

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
JANUARY 7, 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, Zuniga, Connor

ABSENT: Valenzuela, Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2014- | 1011 E. Houston |
| 2. Case No. 2015-006 | 1721 E. Houston |
| 3. Case No. 2015-005 | 227 Daniel |
| 4. Case No. 2015-003 | 415 E. Locust |
| 5. Case No. 2015-002 | 302 Cedar |
| 6. Case No. 2015-001 | 630 E. Guenther |
| 7. Case No. 2015-004 | 223 Devine |
| 8. Case No. 2014-082 | 206 W. Woodlawn |
| 9. Case No. 2014-081 | 1722 E. Houston |
| 10. Case No. 2014-080 | 122 Gorman St. |
| 11. Case No. 2013-343 | 519 Roosevelt |
| 12. Case No. 2015-011 | 214 W. Rosewood Ave. |
| 13. Case No. 2015-013 | 115 E. Travis |
| 14. Case No. 2014-387 | 606 Nolan |

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2014-407

Applicant: Rich Hall

Address: 109 E. Rosewood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove four (4) existing windows located on the rear of the building located at 109 E. Rosewood. The windows will be replaced with wood double hung windows that will be painted to match the existing. The existing screens will be reused and reinstalled over the proposed new windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The proposed replacement windows are not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A. iii. The guideline states that historic windows should be preserved and the proposed change would adversely alter the integrity of the structure by replacing the historic windows.

b. The applicant proposes to reuse and reinstall the existing historic screens. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance 6.A.iv., which recommends that historic screens be preserved.

c. The applicant has expressed concern to staff regarding the need to improve the energy efficiency of the house. However, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a house. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows and thermal shades. In most cases, windows may also be retrofitted with new glass. In general, staff encourages the repair of historic wood windows. A wood window that is maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan and cannot be repaired once they fail.

d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding a and c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to deny based on findings a and c.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

16. HDRC NO. 2015-010

Applicant: The Home Depot

Address: 153 Ostrom

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

Replace three, non-original wood windows on the rear and west façade of the house at 153 Ostrom.

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 153 Ostrom was constructed circa 1928 in the Craftsman style. The exterior materials have been modified over time. The original siding has been covered with asbestos siding, and many of the original windows have been replaced with either vinyl or aluminum.

b. According to Sanborn maps, the three windows to be replaced appear to be located on a rear addition. While the actual date of the addition is unknown, the windows appear to be circa 1950 construction. The windows are not visible from the street.

c. Generally, the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii. Recommend that historic windows be preserved. Staff encourages the repair of historic wood windows. A wood window that is maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan and cannot be repaired once they fail. In this case, staff finds that the existing windows have deteriorated to the point where replacement may be necessary.

d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., matching replacement windows are recommended when the original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. The proposed vinyl replacements are not consistent with the Guidelines in terms of materials. Wood replacement windows would be more appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of window replacement with the stipulation that wood windows are installed based on finding d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted based on findings a through d with the stipulation that that wood windows are installed based on finding d.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

17. HDRC NO. 2015-009

Applicant: Stephen Jackson

Address: 139 Thorain Blvd.

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

Construct a bathroom addition on the north (side) façade of the house at 139 Thorain. The addition will have a footprint of approximately 108 sf addition, a side gable and stone exterior to match.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 139 Thorain was constructed circa 1940. According to Sanborn maps, the existing porch configuration appears to be original, and the addition will impact an original portion of the house. The proposed addition will require the removal of four original window openings.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., residential additions should be positioned at the side or rear of the building whenever possible in order to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. While the proposed addition is located on the side of the structure, it is at a highly visible location towards the front of the house and will impact views from the right-of-way.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure. The proposed addition will result in the addition of a new gable on the north façade, obscuring the original roof form. This does not meet the intent of the Guidelines.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i., new additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass. The proposed addition projects past the original porch and side gable and is not subordinate to the structure. A rear addition or one that is located behind the existing side gable would be more appropriate.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2015-007

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 115 David Court

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the Building Standards Board (BSB) for the residential structure at 115 Davis Court. The City's Code Enforcement Division has determined that the wood frame residential structure at this address is deteriorated beyond repair and is recommending demolition of the structure per Chapter 6-156, subsections 5, 7, 8, 12 & 15.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 115 Davis Court was designated as a local historic landmark in 2003. The building is a good example of a bungalow form with Craftsman style detailing in the Mahncke Park neighborhood.
- b. This property was first identified by Code Enforcement and referred to the HDRC on January 18, 2012, for a recommendation to the Building Standards Board (BSB). Code enforcement recommended demolition at that time. The case was referred to an on-site meeting of the Demolition and Designation Committee. The committee recommended that the property be repaired and suggested that economic hardship would need to be proven for demolition. OHP staff also recommended that the property be repaired rather than demolished. Formal action was never taken by either the HDRC or the BSB.
- c. Code enforcement continues to recommend demolition to the BSB. The house at 115 Davis Court is deteriorated and is in need of substantial repairs, including foundation work, roof framing and general stabilization. In particular, there is a two-story rear addition that appears to be further deteriorated than the original portion of the house facing Davis Ct. While Code Enforcement staff does not distinguish the structures as two separate cases, staff finds that repairs to the original portion may be more feasible than the rear addition.

d. Demolition of a historic landmark constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of the City of San Antonio and should always be a last resort. Staff finds that repairs which will meet minimum requirements identified by Code Enforcement must be attempted first and estimates for such work must be provided for consideration by the HDRC. UDC Section 35-614 requires evidence pertaining to an economic hardship on the owner unless demolition is approved. Information pertaining to an economic hardship or evidence which indicates that repairs are not feasible has not been provided to the HDRC for its consideration.

e. If demolished as a public safety hazard identified by Code Enforcement, then UDC 35-615(c)(3)(iv) requires that , no application for a permit for a project on the property may be considered for a period of five (5) years from the date of demolition of the structure. Furthermore, a demolition permit shall not be issued until the appropriate fees which are outlined in UDC Section 35-614(e) have been collected.

Staff does not concur with code enforcement's recommendation for demolition. The original structure facing Davis Ct retains architectural integrity and the materials required by the Unified Development Code have not been provided.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Judson and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to recommend repairs be made to 115 Davis Ct.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Connor

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 4:30 P.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair