

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
3 October 2018**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:10 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, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**ABSENT:** Wolff, Connor, Bustamante, Kamal.

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

A motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Garza to nominate Commissioner Fetzer as vice chair.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**ABSTAIN:** Fetzer.

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in support of item \$14 on the consent agenda.

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

- Item #1, Case No. 2018-469 3903 N ST MARY'S
- Item #2, Case No. 2018-492 1335 SE MILITARY DR
- Item #3, Case No. 2018-478 122 E HOUSTON ST
- Item #4, Case No. 2018-479 310 E HOUSTON ST
- Item #5, Case No. 2018-493 Right of way at DOLOROSA between SAN PEDRO CREEK and FLORES
- Item #6, Case No. 2018-472 410 BARRERA, 414 BARRERA
- Item #8, Case No. 2018-474 7300 JONES MALTSBERGER RD
- Item #9, Case No. 2018-490 4039 IH-10
- Item #10, Case No. 2018-473 403 E MYRTLE
- Item #12, Case No. 2018-487 121 SAN ARTURO
- Item #13, Case No. 2018-484 921 LAMAR ST
- Item #14, Case No. 2018-475 314 E ASHBY PLACE
- Item #22, Case No. 2018-476 909 W HOUSTON

Item #11 was moved to individual consideration by the applicant. Item #22 was moved to the consent agenda by the applicant and case manager.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**RECUSALS:** Garza.

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

- Item #7, Case No. 2018-477 3003 BROADWAY

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**RECUSALS:** Garza.

**11. HDRC NO. 2018-456**

**Applicant:** William Maney

**Address:** 613 CHESTNUT  
424 LAMAR ST  
618 LIVE OAK

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting final approval to:

1. Relocate the front portion of the 1-story structure from 613 Chestnut St/618 Live Oak to the rear of the lot addressed 424 Lamar in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
2. Construct a rear addition onto the relocated structure to measure approximately 450 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to relocate the front portion a 1-story structure to the rear of the property of 424 Lamar, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure to be moved is currently located at 618 Chestnut St/618 Live Oak and is a 1-story single family home constructed in approximately 1901 in the Folk Victorian style. The main portion of the structure has retained a high degree of original architectural detailing and materials, including the original standing seam metal roof, original wood front porch structure, decorative gingerbreading, original wood jigsaw door detailing, woodlap siding covered by non-original siding, and several original wood windows in proportions and configurations common to the Folk Victorian style. The structure fronts Nolan St and was originally addressed 219 Nolan St. The structure abuts the Healy Murphy Historic District and is 2.5 blocks from the eastern boundary of the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

- b. **CASE HISTORY** – On August 9, 2018, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner for the structure proposed for relocation at 618 Chestnut St/618 Live Oak, which is located within the Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association boundary. OHP staff conducted research and contacted the Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC Section 35-455. On September 5, 2018, OHP brought forth a finding of historic significance request to the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC). The HDRC recommended approval of the designation. On August 31, 2018, OHP staff received an application for relocation of the structure. OHP staff informed the HDRC of the receipt of this application during the discussion for a finding of historic significance at the HDRC hearing on September 5, 2018. The recommendation for a finding of historic significance is pending placement on a City Council agenda until the relocation request has been reviewed by the HDRC. The applicant received conceptual approval for the relocation of the structure from the HDRC on September 19, 2018. If the proposed relocation is approved, then the property will effectively become designated within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and no further action by City Council will be necessary.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 25, 2018. The discussion included consideration of final approval for the relocation and details of the proposed new rear addition. The DRC recommended that the proposed addition roofline be lowered to be subordinate to the existing structure to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. The DRC offered advice on how this may be achieved with a gable or hip in conjunction with a shed roof. The DRC was in support of the proposed site plan due to the Sanborn Maps of Fayn Way, which indicated that a primary structure used to exist in the approximate location of the proposed relocation, as well as the development pattern of Fayn Way, which does not feature a prevailing setback pattern. The DRC strongly recommended that the applicant salvages existing woodlap siding and other architectural elements from the “L” element of the existing structure to be reused on an addition. The applicant expressed their wish to incorporate horizontal metal siding on the addition, and the DRC recommend that the applicant provide as much information as possible on the material, including the dimension of the reveal and the edging crimping, profile, and fasteners, for consideration.

Findings for Item #1, relocation:

- d. **DEVELOPMENT PATTERN: LIVE OAK AND ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOOD** – 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 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.
- e. **DEVELOPMENT PATTERN: LAMAR ST AND ADJACENT AREA** – The proposed site for relocation is an interior residential lot located on the south side of Lamar St as bounded to the west by N Hackberry St, to the east by Mesquite St, and to the south by Fayn Way. The lot currently contains a 2-story primary structure constructed in 2012. The structure to be relocated would be placed at the rear of the lot fronting Fayn Way and would visually read as rear accessory structure or small single family home. Based on Sanborn Maps, the lot was previously occupied by a 2-story primary structure with a 1-story single family structure and 1-story auto structure at the rear facing Fayn Way. The lot is flanked to the west and to the east by 1-story single family structures designed with Queen Anne and Craftsman influences. Historically, Fayn Way featured a few single family residential structures facing the street, but that context has been largely eroded. Several historic rear accessory structures still exist along Fayn Way. The era of significance of the district is comparable to the age of the structure to be relocated, and the distance from the structure's existing lot to its proposed location is 0.6 miles. The move would restore the structure to a predominantly residential setting that respects the historic context of the structure. Furthermore, adding this structure to the lot fronting Fayn Way would restore lost integrity of this portion of Fayn Way, which originally featured more single family structures along its frontage. The structure would contribute to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
  - f. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the orientation should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the structure to face Fayn Way, which is consistent with the historic development pattern for rear accessory structures. The applicant has also verified the setback requirements with Zoning. Based on the submitted site plan, staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
  - g. **SCALE & MASSING** – Per the Historic Design Guidelines, a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed relocated structures should be used. This area of Fayn Way primarily features 1-story structures, most of which are residential in design. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
  - h. **LOT COVERAGE** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, building footprints should not cover more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. Based on the submitted site plans, the relocation would not eclipse this percentage. Staff finds the lot coverage appropriate and consistent with the development pattern of the block.
  - i. **MATERIALS & ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The structure to be relocated features woodlap siding, a gable roof with original standing seam metal, historically appropriate window patterns and proportions, and architectural details that are characteristic of early 1900s Folk Victorian architecture. Per the Historic Design Guidelines, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The architectural details of the proposed structure to be relocated are of the era of significance of the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are appropriate for this location. Any restoration efforts, including the removal of non-original siding and additions and the restoration of historic or original materials, are eligible for administrative approval.
  - j. **HARDSCAPING & LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has indicated a rear driveway to be introduced on site off Fayn Way on the submitted conceptual site plan. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, driveways that are similar to the historic configuration found on site or in the district should be incorporated. According to Guideline 5.B.i, driveways similar in material found in the district should be used. Rear driveways off alleys are characteristic of the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Additionally, no walkways or landscaping elements are indicated at this time. The applicant is responsible for submitting a comprehensive site plan to staff that indicates all hardscaping materials, locations, and dimensions, as well as any new landscaping to be introduced to the site prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- k. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for accommodating mechanical elements and screening them from the public right-of-way.

Findings for Item #2, rear addition:

- l. FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition that totals approximately 500 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should not double the size of the existing structure. The proposal exceeds this Guideline; however, the addition is replacing a portion of the structure that has been extant in its original location on Nolan St. Additionally, the addition does not overwhelm the lot in terms of footprint and is inset from the sides of the existing structure on both the west and the east. Staff finds the proposed footprint appropriate based on these site and structure-specific considerations.
- m. SCALE AND MASSING – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story addition to the rear of the original structure. The ridgeline is proposed to match that of the existing structure. Staff finds the general location consistent with the Guidelines, but finds that the roof height of the addition should be reduced to distinguish the original structure from the addition. Lowering the roofline would create a subordinate condition which is more consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. ROOF – The applicant has proposed a new standing steam metal roof with a hipped configuration. As noted in finding n, staff finds that the ridge height should be reduced and the addition’s roofline should be subordinate to the existing structure, but finds the integration of a hipped roof appropriate.
- o. WINDOWS AND DOORS – The applicant has proposed to install window and doors in proportions and locations that are consistent with the Guidelines. A final material specification is required to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness per the stipulations in the recommendation.
- p. MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed to clad the addition in horizontal metal siding. The specific details of the siding have not been submitted at this time, but the applicant has expressed verbal and written interest in 20 gauge flat seam metal siding. While metal siding is not a historically common material seen in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, staff finds the applicant’s proposed use as a secondary material only for the addition may be appropriate since the proposed metal will be limited to the addition only and solely located at the rear of the property. Additionally, there is not a predominant existing pattern of siding materiality, orientation, and detailing along Fayn Way as noted in finding e. Staff finds that the proposal may generally appropriate based on these site and structure-specific considerations. Additional information on the metal siding, including reveal dimensions, installation method, and seam detailing, is required prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- q. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The Guidelines state that architectural details should be reflective of their time but rooted in precedents found within the district. Staff finds that the approach to the addition is generally consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends final approval of the relocation of the front portion of the structure located at 613 Chestnut/618 Live Oak based on findings a through k with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provides a comprehensive site plan to staff for review and approval that indicates the dimensions, locations, and materials of all hardscaping, landscaping, mechanical equipment, and mechanical equipment screening, if applicable, as noted in findings j and k.

If the proposed relocation is approved, then the property will effectively become designated within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and no further action by City Council will be necessary.

Item 2, Staff recommends final approval of the rear addition based on findings l through q with the following stipulations:

- ii. That the applicant reduces the height of the ridgeline to be subordinate to the existing structure as noted in findings m and n. The applicant is required to submit updated dimensioned drawings to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iii. That the applicant submits specifications for the proposed windows and doors. The material should be wood and the windows should 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.
- iv. That the applicant submits comprehensive details for the proposed metal siding as noted in finding p.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Lulu Francois, Barbara Garcia, Mitsuko Ramos, and Lowell Tacker spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2018-432**

**Applicant:** Oscar Santana/JAS Builder

**Address:** 827 LAMAR ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace the existing, wood windows with vinyl windows.
2. Construct a rear addition to feature 551 square feet.
3. Construct a side addition to feature 77 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 827 Lamar was constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman style and is first found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The structure features a front facing, clipped gable roof and is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. At this time, the applicant has proposed to construct both a side and rear addition. The applicant has received Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness for foundation repair, the installation of a privacy fence, roof repair and painting. This request was originally heard by the Historic and Design Review Committee on September 19, 2018, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.

- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 27, 2018. At that meeting, the committee noted that the existing wood windows should be repaired, that the rear addition was appropriate and that if the side addition featured a setback from the historic facades, it may be appropriate.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, wood windows with vinyl windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. notes that historic windows should be preserved. Staff finds that the existing wood windows should be preserved. Per photos provided by the applicant, the existing, wood windows are in a condition that can be repaired.
- d. SIDE ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited at the side or rear of the building to minimize views 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. While the Guidelines notes that side additions may be appropriate; staff finds that the proposed side addition alters the historic profile of the front façade and massing of the structure by creating an unbalanced front facade. Staff does not find the proposed side addition appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. REAR ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited at the side or rear of the building to minimize views 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 to locate the addition at the rear of the historic structure, feature a subordinate ridge line and feature an inset of approximately 8’ – 6” from the eastern wall plane of the historic structure. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a rear facing gabled roofs of various heights. The proposed pitch is to match that of the historic structure’s clipped gable roof. Staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate.
- g. TRANSITION –The Guidelines note that all additions should feature a transition between the old and the new. The applicant has proposed transitions that include insets from the wall planes of the historic structure and reduced ridge heights. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.
- h. SCALE, MASS & FORM – Regarding scale, mass & form, the applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a footprint of 551 square feet, more than half of the historic structure’s footprint. While inconsistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that given the large inset proposed from the east façade, that the proposed footprint is appropriate.
- i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include an asphalt shingle roof, vinyl windows and wood siding (117 profile). Staff finds the installation of the asphalt shingle roof and wood siding appropriate; however, the proposed vinyl windows are not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.1., which notes that materials that match in type, color and texture should be used.
- j. WINDOW MATERIALS – As noted in finding h, the applicant has proposed vinyl 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.
- k. FENESTRATION – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature long expanses of walls without windows as well as windows that feature profiles that are inconsistent with the Guidelines, which note that the shapes of window openings should relate to those found on the

historic structure. Staff finds that the incorporation of large, fixed windows is inappropriate. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant add window openings to the north and west facades.

1. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding j, additional fenestration should be added to the north and west facades. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and form to be appropriate.
- m. 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 does not recommend approval of item #1, wood window replacement based on finding c.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the construction of a rear addition based on findings e through l with the following stipulations:
  - i. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed that feature meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
  - ii. That window openings be incorporated that are comparable to those found in the historic structure and that additional window fenestration be added to the north and west facades as noted in finding k.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the construction of a side addition based on finding d.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Barbara Garcia and Lulu Francois spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

Note: Item #16 was heard after 4 PM at the applicant’s request. It was heard after item #18.

