

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
MAY 5, 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, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**  
**ABSENT: Laffoon, Salas**

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1. Case No. 2014-374  | 3801 Broadway                              |
| 2. Case No. 2015-154  | 345 S. Alamo                               |
| 3. Case No. 2015-156  | 1001 Burnet St.                            |
| 4. Case No. 2015-139  | 236 Barrera                                |
| 5. Case No. 2015-131  | 720 N. St. Mary’s                          |
| 6. Case No. 2015-153  | 3501 Broadway                              |
| 7. Case No. 2015-174  | 120 9 <sup>th</sup> Street                 |
| 8. Case No. 2015-170  | 338 Madison                                |
| 9. Case No. 2015-167  | 434 S. Alamo                               |
| 10. Case No. 2015-109 | 1115 S. St. Mary’s                         |
| 11. Case No. 2015-107 | 801, 803, 809, 815 S. St. Mary’s           |
| 12. Case No. 2015-158 | 431 King William                           |
| 13. Case No. 2015-169 | 434 Adams St.                              |
| 14. Case No. 2015-172 | 524 E. Guenther                            |
| 15. Case No. 2015-173 | S. St. Mary’s at Cesar E. Chavez           |
| 16. Case No. 2015-161 | 106 W. Rosewood Ave.                       |
| 17. Case No. 2015-159 | 506 Lamar St.                              |
| 18. Case No. 2015-157 | 515 Hays St.                               |
| 19. Case No. 2015-168 | 606 Nolan                                  |
| 20. Case No. 2015-179 | 1600 Buena Vista St.                       |
| 21. Case No. 2015-180 | 1610 Buena Vista St.                       |
| 22. Case No. 2015-171 | Donaldson at Kampmann – Thespian Island    |
| 23. Case No. 2015-122 | San Pedro Creek/Various Downtown Locations |
| 24. Case No. 2015-162 | 1115 Mission Rd.                           |
| 25. Case No. 2015-160 | 311 Shannon Lee                            |
| 26. Case No. 2015-181 | 700 W. Commerce St.                        |
| 27. Case No. 2015-165 | 132 Magnolia Ave.                          |
| 28. Case No. 2015-092 | 223 E. Summit                              |

Item 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 23, 27, and 28 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**2. HDRC NO. 2015-154**

Applicant: Michael Beaty  
Address: 345 S. Alamo/418 Villita St.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to reconfigure the perimeter wall and entrance to Maverick Plaza in the La Villita Historic District.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. In general, the proposed improvements will increase visibility between the plaza and the street edge and improve the pedestrian experience at this location.
- b. The present-day wall along South Alamo was constructed circa 1970 and is a non-contributing element to the La Villita Historic District. Its alteration or partial removal will not have a negative impact to the integrity of the district. This is consistent with UDC Section 35-643(i).

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a and b.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**10. HDRC NO. 2015-109**

Applicant: Arturo Rivera

Address: 1115 S. St. Mary's

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

- 1. Install a new driveway that is to lead from an existing parking lot at the rear of the property to S St Mary's Street. The applicant will also create an additional curb cut.
- 2. Replace the existing wrought iron fence with a new, white picket fence.
- 3. Install entrance and exit signage.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The house located at 1115 S St Mary's includes the designation of Historic Significant, is a contributing structure to the King William Historic District and is currently zoned Commercial 2. Currently, the property features a concrete driveway located on its north side which leads to the rear of the house where there is currently parking for approximately eight (8) vehicles. Along the front (east) of the property at the side walk and along the drive way on the north side, there is an existing wrought iron fence.
- b. This request was heard by the HDRC on April 1, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 7, 2015, where committee members stated that the proposal of a straight driveway with no front yard parking was an appropriate solution.
- c. The applicant has proposed to construct a driveway of crushed granite that is to extend from the existing rear parking lot to the front yard where an additional curb cut will be needed for access to S St Mary's. The applicant has proposed for the new curb cut to be ten (10) feet in width to match the existing. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i. states that historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet and that a similar driveway configuration regarding materials, width and design should be used that would be historically found on the site. The applicant has proposed a paving system of crushed granite for the proposed driveway. The applicant's proposal for an additional driveway is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements. Staff's recommendation for approval of the proposed driveway as well as curb cut is in regards to the historic context of the property, not zoning. The applicant is responsible for complying with all zoning regulations regarding the proposed additional curb cut.
- d. Along the front (east) of the property at the side walk and along the drive way on the north side, there is an existing wrought iron fence. The applicant has proposed to remove this existing wrought iron fence and to install a new, white picket fence along the east and north sides to match the existing white picket fence that exists on the south side of the property. This request is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.
- e. The applicant has noted that entrance and exit signage is to be installed with the proposed circular driveway, but has not specified the design of these signs nor the location. The applicant should provide staff with more information regarding the proposed signage to ensure that it is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff and the HDRC with more information regarding the proposed signage.
- ii. That the proposed white picket fence is no taller than four (4) feet tall at any location.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**11. HDRC NO. 2015-107**

Applicant: Bryan Penn

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

Withdrawn per the applicant.

