

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
5 September 2018**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:05 PM, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.
- The meeting was called to order by Chair Guarino, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

ABSENT: Bustamante, Kamal, Laffoon.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Barbara Garcia spoke in support of 413 N Pine St and 909 N Pine St.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-429 436 DEVINE ST
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-428 1010 S FLORES ST
- Item #3, Case No. 2018-303 420 BROADWAY/Print Building
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-410 419 W CEVALLOS
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-435 120 NINTH ST
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-356 126 MAIN PLAZA
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-482 7023 SYMPHONY LANE
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-408 320 E COURTLAND PLACE
- Item #11, Case No. 2018-415 402 E DEWEY PLACE
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-416 315 STIEREN
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-418 841 E GUENTHER ST
- Item #15, Case No. 2018-420 723 BROOKLYN AVE
- Item #16, Case No. 2018-421 921 LAMAR ST
- Item #17, Case No. 2018-422 2047 W WOODLAWN
- Item #18, Case No. 2018-425 1950 W GRAMERCY PLACE

Item #7 was pulled for citizens to be heard. Items #5 and 14 were moved to individual consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2018-409

Applicant: Sal Garcia Ryan Reed/NRP Group

Address: 1001 BROADWAY/1011 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a five story, mixed-use structure at the intersection of Broadway and Jones.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a five story, mixed-use structure at the intersection of Broadway and Jones. The structure will be bound by Broadway to the east, Jones to the north, Avenue B to the west and Tenth Street to the south. The proposed new construction will feature structured parking, wrapped by both residential and retail space.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 21, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that the proposed façade breaks reduced the overall massing of the façade, that the curb cut being removed from Broadway would be most appropriate; however, it's located at mid-block was more appropriate than at a corner, noted that articulation to the façade should be added to the Broadway façade and noted that the additional of brick to other facades would be appropriate.
- c. EXISTING STRUCTURES – This block currently features three separate lots, two of which have existing structures. The lot addressed 210 E Jones features a single story commercial structure and a warehouse structure. The lot addressed as 1001/1011 Broadway features a one story commercial structure, previously used as a commercial structure for a automobile sales lot. The demolition of these structures is eligible to be approved administratively.
- d. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed sidewalks and pedestrian walkways on each street including those linking to property to the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.
- e. CURB CUTS – The RIO design objectives outlined in the UDC include the creation of a “positive pedestrian experience” at the street edge. Standards related to curb cuts and interference with pedestrian traffic are also provided. The UDC requires projects to limit curb cuts to two (2) on parking areas or structures facing only one (1) street, and one (1) for each additional street face.
- f. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed one curb cut on Broadway as well as one on Avenue B. Staff finds the proposed Avenue B curb cut to be appropriate provided that it does not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width. The intent of the upcoming bond project for Broadway is to promote pedestrian and bicycle activity along Broadway. Minimizing the number of driveways (conflict points) would be important to enhance the pedestrian/cycling environment. In addition to HDRC approval of the site plan, the applicant is responsible for coordinating with TCI regarding allowable curb cuts and obtaining all required permits. Staff finds that the applicant should explore ways to either eliminate the proposed Broadway curb cut, or to incorporate a pedestrian island between vehicular entry/exit lanes.
- g. PARKING GARAGE – The applicant has proposed a parking garage that is to be wrapped by both commercial and residential units. This is consistent with the UDC.
- h. SITE DESIGN – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has sited the proposed new construction to feature retail space at the corners of Broadway and Jones, Broadway and Tenth and Jones and Avenue B. The majority of the facades at both the ground and second levels between the

previously noted corners also feature retail space that promote active spaces and animate the street scene.

- i. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has noted various landscaped areas which appear to be appropriate. When returning to the HDRC for final approval, a complete landscaping plan should be submitted.
- j. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- k. **HUMAN SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed multiple elements to provide a human scale, including façade openings scaled for human interaction, balcony railings, street level canopies, recessed balconies, terraces, street level terraces of varying heights and individual balcony canopies.
- l. **FAÇADE SEPARATION** – The UDC Section 35-674 (b)(4) notes that a façade in RIO-3 that features more than thirty (30) feet in length should be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has separated the façade both horizontally and vertically through the use of alternating materials, projecting and recessed balconies and alternating depths of façade planes.
- m. **BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT** – The UDC regulates building height within the River Improvement Overlay Districts. In RIO-2, this is ten stories or 120 Feet. The proposed height is consistent with the UDC.
- n. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include brick, wood siding, metal siding, metal railing systems, stucco and metal storefront systems. The proposed materials types are consistent with the UDC.
- o. **MATERIALS** – As noted in the previous finding, the applicant has proposed brick and stucco. The applicant has proposed brick to be located at the corner of Broadway and Jones, to extend approximately half the length of the Broadway façade and approximately one fourth of the Jones façade. Staff finds that additional brick or another dimensional masonry material should be incorporated into the design, on all street-facing facades.
- p. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – The UDC Section 35-678(e) notes that traditionally, buildings have been organized into three distinct segments; a base, midsection and cap. This organization helps to give a sense of scale to a building and its use should be encouraged. The applicant has incorporated a base and midsection and a cap through detailing and separation of materials are the cornice level. Staff finds that additional detailing to the cap would be appropriate to provide a distinct building cap on each façade.
- q. **WINDOWS** – The applicant has not specified window materials at this time. Staff finds that a non-white window should be installed. Per the UDC Section 35-678(e)(2), windows should be recessed at least two inches within solid walls. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- r. **AWNINGS & CANOPIES** – The applicant has incorporated a series of awnings and canopies throughout the proposed new construction. Staff finds their proposed locations and profiles to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- s. **SIGNAGE** – At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding signage. Signage will need to be reviewed and approved by the HDRC prior to installation.

- t. **OUTDOOR FURNITURE** – The applicant has proposed outdoor seating areas adjacent to the public right of way. High quality street furnishings are required per UDC Section 35-673(i). The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- u. **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 project boundaries. 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:

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

- i. That the applicant explore ways to either eliminate the proposed Broadway curb cut, or to incorporate a pedestrian island between vehicular entry/exit lanes to minimize the distance a pedestrian must travel across active automobile access points.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate additional brick or another dimensional masonry material into the design, on all street-facing facades.
- iii. That additional detail be added to ensure that a distinguished building cap is found on each façade.
- iv. That the applicant submit information regarding the screening of mechanical equipment, outdoor furniture, landscaping and lighting when returning for final approval.
- v. That the applicant install windows that feature dark colored frames and that all windows be recessed at least two inches within wall openings.
- vi. **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: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

7. HDRC NO. 2018-430

Applicant: Sergio Medellin, Jr.