**17. HDRC NO. 2018-409**

**Applicant:** Sal Garcia Ryan Reed/NRP Group

**Address:** 1001 BROADWAY

## 1011 BROADWAY

### REQUEST:

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

### FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for 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. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval at the September 5, 2018, Historic and Design Review Committee hearing 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. **(The applicant has incorporated brick on each street facing façade.)**
  - iii. That additional detail be added to ensure that a distinguished building cap is found on each façade. **(The applicant has increased the parapet cap profile and has incorporated seams between materials, building cap detailing and canopies near the building cap to further distinguish the building cap.)**
  - iv. That the applicant submit information regarding the screening of mechanical equipment, outdoor furniture, landscaping and lighting when returning for final approval. **(The applicant has provided additional information and design documents for each requested item.)**
  - v. That the applicant install windows that feature dark colored frames and that all windows be recessed at least two inches within wall openings. **(The applicant has proposed bronzed colored windows and has proposed to recess windows two inches within 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.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 25, 2018. At that meeting, the committee noted that the updates to each facades, including the incorporation of brick was appropriate and provided an appropriate level of façade separation.
- d. 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.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. **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. Staff finds that the elimination of the curb cut on Broadway and its relocation to another street would be the most appropriate solution to promote the pedestrian atmosphere along Broadway. Documentation on the inability to relocate this curb cut should be presented to the HDRC.
  - h. **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.
  - i. **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.
  - j. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has noted various landscaped areas which are appropriate.
  - k. **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 has noted that parapet walls will screen all roof mounted mechanical equipment. This is consistent with the UDC.
  - 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, composite wood siding, metal siding, metal railing systems, stucco and metal storefront systems. The proposed materials types are consistent with the UDC. The applicant has incorporated additional brick into the design on each façade per staff's stipulation at conceptual approval.
  - o. **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 at the cornice level. The applicant has incorporated additional building cap detailing per staff's stipulation at conceptual approval.
  - p. **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 has provided a wall section noting compliance with this requirement.

- q. **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. The applicant has submitted detailing for canopy installation and profile to address comments from the Commission at the time of conceptual approval.
- r. **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.
- s. **OUTDOOR FURNITURE** – At this time, the applicant has noted that street furniture will not be installed by the applicant.
- t. **ARCHAEOLOGY** –The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommend final approval based on findings a through t with the following stipulations:

- i. **ARCHAEOLOGY**- The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- ii. That the proposed garage access be relocated away from Broadway. If the HDRC finds the proposed Broadway curb cut to be appropriate, staff recommends that the applicant work to mitigate the impact to pedestrian traffic along Broadway by installing a pedestrian island.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2018-451**

**Applicant:** Jose Calzada/Architectura SA

**Address:** 607 E LOCUST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct three, three story townhomes on the vacant lot addressed 607 E Locust.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct three, 3-story buildings on the vacant lot at 607 E Locust, located within the Tobin Hill Historic District. The lot is flanked by a historic 2.5-story single family homes to the east and west designed with Queen Anne and Craftsman influences and 1-story single family homes to the south. The lot is located a distance of approximately three lots from the intersection of E Locust and N St Mary’s St. This stretch of E Locust is characterized by

historic 1-story, 2-story, and 2.5-story single family homes, designed primarily in the Queen Anne and Craftsman styles and historic 2 to 2.5-story multifamily homes with larger footprints. 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.

- b. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE AND CASE HISTORY** – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on September 11, 2018. The noted that several historic structures on the north side of the block are 2 to 2.5 stories tall, with mostly 1-story houses lining the south side of the block. The DRC stated that the applicant should provide a setback that is greater than the neighboring houses, which are approximately 25 feet set back from the street. The DRC also noted that front porches that engage the street are prevalent in the district and a true front porch should be integrated into the design versus a wall plane and a door. Additional feedback from the DRC included: reducing the height to be closer to the neighboring structures; reducing the width of the driveway to 10 feet, which will gain more buildable space; attaching two units each to create a more traditional primary and accessory structure relationship versus placing identical footprints in a row, which is a deviation from the development pattern of the district; designing the front unit in a way that screens any vehicular access from the street; reducing the amount of materials used on the façade and taking inspiration from a majority of the historic neighboring structures, which are mostly horizontal wood siding; exploring the option of removing the fourth unit and creating three larger but most appropriately designed units if the lot can accommodate such an approach; and incorporating a foundation height of at least 18 inches. The applicant withdrew their application prior to the HDRC hearing on September 19, 2019. The application under consideration as part of this recommendation is updated.
- c. **CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – As presented, the individual units reviewed as standalone structures exhibit some features that are generally consistent with the overall principles in the Guidelines. However, when considering the proposed streetscape and context of the project, the proposed design does not relate well to the historic single-family residential nature of the district and the district’s predominant developmental pattern. Of the historic structures on the immediate block of E Locust, bounded by Kendall to the west and N St Mary’s to the east, one house is 2-stories in height, and the remainder are 1-story. Continuing east, on the block of E Locust bounded by Paschal and Gillespie, the historic homes are predominantly 2 to 2.5-stories in height. While the proposal’s overall ridge height is compatible to the surrounding context, other components of the design, including the roof form, porch configuration, footprint, and fenestration, are not familiar in terms of the predominant development pattern.
- d. **SETBACKS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. The median setback should be used where a variety of historic setbacks exist. This block of E Locust contains historic structures that feature front yard setbacks of approximately 20-35 feet. Based on the submitted documentation, the neighboring historic structures to the east and west have a front setback of approximately 25-27 feet. The applicant has proposed approximately a 25 foot setback. While the proposed setback matches the structure immediately to the east, staff finds that the setback should be increased to match the structure to the west, which is approximately 2 feet deeper.
- e. **ORIENTATION & ENTRANCES** – The applicant has proposed to orient the front most unit towards E Locust as defined by a side porch element and a recessed front door. The rear two units will face east towards the shared driveway. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade should be oriented to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. Typically, historic entrances are oriented towards the primary street. This is true for this particular block of E Locust. Staff finds the front unit to be consistent with the Guidelines, but finds the orientation and entrances of the rear two units to be a departure from typical

development patterns in the vicinity. Staff finds that a primary and secondary relationship would be more consistent with the Guidelines.

