

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
APRIL 1, 2015**

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

**PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Feldman, Judson, Lazarine**

**ABSENT: Valenzuela, Rodriguez**

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                      |                    |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-118 | 200 RiverWalk      |
| 2. Case No. 2015-108 | 211 Barrera        |
| 3. Case No. 2015-110 | 223 Laurel Heights |
| 4. Case No. 2015-114 | 126 W. Agarita     |
| 5. Case No. 2015-120 | 436 Labor St.      |
| 6. Case No. 2015-055 | 222 Furr Dr        |
| 7. Case No. 2015-098 | 343 Donaldson      |

Item 1, 4 and 7 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Feldman, Judson, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**1. HDRC NO. 2015-118**

Applicant: Beaty Palmer Architects

Address: 200 RiverWalk

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

Install a memorial bust honoring Robert H Hugman in an existing planter bed on the River Walk sited near his former studio and the Clifford Building. The existing planting bed was installed circa 2011 and is not an original Hugman feature.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to remove an existing planting bed that was installed circa 2011 that is not an original Hugman feature. By removing this, the applicant would be returning to the original, Hugman design, which would be appropriate.

b. The applicant has also proposed to remove a section of the river wall that’s approximately eight (8) inches in height to accommodate a reinforced concrete foundation which will support the granite statue base. The applicant is responsible for complying with any State and Federal regulation regarding the removal of a portion of the river wall.

c. The applicant has proposed to mount the bronzed bust of Robert H. H. Hugman on a granite base. Per the UDC Section 35-673(g) in regards to paving materials, any new materials on or adjacent to the Riverwalk pathway should be clearly distinguishable from those of the Riverwalk. The applicant’s proposed to use a granite base is consistent with the UDC.

d. Per the UDC Section 35-679(d) in regards to Monuments, Markers, Memorials and Acknowledgements in the River Improvement Overlay, monuments must commemorate an event or person significant to the Riverwalk or the history of the Riverwalk. The applicant's proposal to place a bust and plaque honoring Robert H. H. Hugman, the designer of the Riverwalk is consistent with the UDC.

e. The applicant is proposing the modify the existing landscaping around the proposed location of the commemorative plaque and bust. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(f) in regards to plant materials.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Feldman, Judson, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Laffoon**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**4. HDRC NO. 2015-114**

Applicant: Thomas Bradley/Thomas Bradley & Associates

Address: 126 W. Agarita

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install new plants, trees and grass in front and back yard, install new flagstone patio in backyard, and install new concrete sidewalk in side yard.

**FINDINGS:**

a. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, removal of lawn areas should be limited to mulched planting beds in locations where they will be historically found. The proposed mulch beds in the front yard will incorporate various plants and are consistent with the guidelines. However, the proposed mulch area on the rear of the house does not incorporate any plantings which should be avoided.

b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, large areas of impervious hardscape should not be used where not historically located. The proposed hardscape walkway along the side of the house is consistent with the guidelines. However, the proposed new patio, in addition to existing impervious hardscape areas will significantly reduce the pervious areas of the rear yard which should be avoided. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50%. The total area of proposed and existing hardscape in the rear yard will exceed 50% of the rear yard area. A semi-pervious patio with the stone pavers set on sand or crushed stone instead of concrete would be more appropriate.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a-b with the following stipulations:

- a. The mulch bed in the rear yard incorporates plantings.
- b. The new flagstone patio is set on sand or crushed stone and not concrete.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Feldman, Judson, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**7. HDRC NO. 2015-098**

Applicant: Adan Ochoa

Address: 343 Donaldson Ave.