Address: 508 N CHERRY

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform exterior modifications to the front façade including the reconstruction of a front porch.
2. Perform maintenance scopes of work including window restoration, installing a new asphalt shingle roof and siding repair.
3. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 464 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 508 N Cherry was constructed circa 1920 and is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This structure first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The structure features Craftsman elements including a hipped roof with a front facing gabled dormer, exposed rafter tails and an asphalt shingle roof. The structure's original front façade has been modified to include the infilling of the original front porch. At this time, the applicant has proposed to perform rehabilitative scopes of work, restore the front porch and construct a rear addition. The structure features a rear addition, which is not found on the 1951 Sanborn Map that the applicant has proposed to remove. This item is eligible for Administrative Approval.
- b. REPAIR ITEMS – The applicant has proposed repair the existing, wood windows, install a new asphalt shingle roof and repair the existing 117 profile wood siding. The proposed rehabilitative scope of work is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.
- c. PORCH RECONSTRUCTION – The historic structure currently features a front porch that has been in-filled. The form of the original front porch is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The front porch was modified prior to a 1994 survey photo, located within the exhibits. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v. porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence. When evidence does not exist, the design should be based on the architectural style of the house and historic patterns. The historic structure to the immediate south, 506 N Cherry, shares a matching footprint and roof form at 508 N Cherry.
- d. PORCH RECONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to reopen the existing porch to a depth of 5' – 8 ½". Per the proposed floor plan, the applicant has proposed to install a front porch door, facing the side yard and no front porch window. The historic structure at 506 N Cherry features both street and side yard facing front doors and a street facing porch window. Staff finds that given the close similarities between these two houses, the porch profile at 506 N Cherry is potentially the original form of the porch at 508 N Cherry. Staff finds that the proposed porch modification should be modified to include a side door facing the street in addition to that facing the side yard, a street facing porch window and a porch depth that matches that at 506 N Cherry. Staff finds the proposed porch railings to be appropriate.
- e. REAR 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 matching ridgeline and wall plane. Staff finds that either a subordinate ridge line and an inset in wall planes, or a combination of both should be incorporated into the design to differentiate the proposed addition from the historic structure.
- f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof form that features a hipped roof with a rear facing dormer with a gabled roof to match that found on the front façade. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate.
- g. TRANSITIONS – As noted in finding e, a subordinate ridge line and an inset in wall planes, or a combination of both should be incorporated into the design to differentiate the proposed addition from the historic structure. A vertical trim piece may also be used to differentiate the proposed addition from the new construction; however, it should be installed in addition to the use of a subordinate ridge line.
- h. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted materials that include wood siding to match the original, like windows and one exterior door. Staff finds that matching the existing, 117 profile siding is appropriate.

- i. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of like windows. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and form of the proposed addition to be appropriate.
- k. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – At this time, the applicant has not submitted an application for Historic Tax Certification. Staff encourages the applicant to apply for Historic Tax Certification to begin the process for obtaining the local tax incentive for substantial rehabilitation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the proposed porch reconstruction based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the proposed porch modification be modified to include a side door facing the street in addition to that facing the side yard, a street facing porch window and a porch depth that matches that at 506 N Cherry.
 - ii. That the stipulated porch window feature a profile and materials (wood) that matches the existing window on the front façade.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, exterior repair and maintenance as submitted.
- 3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the construction of a rear addition with the following stipulations:
 - i. That either a subordinate ridge line and an inset in wall planes, or a combination of both be incorporated into the design to differentiate the proposed addition from the historic structure.
 - ii. 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: Barbara Garcia spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2018-427

Applicant: Enrique Patuel

Address: 219 DELAWARE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 5 foot tall, wrought iron front yard fence including a front driveway gate.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 219 Delaware was constructed circa 1910 and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a fence to span the width of the property, including a gate spanning across the driveway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii, new front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that did not historically have them. While staff finds that a fence is not currently present on this property, fences are found on Delaware and within the Lavaca Historic District. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.i., privacy fences should be set back from the front façade to reduce their visual prominence. Staff finds that the fence should turn at the driveway to meet the corner of the structure, rather than spanning across the driveway as proposed. Staff finds that the driveway gate, if included, should be set back behind the front façade plane of the structure.
- c. FENCE DESIGN – The applicant has proposed the new fence to feature a wrought iron design and five feet in height. 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 wrought iron fence is found within the Lavaca Historic District and with Folk Victorian homes.
- d. FENCE HEIGHT - Per the Guidelines 2.B.iii, the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds that the proposed five foot tall fence should be reduced to four feet.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

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

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2018-406

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 613 CHESTNUT ST

REQUEST:

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property located at 613 Chestnut.

FINDINGS:

- a. On August 9, 2018, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner for two structures at 613 Chestnut Avenue which is located in the Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association. OHP Staff conducted research and contacted the Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
- b. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- c. On August 22, 2018, the Designation and Demolition Committee (DDC) visited the property. The committee noted that the structure retained its original materials and form. They saw that the original siding material existed under the non-original asbestos siding. They noted that the structure and materials are in good condition and were well maintained. The DDC also noted that the residential structure had lost its original context. They found it appropriate to relocate the structure to a residential neighborhood with a similar historic development pattern, such as Dignowity Hill. Based on the site observations, the group was in support of designation.
- d. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION – Residential Structure** The structure faces Nolan Street, which is a primary thoroughfare; the structure used to be addressed 219 Nolan St and is set 1' to 3' from the public right-of-way. There is a side rear entrance on the east façade. There is an asphalt and gravel driveway to the east. There is no front walkway from the public sidewalk or from the private driveway. The rear yard is mostly paved or gravel. This single story vernacular structure has a cross gabled roof with standing seam metal, a full front attached porch with a shed roof, and a symmetrical front façade with two front entrances. The two front doors retain their original wood jigsaw detailing and each has a half-light that is boarded up. The porch decking appears original but there have been modifications to the porch fascia and supports; the fascia and porch columns are iron and appear to be non-original to the structure. There are two original decorative brackets flanking the porch roof that provide a Folk Victorian influence. There is a transom window above each door and two-over-two wood windows throughout the home. A brick chimney can be seen in the middle of the roof. The existing wood siding is covered by synthetic asbestos siding. The structure has a L-plan with an original rear, side porch along the east façade of the rear wing; the porch has been enclosed with non-original plywood siding. Materials and form appear original with the exception of the asbestos siding, partial porch materials, and the enclosed rear porch. **Commercial Structure** The structure is set back 3' to 6' from the public right-of-way along Nolan and 6' to 10' along Chestnut. The structure does not

have a primary façade and all of the entrances are vehicular in nature as they are accessed by full length sliding doors. The commercial warehouse at the corner of Nolan and Chestnut were assessed, after which staff determined that this structure may be demolished. Property documents show that there were originally three residential structures between the subject extant residential structure mentioned above and the corner of Nolan and Chestnut. The current commercial structure is a combination of three forms; two double height warehouses with a CMU and steel frames, and corrugated metal siding flanking a one-story wing with stucco siding and steel casement windows. The two side metal wings do not have any windows. The building has both flat and shed roofs and sliding metal doors that are the full height of the building.

