

July 2, 2014

1

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
July 2, 2014**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Training Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Cone, Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez
ABSENT: Zuniga

- Chairman's Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-382 | River Walk Areas 16, 17 and 20 |
| 2. Case No. 2014-212 | 101 Jackson Keller Rd. |
| 3. Case No. 2014-213 | 207 Delaware |
| 4. Case No. 2014-178 | 212 N. Alamo |
| 5. Case No. 2014-214 | 215 W. Lullwood |
| 6. Case No. 2014-172 | 215 San Saba |
| 7. Case No. 2014-173 | 246 E. Lullwood |
| 8. Case No. 2014-086 | 319 E. Mulberry |
| 9. Case No. 2014-216 | 327 N. Flores |
| 10. Case No. 2014-217 | 415 E. Dewey Pl |
| 11. Case No. 2014-218 | 617 N. Olive |
| 12. Case No. 2014-219 | 656 S. Main |
| 13. Case No. 2014-221 | 809 Labor |
| 14. Case No. 2014-222 | 1250 Mission Grande |
| 15. Case No. 2014-223 | 1331 & 1339 S. Flores |
| 16. Case No. 2014-225 | 2118 W. Kings Hwy |

Items 4, 5, 6, 8, and 12 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve the remaining cases on the Consent Agenda based staff recommendations.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

4. HDRC NO. 2014-178

Applicant: John Harrison

Address: 212 N. Alamo

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

1. Restore the first floor façade based on historic photographs. The new façade will consist of wood-framed storefront, granite veneer wainscot, and stucco siding and cornice;

2. Install striped canvas awnings based on historic photographs;
3. Construct an elevator shaft at the back corner of the building. The shaft will be clad in stucco and incorporate a new cornice that is aligned with the existing cornice;
4. Construct a two-story balcony in the rear of the building to provide access to units. The structure will consist of tube steel beams and columns and feature a striped canvas roof system; and
5. Reconfigure the rear elevation fenestrations to incorporate new wood-framed windows and doors.

FINDINGS:

- a. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 27, 2014. At that meeting, there was concern regarding a few items. It was noted that the addition of a new cornice line at the ground level should be avoided if possible. The applicant indicated that the cornice was necessary in order to account for the change in thickness due to the addition of the stucco veneer. The applicant also cited similar conditions at nearby historic buildings. The committee recommended that any required detail to account for the difference in thickness be as minimal as possible and only occur on the front façade where the stucco is being added. There was also concern regarding the reconfiguration of the rear fenestration pattern. The applicant indicated that the configuration of the proposed interior units necessitates the addition of new openings. This also requires the removal of the original masonry openings. Due to site constraints, these openings are difficult to view from the right-of-way. One committee member noted that the proposed interior plan might allow for the retention of the northernmost and southernmost openings and recommended, as a compromise, that the sill heights of those openings be lowered to accommodate the required doors. The committee was supportive of the elevator addition.
- b. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on June 24, 2014, during a site visit to the property. The applicant was encouraged by the committee to retain as many of the original openings as possible. Where an opening must be filled in, the applicant indicated that salvaged brick would be inserted into the opening in a herringbone pattern in order to be distinguishable from the original opening.
- c. The Henry Terrell Building was constructed circa 1908. The ground-level storefront has been altered significantly over time with the addition of aluminum windows, ceramic tile and glass block. The proposal to remove this storefront to expose the original masonry openings based on historic photographs is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.ii.
- d. The addition of a new cornice above the ground level does not have historic precedent at this location and will obscure a uniform brick band that is present on all four sides of the building. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i. The applicant should explore ways to limit the thickness of the new stucco veneer which necessitates the cornice detail. If this cannot be accomplished, the stucco veneer should be capped with a small sill or flashing detail limited to the front façade where the stucco is being added.
- e. The installation of canvas awnings is based on historic evidence and is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.iii.
- f. The proposed elevator shaft fills in a corner at the rear of the building and is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A and 2.B in terms of location, roof form, height and transition between old and new.
- g. The proposed rear balcony is simple in design and does not distract from the historic character of the building consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv.
- h. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., historic window and door openings should be preserved. Although the rear openings are not highly visible from the street, the removal of original openings for new openings is not consistent with the guidelines. Staff finds that the northernmost and southernmost openings could be adapted for the proposed entrances by lowering the height of the existing sills. This would be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. Staff further finds that any new or relocated openings should match the original openings in height, width and shape consistent with Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.ii.

July 2, 2014

3

1. Staff recommends approval of reconfiguring the storefront based on finding b with the stipulation that the cornice is removed from the design in favor of a small sill or flashing detail limited to the front facade based on finding d.
2. Staff recommends approval of the fabric awnings based on finding e.
3. Staff recommends approval of the elevator shaft addition based on finding f.
4. Staff recommends approval of the rear balcony based on finding g.
5. Staff recommends approval with the stipulations:
 - That as many of the original rear openings are retained and reused as possible based on finding h; and
 - That new masonry openings for the remaining units match the original arched openings in height, width and shape based on finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through h.

Item 1: stipulation that the cornice is removed from the design in favor of a small sill or flashing detail limited to the front facade based on finding d.

Item 5: stipulations that as many of the original rear openings are retained and reused as possible based on finding h; and that new masonry openings for the remaining units match the original arched openings in height, width and shape based on finding g.

Applicant submitted a drawing on July 1, 2014 which meets the required stipulations.

AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Cone

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2014-214

Applicant: Arnold Flather

Address: 215 W. Lullwood

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

Construct a rear porch over an existing deck. The porch will be flat roofed with a parapet wall with stucco exterior to match the rest of the house. The proposed footprint of the porch is approximately 12 feet wide, 9 feet deep and 10 feet tall.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 215 W Lullwood was constructed circa 1928 in the Spanish Eclectic style. A large addition appears to be located at the rear of the house. However, Sanborn maps indicate that the current footprint has remained relatively unaltered since at least 1951.
- b. The proposed rear porch is sited at the rear of the property and will not be visible from the right-of-way, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i.
- c. Drawings submitted by the applicant indicate that the porch will have a similar roof line as the existing construction consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii.

July 2, 2014

4

d. According to the applicant, the top of the porch would be set approximately 2 feet below the existing parapet height of the house. This allows for a transition between the house and the new construction, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv.

e. The proposed porch addition is subordinate to the principal façade in terms of scale and mass, consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to reset to July 16, 2014.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2014-172

Applicant: Lee Imbimbo – Michael Imbimbo, Inc.

Address: 215 San Saba

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

Construct a new CST Corner Store (No. 1079) with gasoline sales.

Staff recommends approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve as submitted.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED.

8. HDRC NO. 2014-086

Applicant: Wes Putman

Address: 319 E. Mulberry

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

Construct a monument sign and brick planter bed in the front lawn at Trinity Baptist Church. The sign will be externally-illuminated and feature a changeable message panel. Proposed dimensions for the planter are 13' by 22'-6". The signs itself measures 7'-8" tall by 12' wide. The changeable marquee panel measures 4' tall by 7' wide.

FINDINGS:

a. The overall scale of the proposed sign is appropriate in proportion to the adjacent sanctuary building. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.A.iii.

- b. The proposed exterior lighting of the sign is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.E.i.
- c. The proposed sign is well-sited in the open lawn area. It is legible to both pedestrians and motorists on Mulberry. It has an ample setback from the street as to not impede or obstruct traffic consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.ii.
- d. While other wayfinding signs are currently on the property, the proposed sign would be the only freestanding sign on the property with this type of display. Staff finds this to be consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.iii.
- e. The Guidelines for Signage 4.A.iv. generally discourages the use of suburban-style monument signs in historic districts. However, staff finds that the sign has been designed in response to the site and that this type of sign may be appropriate at this location.
- f. According to the Guidelines for Signage 4.B.i., the height of freestanding signs should be limited to no more than 6 feet. With the sign positioned in a brick planter, the sign will likely be even taller when measured from the ground up. Staff finds that the overall height of the sign could be reduced to conform with the Guidelines.
- g. As submitted, the overall requested signage encompasses an area of approximately 180 square feet (both sides of the entire structure counted). The actual changeable marquee panel encompasses an area of 56sf. This is much larger than what is normally recommended within the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.iv. However, staff finds that the location and scale of the adjacent buildings warrant an exception to the typical 50 square feet. Renderings submitted by the applicant indicate that the proposed sign is at a comfortable scale in relation to the church and open lawn area.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the sign be no taller than 6 feet when measured from the ground to the top of the sign.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to refer to a site visit by the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2014-219