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

1. Deconstruct the existing garage and reconstruct it as a one car garage with a new living quarters attached. The existing garage will be disassemble and reassembled on a new foundation. The reconstruction will match the existing footprint. All materials will match existing and will be salvaged.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property located at 343 Donaldson contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the garage, demolish the adjacent accessory building and construct an addition to the reconstructed portion. The existing garage appears on the 1925 Sanborn map. The existing accessory building does not appear on the Sanborn map. The accessory building would not be considered to be historically significant.
- c. The existing structure is structurally unsound and has been deemed a hazard to the current residence according to a report given to the owner by his insurance company and licensed engineer.
- d. The massing and scale of the proposed reconstructed garage and addition is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., 5.A.i. & 5.A.ii. The overall height and scale is compatible with nearby historic buildings and the proposed secondary structure will be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of height, massing, and form.
- e. The proposed roof form and relationship of solids to voids of windows and doors are compatible with the typical pattern found in the subject area. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i & 2.C.i.
- f. The proposed building materials are visually compatible to the primary building as well as with what is predominately found on the block. Material from the existing garage including, the wood siding, one garage door, and any other salvageable pieces will be reused to fabricate the reconstructed garage. The addition will be clad with both new and salvaged wood. The garage door to face the alley will be clad with wood. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.B.
- g. The proposed roofing material will be asphalt shingles. This will match the existing roof condition. The windows are proposed to be vinyl. Handmade wooden screens will be installed over the windows. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i, ii.
- h. The setback and orientation of the building will match what is existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.i. – ii.
- i. This case was last reviewed by the DRC March 24, 2015. The DRC suggested that wooden screens be used to cover the Pella vinyl windows to mitigate possible concern over the proposed window material. The applicant concurred and re-designed accordingly. DRC also highly suggested that both of the garage doors be salvaged as opposed to only one as proposed.

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

- 1. The proposed living quarters' front door needs to be restudied and submitted to staff for review;
- 2. Staff recommends that the applicant explore ways to incorporate the second, existing garage door into the new design.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve with staff recommendations.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Feldman, Judson, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**8. HDRC NO. 2015-090**

Applicant: Diana Webb

Address: 216 W. Mariposa

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to add metal bars over an existing privacy fence on the front and over an existing wall on the east side of the property. Overall height will be approximately 8ft.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of scale, transparency and character. The proposed fence is consistent with other fences in the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District.
- b. New fences should incorporate materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district and that are compatible with the main structure according to the Guidelines for Site Elements. The proposed wrought iron fence is consistent with the guidelines.
- c. According to Sec. 35-514 of the UDC, the maximum height for rear yard fences is 6 ft. The proposed fence will exceed the maximum height allowed and its construction will require a variance.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a-c with the stipulation that the overall fence height is reduced to no more than 6 ft.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with the stipulation that the temporary side fence be allowed for 24 months with the stipulation that the iron portion facing the front is removed.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**9. HDRC NO. 2015-117**

Applicant: Lewis McNeel/Candelilla, LLC

Address: 902 N. Pine

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

- 1. Replace non-historic steel door at front and rear with new wood door
- 2. Replace wrought iron columns with 8"x8" wood columns at front porch
- 3. Install new corrugated metal skirt and siding at rear addition
- 4. Historic Tax Certification

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The house at 902 North Pine was built ca. 1905 in the Folk Victorian style.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, a non-historic door should be replaced with a new door that matches the architectural style of the building. Although replacement of the non-historic metal doors may be appropriate, the proposed door has a Craftsman style which does not match the style of the house. A replacement wood door with a simple oval or rectangular lite would be more appropriate.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, replacement porch elements such as columns should be simple to avoid competing with the historic character or creating a false sense of history. The proposed columns are simple in design and appropriate replacements for the non-historic wrought iron columns.
- d. Replacement skirting should consist of durable, proven materials, and should either match the siding or be applied to have minimal impact as recommended by the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. The proposed corrugated metal skirting is not a commonly used skirting material in historic residential structures and its installation will significantly impact the structure. Wood siding to match existing would be a more appropriate skirting material.
- e. Consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, materials that match in type, color, and texture should be used. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. The proposed corrugated metal is not compatible with the existing materials on the house or is a commonly found cladding material in residential structures within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Its installation, which will be visible from the street, will cause an adverse effect to the historic structure. Wood siding with a different profile from the existing would be a more appropriate cladding material.
- f. The applicant has met all requirements of the City's tax certification process as described in Section 35-618 of the UDC and has furnished evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

