

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
FEBRUARY 4, 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 Cone, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman, Connor

ABSENT: Zuniga, Valenzuela

- Chairman’s Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements
- Election of Officers

Shanon Miller, Historic Preservation Officer, opened up the nominations for HDRC Chair.

Commissioner Cone nominated Commissioner Guarino for Chairperson.

No other nominations for HDRC Chair. Nominations closed.

The vote was unanimous for Michael Guarino as Chairperson for HDRC.

Shanon Miller, Historic Preservation Officer, opened up the nominations for HDRC Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Feldman nominated Commissioner Connor for Vice-Chair.

No other nominations for HDRC Vice-Chair. Nominations closed.

The vote was unanimous for Michael Connor as Vice-Chair for HDRC.

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-045 | 454 Donaldson Ave. |
| 2. Case No. 2015-043 | 1918 Martin Luther King Dr. |
| 3. Case No. 2015-041 | 2131 W. Gramercy Place |
| 4. Case No. 2015-050 | 1005 Nolan |
| 5. Case No. 2015-047 | 3502 N. St. Mary’s |
| 6. Case No. 2015-044 | 633 S. St. Mary’s |
| 7. Case No. 2015-042 | 112 Lindell Place |

Item 7 was pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

7. HDRC NO. 2015-042

Applicant: Jim Bailey

Address: 112 Lindell

The applicant is requesting conceptual 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:Findings related to request item #1:

- a. 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.
- b. 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.
- c. 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.
- d. 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:

- e. 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.
- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. 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.
- j. 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.

k. 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.

l. 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 it reaches the front yard where the height will be reduced to 36"- 42" inches; this is consistent with the Guidelines. 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.

m. 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.

n. The applicant has not provided a tree survey nor coordinated with the Office of Historic Preservation regarding a detailed plan on the preservation of any heritage trees and the replacement of any trees that may be removed. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D. as well as the UDC Section 35-525 in regards to tree preservation. Species selection and planting procedure should be done with guidance from the City Arborist.

o. 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.

p. 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 are being considered 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.

q. 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.

r. The applicant has proposed to include three (3) 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.

s. This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on January 27, 2014. At that meeting, the Design Review Committee expressed that they did not have any concerns regarding the proposed design, however they did express concern over the need for a tree preservation plan.

t. 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 a through d.

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

i. That the applicant provide a tree survey identifying the location and species of all trees that may be affected by construction as well as a tree preservation plan.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

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

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

9. HDRC NO. 2015-021

Applicant: Michael Looney

Address: 706 E. Guenther St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: Construct a 10' x 20' shed at the east side of the property at 706 E Guenther. The back wall of the shed will be a part of the existing fence that abuts the parking area/driveway. The opening to the shed will face the backyard with a small overhang for rain protection. The materials will match the studio/shop structure (Hardie Board siding and a standing seam metal roof to match the existing house and studio/shop).

FINDINGS:

- a. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5 A, new garages and outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form, should be no larger in plan than forty (40) percent of the principal historic structure footprint and should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials. The proposed shed located at 706 E Guenther is noted to be 10' x 12' in size, approximately 10' feet in height and features complementary materials such as Hardie Board siding and a standing seam metal roof to match the existing house and garage. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- b. Historically, accessory structures found in the King William Historic District, particularly those found on lots along Guenther Street are located toward the rear of the property often behind the lot's principal building.
- c. The proposal to position the accessory structure in the side yard setback approximately thirty (30) feet from E Guenther does not match the predominant accessory structure orientation found along the block and is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5. B. i and ii. It would be more appropriate if the proposed accessory structure was located further to the rear of the lot or behind the principal structure to be less visible from the public right of way.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b and c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Laffoon to approve with the stipulation that the shed be concealed from the front.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

10. HDRC NO. 2015-038

Applicant: Syngman Stevens

Address: 619 Nolan

- 1. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the house at 619 Nolan
- 2. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the house at 621 Nolan.
- 3. The applicant is requesting Conceptual approval to construct a new two story house on each lot.