Applicant: Dale Carse

Address: 656 S. Main

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

- 1.Rehabilitate the 1860 Arsenal Office building for reuse as a visitor's center. The exterior of the building will be restored based on historical evidence. A non-contributing rear addition will be removed and replaced with an enclosure that follows the original rear porch roofline. An accessible ramp and entry will be located on this rear elevation. A single set of handrails will be installed on the front steps; other portions of the steps will be blocked off with bollards. All original materials will be restored and preserved including the removal of elastomeric paint from the original limestone.
- 2.Develop a visitor's parking area in the lot immediately to the west of the visitor's center. The parking will be screened with a low wall and landscape buffer. Adjacent paving and sidewalks will feature scored concrete to match nearby historic walkways; and
- 3.Develop a landscaped plaza immediately to the east of the visitor's center at a location that is believed to fall within the path of the San Pedro acequia. The plaza will feature flagstone paving and a rectangular water feature.

FINDINGS:

- a. The 1860 Arsenal Office building was the first building constructed for the US Arsenal in San Antonio. It is a significant historic resource. The building has had some modification over time including the enclosure of the front porch and a rear warehouse addition. Staff commends the applicant for undertaking the rehabilitation of this structure which will prolong the life of the building as well as return its exterior to a more original condition.
- b. The applicant has received an administrative approval from staff to remove a non-contributing rear addition from the building. A portion of the addition that is believed to encompass the original rear porch will be retained for the proposed rear enclosure. Archaeological monitoring will occur throughout the demolition as the San Pedro acequia is believed to be extant at this location.
- c. The proposed restoration of the original building is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B., 6.A. and 7.B. Given the period of construction of the building, staff finds that contemporary elements, such as the ceiling fans shown in the front elevation drawings, should be avoided.
- d. The proposed rear enclosure takes advantage of a former rear porch area that was previously enclosed. The selected materials are compatible for the structure and allow the original porch bays to be easily interpreted. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.ii. and 7.B.iv.
- e. The proposed accessible entry at the rear elevation is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 8.C.i.
- f. The proposed parking area will be adequately screened and incorporate a landscape buffer that is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.i.
- g. The proposed landscaped plaza incorporates compatible materials and references the historic acequia route at this location. Any additional excavations at this location are to be done in accordance with the requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Section 35-631.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that ceiling fans are eliminated from the front porch based on finding c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve with the stipulation that the ceiling fans are eliminated from the front porch based on findings c.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Valenzuela, Salas, Shafer, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

17. HDRC NO. 2014-113

Applicant: Syngman Stevens

Address: 619 Nolan

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the structure at 619 Nolan. The applicant has provided estimates from contractors for roof repairs/replacement and general exterior and interior repairs to make the structure habitable. The estimates total around \$132,000. The assessed value of the structure according to the Bexar County Appraisal District is \$52,300.

Postponed by the applicant.

18. HDRC NO. 2014-206

Applicant: Mark Tolley

Address: 222 E. Mitchell

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish seven buildings on the St. John's Seminary property and two single-family residences at 203 and 215 Felisa Street as non-contributing buildings. The demolitions are identified in the exhibits as buildings 5, 6, 9, 10, a, c, d, e and f. The remaining buildings at the St. John's Seminary site would be adaptively reused within the development.

2. Construct two, new apartment buildings located along E Mitchell and Felisa Streets for a total of approximately 156 new units. The new buildings would each be three stories tall.