April 1, 2015

5

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1 as submitted based on finding a-b. Staff recommends that the doors are replaced with an appropriate style door.
2. Staff recommends approval of item 2 as submitted.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item 3 as submitted based on findings d-e. Staff recommends wood siding is used.
4. Staff recommends approval of item 4 as submitted.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve items 1,2 and 4 with staff stipulations. Approval of item 3 as submitted.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**10. HDRC NO. 2015-112**

Applicant: Jose Cueva

Address: 268 W. Mariposa

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish existing garage
2. Construct a 700 sq. ft. one bedroom cottage. The proposed cottage will have a composition gable roof, cedar and hardi plank siding, and multi-light windows.
3. Construct a concrete walkway to connect the rear door of the main house to the new cottage.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The house at 268 W. Mariposa was built in 1938 according to the Olmos Park Terrace survey. The existing garage was likely built around the same time as the main house. The existing garage is contributing to the historic district.
- b. According to UDC Sec. 35-614, demolition of contributing structures within a historic district should not be approved unless the applicant demonstrates clear and convincing evidence supporting an economic hardship. If economic hardship cannot be proven, the applicant might provide additional information regarding loss of significance. No information on economic hardship has been presented by the applicant.
- c. Demolition of a historic structure should only be used as a method of last resort when all other options have been exhausted. The existing structure appears to be sound and its rehabilitation and conversion into a living unit should be explored prior to demolition being approved.
- d. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the main structure, should not be larger than 40% of the footprint of the main structure, and should relate to the main structure through the use of complementary materials and details. The proposed cottage is consistent with the guidelines in form, mass and size.
- e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, historic setback patterns should be followed for new outbuildings. The proposed cottage will match the side setback on the existing structure and expand the rear wall to meet the rear setback. The proposed setbacks are consistent with the guidelines. However, the new structure might encroach on the side setback which may require a variance.
- f. The Guidelines for New Construction recommend new outbuildings to have window and door openings similar to those found on the principle structure in terms of spacing and proportions. The proposed windows are consistent in proportions to the main house. However, the proposed nine over nine aluminum windows will not match the six over six true divided lite windows on the house which should be avoided. In addition, the proposed doors are not a typically found door type in historic districts and does not relate to the historic home.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings a-c. Staff recommends the existing structure is rehabilitated to accommodate the new use.

If demolition is approved, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- a. A door type that is consistent with those found in historic districts is used
- b. If windows with divided lites are used, they should match the windows on the main house and use true divided glass.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to refer to DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**11. HDRC NO. 2015-119**