FINDINGS:

Item #1:

a. The property at 619-621 Nolan is associated with Captain William Holt which acquired the property by 1892. William together with his wife Sarah and sons Thomas and William Jr. lived at the family house on 621 Nolan. Frank Holt and his wife Emma occupied the house at 619 Nolan by 1895. Capt. Holt served as the civil service clerk at Fort Sam Houston for many years. Later he became alderman and also chancellor of the local chapter of the Knights of Pythias. During the time the family occupied the property, the site was venue to many family events including William Jr.'s secret wedding to Ida Zinsemeyer in 1891, Thomas' wedding to Katie Guon in 1897, William Jr.'s funeral after he died in a two train head on collision in 1896, and Thomas' funeral after he was murdered at a local bar in 1902. Frank and Emma occupied the house at 619 Nolan until Emma's death in 1912 when the house became a rental property. Sarah Holt occupied the house at 621 Nolan until 1924.

- b. Although the property was occupied by 1892, the Craftsman style of the house (which became popular in the early 20th century) indicates it was built at a later time. There are no Sanborn Maps available prior to 1904 for the area; however the 1904 footprint of the house at 619 Nolan is much smaller than the current structure. The 1911 map shows a similar sized structure to the 1904 footprint. The 1951 map shows a wider and much longer structure similar to the existing house. It is unknown if the original 1904 structure was enlarged or reconstructed. However, the Craftsman details on the house indicate it was built ca. 1900-1915.
- c. The house was identified in the Dignowity Hill Historic District survey as contributing based on its scale and materials. The house at 619 Nolan has been modified from its original condition including the enclosure of the front porch.
- d. A demolition request for the house at 619 Nolan was heard by the HDRC on June 4, 2014, at that time the request was referred to the Designation and Demolition Committee. The DDC performed a site visit to the property on June 11, 2014. Overall, the committee found that the structure was extremely deteriorated and had lost its significance. The committee recommended that, if demolition was approved, the materials be salvaged. The case was presented to the HDRC on June 18, 2014, and was postponed until the applicant could present a salvage plan. The case was set for July 2, 2014, but no action was taken by the HDRC since the case was postponed by the applicant. Staff performed a site visit to the property on April 2, 2014. At that time, staff found that the home is in a deteriorated condition, has undergone several modifications and various incompatible additions have been constructed.
- e. The request was heard again by the HDRC on January 21, 2015, at that time the case was referred to the Designation and Demolition Committee. The DDC visited the property on January 28, 2015. At that time the DDC found the house is severely deteriorated but that materials should be salvaged if demolition is approved.
- f. The 600 block of Nolan is generally intact. Only one vacant parcel existed on this block which recently became the site to a relocated house. This portion of Nolan serves as a gateway into the Dignowity Hill Historic District and should be protected.
- g. Although the home is in a deteriorated state, demolition of a contributing resource in a historic district should always be the last resort where a loss of significance has occurred or where repairs to the structure are found to be unfeasible, resulting in an unreasonable economic hardship as outlined in the UDC Section 35-614. The loss of a contributing building constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. A great number of demolitions have previously occurred within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, and this block of Nolan is especially threatened with future demolitions. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the owner must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in Sec. 35-614 (b) (3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:
- A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*
 - B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*
 - C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.*
- [In April of 2014, the applicant provided several construction estimates for repairs at 619 Nolan including foundation repair, replacement of damaged/missing floor boards, sheet rock, window repair, siding repair, painting, plumbing and electrical work, and roof replacement. This work is estimated to cost approximately \$130,000. A second estimate was submitted on January 21, 2015, estimating work to cost \$500,00. The property has not been made available for sale. Although rehabilitating this structure would be costly, staff does not find that an economic hardship has been proven.]
- h. According to Section 35-614, if demolition is approved the applicant must document all structures to be demolished and supply a set of prints to the historic preservation officer. The applicant shall also prepare a salvage strategy for reuse of building materials deemed valuable by the historic preservation officer. A salvage plan has not been provided by the applicant.
- Item#2:
- i. The property at 619-621 Nolan is associated with Captain William Holt which acquired the property by 1892. William together with his wife Sarah and sons Thomas and William Jr. lived at the family house on 621 Nolan. Frank Holt and his wife Emma occupied the house at 619 Nolan by 1895. Capt. Holt served as the civil service clerk at Fort Sam Houston for many years. Later he became alderman and also chancellor of the local chapter of the Knights of Pythias. During the time the family occupied the property, the site was venue to many family events including William Jr.'s secret wedding to Ida Zinsemeyer in 1891, Thomas' wedding to Katie Guon in 1897, William Jr.'s funeral after he died in a two train head on collision in 1896, and Thomas' funeral after he was murdered at a local bar in 1902. Frank and Emma occupied the house at 619 Nolan until Emma's death in 1912 when the house became a rental property. Sarah