- f. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed three detached 3-story units. One will be located along the street frontage of E Locust, and two will be located in the rear of the property. Per the submitted elevations, the ridgeline of the units is approximately 32'. Guideline 2.A.i stipulates that the height and scale of new construction should be consistent with nearby historic buildings and should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Per the submitted elevations, the applicant has indicated that the 2-story historic structures directly to the east and west are approximately 30-31 feet. While there are taller structures throughout the district, staff finds that a 2-1/2 story structure would be more appropriate for the overall context of the block, which includes 1-story structures immediately to the south. Staff finds that the overall height should be lowered to be more consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. Throughout this block, the foundation heights of historic structures are between two and three feet. The elevations for the units are approximately 1 foot with slab on grade construction. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed an asymmetrical gable roof form. Staff finds that the overall roof form is a departure from existing precedents based on its scale and configuration. As proposed, the overall roof forms are not consistent with precedents in the district or the Historic Design Guidelines. Staff finds that a traditional gable roof form would be more appropriate for the immediate context of the block.
- i. **PORCH** – The applicant has proposed a double height recessed porch on the east side of the front unit. The porch features a traditional railing based on the submitted renderings with a depth of approximately 8 feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, and new structures and design elements should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. The conceptual porch configuration pulls from the historic structure located 2 houses to the west. However, this precedent features a higher foundation height and stairs that engage the streetscape leading from the front porch. Staff finds that further articulation of the porch as an element geared towards the pedestrian experience is required to be more consistent with the Guidelines and development pattern of the block and the district.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, window openings with a similar proportion of wall to window, as compared to nearby historic facades, should be incorporated. Similarity is defined by windows that are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed several window and door openings that generally feature sizes that are found on historic structures. However, the west elevations contain fixed square windows that are not consistent with the OHP Window Policy Document or historic fenestration precedents in the district. Additionally, the front unit facing Locust does not have any window openings on the western portion of the first floor. Blank wall space on the front façade, especially at the pedestrian level, is not historically common or appropriate. Regarding materiality, the applicant has not yet specified a product.
- k. According to the OHP Window Policy Document, wood windows are most appropriate. Windows should also maintain traditional dimensions and profiles, and false dividing lites are not encouraged. Each window should be inset at least two (2) inches within walls to ensure that a proper façade depth is maintained. All windows should feature traditional appearance and feature traditional trim and sill details.
- l. **LOT COVERAGE** – New construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area. The proposed appears to generally meet this

Guideline, but further elaboration on the amount of pervious versus impervious groundcover should be provided.

- m. **MATERIALS** – The applicant stated that horizontal wood or wood composite siding will be used on the exterior elevations. The submitted renderings feature a smooth surface due to the limitations of the computer program used for the rendering. Staff finds the use of horizontal wood siding to be appropriate based on the context of the district. The applicant has also proposed to introduce stucco on the façade masses that project to the west. Staff finds that this material combination may be appropriate, but requires additional information to make a final determination when considering the design holistically.
- n. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The proposed units feature design elements that deviate from the details found within the district.
- o. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per the Guidelines for new construction, mechanical equipment should be screened from the public right-of-way. The applicant has not indicated details on the location of mechanical equipment or whether the units will be roof or ground-mounted. Staff finds that the proposed screening method needs to be indicated and developed to comply with the Guidelines.
- p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not provided staff with a landscaping plan at this time beyond the indications of general portions of grass. The applicant should provide this information prior to returning to the HDRC.
- q. **HARDSCAPING AND PARKING** – The applicant has proposed a 12 foot wide central driveway on the eastern edge of the property. The driveway will provide access to three double wide 2-car garages. The Guidelines state that driveway should be a maximum of 10 feet to comply with the historic development patterns of the district. Staff does not find the proposed driveway and parking proposal consistent with development patterns in the district.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval based on findings a through q. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant proposes a primary and accessory structure condition to be more consistent with historic development patterns in the district as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the applicant explores 2.5-story massing options to respond to the dominant historic massing context of the neighborhood as noted in finding g.
- iii. That the applicant incorporates roof forms that are more consistent with the typologies found in the Tobin Hill Historic District as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the applicant incorporates a foundation height of at least 18 inches to be more consistent with the foundation heights of nearby historic structures as noted in finding h.
- v. That the applicant utilizes a front setback that is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines as noted in finding d.
- vi. That the applicant develops a modified street elevation that incorporates window openings on the first floor and a front porch design that is more consistent with the development pattern of the district as noted in findings j and k.
- vii. That the applicant proposes a fenestration pattern ,window opening proportions, and materials that are more consistent with the Guidelines, the OHP Window Policy document, and the historic examples found in the Tobin Hill Historic District as noted in finding j.
- viii. That the applicant proposed a driveway and parking configuration that is more consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding q.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. 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. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on Wednesday, September 12, 2018. At that meeting, committee members noted that the front setback should be increased, that the side setbacks should be increased, that the roof form’s massing should be decreased, that the front façade should be balanced, that the massing of the structure be decreased and that the driveway be extended along the side of the proposed new construction to remove the front yard parking condition.
- 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 applicant has proposed a setback of thirteen feet from the property line. Staff finds that a setback that is greater than those found historically on the block should be used. The applicant has also proposed side and rear setbacks that are consistent with zoning setback requirements. The applicant should ensure that the front setback is greater than those of neighboring historic structures prior to approval.
- 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 Pierce. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. 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.

- 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 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.
- i. **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.
- j. **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.
- 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 Pierce.
- m. **DRIVEWAY** – The applicant has proposed a driveway to extend along the south side of the proposed new construction to be ten (10) feet in width. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. **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 at this time. Generally, staff finds the updated site plan to be appropriate; however, the applicant should modify the proposed massing to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and appropriate for the Government Hill Historic District.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Patti Zaiontz spoke in opposition; Rose Hill spoke but did not indicate support or opposition.

**POSTPONED BY APPLICANT.**

**19. HDRC NO. 2018-427**

**Applicant:** Enrique Patuel

**Address:** 219 DELAWARE

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 4-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 one-story single family structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. COMMISSION ACTION - The applicant originally requested to install a 5-foot tall wrought iron fence to span across the front yard, including a front driveway gate at HDRC hearing on September 5, 2018. The request was referred to the Design Review Committee by the HDRC. The applicant was not able to meet with the committee due to scheduling conflicts and opted to consult with staff. During the consultation, staff summarized the comments from the commission at the last hearing: (1) no portions of a front yard fence may exceed four feet in height per the Historic Design Guidelines and the Unified Development Code, (2) staff's recommendation to turn the fence at the corner of the front yard instead of spanning across as a front gate is generally consistent with the Guidelines, (3) one commissioner was concerned with a lack of a profile drawing of the proposed fence and (4) another commissioner was considering a motion to approve a fence with a front yard gate with the stipulation that the fence matched its neighbor in design and height (3-foot tall metal-framed cattle panel fence). Since the consultation, the applicant has reduced the proposed height from 5-feet to 4-feet and provided a profile drawing and additional examples of front yard gates on other properties within the district.
- 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 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.
- d. FENCE DESIGN – The applicant has proposed the new fence to feature a wrought iron design and four 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on finding c and d 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 Fish and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2018-489**