Applicant: Robert Lee/LindLee, LLC

Address: 310 Refugio

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Construct two attached, two-story units which will share a common demising wall on a currently vacant lot at 310 Refugio. Each unit is to have a street-fronting entry with a walkway from a new sidewalk and off street parking for two vehicles. One parking location is covered simultaneously providing an outdoor space on the second level. At the rear, each unit is to have a private outdoor space.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. This request for Conceptual Approval of the construction of two attached, two story units at 310 Refugio was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 24, 2015. At that meeting, committee members noted that the front yard should contain turf, that the applicant should resolve design issues regarding the south facing parapet, that window fenestration be carefully addressed and for the applicant to provide a more developed site plan.
- b. General Principle #1 in the Guidelines for New Construction is “ensure that historic buildings remain the central focus of the district.” Staff is concerned in general that the proposed design will become the focus on this block due to its overall height and scale. While the scale overall may not be inappropriate, the way it addresses the street is different than the adjacent properties.
- c. Refugio Street features buildings orientations and setbacks that range from buildings being orientated toward Refugio featuring setbacks that are approximately twelve (12) feet to buildings that feature set backs of up to approximately twenty-five (25) feet. The proposed new construction is to front Refugio and feature a setback of approximately twelve (12) feet to match the historic setbacks found on Refugio and throughout Lavaca. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i and ii.
- d. The Guidelines for New Construction state that primary building entrances, porches and landings should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has designed two primary entrances for both units, however with the inclusion of the carports with adjacent side doors, staff has concerns that through the use of the carport, the side entrances will be dominant. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. Staff recommends that the applicant address the car-focused design in order to emphasize each front entrance.
- e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. This particular section of Lavaca features homes that are both one, one and one half and two-story homes ranging from those that are modest in size to those that are quite prominent on their respective blocks and are the center pieces of the district. The applicant’s proposal to construct a two-story structure is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i.
- f. New construction in historic districts should utilize step downs in building height, wall-plane offsets and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition when the height of new construction exceeds that of adjacent historic buildings by more than one-half story. The applicant has proposed step-downs on both the east and west facades of the house as well as a series of wall plane offsets and changes in materials to further convey building transitions, however, the use of the parapet wall on the front façade is misleading and does not fully convey the use of step downs to convey a visual transition. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii.
- g. The majority of houses in the direct vicinity of 310 Refugio feature either front gable or side gable roofs. The proposed new construction features a front gable roof, however the proposed front gable roof is hidden by the proposed front parapet. Staff recommends that the applicant remove the front gable in order to become consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i.
- h. Window and door openings of new construction in historic districts should have a similar proportion to those of other houses located within the historic district. Blank walls should be avoided and each façade should possess elements that separate the façade into three distinct segments. The applicant has provided information regarding window and door openings, however, staff finds that the lack of a base or material change where a traditional foundation skirting would be placed does not provide the separation needed for three distinct façade segments, which is needed to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. The applicant should resolve these issues to receive conceptual approval.

- i. The vacant lot at 310 Refugio features approximately 4,300 square feet. While the applicant has proposed to build up to the side and rear yard setbacks bringing the proposed footprint to more than half of the square footage of the lot, there are instances of historic structures with a similar footprint in Lavaca. While this is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.D.i., a stronger attempt should be made to relate the proposed new construction in with the existing, historic structures of the neighborhood rather than potentially distract from the historic structures.
- j. The applicant has proposed a number of exterior materials which include cement board and batten siding, cement board siding, wood clapboard siding, stucco and a standing seam metal roof. According to the Guidelines for New Constructions 3.A.i., materials that complement the type, color and texture of materials traditionally found in the district should be used. The proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. The applicant has proposed a standing seam metal roof. This is consistent with the roof materials found throughout Lavaca and is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.iii. 1. In regards to architectural details, the applicant has proposed to incorporate various aspects of the neighborhood into the design of the new construction all while not mirroring or replicating them. The applicant has proposed simple details with complementary and traditional materials that are in kind with those found throughout Lavaca, however staff finds that the contemporary windows, carport and deck structure and cantilevered front porch roof should be redesigned to incorporate more traditional features that are existing to the neighborhood and district.
- m. According to the provided floor plans, the applicant has proposed to place mechanical equipment at ground level on the sides at the rear of each unit. The applicant has proposed to screen each unit with wood fencing. The placement as well as screening of each unit is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A.i. and 6.B.ii.
- n. The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan, however the renderings note that at this time the applicant is proposing to xeriscape the front yard. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.ii and 3.B. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines in regards to landscape design prior to returning to the HDRC.
- o. The applicant has proposed two driveways on the property, one for each unit. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.iii. in regards to driveway width and alignment. Staff recommends that the applicant use a semi pervious paving material.

