

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
MAY 20, 2015**

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

**PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Valenzuela**

**ABSENT: Salas, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |                              |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-111  | 517 E. Houston               |
| 2. Case No. 2015-119  | 310 Refugio                  |
| 3. Case No. 2015-186  | 921 Matagorda                |
| 4. Case No. 2015-193  | 1303 S. St. Mary’s           |
| 5. Case No. 2015-188  | 227 Florida St.              |
| 6. Case No. 2015-189  | 222 King William             |
| 7. Case No. 2015-190  | 125 Blue Star                |
| 8. Case No. 2015-197  | 504 King William             |
| 9. Case No. 2015-184  | 2115 W. Gramercy Place       |
| 10. Case No. 2015-185 | 1123 W. French Pl            |
| 11. Case No. 2015-149 | 600 Blk of Burleson at Olive |
| 12. Case No. 2015-195 | 501 E. Locust                |
| 13. Case No. 2015-165 | 132 E. Magnolia Ave.         |
| 14. Case No. 2015-200 | 202 E. Park Ave.             |
| 15. Case No. 2015-150 | 112 W. Magnolia Ave.         |
| 16. Case No. 2015-D03 | 215 N. San Saba              |

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: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Zuniga, Lazarine, Valenzuela**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**7. HDRC NO. 2015-190**

Applicant: Jim Bailey/Alamo Architects

Address: 125 Blue Star

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

Partially demolish a portion of building 125 at the Blue Star complex and construct a new 5 story mixed use development containing 25 studio, 1 bedroom and 2 bedroom units. The basement level, partially underground will consist of 19 parking spaces for tenant use. The first floor will contain 6,500 square feet of commercial space.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on May 11, 2015. At that meeting,

- b. The applicant has proposed to partially demolish Blue Star Building 125, which was constructed circa 1950. This structure is a part of the Blue Star National Register District, has fallen into disrepair and has become structurally unsound. Staff finds the applicant's proposal to partially demolish this section of building 125 appropriate given the proposed plans for new construction.
- c. The applicant has proposed to locate the parking structure on the ground and basement level of the structure, which will be partially underground. According to the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3), parking areas are to be screened and buffered from the view of public streets, the San Antonio River or adjacent residential uses. The applicant has proposed materials including stucco and aluminum storefront to screen the proposed parking garage from the public right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.
- d. 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, a change in materials and material color to fulfill this requirement.
- e. 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.
- f. 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 has noted the dumpster enclosures will be relocated and screened and that some mechanical equipment will be located on the roof. This is consistent with the UDC.
- g. 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 incorporated a series of windows, balconies and recessed façade planes that relate to interior spaces displaying a human scale through door openings. This is consistent with the UDC.
- h. 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, change material colors, use alternate roof lines, and use a series of recessed and projected wall planes to divide the façade. This is consistent with the UDC.
- i. The UDC Section 35-674 (c) addressed height issues in the River Improvement Overlay Districts. At a height of approximately seventy (70) feet tall in proximity to other multi story structures, the proposed multi-family proposal is consistent with the UDC.
- j. The materials that have been proposed by the applicant include aluminum windows, stucco, prefinished metal panels, aluminum storefront systems and metal guardrails. Each of the previously listed materials as well as their chosen colors are consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d).
- k. 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. The applicant has achieved this by incorporating a base of stucco, a midsection of prefinished metal panels, alternating wall planes, and varying façade colors and a cap which features a solid band of the metal siding that is uninterrupted by windows or other openings in each specific façade section.
- l. 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.
- m. While the primary use of this structure will be residential, there will be a commercial component featuring approximately 6,500 square feet of commercial space. The applicant has provided specific entries for each component and has included an open air stairwell that further provides emphasis to the entrance of the residential component. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(3).
- n. The applicant has proposed various planting areas around the proposed new construction. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(f) regarding plant materials.
- o. The property is within the Blue Star Industrial National Register District and the River Improvement Overlay District, is along the San Antonio River, and is in close proximity to a previously recorded archaeological site, 41BX2017. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area. All excavations must meet the requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Sections 35-630, 35-634, 35-675 and 35-606.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through o with the flowing 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 a detailed landscaping plan noting all materials that are to be used in the proposed courtyards prior to returning for final approval.
- iii. 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 Zuniga to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through o.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Zuniga, Lazarine, Valenzuela**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2015-194**