**Applicant:** Brian Voges

**Address:** 210 W LYNWOOD

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace approximately 40 existing six over six wood windows with new aluminum clad wood windows to match the divided lite pattern and dimensions of the existing. Approximately 30 windows are located on the primary structure and approximately 10 windows are located on the rear accessory structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 210 W Lynwood is a 2-story single family home constructed in approximately 1940 in the Colonial Revival style with Spanish Eclectic influences. The home features a symmetrical front façade with two masonry chimneys on either side and six over six double hung wood windows. The home is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The property also contains a 1-story rear accessory structure, which is also contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace approximately 30 existing wood windows on the primary structure and approximately 10 existing wood windows on the rear accessory structure with new aluminum clad wood windows to match the existing in terms of divided lite pattern, dimensions, inset, and profile.
- b. **EXISTING WINDOWS: CONDITON** – Staff conducted a site visit with the applicant on September 27, 2018, to examine the condition of the windows. Several of the windows still feature original one over one wood screens, which have protected the sashes from the elements. While some sashes feature some minor joint separation and patches of weathered wood, staff finds that the windows are well maintained and in great condition. Staff finds that the windows 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

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on findings a through d. 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.**

**21. HDRC NO. 2018-481**

**Applicant:** Diana Orosco

**Address:** 1811 N PALMETTO

**REQUEST:**

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

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure located at 1811 N Palmetto was constructed circa 1910 and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and features a standing seam metal roof, two brick chimneys and turned columns.
- b. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. notes that metal roofs should be used on those where a metal roof is appropriate for the style of construction or on structures that historically featured a metal roof. The 1912 Sanborn Map notes a non-combustible roof, in this instance, metal. Staff finds that the proposed asphalt shingle roof

is not consistent with the Guidelines and finds that a metal roof should be installed to be consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. Staff recommends that a standing seam metal roof be installed to feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.

A roof inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff 24 hours prior to the start of roof replacement to ensure that a crimped ridge seam is to be installed.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None

**POSTPONED.**

Note: Item #22 was moved to the consent agenda.

**23. HDRC NO. 2018-488**

**Applicant:** Doug Robins

**Address:** 125 CITY ST

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear carport measuring approximately 800 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 125 City is a 1-story residential structure constructed in approximately 1920 with Craftsman and Queen Anne influences. The home features a symmetrical façade with two front-facing gables, decorative wood shingles in the gables, one over one wood windows, and a front porch with wide tapered stucco columns. The home is a contributing structure in the King William Historic District.
- b. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new carport structure in the rear of the lot. The structure will shade 3 vehicles. The proposed footprint is approximately 828 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new outbuildings should be less than 40% the size of the primary structure in plan. The primary structure is approximately 2,000 square feet. The proposal generally meets this Guideline.
- c. **ORIENTATION AND SETBACK** – The applicant has proposed to orient the new accessory structure off the rear alleyway. Guidelines 5.B.i and 5.B.ii for new construction stipulate that new garages and outbuildings should follow the historic orientation and setbacks common in the district. Staff finds the proposal for orientation consistent with the Guidelines. The rear setbacks are also consistent with historic precedents in the King William Historic District. The applicant is responsible for complying with all zoning setback standards and filing for a variance with the Board of Adjustment if applicable.
- d. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed a 1-story carport structure with a curved roof. The structure appears to measure approximately 12 feet in height at its tallest point; however, true elevation drawings have not been submitted. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings

- and rear accessory structures. The general height of the proposed structure is comparable to existing carports nearby. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **ROOF** – The applicant has proposed a curved roof canopy structure supported by metal columns. The Guidelines state that roof forms in terms of pitch, overhangs, and orientation should be consistent with those predominantly found on the block. Residential roof forms are typically pitched. The proposed form does not have precedence in the district. Staff does not find the proposed roof form consistent with the Guidelines.
  - f. **MATERIALS** – The proposed carport will be constructed with metal columns, a metal frame, and a knitted fabric canopy in the color Rivergum Green. The Guidelines for New Construction state that materials should complement the type, color, and texture of those found in the historic district. Adjacent carports and rear accessory structures feature wood siding and support posts and standing seam or composite shingle roofs. Staff does not find the materiality consistent with the Guidelines.
  - g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, new buildings in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Architectural details should also not visually compete with the historic structure. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with this Guideline.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through g. Staff recommends that the applicant address the various inconsistencies with the Guidelines prior to returning to the HDRC.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** None.

**POSTPONED.**

**24. HDRC NO. 2018-483**

**Applicant:** Ana Lisa Garza

**Address:** 327 WICKES

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace a non-original fence with a 4-foot tall wrought iron front yard fence including a front driveway gate.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 327 Wickes was constructed circa 1900 and is first found on the 1904 Sanborn Map. The structure was constructed in the Folk Victorian style, is contributing to the King William Historic District, and is individually designated at the McCartney House historic site. The single-family, one-story structure features a traditional L-plan, a covered porch with architectural details typical of the style, and non-original wrought iron fence spanning across the front yard terminating before the driveway.
- b. **EXISTING FENCE** – The existing fence is a simple, black wrought iron fence at approximately 3-foot tall with a 1-foot tall “dog panel.” The fence currently spans across the front yard and terminates the driveway. Staff finds that the existing fence is not original to the structure and is eligible for removal and replacement.
- 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. Staff finds that a non-original fence is installed on the property, and that 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.

- d. FENCE DESIGN – The applicant has proposed the new fence to feature a wrought iron design and four 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on finding b through d 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 Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve item #3 as submitted with the additional stipulation that the applicant present fence details to staff.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2018-491**

**Applicant:** Cory Johnson

**Address:** 1010 N HACKBERRY ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct 337 square foot addition rear addition.
2. Replacement of wood windows with aluminum windows on side elevations.
3. Removal and/or relocation of window openings on side elevations.
4. Install full-width wood front porch deck over existing concrete porch.
5. Replace front door.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 1010 N Hackberry was constructed circa 1925 and first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The single-family one-story structure features a primary front-facing gable

with capped with matching side gables in the front and rear. The front gabled features a Craftsman style covered stoop with concrete steps and decorative brackets. The rear gabled roof features a secondary hipped roof that appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The structure also features Tudor style elements including high pitched roofs, a stucco-covered brick chimney, and a set of arched wood windows on the side elevation. The remaining windows on the property are sashed or picture wood windows.

- b. On a site visit conducted on September 17, 2018, staff found that the following work had occurred prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and permits: 1) construction of a rear addition, 2) modifications and the relocation of window openings, and 3) partial removal of a chimney. The applicant submitted a request to be heard by the HDRC on September 21, 2018. The application also included a number of request item that are eligible for administrative approval pending the commission approval of the remaining outstanding items. The \$500 post work application fee has not been paid at this time.
- c. 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 enlarge the existing side gabled roof in height and length, with a vertical trim piece between new and old forms. Staff finds that the proposed addition and its details are not consistent with Guidelines for its exclusion of a subordinate ridgeline and/or inset wall plane and modification of the existing roof form.
- d. FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a 337 square foot addition to the rear of the 1316 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.
- e. ROOF FORM - The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof form that doubles the size of the rear gable in height and length. Staff finds that the symmetrical proportions of the front and rear gables to be a character-defining feature. Staff finds the proposed enlarged roof form is not consistent with the Guidelines for Addition 1.A.iii noting that an addition's roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation should be similar to the historic structure.
- f. 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.
- g. MATERIALS - The applicant has noted materials that include wood siding to match the primary structure, new aluminum windows with a window bay, and double-doors. Staff finds that matching the existing, 105 profile siding and installing new aluminum windows in the addition appropriate.
- h. WINDOWS - The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum window that are similar to the dimensions of the existing window openings on the historic structure. Staff finds that new windows should adhere to 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.