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval at this time based on findings a through o. Staff recommends that the applicant resolve the following prior to returning for conceptual approval:

- i. Address the overall scale as it relates to adjacent historic properties.
- ii. Emphasize the front entrance through the reduction in mass of the carport or through the use of traditional materials and front porch design as mentioned in finding c.
- iii. Address the use of a parapet on the front façade which obscures the front gable as mentioned in findings e and f.
- iv. Resolve the design issues preventing three distinct façade segments as mentioned in finding g.
- v. Provide a detailed landscaping plan identifying each landscaping material that is to be used.
- vi. That the applicant provide an additional site plan annotating the dimensions of the proposed driveways and walkways in relationship to the yard and property lines.
- vii. That the applicant consider pervious paving solutions and place turf in the front yard.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to refer to DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**12. HDRC NO. 2015-116**

Applicant: Mike Reiland/Budget Signs

Address: 2800 Broadway

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

- 1. Install a monument sign at the corner of Broadway and Humphreys. The base for the monument sign will be limestone and will be approximately three (3) feet tall, one (1) foot wide and fifteen (15) feet long. Mounted on the limestone base will be 3.3 inch tall letters which read "San Antonio's Museum for Kids".

2. Mounted above this will be the featured sign for the museum which is approximately 8' – 6" at its widest point and approximately 5' - 0" at its tallest. The cabinets for the internally illuminated sign will be five (5) inches deep with one (1) inch aluminum retainers with no seems. The cabinets will be painted and feature returns with white 3/16" acrylic faces with applied translucent vinyl. The letters themselves will be reverse cut vinyl.

3. Install 6, double sided 3' – 0" wide by 9' – 0" tall opaque vinyl digitally printed banner signs that are to mounted on light poles at various locations throughout the Doseum campus.

4. Install three (3) perforated aluminum panels that are to be painted silver metallic. The first panel is measure approximately 14' – 0" in length and approximately 5' – 4" in height. Mounted on this panel in approximately 4' – 4" tall purple channel letters will be the word "LEARN". The second panel is to measure approximately 14' – 0" in length and approximately 4' - 4" in height. Mounted on this panel in approximately 2' – 6" tall green channel letters will be the word "EXPLORE". The third panel is to measure approximately 14' – 0" in length and approximately 4' – 9" in height. Mounted on this panel in approximately 2' – 9" tall channel letters will be the word "CREATE".

5. A signage master plan.

**FINDINGS:**

a. This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on March 24, 2015. At that meeting, committee members expressed concern over the design of the monument sign, particularly the use of channel letters and the proposed lighting design.

b. The applicant has proposed to install a monument sign at the corner of Broadway and Humphreys. The base for the monument sign will be limestone and will be approximately three (3) feet tall, one (1) foot wide and fifteen (15) feet long. Mounted on the limestone base will be 3.3 inch tall letters which read "San Antonio's Museum for Kids". Above this limestone base, the applicant has proposed to install the "THE DOSEUM" signage which is 8' – 6" at its widest point and approximately 5' - 0" at its tallest. The cabinets for the internally illuminated sign will be five (5) inches deep with one (1) inch aluminum retainers with no seems. The cabinets will be painted and feature returns with white 3/16" acrylic faces with applied translucent vinyl. The letters themselves will be reverse cut vinyl. Given the clash between the limestone base, the vinyl internally illuminated channel letter and the design of the primary structure on the site, staff finds that the proposed monument signage is not consistent with the UDC Section 35- 678(c)(1). An aluminum sign with reverse lit channel letters would be more consistent with the three proposed perforated signs that are to read "LEARN", "EXPLORE" and "CREATE".

c. Along Broadway and Humphreys the applicant has proposed to install 6 double sided 3' – 0" wide by 9' – 0" tall opaque vinyl digitally printed banner signs that are to mounted on light poles at various locations throughout the Doseum campus. Each banner is to be at least ten (10) feet above street level. This proposal is consistent with the UDC in regards to sign design and placement 35-678(c). Due to the size of the site, staff finds that the request for additional signage is appropriate as specified in UDC Section 35-678(e)(1).

d. The applicant has proposed to install three perforated aluminum signs that are to read "LEARN", "EXPLORE" AND "CREATE". These signs are designed to address Humphreys, are constructed of materials that are complementary of the primary structure. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-678(c). Due to the size of the site, staff finds that the request for additional signage is appropriate as specified in UDC Section 35-678(e)(1).

e. The applicant has provided a master signage plan that shows the placement of the above requested signage, directional signage and various site signage such as parking. This request for a master plan for signage is appropriate and consistent with the UDC. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-678(f) in regards to additional signage that is allowed that is not included in the total signage area.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on findings a and b. Staff recommends that the applicant consider an aluminum sign to be more consistent with the proposed perforated aluminum signs. Staff recommends approval of items #2 through #5 as submitted based on findings c through e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to approve as submitted.

