

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
APRIL 15, 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, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman
ABSENT: Zuniga, Rodriguez, Judson**

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-152 | 425 Burleson |
| 2. Case No. 2015-151 | 1033 Dawson |
| 3. Case No. 2015-148 | 1005 Hays St. |
| 4. Case No. 2015-146 | 133 E. Huisache |
| 5. Case No. 2015-125 | 815 Avenue B |
| 6. Case No. 2015-127 | 3755 N. St. Mary’s |
| 7. Case No. 2015-129 | 529 E. Craig Pl |
| 8. Case No. 2015-136 | 106 Alamo Plaza |
| 9. Case No. 2015-137 | 1102 S. Flores |
| 10. Case No. 2015-140 | 1403 N. St. Mary’s |
| 11. Case No. 2015-102 | 511 Adams St. |
| 12. Case No. 2015-143 | 8514 Mission Rd. |
| 13. Case No. 2015-042 | 112 Lindell Place |
| 14. Case No. 2015-134 | 555 Funston Place |
| 15. Case No. 2015-121 | 200 N. Park Blvd. |
| 16. Case No. 2015-133 | 9023 Bowen |
| 17. Case No. 2015-132 | 8601 Timber Path |
| 18. Case No. 2015-126 | 901 Rigsby |
| 19. Case No. 2015-123 | 220 Broadway |
| 20. Case No. 2015-122 | San Pedro Creek |
| 21. Case No. 2015-124 | 2046 W. Mistletoe |

Item 5, 6, 12, 13, 19 and 20 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, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman
NAYS: None**

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2015-125

Applicant: David Adelman
Address: 815 Avenue B

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Construct a 6 level 305 unit apartment structure bounded by the San Antonio River, Avenue B, 8th and 9th streets that is to include a 7 level parking garage and ground level retail space.

FINDINGS:

- a. The single-story brick structure at 815 Avenue B was constructed in 1929 and served as the Terminal Motorbus Garage. It was identified as a potential landmark in the 2010 River North Survey, but was not recommended by the HDRC at that time. This building and the adjacent non-historic buildings are eligible for demolition.
- b. 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 provided a site plan that has noted sidewalk connections across the property and has connected the various functions of the site in a coordinated system incorporating courtyards. This is consistent with the UDC.
- c. Currently, there is pedestrian access from the Riverwalk up to the 9th Street level via a pedestrian stair on the east side of the San Antonio River. According to the UDC, a connection should be provided from the street level sidewalk to the Riverwalk at cross streets and bridges. Given the size and location of this project, the applicant is responsible for providing pedestrian access from the street level sidewalk to the Riverwalk. In addition to this, the applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(l) regarding Access to the Public Pathway Along the River, particularly access to and from the site to the Riverwalk and connectivity with from the proposed development to the street level and Riverwalk.
- d. The applicant has noted two (2) curb cuts in the provided site plan; one for access to the parking garage and another for a loading access point. The applicant has also proposed to locate the proposed parking structure at the interior of the site where it will be wrapped by residential units and therefore screened from the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(b) regarding Automobile Access and Parking.
- e. Per UDC Section 35-672(c), an architectural focal point shall be incorporated in to the design of a structure located at a prominent curve in the river or at a prominent intersection where the street appears to terminate. The applicant has created a tower, used variations in roof shapes and has used changes in colors and materials to meet this requirement.
- f. The applicant has provided a study showing solar access to the San Antonio River with the proposed development. The applicant has met the UDC's requirements regarding solar access to the river and is consistent with the UDC.
- g. The applicant has oriented the structure in a manner that situates the primary entrance along 9th Street with secondary entrances at the interior of the site. The applicant has also proposed to incorporate a series of interior courtyards as well as courtyards that will connect the San Antonio River with the development. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(b).
- h. The UDC Section 35-673(c) provides guidelines regarding the preservation of the existing natural contours and distinct character of the San Antonio River. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.
- i. The applicant has noted that courtyards will be used to connect the proposed development to the Riverwalk. The applicant has also noted that each of these courtyards will incorporate various plantings. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(e)(f)(g) in regards to Landscape Design, Plant Materials and Paving Materials.
- j. The applicant has not specified a distinct lighting scheme at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to Lighting.
- l. Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen various mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. The applicant has not specified the exact location of all mechanical and service equipment, however the applicant should provide a method of buffering and screening any visually obtrusive equipment from the public right of way prior to returning for final approval.
- m. Bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO Districts. The applicant is responsible for providing bicycle parking in well lit and accessible areas on the site per UDC Section 35-673(o) and 35-526.
- n. According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a "human scale" which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed multiple components that achieve this which include projecting and recessed balconies, the positioning of the street façade on the block face, the use of different materials between lower, middle and upper floors and the use of a ground level store front façade. This is consistent with the UDC.
- o. For river and street facing facades in RIO-2 that are longer than fifty (50) long, additional steps must be taken to divide the façade. The applicant has proposed to change materials with each building module to reduce its perceived mass and to alternate the arrangements of windows and balconies to further divide the façade. This is consistent with the UDC.
- p. The UDC Section 35-674 (c) addressed height issues in the River Improvement Overlay Districts. At a height of approximately sixty (60) feet tall in proximity to other multi story structures, the proposed multi-family development is consistent with the UDC.