Holt occupied the house at 621 Nolan until 1924.

j. Although the property was occupied by 1892, the Craftsman style of the house (which became popular in the early 20th century) indicates it was built at a later time. There are no Sanborn Maps available prior to 1904 for the area; however the 1904 footprint for the house at 621 Nolan remained generally intact until the 1950's, and appears to match the current footprint which indicates the house was built ca. 1904.

k. The house was identified in the Dignowity Hill Historic District survey as contributing based on its scale, materials and details. The house at 621 Nolan has suffered no major modifications and overall materials and features are intact.

l. The request first heard by the HDRC on January 21, 2015, at that time the case was referred to the Designation and Demolition Committee. The DDC visited the property on January 28, 2015. At that time the DDC found the foundation on the house is in extreme disrepair and repairs would be extensive and costly. The DDC also found that materials should be salvaged if demolition is approved.

m. The 600 block of Nolan is generally intact. Only one vacant parcel existed on this block which recently became the site to a relocated house. This portion of Nolan serves as a gateway into the Dignowity Hill Historic District and should be protected.

n. Although the home is in a deteriorated state, demolition of a contributing resource in a historic district should always be the last resort where a loss of significance has occurred or where repairs to the structure are found to be unfeasible, resulting in an unreasonable economic hardship as outlined in the UDC Section 35-614. The loss of a contributing building constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. A great number of demolitions have previously occurred within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, and this block of Nolan is especially threatened with future demolitions. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the owner must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in Sec. 35-614 (b) (3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;

B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;

C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.

[The applicant submitted an estimate for roof replacement at 621 Nolan. Work is estimated to cost \$39,000. No other repair estimates have been submitted by the applicant. The property has not been made available for sale. Staff does not find that an economic hardship has been proven.]

o. According to Section 35-614, if demolition is approved the applicant must document all structures to be demolished and supply a set of prints to the historic preservation officer. The applicant shall also prepare a salvage strategy for reuse of building materials deemed valuable by the historic preservation officer. A salvage plan has not been provided by the applicant.

Item #3:

p. Plans for the replacement of the structures at 619 and 621 Nolan have been provided by the applicant. The proposal includes constructing an identical house on each lot. According to Section 35-614 of the UDC, a demolition permit shall not be issued until all departments, boards and commissions have approved the replacement plans for the building, all applicable fees have been paid, and proof of financial means to complete the project are submitted. A demolition and building permit shall be issued simultaneously.

q. The proposed design for the new structure is compatible in orientation, height and setbacks to the surrounding buildings as recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction.

r. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, foundation and floor heights should align with adjacent historic structures. The proposed design sits low on the ground and does not have a similar foundation height to other historic houses on the street.

s. Roof forms including pitch, overhangs, and orientation should be consistent with those predominantly found on the block as recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction. Although there are a couple of houses that have hip roofs, the majority of the houses on the block have gable roofs. The proposed hip roof design is also not consistent with other hip roofs on the block in pitch and overhang depth.

t. The building footprint for new construction should be limited to no more than 50% of the total lot area consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. In general, houses on this block except those located at the corners do not occupy an area larger than 50% of the lot area. As presented, the design appears to occupy over 50% of the lot area which is not consistent with the guidelines.

u. No indication of roofing material or information on fenestration pattern and relationship of solid to void on the sides and rear elevations have been received.