**12. HDRC NO. 2015-158**

Applicant: Nathan Perez – Ford, Powell & Carson Architects

Address: 431 King William

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: Complete various exterior modifications to an accessory structure at 431 King William that was constructed in 1985. The applicant has not proposed to modify the historic structures on the site. The applicant is requesting approval to:

1. Construct a ground level brick paved porch.
2. Remove a portion of the existing rear roof and construct a second level balcony addition.
3. Apply smooth textured stucco over the accessory structure's non-historic stone veneer.
4. Replace the existing hip roof dormer roofs with simple gable roofs.
5. Install a new standing seam metal roof to match the existing and replace rotten roofing elements with new materials.
6. Construct a plaster garden wall and small storage room on the east side of the garage to screen the pool and mechanical equipment from view.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The existing two story garage at 431 King William was constructed in 1985 and currently features a large rear balcony roof which faces the yard and swimming pool, a standing seam metal roof and stone veneer. The applicant has proposed various façade alterations to this structure to reduce the amount of contrast between it and the primary structure on the property.
- b. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing standing seam metal roof, replace rotten roofing elements and install a new standing seam metal roof to match the existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi.
- c. The applicant has proposed to construct a ground level porch addition to both the north and west sides of the garage. The proposed porch addition will be approximately nine (9) feet by thirty (30) feet on the north side and approximately four (4) feet by twenty (20) feet on the west side and will feature brick pavers to match those of the existing porch that the proposed porch will join. Given the size of the overall lot, the age of the existing garage, staff finds that the proposed ground level porch addition is appropriate. The proposed material of brick is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii regarding materials.
- d. Currently, the garage features a second story balcony that features a roof covering. The applicant has proposed to remove this roof covering at the second level and construct a balcony addition that will provide covering for the proposed ground level paved porch. The proposed balcony will be supported by wood columns and will include wood railings, both of which will match those of the original house. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.ii and 5.A.iii.
- e. The applicant has proposed to alter each of the existing hip roof dormers and to reconstruct them as gable roof dormers. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., garages and outbuildings should contain architectural details that are simple in form and complementary of the primary, historic structure on the site. Staff finds the applicant's proposal to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

f. The existing façade of the garage currently features stone veneer that's intentional purpose was to mimic the stone of the primary, historic structure. The applicant has proposed to apply a layer of stucco over this stone veneer to improve its appearance as well as create a distinct separation in materials from it and the primary structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.ii.

g. To the west of the existing garage, the applicant has proposed to construct a plaster covered CMU wall that is to span from the proposed brick paved walkway to the proposed garden storage room; approximately thirty (30) feet in length. The applicant has proposed for the wall to be eight (8) feet in height. According to the UDC Section 35- 314(c)(1), no fence in any side or rear yard is to exceed a height of six (6) feet. Staff recommends that the applicant lower the height of the proposed garden wall to six (6) feet.

h. The applicant has proposed to construct a garden storage building that is to be eight (8) feet in length and width. The applicant's proposed materials include a standing seam metal roof, a plaster covered façade and an aluminum gable vent that is to be painted. The overall height of the proposed garden storage building is to be approximately fourteen (14) feet in height. According to the Guidelines for New Construction for Garages and Outbuildings, new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principle historic structure, should relate in character to the principle historic structure and should contain similar or complementary architectural details. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #6 as submitted based on findings a through g with the following stipulation:

i. That the applicant lower the height of the proposed fence to no taller than six (6) feet.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve items 1 – 6 based on findings a through g with the stipulation that the applicant lower the height of the proposed fence to no taller than six (6) feet.