q. The materials that have been proposed by the applicant include various colors of brick, metal panels, fiber cement panels, burnished brick, stucco, a series of trellises and a standing seam metal roof. Each of the previously listed materials as well as their chose colors are consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d).

r. According to the UDC Section 35-764 (e), building facades located in the River Improvement Overlay must be organized into three distinct segments; a base, mid-section, and a cap. Through a change in materials, material colors, walls at the base of the building, projecting balconies, varying roof lines and materials at the various roof lines, the applicant has clearly separated the façade into three distinct segments and is consistent with the UDC.

s. In regards to window fenestration, the UDC Section 25-674 (2) states that windows help provide a human scale to a façade and therefore should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, they should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them, they shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and grouped to establish rhythms and that curtain wall systems should be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions. The applicant has provided information meeting each of these requirements.

t. While the primary use of this structure will be residential, there will be a commercial component featuring leasing space, space for various amenities, tenant lounges, a business center and restaurant space. The applicant created subordinate, unique entrances for each of these spaces that is appropriately scaled. River side entrances, where they exist are smaller in scale than the proposed street entrances. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(3).

u. According to the UDC Section 35-674 (4) the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façade. The proposed riverside façade features setbacks, variations in materials and incorporates courtyards into the design. This is consistent with the UDC.

v. The UDC Section 35-674 (f)(1) states that staircases to the river level shall be uniquely designed; they shall not replicate other stairs in a single project, they shall be constructed of handcrafted and traditional materials and they should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC when connecting the site and Riverwalk.

w. The UDC Section 35-675 states that an HDRC application for commercial development projects within a River Improvement Overlay district shall be reviewed by the city archaeologist to determine if there is potential of containing intact archaeological deposits. The applicant has provided the city archaeologist with information pertaining to the required archaeological investigation. All excavations must meet the requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Sections 35-630, 35-634, 35-675 and 35-606.

Staff recommends approval based on findings b through w with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant coordinate with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.
- ii. That the applicant provide information regarding the connection of the proposed development to the Riverwalk through accessible sidewalks as well as information regarding connecting the Riverwalk to 9th Street via a staircase on the west side of the river prior to returning for final approval.
- iii. That the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan noting all materials that are to be used in the proposed courtyards prior to returning for final approval.
- iv. That the applicant provide information regarding architectural and site lighting prior to returning for final approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff recommendations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

6. HDRC NO. 2015-127

Applicant: Mike Beaty

Address: 3755 N. St. Mary's

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

1. Demolish the existing, non-compliant ADA ramp at the north entrance which is not original to the structure.
2. Construct a new compliant ADA ramp at the south entrance.
3. Install a new door and window transom at the south entrance.
4. Install a new canopy at the south entrance.
5. Install lighting at the south entrance.
6. Designate new accessible parking spaces near the west façade of the structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to demolish an existing, non-original, non-compliant ramp on the north elevation of the structure and replace it with a new, compliant ADA ramp on the south elevation of the existing structure, which is closer to the proposed new accessible parking spaces on the site. The construction of the new, ADA ramp will also contain the construction of a new concrete stoop. The applicant has proposed to construct the new ramp and stoop of concrete, the material of the existing ramp and a material complementary to those of the existing structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 8.C.i. Staff recommends that the proposed new ramp be visibly separate from the existing, historic structure. Staff recommends a spacing of one (1) foot between the ramp and existing structure.
- b. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing steel door and replace it with a new metal door with side lights. The applicant has also prepared to replace the existing transom with a new transom with a matching profile. Due to the nature of the non original steel door and the fact that the applicant is not altering the size of the existing transom, staff find the replacement of both appropriate.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new canopies should be designed based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale and façade of the building to which they will be attached. The applicant has proposed for the new canopy to be approximately eight (8) feet in length and less than half of the height of the structure. The canopy’s color is to be complementary of the existing, historic structure. The applicant’s proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii.
- d. The applicant has proposed to install new safety lighting at the south entrance. The applicant hasn’t specified the design or scale of the proposed lighting, however, the Guidelines state that light should be directed downward and fixtures should be shielded to prevent light spill. The Guidelines for Site Elements 6. D. also states that appropriately scaled lighting for pedestrian walkways should be used. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements regarding lighting prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- e. The applicant has proposed to reposition the existing accessible parking from a location convenient to the north entrance to one convenient to the new, south accessible entrance. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant separate the proposed new ramp from the existing, original structure as to not damage or altar the structure in any way. Staff recommends at least one (1) foot of separation.
- ii. That the applicant provide information regarding the proposed site lighting.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff recommendations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED

12. HDRC NO. 2015-143

Applicant: Clay Hagendorf

Address: 8514 Mission Rd.

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

Construct a new parking lot at the Stinson Airport to replace an existing informal parking lot.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is proposing to construct a new parking lot to serve the Stinson Municipal Airport that will replace an informal lot in the same location. The applicant has proposed materials of asphalt, concrete, various shrubs, trees and other planting materials, decomposed granite and river rock.
- b. The applicant has proposed two curb cuts to provide automobile access to the proposed parking lot. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1) regarding automobile parking and curb cuts.
- c. The applicant has provided a landscaping plan which includes a tree preservation plan, specifics on planting materials and information regarding the buffering and screening of parking from the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3).
- d. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 5, Guidelines for Site Elements, planting should be incorporated into the design when rock or gravel is used in place of a lawn area. The applicant has proposed to provide xeriscape planting at locations shown in the provided site plan including decomposed granite and river rock at various curb locations. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements. In regards to appropriate plant material, the applicant is to comply with the UDC Appendix E: San Antonio Recommended Plant List—All Suited to Xeriscape Planting Methods.
- e. The UDC Section 35-675 states that an HDRC application for commercial development projects within a river improvement overlay district shall be reviewed by the city archaeologist to determine if there is potential of containing intact archaeological deposits. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2015-042

Applicant: Jim Bailey/Alamo Architects

Address: 112 Lindell Place

The applicant is requesting a conceptual approval for approval to:

- 1. Rehabilitate the existing structure at 112 Lindell place.
- 2. Construct a two story building housing six residential units along the corner of Woodlawn Avenue and Lindell Place.

FINDINGS:

- a. The rehabilitation and new construction currently proposed at 112 Lindell Pl has been heard by the Design Review Committee on two separate occasions. The first, on January 27, 2015, focused on the proposed design and concerns of the neighborhood. The project was heard a second time on March 24, 2015, where the Design Review Committee reviewed an updated site and landscaping plan which addressed many of the issues that were voiced at the February 4, 2015, Historic and Design Review Commission meeting.
- b. The proposed rehabilitation and new construction at 112 Lindell was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 4, 2015. At that meeting, a number of individuals from the River Road Neighborhood Association voiced their concern over the proposed design, the possibility of additional traffic and the preservation of the existing tree canopy. The applicant has since addressed each of these issues at the Design Review Committee at the deferment of the HDRC.

Findings related to request item #1:

- c. The existing structure at 112 Lindell was constructed circa 1950 and includes additions that have been subsequently added. These additions include a rear addition on the east façade, a patio addition on the north façade, a consecutive front porch on both the west and north sides and a swimming pool located north of the patio addition. The applicant is proposing to alter the existing structure by removing each of the additions and restoring the original façade of the structure.
- d. The existing structure has a façade of stucco covered masonry. The applicant has proposed to keep this existing façade as well as make the necessary repairs to restore it to its original state. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Alterations 2.B.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3, the original shape, line, pitch and overhangs

of historic roofs should be preserved as well as other distinctive roof features and vents. The applicant has noted that the original roof features will be preserved which is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has proposed to reroof the existing structure with a standing seam metal roof. Currently, the structure features an asphalt shingle roof. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. states that metal roofs should only be used on structures that historically have a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. While this structure historically would not have had a metal roof, staff finds that the use of a metal roof is appropriate in this setting.

f. With any substantial rehabilitation of a historic property, all original window and door openings, as well as historic windows and doors should be preserved. Where the original windows and doors are no longer in place, or are damaged beyond repair, the applicant should replace those windows with windows that are in kind and typical of the architectural style of the building. The applicant has proposed to preserve all existing window and door openings which is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i,ii,iii. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B. in regards to any replacement windows or doors that are needed.