- i. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS-** Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and form of the proposed addition to be appropriate if the rear gable was restored to its original size and a subordinate ridgeline and/or inset wall plane be incorporated into the design.
- j. **EXISTING WINDOWS** – According to the applicant, the two (2) picture wood windows flanking the chimney and the two (2) arched wood casement windows on the side elevation were removed and boarded up prior to acquiring the property. The remaining window are made with wood construction including the following: three (3) one-over-one window on the front façade, five (5) one-over-one and two (3) picture windows on the west elevation, and two (2) two-over-two windows on the east elevation.
- k. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** –The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. notes that window replacement should only be considered when the original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant has provided evidence that some of the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Replacement should be considered on a case by case basis and staff does not recommend total replacement at this time.
- l. **NEW WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wood windows with aluminum windows matching their configuration (sashed, picture, and arched casements). The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. notes that new windows are to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and details. Staff finds that the proposed windows and modifications to openings are not compatible in style or materials with the original windows. Remaining windows should be repaired in-place.
- m. **WINDOW REMOVAL AND RELOCATION** - The applicant has proposed to remove two picture windows on east elevation and relocate the arched casement window openings with new windows and the existing set of sash windows further in the rear to accommodate for interior changes and the proposed rear addition. Per the Guidelines of Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i, window openings should not be added, altered, or removed on primary facades or where visible from the public right of way. Staff finds that the proposed fenestration changes to the side elevations are visible from the public right of way, are inappropriate for the historic configuration of the structure, and are inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- n. **FRONT PORCH DECK** – The applicant is requesting to install a wood deck platform spanning the width of the front façade over the existing concrete porch. Staff finds the proposed front porch deck would disrupt the character defining front façade configuration and is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv. noting that new elements, such as stairs, should be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building and do not create a false historic appearance.
- o. **FRONT DOOR REPLACEMENT** -The applicant has proposed to replace the existing front door featuring divided lights with a solid Craftsman style door. Per the Guidelines of Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, doors, hardware, fanlight, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures in-kind when possible and when deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds that the existing door should be repaired.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1. Staff does not recommend approval of the addition as proposed based on finding c. Staff recommends the addition be revised to include a subordinate ridgeline and/or wall plane in addition to the proposed vertical trim piece and that existing rear gable be restored in place rather than enlarged.

Item 2 & 3. Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement, or the removal, resizing, or relocation of any window openings at this time based on findings j through m. Staff recommends that all window openings be restored to their original configuration and location, and all wood windows that have been permanently discarded to be replaced with new windows matching in material, size, and configuration. A window restoration plan must be submitted to staff prior to their installation. New sashed

windows should adhere to 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.

Item 4. Staff does not recommend the full-width front porch deck based on finding n.

Item 5. Staff recommends chimney restoration with the stipulation that a detailed drawing that matches the historic chimney be submitted to staff prior to construction.

Item 6. Staff recommends front door replacement with the stipulation that the new door feature a divided light configuration that is similar to the existing door.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Barbara Garcia spoke in opposition. Lulu Francois spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**26. HDRC NO. 2018-486**

**Applicant:** Cory Johnson

**Address:** 1018 BURNET ST

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a rear addition with wood deck.
2. Replace all existing wood windows with aluminum windows.
3. Remove two existing window openings on west elevation.
4. Install five new picture windows (three on the east elevation and two on the west elevation).
5. Replace the turned columns with square cedar columns.
6. Replace the existing door and transom window with a new door with sidelights.
7. Install a crushed granite driveway.
8. Replace in-kind the concrete walkway.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure at 1018 Burnet was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and first appears on the 1911 Sanborn map addressed as duplex at 1016/1014 Burnet. The one-story structure features a tradition Lplan with a covered porch and a primary hipped roof with a front-facing gable with composition shingle roofing material. The front porch originally featured full-

height, two-over-two wood windows (two front-facing, one perpendicular), two of three remaining turned columns, and a front door with a transom. The front yard features deteriorated front walkway and a driveway apron with no paved driveway. The structure is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

- b. On a site visit conducted on September 14, 2018, staff found that the following work had occurred prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and permits: 1) construction of a rear addition, 2) modifications and the relocation of window openings, and 3) the installation of sashed and picture aluminum windows. The application also included a number of request items that are eligible for administrative approval pending the commission approval of the remaining outstanding items. The \$500 post work application fee has not been paid at this time.
- c. 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 ridge line and wall plane with a vertical trim piece. The proposed addition also features a window bay, a covered deck, two sets of double-doors, and aluminum windows. Staff finds that the proposed addition and its details are not visible from the right of way and is generally consistent with the Guidelines, with the exception to exclude a subordinate ridge line and/or inset wall plane.
- d. FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a 792 square foot addition to the rear of the 1198 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.
- e. ROOF FORM - The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a roof form that extends the existing hipped roof to cover the proposed rear deck. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be consistent with the Guidelines for Addition 1.A.iii noting that an addition's roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation should be similar to the historic structure.
- f. 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.
- g. MATERIALS - The applicant has noted materials that include wood siding to match the primary structure, new aluminum windows with a window bay, and double-doors. Staff finds that matching the existing, 105 profile siding and installing new aluminum windows in the addition appropriate.
- h. WINDOWS - The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum windows that are 80 inches tall by 30 inches wide, with larger top sashes than bottom sashes, and feature faux divided lights. Staff finds that new windows should adhere to 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.
- i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS- Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and form of the proposed addition to be appropriate.