**AYES: Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Guarino, Lazarine**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

April 1, 2015

9

**13. HDRC NO. 2015-109**

Applicant: Arturo Rivera

Address: 1115 S. St. Mary's

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

1. Install three parking spaces in the front yard of the property.
2. Install a semi-circular driveway in the front yard of the property.
3. Replace the existing fence with a white picket fence.
4. Install entrance and exit signage.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The house located at 1115 S St Mary's includes the designation of Historic Significant, is a contributing structure to the King William Historic District and is currently zoned Commercial 2. Currently, the property features a concrete driveway located on its north side which leads to the rear of the house where there is currently parking for approximately eight (8) vehicles. Along the front (east) of the property at the side walk and along the drive way on the north side, there is an existing wrought iron fence.

b. The applicant has proposed to install a circular drive and three additional parking spots that will be on the southern side of the front yard. The applicant will use the exiting curb cut on the north side of the site and will add one (1) new curb cut on the south side of the site for exiting vehicles. The existing curb cut is approximately ten (10) feet in width. The applicant has proposed for the new curb cut and driveway to be approximately twelve (12) feet in width. Circular driveways are not typically found in historic districts, are not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements and disrupt the existing front of lot pattern found along S St Mary's at other historic structures. Staff does not recommend approval of the circular driveway. The new driveway should be straight and should be ten (10) feet wide.

c. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. regarding off-street parking, parking areas for non-residential and mixed-use structures should be located at the rear of the site, behind the primary structure to be hidden from the public right of way and should be accessed by secondary street or alleys. The applicant has proposed to place three parking spaces in the front yard of the property to be accessed by the proposed circle drive that provides access to the site from S St Mary's. Front parking is not recommended by the Design Guidelines, but if approved given the circumstances, staff recommends that the applicant utilize a pervious paving system.

d. Along the front (east) of the property at the side walk and along the drive way on the north side, there is an existing wrought iron fence. The applicant has proposed to remove the wrought iron fence from the front of the property at the side walk and replace it with a white, wood picket fence. The Guidelines for Site Elements 2.A.ii. states that only deteriorated sections of fences that are beyond repair should be replaced. If the existing wrought iron fence along the front of the property were replaced, the applicant would have the new, wood picket fence in the front and the existing wrought iron fence on the side along the existing driveway. Staff recommends that the applicant modify the existing wrought iron fence to accommodate the proposed semi-circular drive.

e. The applicant has noted that entrance and exit signage is to be installed with the proposed circular driveway, but has not specified the design of these signs nor the location. The applicant should provide staff with more information regarding the proposed signage to ensure that it is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on finding c. If the HDRC approves the proposed front yard parking, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant screen the proposed three front yard parking spots with landscaping that will make them less noticeable from the public right of way. The applicant should refer to the Guidelines for Site Elements and coordinate with staff on the landscaping materials that are to be installed.
- ii. That a semi-pervious material such as river rock or decomposed granite be installed at the location of the three parking spots.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant install a straight driveway to be ten (10) feet wide.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #3 based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant have one continuous fencing material on the site.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4 at this time. The applicant should provide staff with more information regarding the proposed signage to ensure that it is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to refer to DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**14. HDRC NO. 2015-107**