Findings related to request item #2:

g. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A., front facades of new buildings should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings and should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has oriented the north façade of the proposed structure to align with the existing homes found along E Woodlawn. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. The proposed structure, while at two stories in height shares a similar height to other structures found in the near vicinity, notably the multi-family residence across E Woodlawn from the proposed structure. The applicant has aligned the floor heights of the proposed structure with that of the existing house on the property, implemented a series of variations in building massing and has utilized the use of a standing seam metal roof to provide a visual transition and a variation in scale of the proposed structure. This consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A in regards to scale and mass.

i. The applicant has noted that the proposed structure will feature a similar roof form, pitch, overhang and orientation as that of the existing house as well as others found in the River Road Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.

j. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.D. in regards to lot coverage state that new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. Furthermore, the Guidelines state that the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the total lot area unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The square footage of the lot is 11, 979. The square footage of the proposed new construction is approximately 2,600 square feet. The total proposed lot coverage of the new structure and rehabilitated structure is 5,559 square feet. The proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.

k. The applicant has proposed to use materials that consist of stucco, shake siding, painted 4 inch lap siding, wood for the construction of a trellis, wood columns, a standing seam metal roof and welded wire mesh on a steel frame to serve as screening and railing at balconies and stairways. These proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A. in regards to the use of new materials.

l. The proposed structure features a series of architectural features related to both the massing and form as well as the proposed materials that provide historic context and complement the other structures in the River Road Historic District. The use of modern materials are presented in a contemporary manner and are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.

m. The applicant has noted that the mechanical equipment for the proposed new construction will be located on the roof. The applicant has also noted that the proposed parapet has been designed to not only completely screen the mechanical equipment from the public right of way, but to also provide noise abatement. The proposed location and screening methods of the mechanical equipment are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and 6.B.

n. The applicant has proposed to construct a privacy fence along the east side of the property. The applicant has noted that the proposed fence will be six (6) feet in height until and will not progress to the front yard. The applicant will be responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2. B. and C. in regards to the final design and materials of fences and walls.

o. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A. only native xeric plant materials that thrive in local conditions should be introduced. See UDC Appendix E: San Antonio Recommended Plant List – All Suited to Xeriscape Planting Methods, for a list of appropriate materials and planting methods.

p. The applicant has provided a tree survey locating all existing trees on the property including an anaqua tree located on the north side of the property which the applicant has proposed to preserve. This is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D. as well as the UDC Section 35-525 in regards to tree preservation. Future species selection and planting procedure should be done with guidance from the City Arborist.

q. The proposed driveway currently is noted to be 12' – 0" wide, which is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B. The applicant has noted that a providing a driveway with a width that is keeping with the neighborhood precedent is a goal. Staff recommends that the applicant further explore ways to provide a driveway that is consistent with what is historically found in the neighborhood.

r. The applicant has noted that while the curb cut apron at the street is required by code to be concrete, a series of pervious materials have been proposed for site paving in order to accommodate vehicles. This is consistent with the

Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i. and ii. in regards to paving materials.

s. The applicant has proposed on-site parking for eleven (11) vehicles. The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. and B. in regards to off-street parking state that parking areas should not be added within the front yard setback, off-street parking should be accessed from alleys or secondary streets rather than from principal streets whenever possible and that off street parking should be screened. The proposed parking is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Design Guidelines in regards to permeable materials as well as the proposed parking structure.

t. The applicant has proposed to include two (2) ADA dedicated parking spaces to be accessible from the alley. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements 8. A., B., and C. in regards to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance.

u. The UDC Section 35-675 states that an HDRC application for commercial development projects within a river improvement overlay district shall be reviewed by the city archaeologist to determine if there is potential of containing intact archaeological deposits. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC as well as Sections 35-630, 35-634 and 35-606.

1. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the rehabilitation of the existing structure noted in item 1 based on findings c through f.

2. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed new construction based on findings e through s with the following stipulations:

i. That the excavations meet all requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Article 6, Sections 35-630, 35-634, 35-675 and 35-606.