Applicant: Jim Bailey/Alamo Architects

Address: 422 Hays St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct four 1300 sq.ft. detached two story units on a vacant lot.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 12, 2015, at that time the Committee noted concern regarding square windows on primary façade and recommended adding a walkway to connect the private entrances with the public sidewalk.

b. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, front facades of new buildings should align with adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established. The proposed townhomes follow the setback pattern along Hays Street and are consistent with the guidelines.

c. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front façade of new buildings should be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. As presented, the unit closer to the street faces Hays Street while the units set behind face the sides of the lot. The proposed layout will maintain the continuity along Hays Street and is consistent with the guidelines. However, more clear definition on the location of entrances to units B-D should be incorporated.

d. As recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction, new buildings should be consistent with historic buildings in terms of building to lot ratio. New construction should be limited to no more than 50% of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. Although the project will have a higher density than adjacent properties, the building to lot ratio is still below 50%.

e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, materials that complement the type, color and texture of materials traditionally found in the district should be used. The majority of houses within the Dignowity Hill Historic District are clad in wood siding. The proposed cement board siding may be appropriate if proper dimension, finish and texture is used, however wood siding would be more appropriate.

f. Window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as nearby historic facades should be incorporated. Windows and doors should be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades as recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction. The proposed square windows are not consistent with the guidelines. In addition, large expanses of blank walls are not typical of historic facades and should be avoided.

g. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, while new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. Although the proposed front porch on unit A will relate to adjacent structures and is appropriate for its context, the proposed columns are out of scale and do not relate well to adjacent historic porches.

h. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should be similar to those used historically within the district. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. A 4ft tall chain link front yard fence exists at this location. Replacement with a 4ft tall wood post and wire fence is appropriate and consistent with the guidelines. However, no indication on height has been provided for fencing on the property.

i. As recommended by the Guidelines for Site Elements, front yard gardens should be maintained. The proposed turf and Asian Jasmine landscaping on the front of the property is consistent with the guidelines. However, no information on landscaping around units B-D has been submitted.

j. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, driveway configurations should match those historically found in materials, width, and design. In addition, historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. The majority of houses on this block of Hays Street do not have driveway access. The few driveways on this block are not wider than 10 feet and constructed of pervious materials. Installation of a pervious driveway instead of concrete would be more appropriate at this location.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a-j with the following stipulations:

- a. Clear definition for the entrances for units B-C is incorporated
- b. Fenestration pattern is revised to be consistent with historic facades
- c. The scale of the columns at unit A front porch is revised
- d. Information on height and location of proposed fences is submitted
- e. Landscaping information around units B-D is submitted for review
- f. The driveways are pervious and no wider than 10ft

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to grant conceptual approval with staff recommendations based on findings a through j.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Zuniga, Lazarine, Valenzuela**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Cone arrived at 4:50**

**18. HDRC NO. 2015-175**

Applicant: Ryan Schmidt

Address: 6709 Forest Village

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

**Item 1:**

Rehabilitate the existing structure and construct a bathroom addition of approximately 213 square feet to the north west corner of the residence.

**Item 2:**

Receive Tax Certification

**FINDINGS:**

- a) The existing structure is a designated historic landmark. The structure has been surveyed in part of the farm and ranch resource survey.
- b) The existing pressed metal siding will be removed to expose the original wood siding. The wood siding will be repaired as needed and will be painted, *Benjamin Moore* "Oxford Gray". This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A-B.
- c) Paint will be removed from the existing masonry walls using, "Prosoco SureKlean Paint Stripper and then clean surface with Prosoco SureKlean Limestone Afterwash. Improper cleaning methods and products can damage the surface of masonry. The use of any abrasive, strong chemical, sandblasting, or high-pressure cleaning method should be avoided. Care must be taken when removing paint from masonry as the paint may be providing a protectant layer or hiding modifications to the building. Use the gentlest means possible, such as alkaline poultice cleaners and strippers, to remove paint from masonry. The proposed products/methods appear to be consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A.iv. – 2.B.iii.
- d) The foundation will be leveled as needed to remedy separation issues near the stone wall. The skirting will also be patched and repaired as needed. This is consistent with 2.8.A

e) The existing windows are proposed to be partially replaced with the JeldWen Sitrine double hung sash kits – 4 over 4 true divided lite. JeldWen Sitrine picture window units will be installed in the existing screen porch. The walls in the existing breezeway will also be replaced with JeldWen Sitrine picture window units and swing patio doors. The existing trim and screens will be reused. The replacement windows will match the existing. It is recommended that windows be repaired not replaced. The proposed replacement windows are not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A-B.