Applicant: Bryan Penn

Address: 801, 803, 809, 815 S. St. Mary's

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

1. Install a wrought iron fence on the property.
2. Create 9 new window openings and install 9 new windows into the existing east façade.
3. Create 3 new window openings and install 3 new windows into the existing north façade.
4. Create 1 new door opening and install 1 new door into the existing east façade as well as transoms above the existing single width doors.
5. Install festoon patio lighting with new metal supports.
6. Create 8 new window openings and install 8 new windows into the existing west facade.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 801 S St Mary's, also known as the King William Professional Building was constructed circa 1970, according to the King William Neighborhood Historic Resources Survey and is located at the corner of S St Mary's and Madison in the King William Historic District. This property received Historic Tax Certification on September 4, 2013, for roof replacement, the cleaning of the brick façade and exterior painting.
- b. The applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence on the rear (southwest) side of the building to enclose a proposed outdoor patio. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements B., new fences should appear to be similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character and should be composed of materials that are complementary of those of the primary structure and other fences throughout the district. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. The applicant has proposed to create 9 new window openings in the east façade that front S St Mary's. Currently, the east wall features no windows. Due to this structure's relatively young age, staff finds that the creation of eight new window openings along this wall as well as the installation of those windows is appropriate. Staff recommends that the applicant provide more information regarding window fenestration and the materials of the proposed windows and adhere to the Historic Design Guidelines 10.A.ii. and iv.
- d. The north façade of the structure forms a unique corner at the intersection of S St Mary's and Madison where the applicant has proposed to create three new window openings as well to install three windows. Staff finds that the placements as well as size of these windows is appropriate.
- e. The applicant has proposed to create a new door opening and install a new door to match the two existing single width doors on the east façade. In addition to install the new door, the applicant has proposed to install transoms over the two existing single width doors. Due to the non contributing nature of this structure, staff finds these additions to be appropriate.
- f. The applicant has proposed to install festoon lighting in the outdoor patio area where the proposed wrought iron fence is located. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new light fixtures should be placed in a location that does not distract or damage the primary building's façade or any façade elements. The proposal to install festoon lighting is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. The applicant has proposed to create eight new window openings in the west facade that fronts Madison Street. Currently, the west wall features no windows. Due to this structure's relatively young age, staff finds that the creation of eight new window openings along this wall as well as the installation of those windows is appropriate, however, staff does not find that the proposed size of the windows on the west façade are appropriate. Staff recommends that the applicant

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #5 with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant coordinate with staff on the materials and fenestration of the proposed windows on the east and north facades as well as the proposed doors and transoms.
- ii. That the proposed wrought iron fence be no taller than four (4) feet tall at any location.

April 1, 2015

11

iii. That the proposed metal pole supports for the outdoor patio festoon lighting match the wrought iron fence in appearance.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #5. Staff recommends that the applicant redesign the proposed new west façade arrangement to include window size and placement more consistent with that of the proposed east façade.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to refer to DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2015-008**

Applicant: Daniel Vela/VDF Properties LLC

Address: 121 E. Carolina

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

1. Remove existing window and door openings.
2. Create additional window and door openings.
3. Repair and replace damaged siding and trim to match the existing.
4. Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant was issued a stop work order on December 11, 2014, for performing work outside of the scope of the Certificates of Appropriateness that had been issued. Staff performed a site visit on December 16, 2014 and found that the original wood windows had been removed, new vinyl windows had been installed, original windows openings had been enclosed, new window openings had been created and much of the original siding had been removed.

b. This case was heard by the HDRC on February 18, 2015. At that meeting, the request was withdrawn by the applicant in order to return with accurate construction documents of both the existing façade arrangement and the proposed façade arrangement. The applicant has since received Administrative Approval for the repair of the original wood windows that were removed.

c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, façade materials that are in good condition or that can be repaired in place should not be removed. The applicant has removed much of the existing wood siding and trim, which is not consistent with the Guidelines, however the applicant has proposed to replace the wood siding that has been removed to match the remaining original siding. The proposal to replace the removed siding to match the existing is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.iii.

d. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that existing window and door openings should be preserved. The applicant has removed a number of the original wood windows and has proposed to close those window openings as well as remove two existing doors and close those door openings. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The applicant has met all of the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including interior photos and invoices.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on finding d. Staff recommends approval of items #3 and #4 based on findings c and e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**16. HDRC NO. 2015-111**

Applicant: David Alvidrez

Address: 517 E. Houston St.