Jim Bailey, Alamo Architects, Daniel Ortiz, David Beyer, and Chris presented the case for 112 Lindell Place.

Raleigh Wood, spoke in opposition.

Donna Martin, spoke in opposition.

Anna Ramirez, spoke in opposition.

Ed Piner, spoke in opposition.

Darla Piner, spoke in opposition.

David Brogan, spoke in opposition.

Barbra Witte-Howell, spoke in opposition.

Janet Deedle, San Antonio Conservation Society, spoke in support of staff recommendation.

Sally Buchanan, submitted a letter for the record.

Cliff and Bebe Waller submitted a letter for the record.

Lily Lewis, spoke in opposition.

Buck Benson, presented on behalf of River Road.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve approve with stipulations: 1. That the owner's team makes due diligence to meet with the neighborhood in person regarding their concerns over the current proposal. 2. That the applicant attend the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2015-123

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 220 Broadway

The applicant is requesting review and concurrence of the nomination of the Travelers Hotel at 220 Broadway Street to

the National Register of Historic Places.

FINDINGS:

- a. As a participant in the CLG Program, the City of San Antonio's chief elected official, the mayor, and the local historic preservation review commission, board or committee must comment on properties nominated to the National Register of Historic Districts within their jurisdictions.
- b. This application will be considered by the State Board of Review on May 16, 2015.
- c. The nomination is provided in the exhibits for this request.
- d. The building is nominated to the National Register under Criterion C in the area of Architecture, as a distinctive midrise budget hotel within the central business district, with a period of significance extending from its construction in 1914 through the completion of the 7th floor, c.1928.

Staff recommends concurrence with the nomination of the Travelers Hotel at 220 Broadway Street to the National Register of Historic Places.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Feldman

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2015-122

Applicant: Steve Tillotson

Address: San Pedro Creek/Various Downtown Locations

Reset to May 6, 2015.

22. 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. The Demolition and Designation Committee visited the property on April 8, 2015. At that time the committee agreed that demolition would be an option if materials were salvaged and original details such as vertical battens at the gable were incorporated into the new design. The committee also noted that the garage structure is set on the ground and the existing slab was poured around it sometime after it was constructed.
- d. 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.
- e. 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.

f. 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.

g. 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.

h. New construction in historic districts should be complementary to historic structures found throughout the district. The applicant's proposal exhibits various details that are not consistent with the primary structure on the lot and therefore are not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction which includes issues with the eave and rafter details and the design of the attic vents.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve as submitted on 4/15/15.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2015-094

Applicant: Aurora Morales

Address: 1203 E. Crockett

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

1. Build a 30x6 ft porch across the front elevation of the house and install an extra window on the front facade
2. Install a front door

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 1203 E. Crockett first appears on Sanborn maps in 1911-1924. The Craftsman style house originally had a wraparound porch on the southwest corner. Sometime after 1952, the porch was enclosed and the front door was relocated to a gabled wing. The reintroduction of a front porch was recommended by the HDRC as a way to mitigate for some of the previous alterations. New front porches are typically not recommended in locations for which there is no historic precedent. However, given the circumstances in which the former porch was enclosed by a previous owner, and that the current owner is seeking to restore the façade to a more historical appearance, a new porch may be appropriate.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 10, 2015. The committee member present worked with the applicant to design a porch that followed nearby examples. The committee recommended that the number of columns should be reduced to three, that the porch roof be a simple shed originating below the existing roof eaves, and that a double window be installed where the former door was located in order to balance the façade. The applicant was agreeable to those recommendations. Options for the porch skirting were also discussed.

c. The case received conceptual approval on February 18, 2015 with the stipulations that the number of columns be reduced to three, the porch roof be a simple shed originating below the existing roof eaves, and that a double window be installed where the former door was located in order to balance the façade.

d. The case was heard by the HDRC on March 18, 2015. At that time the HDRC recommended the design was revised and the case was withdrawn by the applicant. The DRC reviewed the request again on April 7, 2015. The committee noted that presentation drawings were much improved and recommended including a detail on the column and railing design. The committee also recommended adding a wooden screened door over the existing door as a possibility to resolve the door issue.

e. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing window openings should be preserved. In addition, non-historic windows should be replaced with new windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Although the proposed window modifications will alter the existing window opening, this opening is not of historic age and the proposed enlargement will not cause an adverse effect. However, the proposed multi-light windows are not typical of the Craftsman style and are not consistent with the guidelines. Using one-over-one wood windows would be more appropriate.

f. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new porches should be constructed based on

accurate evidence of the original. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building. The proposed design is consistent with the guidelines.

g. The Guidelines for New Construction recommend that new facades align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established. The proposed front porch appears to align with adjacent houses and is consistent with the guidelines.

h. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations recommend that doors are replaced in-kind when possible when deteriorated beyond repair. The proposed front door is not in keeping with the architectural style of the home and is not a commonly found type of door in a historic district.