f) 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. During the site visit, staff observed that there are likely other opportunities to improve the energy efficiency of the home. The original windows feature single-pane glass which is subject to radiant heat transfer. 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.

g) 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.

h) The proposed bathroom addition will have an approximate area of 213 square feet. The addition will be located at the rear of the structure. The siding will be wood. The roof will match the existing roof material, but the height will be lowered to delineate the new addition from the older additions. This is consistent with the guidelines for additions 1.A-B. and 3.A-B.

i) The existing milk shed outbuilding will be relocated to preserve both the structure and the 36" live oak tree the outbuilding sits under. The tree has grown very close to the shed and has the possibility of compromising the structure. The minor relocation and installation of new concrete piers is an appropriate action to preserve the structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for 9.A.i.

j) The existing fence will be replaced with a 4' post and welded fence. The proposed fence is consistent with the guidelines for site elements 2.A&B.

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of Item 1 and 2 with the exception of item e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff's recommendation based on findings a through k.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Valenzuela**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**19. HDRC NO. 2015-176**

Applicant: Paul Vidal

Address: 559 E. Huisache Ave.

Withdrawn per the applicant.

**20. HDRC NO. 2015-196**

Applicant: Mario Herrera

Address: 500 Kendall St.

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

1. Remove metal staircases on both sides. Paint exterior.
2. Demolish rear addition that is partially collapsed

3. Replace front porch columns with 10"x10" square wood columns and repair second floor porch railing.
4. Enclose two portions of each side of the house. The proposed cladding is hardi board.
5. Construct a rear addition
6. Enclose two windows on the north side

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The house at 500 Kendall first appears on Sanborn maps in 1911-1951. Prior to 1951, the house had a one story porch at the front and a one story rear addition. The map also shows two side extrusions, one that is tied onto the house located on the south wall and one that appears to be a later addition located on the north wall.
- b. The existing metal staircases to the sides are likely not original to the structure. Removal will not cause an adverse effect.
- c. The rear addition is likely not original to the structure. Removal will not cause an adverse effect.
- d. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, porch elements should be replaced in kind or with new elements that are compatible to the style of the structure. The proposed replacement columns are consistent with the guidelines.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, side porches and original architectural details should not be obscured by enclosure materials. The existing wall offset on the south side appears to be original to the house and should be preserved. The existing wall offset on the north side is likely a later addition and modifications to this element will not impact the historic portions of the house.
- f. As recommended by the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should be located at the side or rear of the building, use a similar roof form and a setback or recessed area to provide clear distinction between old and new. The proposed addition is in keeping with the guidelines in location and roof form, however the walls of the addition will align with the walls of the main house and will not provide a clear separation between old and new.
- g. Consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, materials that match in type, color and texture should be used. The proposed hardi board siding may be appropriate for this installation.
- h. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing windows and window openings should be preserved. The proposed windows to be infilled are located in the main portion of the house and are likely original to the structure. Filling in these windows is not consistent with the guidelines and should be avoided.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1-3. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings b-d.
4. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings a and e. Staff recommends the original portion of the house is preserved.
5. Staff recommends approval based on findings f and g with the following stipulations:
  - a. The siding is smooth and painted
  - b. The new additions are differentiated from the old
6. Staff does not recommend approval based on finding h. If the existing window pattern does not fit with the new interior layout staff recommends the windows are covered on the inside only so that the windows remain on the exterior.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Valenzuela**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Valenzuela left at 5:20**

**21. HDRC NO. 2015-182**

Applicant: Brad Westphall

Address: 130 Gramercy Pl. E.