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

1. Restore the existing plaster on the Houston Street (south) façade.
2. Clean and restore the brick on the Peacock Alley (north) façade.
3. Restore the scupper, downspout and down leader on the Peacock Alley façade.
4. Restore the existing painted signage on the Peacock Alley façade.
5. Install bent aluminum cladding on the Houston Street façade.
6. Install clear insulated glass on the Houston Street façade.
7. Install a glass canopy on the Houston Street façade.
8. Install white frosted glass on the Houston Street façade.
9. Create a new door opening on the Peacock Street façade at the northeast corner of the building.
10. Replace the existing wood windows on the Peacock Street façade.
11. Alter the depth of the existing storefront façade and entrance.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. A similar proposal to rehabilitate and remodel the exterior of 517 E Houston received conceptual approval on October 15, 2008, however that request was last heard by the HDRC on March 4, 2009, where final approval was not given. At that time, Office of Historic Preservation staff noted that many of the proposed alterations to the historic façade were not consistent with the UDC nor the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation.
- b. The applicant has proposed to restore the existing plaster façade which fronts E Houston as well as to restore the existing rear brick façade which fronts Peacock Alley. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2. A. and 2.B. and 10.B.ii.
- c. The applicant has proposed to restore the scuppers, downspouts and down leaders of the existing gutter system. While those that are currently on the façade are not historic, their repair is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 4.A.
- d. The applicant has noted in the application materials that the existing signage on the Peacock Alley façade which reads "SOL FRANK Company" is to be restored. While not original to the façade, this signage has historic value and should be restored with the restoration of the brick façade. This request is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.B.i. and ii.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i. regarding commercial facades, new façade elements that alter or destroy the historic building character such as inappropriate materials should not be added. The applicant's proposal to install bent aluminum, clear insulated glass and white frosted glass on the Houston Street façade is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. The applicant has proposed to remove the recessed storefront entrance that is original to the Houston Street façade and consistent with the facades of other Houston Street buildings and replace it with a new storefront entrance that would be flush with the street wall. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.i., character defining features such as entryways should be preserved. The applicant's proposal to alter the existing recessed entrance is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. Per a photograph dated October 2007, the Houston Street façade at 517 Houston featured a canopy which projected approximately eight (8) feet out over the sidewalk, which has since been removed. The applicant has proposed to install a projecting steel and glass canopy which is to extend over the sidewalk approximately five (5) feet and feature three sections to correspond with the entrance way and the proposed white frosted glass. While a replacement canopy would be appropriate on this façade and on Houston Street, the applicant's proposed canopy is not due to its profile and materials. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii. states that new canopies should be based on accurate evidence of the original, the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached.
- h. The applicant has proposed to create a new door opening on the Peacock Alley façade of the building where an existing window is currently located. The applicant has also proposed to reconfigure the size of the existing window. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. in regards to openings, all existing window and door openings should be preserved. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing windows on the Peacock Alley façade, which are currently covered by plywood and replace them with new windows, of which a material hasn't been specified. According to the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved. When replacing broken glass, the color and clarity of the replacement glass should match the original historic glass. The applicant's proposal to replace the existing windows is not consistent with the Guidelines.

April 1, 2015

13

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 as submitted based on findings b through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant restore the existing plaster and brick without removing any original, existing architectural detailing or elements from the building.
- ii. That the applicant restores the existing ghost sign to match the existing in color, size and font.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #5 through #11 based on findings e through i.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to refer to DRC.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- 17. Amendments to Article VI of the Unified Development Code relating to the use of digital signs

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to recommend approval.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Salas, Judson, Feldman, Lazarine**

**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 5:45 P.M.

APPROVED

  
Michael Guarino  
Chair