FINDINGS:

a. The St. John's Seminary campus first opened at this location in 1920 with the construction of the main, 3-story building located to the northeast of Mission Concepcion. A second building, Margil Hall, was constructed in 1935 to the rear of the main seminary building. St. Mary's Hall, to the north along Mitchell Street, was constructed in 1949. Several other buildings were constructed after 1951, including the chapel immediately to the east of the Mission Concepcion. Other site features include an allée of trees between Mission Road and the main seminary building, multiple sports courts and a historic koi pond.

b. Staff received demolition applications for nine buildings at this location on Monday, June 16, 2014. The applications have been reviewed by staff for both architectural and cultural significance. Staff has determined that Building 6 and Accessory Buildings a, c, d, e and f are non-contributing to the Mission Historic District and St. John's Seminary Campus and are eligible for demolition.

c. The single family residences at 203 and 215 Felisa (Buildings 9 and 10) date to the 1920s. 215 Felisa (Building 9) is a relatively intact early 20th century bungalow. Alterations include porch modifications, rear additions, and application of vinyl siding. 203 Felisa (Building 10) is a good example Spanish Eclectic style home and features its original windows. These homes are part of a residential area that remains relatively intact. Their location at this corner preserves the historic streetscape at this location, although other demolitions along Felisa have occurred midblock. Staff finds that these buildings are contributing.

d. Building 5 is a multi-purpose facility located centrally within the St. John's campus. It is a Mid-Century Modern building with a concrete structural frame and cantilevered roof. It appears to have been constructed at the same time as the two dormitory buildings located along Felisa (Buildings 7 and 8.) Staff finds that this building is contributing.

e. If the HDRC determines that any of the selected demolitions are contributing to the Mission Historic District, then the procedures for demolition of landmarks and contributing buildings as outlined in UDC Section 35-614 shall apply.

f. This request was first reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 13, 2014. At that meeting, the applicant presented an initial proposal and a revised proposal based on early feedback from stakeholders. In the revised proposal, a three story building at the corner of E Mitchell and Mission Rd was shown. It was noted that this configuration avoided construction over the known locations of the mission walls. One commissioner concurred that no construction should take place within the original boundaries of the mission due to the impact to archaeological resources. It was also noted that views to the existing buildings would be an important aspect to the project. Another commissioner questioned whether a tree survey for the property had been done. The applicant indicated that a survey had not been done, but that there was interest in retaining as many mature trees as possible.

g. A separate site visit was conducted by the Design Review Committee and members of staff on June 10, 2014. During that visit, the committee members present reviewed the proposed site plan. One commissioner noted that the non-historic nunnery, which is in close proximity to the mission, may be eligible for non-contributing status and should be considered for demolition. It was noted that there was a preference that no development of any kind occur to the south of the existing allée in front of the seminary building. Another commissioner pointed out that more information on the existing structures would be needed. It was also recommended that attempts be made to relocate the single-family residences on Felisa Street.

h. The applicant has developed conceptual plans for the project through consultation with a number of stakeholders including the National Parks Service and the World Heritage Advisory Committee. Through those consultations, the applicant has eliminated a third building from the proposal which would have originally been located in the northwest corner of the property.