- e. **SITE CONTEXT** – This stretch of Nolan Street is relatively flat. The structure sits on a parcel that includes 4 original rectangular lots. The property is enclosed by a 6’ tall chain-link fence. The property abuts the Healy-Murphy Historic District, and is 2.5 blocks from the eastern boundary of Dignowity Hill Historic District. Most of the structures in the immediate vicinity are industrial or commercial in nature, though there are still a few residential structures to the rear on Chestnut and moving north on Chestnut.
- f. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** – The property abuts the Healy-Murphy Historic District, and is two-and-a-half blocks from the eastern boundary of Dignowity Hill Historic District. In 1888, Margaret Healy Murphy, a former Irish immigrant and educator, opened the St. Peter Claver School and Church on the property that abuts the subject property, at the corner of Live Oak and Nolan Streets. The school became the first private school dedicated to educating African-American children in Texas. Overtime the property continued to develop, becoming a religious order, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, to stabilize staffing and operation at the school. The Dignowity Hill area was originally settled by Dr. Anthony Michael Dignowity, a physician and Czech immigrant, who built his family home on a hill to the east of town and called it Harmony House (demolished in 1926 and became the now Dignowity Park). During the latter part of the nineteenth century, Dignowity Hill, as it became known, was home to prominent San Antonio merchants and business owners. Dignowity Hill was an exclusive and affluent residential area in San Antonio due to its high elevation, proximity to downtown, the size of the lots, and lack of city water, which required residents to construct expensive water collecting systems. The arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1877 significantly changed the neighborhood’s built environment and demographic diversity. Industrial development greatly increased with the construction of an iron works factory, the development of a streetcar service trolley line along Burnet Street (1891), and the extension of sewer and water lines to the area around the turn-of-the-century. By 1914, the neighborhood was surrounded by industry on the north and west, commerce on the south, and modest homes on the east. In a very short time wealthy homeowners began to seek new locations for their homes. The neighborhood consisted primarily of small Folk Victorian style houses and Craftsman Bungalows by the 1930s.
- g. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** – This portion of the neighborhood was filled with varied lots. Along Nolan the church was neighbored by homes of similar sizes to the subject property. Directly across the street, to the south, lot widths matched those to the north with similar size residential structures. Across the street, and one block to the west, was a t-shape home on a lot that spanned the full length of the block from Elm to Live Oak. Commercial was not dense on this block nor on this intersection. The property was first owned and occupied by Ferdinand and Elizabeth Urban in 1901. City Directories show that Mr. Urban was a blacksmith. Mr. Urban died between the years of 1903 and 1905. Elizabeth Urban continued to live there until 1913.
- h. **EVALUATION** – In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b):

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 intact example of a 1901 vernacular architecture retaining original materials.

9. Its character as a geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of historically, architecturally or culturally significant sites, buildings, objects or structures united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development; for its connection with the other early 20th century homes in this early San Antonio suburb.

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; for its example of the economic heritage as home for modest property owners, and an example of a home during the early 20th century as the city began its growth.

- i. Should a Finding of Historic Significance not be approved by the commission, alternatives to demolition should be considered, such as relocation. The HDRC should provide a timeframe for which relocation can occur. Relocation of the structure within the bounds of a historic district would require a Certificate of Appropriateness. Should a Finding of Historic Significance be approved, a Certificate of Appropriateness would be required to relocate the structure to any location.
- j. 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.
- k. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed Finding of Historic Significance based on findings a through h.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Barbara Garcia and Patti Zaiontz spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2018-385

Applicant: Mitsuko Ramos/Government Relations Group of TX

Address: 613 CHESTNUT ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new 1-story child development center at 613 Chestnut St. The complex will feature surface parking, a vehicular drop-off zone, a site wall, landscaping, and a central courtyard.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new 1-story child development center on the parcel addressed 613 Chestnut. The property is zoned Downtown and is being reviewed under the Downtown Design Guide. The development includes surface parking, a central courtyard for children, a vehicular parent drop off zone, and perimeter fencing.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on August 8, 2018. The DRC noted that the proposed parking configuration is inconsistent with the Downtown Development Guide, and suggested some alternative locations that would still potentially maintain the amount of square footage required for the buildings. The applicant indicated that they had explored multiple iterations in the conceptual design phase and that the current proposed solution is the most feasible. The DRC recommended that the applicant provide the Commission with these sketches and design explorations to help justify the proposed parking solution. The DRC commended the applicant on the proposed scale, materiality, and massing of the buildings in response to the surround site context and adjacent Healy Murphy Historic District. The DRC suggested exploring a more visually permeable site wall and emphasized the importance of indicating the proposed landscaping strategy when the project is reviewed by the HDRC.
- c. APPLICATION SCOPE – A submitted rendering features a multistory structure to the north and northeast of the existing Healy Murphy Center and church. Currently, there are no structures on this site, which is located within the Healy Murphy Historic District Boundary. This structure is not part of the current request by the applicant and is not being considered as part of this review. The outcome of this application has no bearing on the review of any additional proposed structures, which require a separate application for consideration by the HDRC.
- d. EXISTING SITE STRUCTURES – The proposed parcel currently contains several structures. One structure is industrial in nature and features corrugated metal siding and other synthetic materials. This structure is eligible for administrative approval of demolition. An additional structure, located in the center of the parcel on Nolan St, is a 1-story wooden structure clad with stucco. The structure has a side gable configuration with a full width front porch and is single family residential in form. This structure has been identified as an eligible historic resource a Finding of Historic Significance is being brought forth by the Office of Historic Preservation in a separate application to be heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on September 5, 2018.
- e. SIDEWALKS – According to the Downtown Design Guide, sidewalks should be designed to be walkable and should accommodate a variety of uses. A minimum 72 inch wide continuous pedestrian path of travel should be provided. The applicant has noted that the east lane of Live Oak Street has been closed to provide a wider continuous pedestrian path of travel and bicycle access. The width of the expanded sidewalk is estimated to be approximately 12 feet, but will be no less than 6 feet, which meets Downtown Design Guide standards. All other sidewalks will not be less than 6 feet wide. A community garden is planned on a portion of Burnet St between Live Oak St and Brooklyn Ave, which will be closed. Staff finds the sidewalk proposals consistent with the Guide.
- f. MASSING & GROUND FLOOR TREATMENT – The proposal features a 1-story structure with interior courtyard element. The applicant has indicated their consistency with the Downtown Design Guide requirements for windows and staff finds the ground floor treatment overall to be appropriate based on the immediate context of the site.