- j. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – Prior to modifications, the front porch featured one (1) perpendicular and two (2) front-facing full-height two-over-two wood windows. The front gable featured one (1) picture window with a window screen mimicking a one-over-one wood window. The east side elevation features three (3) one-over-one wood windows and the west side elevation featured two (2). A total of six (6) windows have been replaced with aluminum windows with faux divided lights and three (3) window openings have been relocated and resize or removed altogether.
- k. WINDOW REPLACEMENT –The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. notes that window replacement should only be considered when the original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Because the windows were discarded prior to approval and without documentation, staff cannot assess the condition of the previous windows.
- l. NEW WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to install black, one-over-one aluminum windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. notes that news windows are to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and details. The applicant has proposed to replace six (6) wood window with aluminum windows with faux divided lights, to replace two (2) window openings on the east side elevation to replace with smaller picture windows, and to remove the window opening perpendicular to the front porch plane. Staff finds that the proposed windows and modifications to openings are not compatible in style or materials with the original windows.
- m. NEW WINDOW OPENINGS- The applicant has proposed to install two picture windows to flank the remaining sash window on the east elevation and three pictures in a row on the west elevation. Per the Guidelines of Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i, window openings should not be added, altered, or removed on primary facades or where visible from the public right of way. Staff finds that the proposed fenestration changes to the side elevations are visible from the public right of way, inappropriate to the historic configuration of the structure, and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- n. COLUMN REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to remove the two turned columns and one pilaster that featured a traditional Folk Victorian detail and to install three new square cedar columns. Staff finds that the proposed replacement is inconsistent with Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii noting that replacements should be made in-kind to scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish – when the original material is deteriorated beyond repair.
- o. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing door and transom window with a new door featuring divided lights and sidelights. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, doors, hardware, fanlight, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures in-kind when possible and when deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds that proposed door modifications is inconsistent with the Guidelines and that the removed transom should be restored without the addition of new sidelights.
- p. DRIVEWAY- The applicant has proposed to install a crushed granite driveway where only a driveway apron exists on the lot. Staff finds that the proposed driveway is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i noting that driveways should be no wider than ten (10) feet and pervious paving may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase storm water infiltration.
- q. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a new front walkway to match the existing in material, configuration, and size. Staff finds that the in-kind replacement is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.ii and iii. noting that every effort should be made for walkway replacements to match in color and material, as well as width and alignment.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on finding c with the stipulation that it features a subordinate ridge line and inset wall plane in addition to the proposed vertical trim piece.

Item 2 & 3. Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement, or the removal, resizing, or relocation of any window openings at this time based on finding j through m. Staff recommends that all window openings are restored to their original configuration and location, and all wood windows that have been permanently discarded to be replaced with new windows matching in material, size, and configuration. A window restoration plan must be submitted to staff prior to their installation. New windows should adhere to 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.

Item 4. Staff does not recommend installation of the five picture windows on the two side elevations based on finding e. These window openings should be removed, and the original fenestration and siding be restored.

Item 5. Staff does not recommend replacement of the turned columns with the square cedar columns based on finding f. The turned columns and pilaster should be restored.

Item 6. Staff does not recommend approval to replace the existing door with transom for a new door with sidelights based on findings g.

Item 7 & 8. Staff recommends approval to install a crushed granite walkway and new walkway with the stipulation that the driveway is no wider than ten (10) feet and that the walkway match the existing in material, configuration, and width.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:** Barbara Garcia spoke in opposition. Lulu Francois spoke in support.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Garza to approve item #1 with the addition of an inset and the ridge can remain where it currently is; to deny items #2-4; to approve item #5 with staff stipulations and the additional stipulation that it be submitted to staff for approval; and to approve items #7 and 8.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**27. HDRC NO. 2018-485**

**Applicant:** Michael Lockwood/Mobilitie LLC

**Address:** 744 DONALDSON - ROW

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new network node pole in the right-of-way at 744 Donaldson.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to install a new network node pole in the public right-of-way, adjacent to the side sidewalk at 744 Donaldson. The proposed location is located within the Monticello Park Historic District, at the front corner of the property at 740 Donaldson, and across the street from Jefferson High School.
- b. On a site visit conducted on August 27, 2018, staff found that a new network pole was installed in the right-of-way at 744 Donaldson prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant submitted a request to be heard by the HDRC on September 12, 2018. Staff notes that the installed pole features a wider top-mounted antenna cabinet than the proposed pole in the submitted documents; the following findings apply to both iterations of the network poles.
- c. LOCATION – Per the Additional Aesthetic Requirements in Design Districts 3B., the installation of new node support poles is discouraged in Historic Districts, the Downtown "D" Business District, River Improvement Overlay Districts, Viewshed Protection Overlays and Mission Protection Overlay Districts. Staff finds that options to relocate the pole outside of the historic district and away from individual historic sites should be explored. Additionally, Aesthetic Requirements 3.B.i. notes that new node support poles must generally be located at commercial corners and intersections and 3.B.ii notes that new node support poles must be separated from other node support poles or existing poles by a distance of 250 feet. Staff finds that existing poles are located within a 250-foot radius and that relocation or collocations should also be further explored.
- d. DESIGN - If the applicant provides evidence supporting the necessity of a new pole in the specific proposed location, per Aesthetic Requirements 3.B.iii, network nodes are preferred to be mounted to existing poles or installed with a stealth method. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Officer may require concealment of the support pole in the form of aesthetically appropriate street lamps, site elements, district signage, or other stealth methods. Staff finds that stealth options should be explored.
- e. HEIGHT – The proposed pole features 30 feet in height. Staff finds that the proposed height is consistent with Additional Aesthetic Requirements 3.iv. noting that new poles should not exceed the established predominant height of other poles and historic site elements located within 500 feet of the proposed installation.
- f. FINISH/DIAMETER – The proposed pole features an unpainted steel finish and has a general diameter of 10 inches at the base. Staff finds that the proposed form is inconsistent with the Aesthetic Requirements 3.v noting that new node support poles must be painted and not exceed 8 inches in diameter at the widest portion of the pole.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed new network node pole. Staff recommends the applicant explore options to relocate the pole away from design districts and individual historic sites or to collocate on existing poles. If the applicant provides evidence supporting the necessity of a new pole in the specific proposed location, then a stealth approach should be explored and submitted for review. The pole that was installed prior to approval should be removed.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with staff stipulations.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

#### **28. HDRC NO. 2018-399**

**Applicant:** Beacon Hill Alliance Neighborhood Association

**Address:** 831 W HOLLYWOOD AVE  
1900 BLANCO RD

#### **REQUEST:**

A request for review by the HDRC regarding eligibility of the property located at 831 W Hollywood, including 1900 Blanco, for landmark designation.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. On June 8, 2018, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) by the property owner of the residential structure at 831 W Hollywood which is located in the Beacon Hill Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD-5). OHP Staff conducted research to determine eligibility and contacted the neighborhood association during the 30 day review period provided by UDC 35-455. Demolition was not requested of the gas station structure on the same parcel.
- b. On July 23, 2018, a Request for Review of Historic Significance for the two structures located at 831 W Hollywood was submitted to OHP by the Beacon Hill Alliance Neighborhood Association, the applicant in this case.
- c. 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.
- d. The property is located in the Beacon Hill Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD-5); this NCD was originally created in 2005.
- e. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION –**

##### Residential Structure

This Tudor influenced one-story residential structure has a steep front gable leading into a front porch. It has a cross-gabled composition shingle roof, with wood siding and wood one-over-one windows. Several windows are covered by original decorative four-over-one wood screens. There is a half-light door with 9 divided lights and a jig-sawed wood screen door. The front porch is inset under a large front gable. The front and side porch openings are arched with five straight lines making a semi-hexagon shape.