- i. The overall site has great potential to yield valuable archaeological deposits including potential for human remains. The original walls of Mission Concepcion have been identified in previous investigations as being located to the south of the existing allée of trees in front of the main seminary building. Additional archaeological investigations will be required per UDC Section 35-675. A detailed archaeological summary has been provided by staff in the exhibits for this request.
- j. Staff commends the applicant for exploring the adaptive reuse and development of this historic property. The applicant has met with stakeholders and has made numerous alterations to the proposal based on the feedback received. The majority of this property lies within the boundaries of the proposed World Heritage nomination for the San Antonio Missions. An UNESCO inspector is scheduled to visit San Antonio in September of 2014. Any proposed development within the boundaries of the nomination will be considered by UNESCO as well as the perceived efficacy of the design review process to review future proposed development. There is concern that proposed new construction in close proximity or that is highly visible from the mission sites could impair the nomination efforts.
- k. Adaptive reuse plans for the buildings to be retained have not been submitted for conceptual review. The rehabilitation of these historic buildings will have a positive impact to the greater mission site and will benefit the World Heritage nomination efforts. However, it is unclear how these buildings will need to be modified in order to accommodate the proposed uses. Further development of these designs should be done in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines through consultation with the Design Review Committee.
- l. The proposed new construction will be sited in the rear of the property, behind the historic buildings of the St. John's campus. The existing buildings and dense vegetation provide a buffer between the mission site and the proposed new construction. Based on photos submitted by the applicant, the proposed new buildings would not be visible to pedestrians from the Mission site. Additional photographs and rendered views should be developed by the applicant as the design progresses in order to ensure that there are no negative impacts to the Mission site.
- m. The existing buildings on the St. John's seminary campus were historically developed in response to the greater mission site. The main seminary building and subsequent later buildings are located behind the front plane of the mission chapel. Staff has included an illustration in the exhibits file which shows a consistent setback line among the seminary buildings. This uniform setback establishes a "front yard" to the seminary which, in turn, creates an open green space adjacent to the mission property. New construction within the established green space would potentially disrupt the existing spatial relationships that characterize the property. Staff commends the applicant for eliminating the originally-proposed front building from the proposal. However, the currently-proposed surface parking lot still has potential to have a negative impact on the integrity of the campus. Staff finds there are a number of ways to develop the parking lot appropriately using low impact design techniques. This should be done through close consultation with the Design Review Committee and other stakeholders.
- n. Based on information submitted by the applicant, the proposed new construction appears to be generally consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i. by featuring a similar building height as those found on the seminary campus. Historic buildings on the seminary campus range between two and three stories.
- o. The proposed new construction appears to feature materials consisting of stucco, stone and concrete barrel tile. Brick is a more common material within the seminary property and would be more consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i. Future development of a materials palette for the proposed new construction should be done in reference to these guidelines.
- p. The Office of Historic Preservation has initiated the development of new zoning overlays for the areas immediately adjacent to the historic mission sites which would place new regulations on building height. While no new overlay has been formally adopted at this time, the proposal would require buildings to be no taller than 2-3 stories at this location.
- q. Pending verification and approval as a World Heritage site, future developments within the boundaries of the nominated area are subject to a Heritage Impact Assessment through guidance issued by the International Council on Monuments and Sites. The applicant is encouraged to continue to assess the anticipated impacts of this proposal as a preliminary response to World Heritage designation through close consultation with the World Heritage Advisory Committee and ICOMOS representatives. The HDRC may consider the formal adoption of similar guidelines for reviewing future projects within the boundaries of the World Heritage nomination.

Request 1. Staff recommends that the HDRC concur with findings c and d that Buildings 5, 9 and 10 are contributing. Every attempt should be made by the applicant to relocate within the Mission Historic District the two single-family residences on Felisa Street (Buildings 9 and 10) based on finding c. If relocation is shown to be infeasible, salvage shall be

required. Alternatives to full demolition for Building 5 must be explored by the design team prior to issuance of a permit. If the HDRC finds that information has been provided which would warrant a determination of non-contributing status for the selected demolitions, then the demolitions may be handled administratively.

Request 2. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the development with the following stipulations:

1. That archaeological investigations be conducted in all areas where ground-disturbing activity is proposed based on finding i. The applicant has concurred with this stipulation;
2. That impacts on views to and from the site are fully explored and illustrated in either renderings or diagrams based on findings j and l and presented to the HDRC in future applications related to this project;
3. That the applicant make a good faith effort to relocate Buildings 9 and 10 and explore options for reuse, such as covered parking, of some or all of Building 5 prior to demolition. The results of this investigation and analysis should be presented to the Design Review Committee.
4. That the surface parking lot located on the northwest corner of the property implement low impact design techniques and be integrated into the overall landscape through the use of grasscrete pavers or other permeable surfaces based on finding m. Lighting for the surface parking lot must also be appropriately designed to prevent light pollution at this location;
5. That the overall development of the designs for new construction continue to be done in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, including the Design Review Committee, National Parks Service and World Heritage Advisory Committee; and
6. That any proposed exterior alterations or additions required for the adaptive reuse of the retained buildings be presented to the Design Review Committee prior to submitting an HDRC application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff further recommends that a standing structures report be provided for future consideration by the HDRC.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve Item 1 – with staff recommendations.