1. Staff recommends approval of item 1 based on findings a-g with the stipulation that the new windows are one over one wood.

2. Staff does not recommend approval of item 2 as submitted based on findings h. Staff recommends that a historically appropriate front door is installed or that a wooden screen appropriate for the style of the house is used instead.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2015-087

Applicant: Diane Hays

Address: 138 E. Hollywood Ave.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish existing small rear addition.

2. Construct a 1,395 sq. ft. rear addition. The addition will be clad in stucco to match the color of existing brick. It will have composition roof that will match the existing in type and material.

3. Garage modifications to include: create two garage bays in the front elevation and enlarge existing opening to accommodate larger vehicles, create a rear garage door opening to allow access to alley and construct new apron, and construct new trellis in front of the garage.

4. Repair existing driveway and expand width of driveway near garage entrance.

FINDINGS:

a. The main house and garage, designed by architect Will N. Noonan were built in 1925 in the Colonial Revival style. According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, both structures are contributing to the district.

b. The existing small rear addition is likely not original or of historic age. Demolition will not cause an adverse effect to the historic structure.

c. The case was presented to the HDRC on March 6, 2015. At that time, the project was referred to the Design Review Committee. The DRC reviewed revised plans on March 24, 2015. The DRC noted that the applicant had addressed the previous concerns but that brick should be toothed back into the façade.

d. Consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should be located at the side or rear of the building to minimize views from the street. The proposed addition is set back behind the main house and is in keeping with the guidelines.

e. According to the Guidelines for Additions, a setback or recessed area should be utilized to provide a clear distinction between the old and the new. The addition is set back from the original house consistent with the guidelines. In addition, the proposed stucco cladding on the new walls will provide a clear distinction between old and new.

f. The Guidelines for Additions recommend that the footprint should respond to the size of the lot, an appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within the districts, and residential additions should not double the footprint of the existing building. The proposed addition will add approximately 1395 sf. to the existing footprint of approximately 2003 sf. Although the addition is consistent with the guidelines in footprint size, the lot to building ratio will be much lower than adjacent properties.

g. Materials that match existing in type, color, and texture should be used according to the Guidelines for Additions. The proposed stucco is consistent with the guidelines.

h. Consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. Architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style and are simple in design should also be used. The proposed detailing will match the existing details on the house but will have a simplified design to clearly differentiate old and new.

- i. According to the Standards for Rehabilitation #10, new additions should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired. As presented, construction of the proposed addition will include the removal of several original brick walls which should be preserved if possible.
- j. The front of the existing garage has been previously modified by enclosing the original door opening. The proposed changes to the door openings will not cause an adverse effect and are in keeping with the style of the main house. Consistent with the guidelines, new garage doors should be compatible with those found on other garages in the district. The proposed front garage doors are consistent with the guidelines.
- k. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, creating new entrances on a façade visible from the public right of way should be avoided. Although the proposed new rear garage door will face the alley and will not be highly visible, the installation of the door will significantly impact the rear elevation of the historic garage, including the removal of a large portion of original brick wall and should be avoided.

- 1. Staff recommends approval of item 1 as submitted based on finding b.
- 2. Staff does not recommend approval of item 2 as submitted based on findings c-i. Staff recommends the following:
 - a. The footprint of the addition is reduced to allow for a similar building to lot ratio of adjacent properties
 - b. Existing brick walls are incorporated into the new layout and removal of historic features such as windows as walls is minimized
- 3. Staff does not recommend approval of item 3 as submitted based on findings j-k. Staff recommends the modifications to the front elevation only.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of item 4 as submitted.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted on 4/15/15.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2015-083

Applicant: Clint Belew

Address: 1011 S. Main Ave.

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

- 1. Construct an addition to both the first and second levels of the existing structure. The applicant has proposed for the addition to include 231 square feet on the first level and 256 square feet on the second level for a total of 487 square feet.
- 2. Add 1 new window on the north side of the house in the kitchen area.

