openings on the new additions. Several windows and doors will match the opening sizes and proportions of those on the existing limestone structure, which are consistent with the Guidelines. However, the proposed elevations indicate that the windows will not be divided and will contain a single pane of glass, which is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, one window on the front elevation of the side addition will feature a square proportion. Staff finds this square proportion to be inconsistent. The north elevation of the side addition also does not feature any window openings. As noted in findings c and d, the side addition should be relocated. The applicant should install openings on every elevation that feature profiles and configurations that are consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **NEW ADDITIONS: FAÇADE MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to install new vertical cedar siding on the additions. The siding features a profile of a few inches and will not feature battens. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure should be used whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an

addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. Staff does not find vertical cedar siding appropriate without the use of battens.

- g. CRAWLSPACE – The applicant has proposed to pour a new concrete slab in an existing crawlspace void. The void is located under the main original limestone structure. Staff does not find this treatment appropriate, as it negatively impacts the breathability and original structural foundation of the 1895 construction. Staff recommends that the foundation be repaired in-kind and the structural configuration remain.
- h. ADA RAMP – The applicant has proposed to construct a new wooden ADA ramp. The ramp will be located on the proposed rear addition and set back from the front façade of the primary limestone structure by approximately 16'-7". The ramp will be constructed of simple wood posts and balusters and feature one switchback. Staff finds the proposal conceptually appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the non-original additions based on finding b.

Items 2 and 3, Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed side and rear additions at this time based on findings c through f. Staff recommends that the applicant make the following modifications prior to resubmitting to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant relocates the proposed side addition to the rear of the historic structure as noted in finding c.
- ii. That the additions feature true board and batten siding with boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.
- iii. That the applicant installs fenestration featuring appropriate proportions and configurations on all elevations of the additions as noted in finding e.
- iv. That the windows feature a one over one configuration and meet the following stipulations: Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. 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.
- v. That the standing seam metal roof features 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.

Item 4, Staff does not recommend the new concrete slab proposal based on finding g. Staff recommends that the existing foundation be repaired in-kind.

Item 5, Staff recommends approval of the new ADA ramp based on finding e.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fetzer and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to refer the case to the Design Review Committee.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2018-369

Applicant: Blake Eden

Address: 802 AUSTIN ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to retro fit TPO over the existing metal roofing. Existing metal roof will not be removed.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 802 Austin is a 1-story commercial structure constructed in 1889. The building is constructed of a buff-colored brick and features brick quoins, segmented arch windows, and an ornamental brick parapet that surrounds a standing seam gable roof. The structure is an individually designated local landmark with the common name of C. Horan & Co. Building.
- b. The applicant has proposed to install Thermoplastic Polyolefin (TPO) roofing over the existing standing seam metal roof. The applicant has stated that the installation will allow for the retention of the existing standing seam metal while improving energy efficiency and reducing heat gain. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, roofing materials should be repaired or replaced in-kind whenever possible. Contemporary roofing materials may be appropriate on flat or gently sloping roofs that are not visible from the public right-of-way. While the gabled metal roof and sloping red metal roof is partially concealed by the ornamental brick parapet, the roof pitch features a traditionally steep pitch and is clearly visible from the public right-of-way from the north and south. Staff finds that the installation of TPO over the existing standing seam metal roof will significantly alter its appearance and add height to the roof. Staff does not find the installation consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. Staff recommends that the existing standing seam metal roof be repaired or replaced in-kind.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve the TPO roof for the 2010 building and deny the TPO roof for the historic building.

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

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Note: Commissioner Lazarine left at 5:05 PM.

24. HDRC NO. 2018-357

Applicant: Jerry Woolf/JB Woolf Sheds

Address: 407 MISSION ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a detached carport in rear yard.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 407 Mission St is a one story, single family home constructed circa 1900 in the Folk Victorian style. The home features several elements of the style, including a standing seam metal hipped roof with front gable, scalloped gable shingles, and decorative bracketing. The home is a contributing structure in the King William Historic District.
- b. GARAGE – The applicant has proposed to construct a detached garage in the rear yard to feature the fifteen feet in height, thirty feet in depth, twenty-four feet in width, a concrete slab foundation, lap siding, a gabled roof, a double-wide garage door, and no windows.
- c. MASSING & FORM – Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.A.i, new garages should be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of height, massing, and form. Staff finds the proposed height of fifteen feet to be generally appropriate.
- d. BUILDING SIZE – Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.A.ii, new garages should be no larger in plan that 40 percent of the principle historic structure. Staff finds that the proposed 720 square foot garage is appropriate given the footprint of the primary historic structure and is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. CHARACTER – Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.A.iii, new garages should relate to the period of construction of the principle building on the lot through contemporary materials and simplified architectural details. Staff finds that the proposed lap siding relates to the wood lap siding of the principal historic structure. However, staff also find that the proposed shingled roof does not relate to the standing seam metal roof of the principle historic structure and instead should feature a matching roofing material.
- f. WINDOWS & DOORS – Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.A.iv, windows and door openings should be similar to those found on the historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principal historic structure in terms of spacing and proportions. Staff finds the side door featuring 3 by 3 divided lights and traditional paneling is consistent with the Guidelines. However, staff also finds that the lack of fenestration and windows is not consistent with Guidelines or other historic garages in the district. Staff finds that fenestration should be incorporated into the side elevations.
- g. GARAGE DOOR – Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.A.v, garages doors should feature similar proportions and materials as those traditionally found in the district. Staff finds that the double-wide garage door is not historically found in the district and instead should feature two bays with single-width garage doors.
- h. ORIENTATION - Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.B.i, new garages should match the orientation of garages on the block. Staff finds the orientation front-facing gable to the street and the alleyway is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. SETBACKS - Per the Guidelines for Garages and Outbuildings 5.B.ii, new garages should follow the setback pattern of similar structure along the streetscape or district, which is often in the rear of the lot and behind the principal building. Staff finds the proposed setbacks are consistent with the Guidelines and other garages found in the district.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the detached garage based on findings b, c, d, h, and i with the following stipulations:

- i. That windows and fenestration details that are consistent with the Guidelines are incorporated into the side elevations.
- ii. That the garage feature two bays of single-width garage doors instead of the proposed double-wide garage door.
- iii. That the structure feature wood or hardi lap siding and a standing seam metal roof instead of the proposed shingle roof. The metal roof must adhere to the following stipulations: panels should be 18-21 inches wide, seam should be 1-2 inches tall and appropriate to the slope of the roof, a crimped ridge seam that is consistent with the historic application, standard galvalume color. Vented ridge caps are not to be used, and a low profile ridge cap/v-crimp panels will require HDRC approval.
- iv. The applicant is furthermore responsible for complying with any building setback requirements per the UDC for the garage.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Kamal to approve with staff stipulations 1, 3, and 4.

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

NAYS: Garza.

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. 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: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Bustamante and seconded by Commissioner Garza 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 Kamal 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 5:19 PM.

APPROVED

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

Michael Guarino
Chair