Item 2 – Approval with the following stipulation for #5: That the overall development of the **site and designs** for new construction continue to be done in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, including the Design Review Committee, National Parks Service and World Heritage Advisory Committee

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: Shafer, Rodriguez

RECUSED: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

19. HDRC NO. 2014-215

Applicant: Skeets Rapier

Address: 224 Lavaca

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

Install solar panels on the primary structure and rear addition at 224 Lavaca. The selected panels have a blue/gray finish to blend with the existing standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 7.C.i., solar collectors should be located on side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right-of-way. The majority of the proposed solar array is located on an addition at the rear of the property.
- b. The proposed solar panels are mounted flush with the roof slope and installed with the lowest profile possible consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 7.C.ii. The selected blue/gray finish will help the panels to blend with the existing standing seam metal roof. The low pitch of the roof will further reduce the visibility of the panels from the right-of-way.

c. The house at 224 Lavaca is a significant historic building within the Lavaca Historic District. It is also individually-designated as a local historic landmark. A contemporary addition has been constructed to the side of the house. Staff finds that any additional contemporary additions, such as the addition of solar panels, should not extend past the plane established by the addition. This would help to further reduce the visual impact of the proposed solar panels and further preserve the integrity of the front façade

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation the front 6 sections of panels are eliminated so as to not extend past the side addition based on finding c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with the stipulation that the front 6 sections of panels are eliminated so as to not extend past the side addition based on finding c.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

20. HDRC NO. 2014-226

Applicant: Ramon Torres

Address: 427 Donaldson

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

Replace the brick exterior of the house at 427 Donaldson with a combination of stone veneer and hardi-board siding.

FINDINGS:

- a. Approved foundation repairs were attempted at this property. As the frame of the house was lifted approximately 6 inches, the brick veneer was left unsupported resulting in its collapse. The applicant discovered that the bricks were not tied into the frame of the house.
- b. While a majority of the bricks remain salvageable, many were broken when the wall collapsed. It may not be feasible for the applicant to completely reconstruct the wall using salvaged materials.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B.i., masonry materials should be replaced in-kind. The proposed stone veneer and hardi-board siding are not an in-kind substitution for brick and are not consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. That applicant has retained the brick on site, but has not submitted a salvage plan for review by staff. Staff finds that all attempts to salvage the brick should be made before considering replacement materials.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings c and d. Staff recommends that the applicant develop a strategy for salvaging the brick. If there is not enough salvageable materials to complete the work, then the applicant may return to staff with an appropriate material for patching that is consistent with the Guidelines.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to grant denial as submitted. Approval to salvage remaining brick and supplement with compatible material.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

July 2, 2014

11

21. HDRC NO. 2014-190

Applicant: Antonio Gonzalez

Address: 1901 W. Mistletoe

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

Construct a new bathroom addition to the east (side) façade of the house at 1901 W Mistletoe. The addition will have a footprint of 9'-6" by 10'-6" and protrude from an existing gabled wing. The addition roof will follow the pitch of the existing roof, but will only feature a half gable. The proposed siding will be 117 double teardrop wood siding to match existing.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 1901 W Mistletoe is located on a corner lot. The existing east wing is highly visible from the front of the house as well as the side street. The proposed addition at this location would likewise be highly visible when viewing the property.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., residential additions should be positioned at the side or rear of the building whenever possible in order to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. While the proposed addition is located on the side of the structure, it is at a highly visible location and would impact views from the right-of-way.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure. While the proposed new roof line is a similar pitch, the proposed half gable is a departure from the existing conditions and results in a blank wall facing the street. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., new additions should utilize 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. This type of detail is not indicated in the drawings submitted by the applicant. Staff finds that a trim piece between the new and old portions of the siding would help to differentiate the addition. An additional break in the roof line would also be more consistent with this guideline.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i., new additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass. The proposed addition matches the height of the existing roof ridge and obscures original architectural details. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. The overall height of the addition should be reduced and alternate locations should be explored.
- f. Typically, for an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, 80% working drawings are required for review by the HDRC. While the applicant has worked with staff to provide measured line drawings, staff finds that the submitted drawings lack sufficient detail that is necessary to review this type of request.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to refer to the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

July 2, 2014

12

- 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 5:30 P.M.

APPROVED

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Cone', written over the printed name.

Tim Cone
Chair