FINDINGS:

- a. This project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 10, 2015. At that meeting, the Committee noted that the applicant should ensure that the new gable be appropriate in height and that the new siding and other materials match the existing materials of the original structure. The applicant has received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate an existing addition on the south side of the house. All materials used in the rehabilitation of the existing addition will match those of the original structure.
- b. The applicant’s proposed additions consists of the addition of 231 square feet on the first level on the rear (west) side of the house and the addition of 256 square feet on the second level on the rear (west) side of the house. The lower level addition will house a utility room and will be adjacent to the covered patio that is approximately 50 square feet. The second level addition will contain both a bedroom and bathroom and will project toward the rear (west) of the property and will be located in the proposed gable.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Additions, residential additions should be constructed at the side or rear of the original structure, designed to be in keeping with the existing structure, utilize and similar roof pitch, form, overhand and orientation and clearly show a transition between the new and old structures. The applicant has proposed the addition at the rear of the existing structure, has designed the addition in a manner that is appropriate with the historic context of the neighborhood, has utilized a similar roof form and has noted details that will differ slightly to distinguish the addition from the original structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The applicant has proposed to construct the second level addition at the rear of the existing structure and has designed it in a manner that is subordinate and opposite of the principal façade, has an appropriate footprint and is consistent with the height of the existing gable roof. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i,ii,iv and v in regards to scale, massing and form.

e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i, materials that match the existing, historic structure in type, color and texture should be used when constructing an addition. The applicant has proposed to use siding that matches the existing in size and color as well as wood windows to match those of the original house. This is consistent with the Guidelines. The Guidelines for Additions 3.A.ii states that new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. The applicant has also proposed to construct the metal roof to match the existing. The metal roof panels should be 18” to 21” in width, include seams that are 1” to 2” in height and have no ridge cap vent or end cap. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

f. The applicant has proposed to enclose two existing window openings and to replace them with one larger window opening. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i, existing window openings as well as historic windows themselves should be preserved. The applicants request to remove two existing windows and to eliminate those openings is not consistent with the Guidelines.

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on findings a through e.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to Approved with stipulations: No windows are to be added or removed. The applicant withdrew request item #2.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2015-147

Applicant: Lisa Pastrano

Address: 721 Hays St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install solar panels on the side and rear portions of the roof.

FINDINGS:

a. According to the Guidelines for Additions, solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch to minimize visibility from the public right of way. As proposed, the panels on the north east corner of the house will be highly visible from the street which is not consistent with the guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on finding a. Staff recommends that the location of the panels is revised to minimize view from the street.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

27. HDRC NO. 2015-135

Applicant: Ntando McIntosh

Address: 932 Burnet St.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to install a 24ft x 28ft two story three car garage with a 750 sq.ft. studio above. The proposed structure will have wood siding and windows to match the house.

FINDINGS:

a. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, new garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal structure in height, massing and form. The proposed garage will be taller than the

main house and will overpower the historic structure.

b. The Guidelines for New Construction recommend that new outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40% of the principal structure footprint. According to BCAD records, the main structure is approximately 1740 sq. ft. The proposed structure exceeds 40% of the total square footage of the main house by over 200 sq.ft.

c. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, garages should relate to the period of construction of the main house through the use of complementary materials and details. Although the proposed garage will use wood siding to match the house, some of the proposed details including the placement of quoins at the corners and arched windows are not consistent with the Folk Victorian style of the house.

d. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, new garages should match the predominant garage orientation found along the block. Although this block of Burnet does not have a consistent pattern for location and access of garages, access through the side street on a corner lot is commonly found within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. However, typically these garages are aligned with the side street so that the doors face the curb.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings a-d. Staff recommends the size is reduced and the design revised to be consistent with the guidelines.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Salas, Feldman, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2015-150

Applicant: Michael Higgins/Green Star Solutions

Address: 112 W. Magnolia

Withdrawn by applicant.

29. HDRC NO. 2015-149

Applicant: Pam Carpenter

Address: 600 Block of Burleson at Olive

Withdrawn by applicant.

30. HDRC NO. 2015-141

Applicant: Travis Jeakins/Woodbine Development

Address: 114, 130, 134 Soledad St., 140 E. Houston

Withdrawn by applicant.

31. HDRC NO. 2015-131

Applicant: Luna Architecture + Design

Address: 720 N. St. Mary's

Withdrawn by applicant.