1. Demolition of a contributing building in a historic district constitutes an irreplaceable and irreversible loss to the quality and character of the city of San Antonio and should be considered only when all other measures have been exhausted. While repairs may be costly, no evidence to support a finding of economic hardship has been presented. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1 based on findings a-h.

2. Demolition of a contributing building in a historic district constitutes an irreplaceable and irreversible loss to the quality and character of the city of San Antonio and should be considered only when all other measures have been exhausted. While repairs may be costly, no evidence to support a finding of economic hardship has been presented. Staff does not recommend approval of item 2 based on findings i-o.

3. If the demolition requested in items 1 and/or 2 is approved, staff recommends the following:

- a. The case is forwarded to the Design Review Committee and that the applicant presents additional information so that new construction is developed in accordance with the Historic Design Guidelines. This recommendation is based on findings p-u.
- b. A salvage plan is submitted for approval.
- c. Salvaged materials are incorporated in the new design.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Salas to refer to the Designation and Demolition Committee.

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

NAYS: Judson, Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED

11. HDRC NO. 2015-049

Applicant: Ruby Casteel

Address: 610 Nolan

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

1. Install a relocated metal fence in the front yard along the front and west property lines. The fence which currently measures approximately 6 ft. tall will be shortened to be 4 ft. tall. The proposed fence will have a 16 ft wide gate for a future driveway and a 5 ft gate for a future walkway.

2. Reconstruct front porch. The proposed porch will have a wood deck and a 3 ft tall railing.

FINDINGS:

a. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should not be installed where they did not historically exist, particularly in the front yard. Although many properties within the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature small yards which likely once contained front yard gardens, there is not strong evidence that indicates that front yard fences were common within the district. On this block of Nolan, three properties feature front chain link fences. A nearby property at the corner of Nolan and Hackberry features an iron fence that appears to be of historic age. An appropriately-designed front yard fence at this location would be consistent with the Guidelines.

b. The applicant is proposing to use fencing salvaged from another property and has submitted photographs for reference. Fences should appear similarly to those used historically within the district in terms of scale, transparency and character consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements. Although wrought iron fences are appropriate and found within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, the proposed fence does not match other existing fences in scale. The photographs submitted by the applicant indicate that the fence features thicker members that are more common to a commercial fence.

c. The applicant has indicated that a 16-foot vehicular gate will be located on the eastern edge of the property at an existing curb cut. Although plans for the driveway have not been submitted for review at this time, staff notes that there is precedent at this location for a six to seven foot driveway. A wider driveway may not conform to the Historic Design Guidelines.

d. The proposed front yard fence will be shortened to 4 feet tall. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, the height of new fences within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. Prior to the relocation of this house to its current site, the original porch had been replaced with concrete. The proposed wooden porch matches the architectural style of the building which is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. However, no detailed information on wood member dimensions or actual profile of the proposed railing has been presented by the applicant.

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1 as submitted based on findings a-d. Although a 4 ft. tall wrought iron fence may be appropriate at this location, the scale of the proposed fence is not in keeping with other residential fences in the district.

2. Staff recommends approval of item 2 based on finding e with the stipulation that final dimensions and profiles for porch members are submitted to staff for approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Salas and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve a 4 ft. tall fence as submitted. Approval of item 2 with staff stipulations.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED

12. HDRC NO. 2015-052

Applicant: Jed Davis

Address: 513 E. Houston

Reset to February 18, 2015

13. HDRC NO. 2015-051

Applicant: Braden Haley/OCO LPA

Address: 618 Live Oak

Postponed per the applicant.

14. Staff briefing on new FCC regulations and potential UDC amendments.

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

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

APPROVED

Michael Guarino
Chair