- g. **PARKING & ACCESS** – The applicant has located off street parking on the corner of Chestnut and Nolan Streets. The applicant has noted that this design decision was made to set back the front facade of the structure from the street for child safety and a parent vehicle drop off egress point. As a result, two curb cuts are to be introduced to this corner, along with several parking spaces directly fronting Chestnut St behind a perimeter wall. According to the Downtown Design Guide, where there is no alley and the project includes frontage on a street, parking access should be located mid-block or as far from a street intersection as possible. Additionally, as noted in Figures 4.2 and 4.3 of the Guide, off-street parking should be located behind or below buildings. The proposed development places parking at a prominent street corner directly in front of the proposed building. This is in direct conflict with the building and marking massing example illustrated in Figure 4.5. The vehicular drop-off zone proposal also requires the addition of a second curb cut. The Downtown Design Guide standards include locating drop-off zones along existing curbs or within parking facilities to promote sidewalk and street wall continuity and reduce conflicts with pedestrians. Curb cuts and parking entries should also be limited to the minimum number required, which is one for this parcel. Staff does not find the parking and access proposal consistent with the Downtown Design Guide Standards. Staff recommends that the parking be relocated towards the interior of the lot to be more consistent and a solution that utilizes only one curb cut be integrated.
- h. **PERIMETER FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence around the proposed surface parking lot and drop-off access points. The fencing will be buffered by landscaping and the applicant has indicated the intent to allow a flowering vine, like jasmine or similar, to grow to cover the static portions of the fence.
- i. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The proposed structure pulls directly from its adjacent context, which is the Healy Murphy Historic District and, primarily, the Healy Murphy Church. The Downtown Design Guide requires that structures feature a base, midsection, and a cap. The proposed design details pull from the existing context and staff finds that for this specific site, the proposed design is appropriate in terms of detailing.
- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include stucco siding with a trowel finish, a red standing seam metal roof, and metal window systems. Staff finds the materials appropriate for the context of the structure and consistent with the Downtown Design Guide.
- k. **LIGHTING** – The applicant has noted that all exterior lighting will be incorporated into the building's design and that light spillover or glare is not anticipated. The applicant has noted the installation of street lights and landscape lights. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Downtown Design Guide.
- l. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** - The applicant has noted that all mechanical equipment will be located on the roof or screened from the public view. Staff finds this consistent with the Downtown Design Guide.
- m. **SUSTAINABLE DESIGN** – The applicant has incorporated sustainable design elements into the proposal, including tinted windows, drip irrigation, drought tolerant plants, and pervious paving. The applicant has also noted that the proposal will comply with Build San Antonio Green recommendations.
- n. **SITE FURNITURE** – The applicant has noted that all site furniture will comply with the Downtown Design Guide and will be well designed and constructed of durable materials.
- o. **PUBLIC ART** – There is no public art proposed as part of this project at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on findings a through n. Staff recommends that the applicant make the following modifications to the proposal prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the proposed surface parking area be relocated to an interior location as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the second proposed curb cut be eliminated as noted in finding f.

- iii. That the applicant submits a comprehensive landscaping plan that indicates all species and locations of proposed plantings, including any additional proposed landscape screening methods.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Barbara Garcia and Patti Zaiontz spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with the stipulation that the structure is relocated within Dignowity Hill to a location approved by staff.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. 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. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on August 28, 2018. The applicant presented modified drawings that are not part of the current application or recommendation. The applicant indicated the importance of maintaining the internal courtyard condition created at the rear of the structure in relationship to the rest of the complex's buildings, including a well, a barn, and additional structures, which requires the additions to be located where proposed. The DRC agreed but suggested that the applicant provide ample photographs of the facades that face this courtyard for the HDRC hearing. The DRC also suggested providing a comprehensive site map that indicated all locations and species of any significant trees that impact the location of additions. Regarding the design of the new additions, the DRC recommended lowering the roofline to be subordinate to the historic limestone structure and incorporating a recess or dog run

condition at the connection of the two. The DRC also stated that using window sizes that were more contemporary on the addition was appropriate if the windows were made of wood and utilized traditional installation methods.

- c. **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.
- d. **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.
- e. **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.
- f. **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.
- g. **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.
- h. **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.

- i. 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 g. 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: Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Carpenter to approve as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2018-344

Applicant: Advanced Solar & Electric, LLC

Address: 2007 W WOODLAWN

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a roof-mounted solar array on the primary structure located at 2007 W Woodlawn. Eighteen (18) panels will be installed on the south (front) facing side gable and four (4) panels will be installed on a rear gable.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2007 W Woodlawn Ave E Park is a 1-story single family structure constructed in approximately 1940 in the Minimal Traditional style. The home features a cross gable configuration, an asymmetrical front porch with simple columns, and one over one windows, some featuring six over six wood screens. The structure is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. **CASE HISTORY AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant was originally heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on July 18, 2018. The case was referred to the Design Review Committee (DRC). The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on August 28, 2018. The applicant provided the original solar installation proposal as well as an alternative proposal that placed a majority of the solar panels on the rear accessory structure. This proposal would require trenching. The DRC stated that the alternative proposal was more appropriate and would meet the Guidelines as written. The applicant expressed the desire to maintain their original proposal due to cost issues, structural issues of the rear accessory structure, the neighbor's tree line, and the energy capability of the installation. Regarding the original proposal, the DRC expressed concern over the visibility of the front panels due to the requirement for the existing tall crape myrtle to be trimmed heavily in order for the panel system to work efficiently. The DRC suggested that the applicant provides photographs of the neighbor's tree line, the oak tree in the front yard, and a cost breakdown of the new proposal to better illustrate the argument for the original solar proposal for the HDRC hearing.
- c. **LOCATION** – The applicant is requesting approval to install 18 solar panels on the south, front facing side of the side gable roof and 4 solar panels on a north, rear facing gable. The 18 panels on the front roof pitch will be visible from the public right-of-way due to their placement. The 4 panels at the rear of the structure will not be visible from the public right-of-way. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i, solar collectors should be located on a side or rear roof pitch to the maximum extent possible. Staff finds that the 4 panels located towards the rear are appropriate. Staff does not find the 18 panels on the front façade consistent with the Guidelines due to their high visibility from the public right-of-way.
- d. **PITCH** – The panels will be installed flush with the roof pitch. Staff finds the pitch consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant relocates the panels on the front façade to the rear of the structure, to the rear accessory structure, or to a ground-mount system to significantly minimize the impact from the public right-of-way. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings reflecting these changes to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: **Lazarine.**

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2018-411

Applicant: Eric McClure/Terramark

Address: 909 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 909 N Pine, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 909 N Pine, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- 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 August, 21, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted concerns over the proposed concrete paver walkway, that the proposed ridge height should be within one to two feet of the neighboring historic structure’s ridge heights and noted that a more integrated second floor massing would be most appropriate. At that meeting, the applicant noted that the proposed setback would be deeper than that of the neighboring historic structure.
- d. **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 example found on the block. The current site plan/setback diagram is incorrect in noting existing and proposed setbacks. The applicant has noted that the proposed setback will be one foot deeper than that of the neighboring historic structure. An accurate setback diagram and site plan should be submitted to staff to ensure that a setback equal to or greater than those found on the block should be used.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a primary entrance that faces N Pine. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SCALE & MASSING** – This block on N Pine features eleven, single family residential structures. Each of these structures features one story in height. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.A. notes that the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Staff finds that the proposed height of the new construction should feature a ridge line that is comparable in height to those found historically on the block. The plate height of the second story should also be reduced to create a form that is a true 1 ½ story. An increased setback may reduce the perceived height and massing of the proposed two story structure to allow for a taller ridge line.
- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. At this time, the applicant has not provided specific

information regarding foundation heights. The applicant is responsible for adhering to the Guidelines regarding foundation heights.

- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has noted a primary roof form to feature a hipped roof above the two story portion, a shed porch roof and a side sloping shed roof. Both hipped and low-pitched shed roofs are found throughout the Dinowity Hill Historic District; however, on this block of N Pine, all but one of the historic structures feature a street facing gabled roof. Staff finds that the incorporation of a street facing gabled roof would be more in keeping with the historic profiles found on the block.
- i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant at this time has provided only information regarding site design, massing and materials. When developing architectural details and fenestration, the applicant should incorporate window openings that are located and sized in a manner that’s comparable to those found historically in the district. Small, fixed windows on the primary façade or in prominent façade locations (those seen from the public right of way) should not be used.
- j. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted materials that include lap siding, brick, metal or wood columns, asphalt shingles, concrete pavers and a standing seam metal roof. Staff find the use of siding appropriate provided that the proposed siding features an exposure of four inches and a smooth finish. Materials that are not found historically in the district, such as metal columns are not appropriate. The installation of asphalt shingles or a standing seam metal roof is appropriate. While not found commonly as a primary façade material in the district, brick is an appropriate material.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff finds that a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used.. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail (need to add detail here). Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- l. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment where it cannot be viewed from the public right of way at N Pine.
- m. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway to be located on the north side of the lot. This is consistent with the historic driveway location found on the block. The applicant should ensure that the proposed driveway does not exceed ten (10) feet in width.
- n. SIDEWALK – The applicant has included concrete pavers in the list of potential materials. The Guidelines note that the historic alignment, configuration, and width of sidewalks and walkways are to be adhered to. Staff finds that a concrete paver walkway may be appropriate provided that the width is consistent with the width of historic walkways found on this block; typically three to four feet.
- o. LANDSCAPING – At this time, the applicant has not specified landscaping design. A landscaping plan should be included in an application for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommend conceptual approval of the proposed site plan and materials based on findings d, e, j, l and m with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide an accurate block survey noting correct setback measurements and confirmation that the proposed setback will be equal to or greater than all historic setbacks found on the block.
- ii. That the proposed driveway width not exceed ten (10) feet in width and that the proposed front walkway not exceed four (4) feet in width as noted in findings l and m.
- iii. That a detailed landscape plan be submitted when returning to the HDRC for final approval as noted in finding n.
- iv. That the proposed lap siding feature a smooth finish and an exposure of four (4) inches, that the proposed metal columns be eliminated and that the proposed standing seam metal roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height a crimped ridge seam or low provide ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish as noted in finding j.
- v. That a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used.. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail (need to add detail here). Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the proposed massing based on finding f. Staff finds that a street elevation should be provided to demonstrate that the proposed new construction features an overall height that is comparable to the overall heights of the historic structures as noted in finding f.

An increased front yard setback may reduce the perceived height and massing of the proposed two story structure to allow for a taller ridge line.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2018-396

Applicant: Jorge Acosta

Address: 304 PIERCE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story, single family residential structure at 304 Pierce, located within the Government Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two story, single family residential structure at 304 Pierce, located within the Government Hill Historic District.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 7, 2018. At that meeting committee members noted that the proposed footprint was inappropriate for the site, that setbacks should be greater than those of neighboring historic structures, that the proposed site plan should show neighboring properties and that the proposed parking was not appropriate.
- 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 example found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of only ten (10) feet from the front property line. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a setback that is greater than those found historically on the block should be used. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant should proposed side and rear setbacks that are comparable to those found historically in the district.
- d. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a primary entrance that faces Pierce. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. SCALE & MASSING – This block of Pierce predominantly features one story, historic structures. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.A. notes that the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Staff finds that the proposed two story massing is inconsistent with the Guidelines. While two story structures are found historically in the district, staff finds that the applicant should provide additional massing information and propose architectural forms that are more in keeping with the historic, two story structures found in the district. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed footprint should be reduced to feature an overall footprint more appropriate for the district, as noted in finding c.
- f. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. At this time, the applicant has not provided specific information regarding foundation heights. The applicant is responsible for adhering to the Guidelines regarding foundation heights.
- g. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed both front and side gabled roofs. While the proposed form (gable) is appropriate, the proposed massing is not. Front facing gabled roofs are found commonly throughout the district; however, they do not feature the overall width currently proposed. Staff finds that additional separation of masses would promote a roof form more consistent with historic examples found in the district. Additionally, the proposed gable returns (gable boxes) should be removed.
- h. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed an overall form and massing that are greater than those found historically in the district. Staff finds that through the incorporation of traditional architectural forms, a more appropriate massing should be developed. Column sizes and profiles, roof massing and form and fenestration patterns should be developed based on historic examples found in the Government Hill Historic District. Other details such as double front doors, porch depth and detailing and façade separation should also be addressed.
- i. MATERIALS – The applicant has not provided specifics in regards to materials at this time. Staff finds that materials that are found historically in the district be installed, or those that feature comparable profiles as those found historically in the district. Composite siding is appropriate; however, the proposed siding should feature a smooth finish and a four inch exposure.

- j. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff finds that a double-hung, one-over-one wood windows or aluminum-clad wood windows be used.. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail (need to add detail here). Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- k. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment where it cannot be viewed from the public right of way at Pierce.
- l. DRIVEWAY/FRONT YARD PARKING – Due to the proposed footprint of the new construction, the applicant a driveway in the side yard, comparable to those found historically in the district has not been proposed. As proposed, the front yard driveway presents an informal, front yard parking condition. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. LANDSCAPING – At this time, the applicant has not specified landscaping design. A landscaping plan should be included in an application for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through m. Staff finds that the applicant should address the above noted inconsistencies with the Guidelines prior to returning to the Commission.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

25. HDRC NO. 2018-633

Applicant: Rick Archer

Address: 413 N PINE ST

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Construct a two story, side addition to be located on the southern facade of the historic structure in the location of an existing addition.
- 2. Construct an addition on the west façade on the second level.
- 3. Replace the existing, front porch roof structure.
- 4. Replace the existing, stucco finish with an architecturally appropriate plaster.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 413 N Pine was constructed circa 1890 and first appears on the 1904 Sanborn map. The structure feature strong traditional elements and an original limestone façade which is currently covered by non-original stucco. Per the 1904 Sanborn maps, this structure featured both a front and a side (southern) porch. A side addition has been constructed on the southern façade at the location of the side porch. This addition does not appear on the 1951 Sanborn map and was probably constructed between 1955 and 1960 based on the addition’s building materials.

- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The Historic and Design Review Commission issued conceptual approval on December 20, 2018, of the following items as submitted per updated documents presented to the commission.
 1. Demolish the addition constructed on northwest corner of the historic structure and replace the walls and roof of a previously enclosed porch with a new addition.
 2. Replace the existing front porch roof structure with a new roof.
 3. Replace the existing, stucco finish with an architecturally appropriate plaster.
 4. Amend a previously approved side addition.
 5. Amend the location of previously approved solar panels.
 6. Amend the previously approved window repair to include possible window replacement.
- c. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has modified the proposal and has received administrative approval for a number of items; include the demolition of the addition on the structure's southern façade, the repair, replacement and reconstruction of wood windows.
- d. SOUTH ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a two story, side addition to be located on the southern façade of the historic structure. 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 side gabled roof and a setback from the primary façade of the historic structure to provide both a visual break and transition point.
- e. SOUTH ADDITION – As noted in finding a, the proposed addition will replace an existing addition. Staff finds that the proposal of a side addition is appropriate given the existing addition being at this location as well as site constraints, such as the historic structure's proximity to the rear property line. The applicant has taken steps to reduce the impact of the proposed addition to the historic structure, including setbacks and a separation of massing.
- f. SOUTH ADDITION (MASSING) – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition that features a footprint of approximately 650 square feet. While this is more than fifty percent of the existing structure's footprint, staff finds that the proposed addition is subordinate in both form and height and is appropriate.
- g. SOUTH ADDITION (MATERIALS)– The applicant has proposed materials that include shiplap siding, a standing seam metal roof, metal stair and balcony railings, aluminum clad wood windows and aluminum garage doors. Regarding materials, the applicant has provided a detail noting installation depth and has noted a non-white color. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. SOUTH ADDITION (ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS) – Generally, the applicant has proposed architectural details that are in keeping with the historic details and profile of the historic structure. The appellant has provided a window diagram noting the relationship of the proposed window openings to those found within the historic structure. Staff does find that the proposed addition should feature a soffit depth similar to that found on the historic house.
- i. WEST ADDITION – On the west (rear) elevation at the second level, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to extend approximately three (3) feet from the existing rear wall plane and feature a total width of approximately thirteen (13) feet. Staff finds the massing and materials of the proposed addition to be appropriate. The appellant has proposed a roof form to match that of the existing, rear facing shed roof.
- j. FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has provided a structural report noting that approximately 70 percent of the roof structure's material is no longer structurally sound or has experienced significant deterioration. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front porch roof structure to feature a hipped/shed combination profile. Staff finds this to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the existing columns should be repaired. If the existing columns are beyond repair, replacement columns should match the existing in profile.

- k. FRONT PORCH RAILINGS – The applicant has proposed for the metal porch railings to also be featured on the front porch. Staff finds the contemporary railings appropriate for the proposed additions; however, for the historic porch, a wood railing featuring both a top and bottom rail should be installed.
1. STUCCO REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to remove the non-original stucco and apply an architecturally appropriate plaster (3-parts lime/1-part white, non-staining Portland cement/plaster sand). Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the construction of a side addition based on findings d through h with the stipulation that the addition feature a soffit depth comparable to that found on the historic structure.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the construction of a rear addition as submitted based on finding i.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the reconstruction of the front porch based on findings j and k with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the existing columns be repaired. If the existing columns cannot be repaired, this should be demonstrated to staff. Replacement columns should match the existing in profile and detail.
 - ii. That the proposed railings be wood and feature both a top and bottom rail.
4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the application of an architecturally appropriate plaster as submitted based on finding l.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Patti Zaiontz spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve as submitted.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2018-413

Applicant: Gustavo Mendoza/Smartworld Energy

Address: 104 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a solar photovoltaic system on the east, south and west facing roofs at 104 Adams.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 104 Adams was constructed circa 1895 and is first found on the 1896 Sanborn Map. The structure features two stories in height with a tower element, a double height front porch and low sloping roofs. At this time, the applicant has proposed to install a total of forty-one (41) solar panels on various roof planes.
- b. The applicant has proposed to locate thirty-four (34) of the proposed 41 panels in a manner that is consistent with the Guidelines. These panels are located on the east facing roof slope of the primary structure, the south roof slope of the primary structure, the east roof slope of the two story wing, the west roof slope of the two story wing, the west roof slope of the tower element and the east roof slope of the tower element. These panels have been outlined in green on a roof plan in the exhibits. Staff finds that the installation of these panels is appropriate provided that they are mounted flush with the roof surface, as noted in the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.
- c. The applicant has proposed to locate seven (7) of the proposed panels on the double height roof slope on the front of the historic structure with a reverse tilt toward the south. The location as well as reverse tilt are inconsistent with the Guidelines, which notes that panels should be mounted flush with the surface of both flat and sloped roofs and should be located on side or rear roof pitches. Flush mounted panels at this location may not be visible from the public right of way.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the thirty-four panels noted in finding b with the stipulation that they be mounted flush to the roof surfaces.

Staff does not recommend approval of the seven panels noted in funding c due to the proposed tilt of the panels. Staff recommends that flush mounted panels at this location be installed following verification that they cannot be seen from the public right of way.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Carpenter to approve with the stipulation that no panels are placed on the tower.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2018-417

Applicant: Henry Rodriguez

Address: 200 W LULLWOOD AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing wood shingle roof with composition shingles.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 200 W Lullwood Ave is a 2-story single family home constructed circa 1928 in the Tudor Revival style. The home was designed by architect Robert McGarraugh, whose designs are prolific along W Lullwood Ave. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including a stone façade with stone window headers, a wood shingle roof, ganged one over one wood windows, and prominent chimneys. The home is a contributing structure in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing wood shingle roof with a new Owens Corning TruDefinition Duration composition shingle roof in the color Brownwood.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iv., roofing materials should be replaced in-kind whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Historic materials should be retained and reused when large-scale replacement of roof materials is required, specifically roofs constructed of tile or significant stylistic materials like wood shingles. New roofing materials to the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile, and style, or select materials consistent with the building style, when in-kind replacement is not possible. The wood shingles on this home are a character defining feature of this particular rendition of the Tudor Revival style. Staff finds that the removal of the wood shingles and the installation of composition shingles would substantially alter the style and visual elements of the home.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. Staff recommends that the roof be repaired or replaced in-kind or replaced with an alternative roofing product that features a similar dimensionality to the wood shingles.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

28. HDRC NO. 2018-419

Applicant: Leon General Construction

Address: 233 W HOLLYWOOD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace existing wood casement windows with new Jeld Wen wood casement windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 223 W Hollywood is a 1-story single family home constructed in 1930 in the Spanish Eclectic style with Mission influences. The home features a white stucco façade, a barrel tile roof, an arched doorway, and distinctive wood casement windows with divided lites. The home is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace existing wood windows with new wood windows to match as closely as possible.
- b. **EXISTING WINDOWS: CONDTION** – The applicant provided several photographs of the existing windows taken from both inside and outside the home. The applicant has noted that some of the windows are not operable or difficult to operate, have deteriorating wood elements, and are drafty. Based on the photographic evidence provided, staff finds that the windows are in good condition and are fully repairable.