##### Filing Station Structure

The one-story filing station structure was built with a streamlined modern design. The character defining features of this style include a stucco finish, coping along parapet, rounded corners, bands below the roof line and a flat roof, all of which this structure exhibits. However, there have been many modifications and additions to the original structure. The front portion is one-story, with stucco and wood siding; the front canopy structure has been enclosed with stucco siding and

no fenestration. There is a raised stucco band at the edge of the roofline painted teal in color. There is about 2" of metal material along the roofline, creating another banded pattern. There appears to be six additions: a two-story addition with a flat roof behind the original footprint, a one-story addition with wood siding to the north of the two-story addition, and another one-story addition with a gable roof to the north of that addition. There is a one-story shed addition with vertical wood siding and a corrugated metal roof on the northwest façade of the enclosed canopy that extends to the west façade of the two-story addition. On the southeast façade of the enclosed canopy, there is one-story shed addition with stucco siding, corrugated metal roofing; this addition has a set of ribbon windows with square fixed sashes, and double wood doors with full lights. The front entrance on the west façade of the two-story addition is a set of wood double doors with full lights and a shed awning. The most northern addition has four fixed wood windows.

A wooden sign hangs from the front of the enclosed canopy; the sign is oval in shape, reads "Chris Madrid's," has an image of a cheeseburger, and is bordered by a red line and blue line.

There is a rear yard, which is accessed by the public from W Hollywood Avenue, enclosed by a 6' wood privacy fence.

- f. **SITE CONTEXT** – At the northeast corner of Blanco Road and W Hollywood Avenue, the original filing station footprint sits diagonal to the intersection, with the front of the canopy facing southwest; the structure is about 5'-9' from the property line along W Hollywood, and 15'-20' from the property line along Blanco Road. The residential structure sits to the east, facing W Hollywood Avenue. Across Blanco, there is a modern one-story gas station and convenience store; the block to the south, across W Hollywood, is a parking lot for restaurant customers. On the same block, to the north, is another parking lot for customers. Generally, along Blanco Road there are one-story commercial structures with flat roofs or residential structures used for commercial purposes. There is angled parking along Blanco Road to the west of the building; there is also a long curb cut along W Hollywood Ave from the corner to the right property line, giving access to parking on site, south of the building. The residential structure sits 20'-25' from the front property line, consistent with its residential neighbors. The home is flanked to the east by a one-story, minimal traditional home with Tudor influences. The structure to the left is the filing station at the same address. Across the street there are one-story craftsman-style homes, similar in size to the subject property.
- g. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - The property is located in the Beacon Hill Alliance Neighborhood Association. Beacon Hill Neighborhood was platted, along with its neighbor Alta Vista, in the early years of the 20th century as many people moved north from downtown to higher ground (hence the names that suggest height) to escape the floodwaters of the San Antonio River. The area is characterized by well-constructed bungalows and appealing cottages as well as Italianate and four-square two-storied homes. The residential structure was a furnished rental property with 5 rooms, a breakfast nook, tile bath, and double garage that is no longer extant. The property is listed in the 1929 City Directory with Dorothy Holmes as its tenant. In 1934, Theo A. and Emma Riebe were residents; Theo is noted as an agent at Humble Oil.
- h. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** - The filing station is to the west of the residential structure. Historic gas stations in San Antonio represent a dominant industry in our regional economy, a nationwide shift in transportation patterns to reliance on a personal automobile, and the growing emphasis on corporate branding through design, with the buildings themselves serving as advertisements for their parent company. Texas economy relied heavily on the oil and gas industry in the early twentieth century. These companies all sold gas under their own brands, establishing filling stations with recognizable logos. The earliest of these simply had individual gas tanks set right on the sidewalk, but market demand and safety concerns quickly led to more sophisticated designs.

Regional influences on the architectural styles of these structures are expressed through tile roofs, parapets, and stucco siding typical to Spanish Eclectic style stations. San Antonio's last streetcars were removed in 1933, and the gasoline industry grew to meet the demand of the growing market of automobile owners. The moniker service station was applied beginning in the 1920s since most had garage bays for mechanical repairs in addition to a standard inventory of fluids, wiper blades, belts/hoses, filters, etc. Each of the thousands of filling stations across the state offered employment opportunities for local mechanics and attendants.

- i. HISTORIC CONTEXT - The filling station structure at 1900 Blanco opened c. 1931 as Hollywood Service Station, as part of the Texas Co./Texaco chain. The filling station also functioned as an ice house, owned by C.W. Carpenter, according to a 1932 article of the San Antonio Light. The property remained a Texaco station until 1965. In 1968, the structure was converted and housed Johnny's Beefmaster Restaurant. In 1977, Chris Madrid's opened in the space and continues to operate at the location today.
- j. 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):
  - (1) **Its value as a visible or archaeological reminder of the cultural heritage of the community, or a national event;** the filling station is a reminder of the cultural heritage of San Antonio as a crossroads for many historic routes such as the Old Spanish Trail and the Meridian Highway.
  - (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;** for its example as an intact Tudor Revival in Beacon Hill.
  - (6) **Its historical, architectural or cultural character as a particularly fine or unique example of a utilitarian structure, including but not limited to, bridges, acequias, gas stations, transportation shelters, or other commercial structures;** the filling station maintains historic, architectural, and cultural character as a pervasive vernacular building type.
  - (7) **Its unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature;** the filling station addresses the corner of the major commercial corridor, Blanco Road, and W Hollywood Avenue.
  - (13) **It bears an important and significant relationship to other distinctive structures, sites, or areas, either as an important collection of properties or architectural style or craftsmanship with few intrusions, or by contributing to the overall character of the area according to the plan based on architectural, historic or cultural motif;** it's a long a block of residences that are intact and neighbors the original filling station as seen on the Sanborn Insurance Map of 1951.
- k. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission concurs eligibility of the property and makes a recommendation of approval for designation, interim design review requirements will be in place and the property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work. Theses interim requirements will remain in place until the City Council makes their final decision on the proposed zoning change or not longer than six months.
- l. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the request. Staff finds that the property at 831 W Hollywood, including 1900 Blanco, meets 3 of the 16 criteria for evaluation and is eligible for landmark designation based on findings c through h. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) determines the property is eligible, the HDRC will become the applicant and will request a resolution from City Council to initiate the designation process.

**CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:**

**WITHDRAWN.**

**Approval of the Historic and Design Review Commission Meeting minutes from 19 September 2018.**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Move to adjourn:**

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Garza to adjourn.

**AYES:** Guarino, Fish, Garza, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Laffoon.

**NAYS:** None.

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:26 PM.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino  
Chair