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

1. Demolish a rear addition
2. Construct a new 2,259 sq.ft. two story rear addition. The proposed addition will be clad in stucco to match the house and will have fixed aluminum clad wood windows.
3. Replace three aluminum windows to the side of the house with aluminum clad wood windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The main house, designed by architect C.B. Schoepl was built in 1923 in the Prairie style. According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, the main structure is contributing to the district.
- b. The case was heard by the HDRC on May 6, 2015, at that time the project was referred to the Design Review Committee. The project was reviewed by the DRC on May 12, 2013, at that time the applicant presented revised drawings to reflect some of the recommendations received. The Committee noted the addition needs more expression and that wood windows should be used.
- c. The 1911-1951 Sanborn map shows a rear addition was built sometime after 1951. The proposed demolition will not cause an adverse effect to the historic structure.
- 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. The proposed addition will match the roof form of the historic structure which is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.
- f. 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 proposed addition is set in and will provide a clear distinction between old and new.
- g. 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 is consistent with the guidelines in footprint size. In addition, due to the size of the lot an appropriate yard to building ratio will be maintained.
- h. According to the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should incorporate design elements such as the shapes of window and doors openings similar to the main structure. The proposed new windows will retain a rectangular shape similar in proportions to the windows on the main house which is consistent with the guidelines. However, double hung windows to match the windows on the house rather than fixed windows would be more appropriate.
- i. Consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, materials that match in type, color and texture should be used. In addition, any new materials must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. The proposed aluminum clad windows may be appropriate if the correct type of window, profile and dimensions are used.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a-i with the following stipulations:

- a. The new windows are double hung and not fixed
- b. New windows are one over one instead of six over one
- a. The fenestration pattern on the rear elevation is revised to be more consistent with the fenestration pattern on the main house.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve option B.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2015-191**

Applicant: Sergio Duran

Address: 140 Lavaca St.

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

1. Install a new bay window to match the bay window shown in the 1900's historic photograph.
2. Replace the existing, damaged wood front porch decking.
3. Relocate an air compressor from the west side of the property to the east side of the property beside an existing compressor.
4. Install a new forty-eight (48) square foot addition to the rear of the house to express the original porch and extend the roof structure to create a wood pergola.
5. Paint the exterior of the structure white.
6. Remove the current plaster façade to expose the original stone façade at the rear, kitchen area of the house.
7. Restore the existing workshop accessory structure.
8. Construct a new covered carport with a standing seam metal roof.
9. Install a twelve (12) foot by thirty-three (33) foot swimming pool in the rear yard.
10. Install a new electric gate to match the existing wood gate.
11. Install a new door in an existing window opening on the south façade.
12. Construct a new cordova crème stone masonry wall at the rear of the property.
13. Replace the existing roof with a new wood shake shingle roof.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a new wood shingle roof. Given the period of construction of this structure as well as its architectural style and roof form, staff finds that a standing seam metal roof is more appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. In addition to this, it appears that in the historic photo that the applicant has provided, the house has a standing seam metal roof.
- b. The applicant has provided a photo showing a bay window that was once located on the north façade. The applicant has proposed to reintroduce this bay window to the house. The applicant's proposal to reinstall the bay window to match the historic window in terms of size, type, configuration, material and appearance is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B., materials that are beyond repair should be replaced with in kind materials. The applicant has proposed to replace the damaged wood porch decking and replace it with wood decking that is in kind to the original. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A. and B. additions to historic structures should be designed to be subordinate to the principal façade, complement the historic structure, include an appropriate footprint, materials and height. The applicant has proposed a forty-eight (48) square foot addition that in height and scale is subordinate to the façade of the primary structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. The structure currently features a plaster façade that is covering the structure's original stone façade. The applicant has proposed to expose the original stone façade at the southwest corner of the house where the kitchen is currently located. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B.iv., however staff suggests that the applicant consider removing the plaster from each facade wherever the structure's original stone façade is covered.
- f. The applicant has proposed to rehabilitate an existing accessory structure which features a standing seam metal roof and wood siding. This proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B. and 3.B.
- g. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., the massing and form of garages and outbuildings should be visually subordinate to that of the primary structure on the property, should relate to the period of construction of the primary, historic structure on the site and should contain a consistent setback and orientation found along the block with other accessory structures. The proposed carport features a wood frame with a standing seam metal roof and relates in size and context to both the existing accessory structure and the primary structure. This proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. The applicant has proposed to install a swimming pool in the rear yard that is to be screened from the pedestrian right of way by existing site elements including fences and accessory structures. The applicant's proposed location is appropriate for the Lavaca Historic District.
- i. The applicant has proposed to paint the existing structure as well as accessory structures Benjamin Moore Rice White. This is both consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations and an appropriate color for the location and architectural setting of the site.
- j. The Guidelines for Site Elements states that fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically throughout the district. The applicant has proposed to remove a portion of the existing wood privacy fence to install an electric gate that is to match the existing fence in materials and profile. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