- c. **EXISTING WINDOWS: ENERGY EFFICIENCY** – The applicant has expressed concern to staff regarding the need to improve the energy efficiency of the house. However, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a house. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. The original windows feature single-pane glass which is subject to radiant heat transfer. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows, and thermal shades. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. In most cases, windows may also be retrofitted with new glass. In general, staff encourages the repair of historic wood windows. A wood window that is maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan and cannot be repaired once they fail.
- d. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. As noted in finding b, staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood windows in place. If there are assemblies that are deteriorated beyond repair, the applicant must submit evidence to that effect to staff in the form of a window schedule and photographs. If an assembly is deemed deteriorated beyond repair by staff, staff recommends that new windows meet the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs double-hung, one-over-one wood windows to match the existing configuration as closely as possible. 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. The final specification should be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

29. HDRC NO. 2018-423

Applicant: Arnold & Pamela Flather

Address: 2042 W KINGS HWY

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Replace an existing non-original one over one aluminum window on the side of the primary structure with glass block.
- 2. Replace an existing dirt and grass ribbon driveway with decomposed granite.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2042 W Kings Hwy is a 1-story single family structure constructed in approximately 1924 in the Tudor Revival style. The home features a brick façade,

dominant front tapered brick chimney, and wood casement windows. The home is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.

- b. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace a non-original aluminum one over one window on the west façade of the structure with glass block. The window is partially visible from the public right-of-way. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. While staff finds that the window is eligible for replacement, staff finds that the installation of glass block is incompatible for the style of the home.
- c. **DRIVEWAY REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace a dirt and grass driveway with decomposed granite. The driveway currently features two dirt ribbons in a traditional ribbon-style driveway configuration due to regular driveway use, but the ribbons are undefined. The property has a concrete apron. Based on the application, the new driveway material will be decomposed granite in a reddish hue. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, a similar driveway configuration to that historically found on site should be used in terms of materials, width, and design. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration. Staff finds the proposal appropriate due to the pervious condition of the existing driveway with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the non-original window replacement based on finding b with the following stipulation:

- i. That the replacement windows be made of wood and 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 2, Staff recommends approval of the driveway modifications based on finding c with the following stipulations:

- i. That a final decomposed granite specification and color be submitted to staff for review.
- ii. That the driveway be no wider than 10 feet.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2018-412

Applicant: Gilbert Perez

Address: 218 LEIGH ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing, standing seam metal roof and install an asphalt shingle roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 218 Leigh was constructed circa 1900 in the Folk Victorian style and is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District. The structure is a 1-story, single family residential structure featuring a traditional L-plan, wood lap siding, a covered half-porch, and a standing seaming metal roof. The structure first appears on the 1904 Sanborn map and indicates a noncombustible roof.
- b. **ROOF REPLACEMENT**– The applicant is proposing to replace the existing, standing seam metal roof with an asphalt shingle roof. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iv. roofing materials should be replaced in-kind whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Staff finds that the standing seam metal roof is a character-defining feature and is featured on the property on the 1904 Sanborn map. Staff finds that the proposed change in roofing material is inconsistent with the Guidelines. The standing seam metal roof should be

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the change in roofing material based on finding b. Staff recommends in-place repair or in-kind replacement.

New metal roofs must adhere to the standard 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 is to be used along with a standard galvalume finish. Vented ridge caps are not to be used, and a low profile ridge cap/v-crimp panels will require HDRC approval.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

31. HDRC NO. 2018-426

Applicant: Sotex Property Brothers LLC

Address: 215 NELSON AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct 650 sq ft rear addition.
2. Install 4ft tall cattle panel front yard fencing.
3. Pour ribbon driveway.
4. Install new front door.
5. Install new front porch railing.
6. Demolition of contributing rear accessory structure.
7. Receive Historic Tax Certification

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 215 Nelson was constructed circa 1928 in the Craftsman style and first appears on a 1951 Sanborn Map. The one-story single-family home features a composition shingle roof with a front-facing gable and a hipped rear, wood lap siding, and a covered porch. Recently issued administrative approvals include: demolition of non-original rear addition, window repair, porch repair with column replacement, replace chain-link fence with wood privacy fence, removal of vinyl siding, wood siding repair, and removal of overgrown plantings. The primary and accessory structures are contributing to the Knob Hill Historic District.
- b. REAR 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 matching ridgeline and wall plane. Staff finds that either a subordinate ridge line and an inset in wall planes, or a combination of both should be incorporated into the design to differentiate the proposed addition from the historic structure.
 - i. FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to install a 648 square foot addition to the rear of the 705 square foot primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed footprint is consistent with Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv. noting that additions should not double the size of the structure.
 - ii. ROOF FORM - The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof form that features continues the gabled roof on the primary historic structure. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be consistent with the Guidelines for Addition 1.A.iii noting that and addition’s roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation should be similar to the historic structure.
 - iii. TRANSITION – The applicant has proposed to use a vertical trim piece to distinguish between the original structure and the addition . Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv, additions should feature a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. A vertical trim piece may also be used to differentiate the proposed addition from the new construction; however, it should be installed in addition to the use of a subordinate ridge line and/or inset wall plane.
 - iv. MATERIALS - The applicant has noted materials that include wood siding to match the original, like windows and one exterior door. Staff finds that matching the existing, 117 profile siding is appropriate.
 - v. WINDOWS - The applicant has noted the installation of salvaged one-over-one wood windows feature 34in wide × 64in tall. Staff finds that installation of the windows should feature the standard stipulations: 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.
 - vi. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS- Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and form of the proposed addition to be appropriate.
- c. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a fence to span the width of the property, including a gate spanning across the driveway. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii, new front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that did not historically have them. While fencing is not historic to the property, staff finds that there are fences found throughout the district. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.i., privacy fences should be set back from the front façade to reduce their visual prominence. Staff finds that

the fence should turn at the driveway to meet the corner of the structure, rather than spanning across the driveway as proposed. Staff finds that the driveway gate, if included, should be set back behind the front façade plane of the structure.