32. HDRC NO. 2015-130

Applicant: Ann McGlone/Ann Benson McGlone, LLC

Address: 1009 S. Alamo

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to: Restore the old Isaac Maxwell Studio at 1009 S Alamo. The

restoration includes the following requests:

1. The replacement of rotten wood features to match the existing.
2. New rear wood siding on the rear to differ in profile from the original, existing siding.
3. Restore all but three wood windows and replace missing window elements.
4. Install a new standing seam metal roof on the rear of the structure.
5. Repair the wood post and beam foundation on the western and rear additions.
6. Replace a non original door and door opening with a wood window.
7. Paint the stucco and wood portions of the façade.
8. Install a new ADA ramp at the rear of the structure.
9. Install new parking at the rear of the site.
10. Create a courtyard in the front yard to the west of the site.
11. Remove two windows in the storage room at the rear of the structure along the driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to replace all rotten and severely damaged wood elements existing throughout the project with new wood elements to match the existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.ii. and iii.
- b. At the east, rear of the structure the applicant has proposed a washroom that currently features a façade with wood siding and stucco. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing wood siding and stucco and to re-clad the façade with new wood siding to match the original. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.i. states that materials that are in good condition should not be removed and should be repaired in place. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood and stucco and only replace the wood siding elements that are beyond repair.
- c. The applicant has proposed to restore all of the existing wood windows and replace any missing window sashes or other original wood elements with new wood to match the existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. The applicant has also proposed to remove two existing aluminum windows on the east façade and replace those with matching wood windows. This is also consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations state that metal roofs that are to be replaced should be replaced with new metal roofs that have panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, crimped ridge seam that is consistent with the historic application, a low profile ridge cap and should use the standard galvalume finish. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guideline regarding the proposed roof replacement.
- e. The applicant has proposed to repair the existing post and beam foundation on the western and rear additions. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.
- f. The 1877 addition currently features a door opening that at one time was occupied by a window. The applicant has proposed to remove this door and replace it with a window to match the structure's existing windows. The applicant has noted that a door at this location is not original and was created in this location due to a second business being located in the rear of the primary structure. While the installation of the non original door is historic, staff finds that the applicant's request to return the structure's original state is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. The applicant has proposed to paint all existing and new wood siding and stucco. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.A.iv. and 2.A.i.
- h. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements regarding ADA Compliance, applicants should design ramps and lifts to compliment the historic character of the building and be visually unobtrusive, should screen ramps with appropriate landscape materials and should minimize the damage to the historic character and materials of the existing structure. The applicant has proposed to locate the ADA ramp at the rear of the structure which is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is responsible for specifying the materials and screening of the ramp prior to returning for final approval.
- i. The applicant has proposed to install ten (10) parking spots in the rear of the lot, including one handicapped parking spot. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, the preferred location for non-residential and mixed-use structures is at the rear of the site, behind the primary structure to hide them from the public right of way. The Guidelines also state the permeable parking surfaces should be used whenever possible. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i. and 7.B.ii. The applicant will need to seek a variance for lacking the required amount of off street parking for commercial zoning.
- j. The applicant has proposed to create a courtyard in the front yard to the west of the site that is proposed to contain a sloped sidewalk and a front yard fence, however has not provided a landscaping plan specifying which landscaping materials should be used. The applicant has noted that a landscape architect will be hired and a landscaping plan will be provided prior to returning for final approval.
- k. The applicant has proposed to remove two existing windows as well as close the existing window openings in the proposed dishwashing area. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., existing window and door openings should be preserved as well as the historic windows that occupy those openings. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the applicant maintain the existing openings and restore the existing wood windows.

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

- i. That the applicant repair the existing wood and stucco siding on the rear addition rather than removing and replacing it with new siding. If the replacement of the existing façade elements is necessary, staff recommends that the applicant salvage the existing wood siding.
- ii. That the applicant maintain the original, existing window openings in the proposed dishwashing area and restore the existing wood windows.
- iii. That the applicant provide information on materials incorporated with the proposed ADA ramp and landscaping materials as well as a detailed landscaping plan.

Staff recommends that the applicant explore the benefits of Historic Tax Incentives and submit a Tax Certification application when requesting final approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to Approved as submitted with the following stipulations: 1. That the applicant keep the window in the first addition. The applicant was given conceptual approval to remove the window in the second addition as well as the existing siding that has been proposed to be removed.

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 7:30 P.M.

APPROVED


Michael Guarino
Chair