k. The applicant has proposed to create a secondary entrance on the south façade where an existing window opening is. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. states that creating new primary entrances or windows should be avoided. Given the location of this proposed door on the south façade, staff finds its creation appropriate.

l. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a new wood shingle roof. Given the period of construction of this structure as well as its architectural style and roof form, staff finds that a standing seam metal roof is more appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. In addition to this, it appears that in the historic photo that the applicant has provided, the house has a standing seam metal roof.

m. The applicant has proposed to construct new Cordova cream stone masonry wall at the rear of the property. While the materials that the applicant has proposed complement those of the original, historic structure, the applicant's proposed height of the wall at approximately ten (10) feet tall is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii. regarding the height of new fences and walls.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #11 as submitted based on findings a through k.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #12 and #13 based on findings l and m. Staff recommends that the applicant explore the installation of a standing seam metal roof as well as the shortening of the proposed wall to no more than six (6) feet in height.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2014-371**

Applicant: Gabriel Martinez/Munoz & Co.

Address: 928 W. Commerce St.

Loss of quorum

**24. HDRC NO. 2015-187**

Applicant: Robert and Peggy Santos

Address: 2909 Mission Rd.

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

Install a ten to twelve foot sign due to obstruction from the six foot tall fence on the left side of the site's primary structure.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant has proposed to construct business signage displaying "Mission View Peggy's Taxes & Notary" and will include the business' telephone number. The applicant has proposed for the new signage to be approximately twelve (12) feet tall in order to be seen by automobile traffic. At the recommended height of six (6) feet, the applicant has noted that the proposed signage would be blocked by an existing on site fence.

b. The Guidelines for Signage states that each building will be allowed signage that is not to exceed fifty (50) square feet. The applicant's proposed signage is that displays "Mission View Peggy's Taxes & Notary" totals forty-eight (48) square feet on both sides, which is consistent with the Guidelines, however the design of this sign features a pole base that displays the address and is graphically presented in kind to the main sign which totals twenty-four (24) square feet bringing to total square footage of the proposed signage to seventy-two (72) square feet. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The applicant has proposed to install the new signage at the front of the property where it is to be oriented toward pedestrian traffic and located in the historically appropriate location. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 4.A.

d. The property currently features a six (6) foot tall wood privacy fence on the side that the applicant has noted will block any signage that is not taller than the height of the fence. According to the Guidelines for Signage 4.B.i. the height of signage should not exceed six (6) feet in height. The applicant's proposed height is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the height of the sign to become consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The applicant has not noted the specific materials of the proposed signage, however to be consistent with the Guidelines for Signage, the applicant should construct the proposed signage of durable materials such as wood, aluminum, wrought iron, steel and metal grill work.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through e. Staff recommends that the applicant provide more information regarding the proposed sign's materials, shorten the overall height of the proposed signage to no more than six (6) feet and reduce the total square footage to no more than fifty (50) square feet.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulation that the applicant provide staff with a pole sign that is no taller than seven (7) feet above grade and no more than fifty (50) square feet. Per the HDRC, staff may then issue an Administrative COA for the requested signage.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Laffoon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

- 25. MINOR AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 35 (UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE) OF THE CITY CODE OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, TO INCLUDE ONE ADDITIONAL SITE CONSIDERED ELGIBLE FOR A VIEWSHED PROTECTION DISTRICT.

**Withdrawn by the applicant.**

- 26. Review and Recommendation of HDRC Rules of Procedure and Subcommittee Assignments

**Postponed.**

- 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 6:00 P.M.

APPROVED

  
Michael Guarino  
Chair