- d. FENCE DESIGN - The applicant has proposed the new fence to feature wrought iron design at five feet in height. 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.
- e. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete ribbon driveway where an unpaved driveway currently exists. One ribbon driveway is found with a Craftsman style home on the block while the rest feature poured concrete or unpaved driveways. Staff finds that proposed ribbon driveway is consistent with the Guidelines for Driveways 5.B.a. noting that driveway configurations should be in corporate materials, width, and design of the driveway that would be historically found on the lot. Driveways should feature a width no wider than ten feet and minimal impervious paving to increase storm water filtration.
- f. DOOR – The applicant has proposed to replace the deteriorating front door with a wood Craftsman style door. Staff finds the proposed door replacement is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i noting that door replacements should be made in-kind and match in size, material, proportion, and profile of the historic element.
- g. PORCH RAILING – The applicant has proposed to install wood front porch railing. Staff has administratively approved the replacement of non-original wrought iron columns with square wood columns that supports the concrete porch. Staff finds that proposed front porch railing is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. noting that new architectural elements should be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building nor create a false historic appearance.
- h. DEMOLITION OF REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE –
 - i. 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.
 - ii. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – On August 15, 2018, the applicant submitted an application for noncontributing status for the rear accessory structure. The structure was determined to be contributing, noted in a COA issued on August 24, 2018. The review describes the structure as a one story accessory structure featuring a gabled roof, wood board-and-batten siding, a side opening with no door, and front-facing carriage doors. The structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. While several original materials exist and the original footprint appears to be intact, the structure does not have a foundation and has a begun to lean. While staff finds that the structure is rapidly deteriorating, the structure is still contributing to the district.
 - iii. 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 and health hazard due to its substantial lean. The applicant indicated that he attempted to collect reasonable costs for repair and restoration. The applicant has committed to providing staff with an engineer’s letter noting the structural deterioration of the structure prior to the commission hearing date. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) has been met based on the documentation provided.

- iv. **LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE** –In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to substantial deterioration of original materials.
- i. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION**
 - i. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 215 Nelson, located within the Knob Hill Historic District. The applicant is simultaneously requesting a number of work items to be heard at the September 5, 2018 HDRC hearing.
 - ii. A number of rehabilitative scopes of work have been administratively approved include: demolition of non-original rear addition, window repair, porch repair with column replacement, replace chain-link fence with wood privacy fence, removal of vinyl siding, wood siding repair, and removal of overgrown plantings. In addition to the previously noted exterior items, a number of interior scopes of work have been planned or completed including electrical and mechanical improvements, interior finishes and framing. The rehabilitation is planned to be completed by the end of 2018.
 - iii. The applicant submitted an itemized lists of cost that meets the threshold to be eligible for Historic Tax Certification.
 - iv. The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 25-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs, an itemized list of cost, and a timeline of completion.
 - v. Approval of Tax Verification by the HDRC in 2018 means that the property owners will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive beginning in 2019.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on finding b with the following stipulations:
 - a. That it feature a subordinate ridge line and inset wall plane in addition to the proposed vertical trim piece.
 - b. That the window installation feature the standard stipulations: 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.
2. Staff recommends approval of the front yard cattle panel fence based on finding c with the stipulation that no portion exceeds four feet in height.
3. Staff recommends approval of the ribbon driveway based on finding d with the stipulation that it feature a total width no wider than ten feet with ribbons that are two to three feet wide.
4. Staff recommends approval of front door replacement based on finding e.
5. Staff recommends approval of front porch railing based on finding f.
6. Staff recommends approval of the demolition based on findings c through f with the following stipulation that materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding be salvaged and stored for use on site in future construction.
7. Staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on findings b through f with the stipulation that all work is approved prior to Verification.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: None.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve item #1 with stipulation b and items #2-7 with all stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Lazarine, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Note: Commissioner Lazarine left at 6:20 PM.

32. HDRC NO. 2018-431

Applicant: Patrick Acosta

Address: 216 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

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

1. Install a cattle panel fence on side property line within the front yard.
2. Replace non-conforming, nine foot tall wood lattice screen in rear of carport with nine foot tall wood privacy fence.
3. Install wood planters on first and second level front façade windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 216 E Huisache was constructed circa 1935 in the American Foursquare style and first appears on a 1951 Sanborn map. The 2-story structure features three sets of wood double-hung windows and a covered porch on the front façade, an attached carport to side elevation, and a hipped primary roof with a front-facing gabled roof. Prior to 2009, the structure also featured window shutters, four round columns instead of two square columns, a window and wood lap siding on the gable instead of a vent with wood shingles, and a brick walkway from the street to the door instead of the concrete paver and brick front patio. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **SITE VISIT** – On a site visit conducted on August 22, 2018, staff found that a number of alterations were performed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Upon verifying which alterations were performed within the past 24 months, staff finds the following items: 1) installation of a cattle panel fence along the side of the front yard, 2) replacement of a non-conforming wood lattice screen with a nine foot tall wooden privacy fence, and 3) installation of wood crate planters under two sets of front façade windows.
- c. **FRONT FENCE LOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a cattle panel fence along the side property line between 216 E Huisache and 226/228 E Huisache. The applicant has noted this fence has replaced an existing, non-conforming chain link fence. Per the Guidelines for New Fences 2.B.ii, new fences should not be introduced where one did not exist historically or in districts that did not have them. Staff finds that side yard fences are found along E Huisache and in the Monte Vista Historic District; however, staff does not find the single cattle panel portion turning parallel to front sidewalk consistent with the pattern of the historic district and should be removed.

- d. FRONT YARD FENCE DESIGN – Per the Guidelines for New Fences 2.B.i, new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character, and the design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Staff finds that the proposed cattle panel fence does not relate to the American Foursquare style of the house and is rarely found within the Monte Vista Historic District. Staff finds that a wood picket fence would be a more appropriate design.
- e. REAR PRIVACY FENCE – The applicant has proposed to replace a non-conforming, nine foot tall lattice screen installed prior to October 2014, with a new nine foot tall wooden privacy fence featuring horizontal pickets. Staff finds the proposed location of the privacy fence is consistent with the Guidelines 2.C.i and ii. However, staff finds that the privacy fence should be reduced to six feet in height.
- f. WINDOW PLANTERS – The applicant has proposed to install wood planters under two sets of front façade windows featuring wood horizontal wood planks. Per the Guidelines for Plantings 3.A.v., landscape escapes should not be introduced that will obscure the historic structure or are located to retain moisture on walls or foundations or as to cause damage. Staff finds that window planters are common to Monte Vista Historic District and is present on American Foursquare style homes. However, staff finds the proposed design is does not relate to the primary historic structure and should be modified to feature a traditional design that is found within the district and is mounted in a way that does not irreversibly alter or damage the wood siding behind it.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff recommends approval of the front yard fence on the side of the property with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the fence features a wood picket design rather than cattle panel.
 - ii. That the fence line only spans along the side property line and the single portion parallel to the sidewalk should be removed.
 - iii. That no portion of the front yard fence exceeds four feet in height.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of replacing the non-conforming lattice screen with a wood privacy fence with the stipulation that the fence height be reduced to six feet in height.
- 3. Staff recommends approval of the window planters with the stipulation that the design of the planters feature a traditional design that is found within the district and is mounted in a way that does not irreversibly alter or damage the wood siding behind it.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Thomas Hardin spoke in support.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Carpenter to approve the screen as submitted and deny installation of flower boxes and the piece of cattle panel fence parallel to the street at the front of the lot.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of the Historic and Design Review Commission Meeting minutes from 15 August 2018.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Fish, Garza, Connor, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

NAYS: None.

THE MOTION CARRIED

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

APPROVED

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

Michael Guarino
Chair