**AYES: Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Guarino**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2015-122**

Applicant: Steven Tillotson

Address: San Pedro Creek/Various Downtown Locations

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the redevelopment of the 2.2 mile section of San Pedro Creek that course from Fox Tech High School through downtown, to the vicinity of the old stockyards. The following design concepts are proposed:

1. Modify the channel to contain the 100-year floodplain within the San Pedro Creek banks. Advance urban watershed and water quality management practices to ensure the safety and sustainability of the natural environment located within the urban core.
2. Develop and restore the creek as a linear urban pocket park with emphasis on establishing an intimate scale relationship between people and the creek. The existing channel infrastructure will be repurposed and reused to respect its historical context.
3. Landscape – The program includes areas of aquatic, riparian, and upland plantings to improve water quality and wildlife habitats. Streets, sidewalks, paths, and transportation routes will be incorporated to connect new nodes of attractions along the Creek path to other pedestrian intersecting areas.
4. Design Components - Many of the existing non-contributing bridges will be replaced or altered. Pavilions will be constructed to shelter public spaces. The pavilions will be the only formal building type within the boundaries of the creek. Public art and site interpretation will be woven throughout the various aspects of the project utilizing and articulating cultural art and craft that is unique to San Antonio.
5. Public Spaces - The landscape is proposed to be portioned into six different areas of varying character: Villa Lagunilla, Salon de Alameda, Agua Antigua, El Merodeo, Canal Principal, and Capo Abajo.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The 2.2 mile section of San Pedro Creek that courses from Fox Tech High School through downtown to the vicinity of the old stockyards is subject to a flood control and improvements project funded by the County of Bexar and administered by the San Antonio River Authority.

May 5, 2015

5

- b. The proposed conservation and redevelopment along the San Pedro Creek responds to both the natural and urban setting surrounding the creek. The proposed improvements have been organized to allow for pedestrian interaction and have conceptually proposed nodes of public areas of exceptional quality that will respond to the unique character of the San Pedro Creek, (significant natural resource) as well as the City of San Antonio's unique culture and history. This is consistent with UDC Section 35-642(a) & 643.
- c. Approximately two-thirds of San Pedro Creek is a structured channel with the lower portion within grassy banks. About half of the structure portion of the creek courses between stone masonry and concrete walls. The City Archaeologist has reviewed the project.
- d. The project was reviewed by the DRC April 7, 2015
- e. Proposed areas where bridges or existing creek walls will be removed, care should be taken to document the items.

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through e with the stipulation that all of the excavations meet the requirements mandated by state and federal agencies, specifically with regard to archaeological resources.

#### COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Cone to grant conceptual approval based on findings a through e with the stipulation that all of the excavations meet the requirements mandated by state and federal agencies, specifically with regard to archaeological resources.

**AYES: Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Guarino**

#### THE MOTION CARRIED

##### 27. HDRC NO. 2015-165

Applicant: Terry Moore

Address: 132 E. Magnolia

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Restore the front porch, add a new front door, and repair existing front steps and handrail.
2. Repair windows, siding and foundation.
3. Reconstruct stair alcove to the side of the house and remove existing metal stair.
4. Replace roof with new shingles and install new gutters.
5. Repair the existing driveway, remove a concrete walkway on the east side of the property, and remove a chainlink fence at existing driveway.
6. Install new wood deck at the rear of the house.
7. Reconfigure window and door openings.

#### FINDINGS:

- a. According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, the house at 132 E. Magnolia was built in 1912 in the Neoclassical style by architect Ernest Behles.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, porches should be reconstructed based on photographs or the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. The house at 132 East Magnolia is very similar in configuration to the house at 124 East Magnolia. The proposed changes to the front porch and front door are consistent with similar to the front porch at 124 East Magnolia, however the style of the proposed columns is not typical of the Neoclassical style. Simplified square or round columns would be more appropriate. It is important to note that the existing dentil detail which is not reflected in the proposed drawings should be preserved. In addition, any original material uncovered once the porch enclosure is removed should be preserved and incorporated into the new design.
- c. The original landing on the interior staircase has been removed and the original stair alcove was lost at some point. The proposed reconstruction of the original stair landing and alcove matches the layout and appearance of the stair alcove located at 124 East Magnolia which is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. The existing metal staircase is not original and was likely added when the house was divided into apartments. Removal of the metal stair will not cause an adverse effect.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should be located at the rear to minimize view, utilize a setback or transition to differentiate old from new, and use compatible materials. The proposed rear deck is consistent with the guidelines.

e. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing window and door openings should be preserved. In addition, filling in historic windows or doors should be avoided. The applicant has presented several modifications to existing windows and door openings to accommodate a new interior layout. Although some exterior openings were added or modified when the house was converted into apartments, historic window and door openings should be preserved.

1. Staff recommends approval of item 1 based on findings a and b with the following stipulations:

- a. The columns are simplified to be compatible with the style of the house
- b. The existing dentil detail is preserved
- c. If any original features are uncovered after removal of the porch enclosure they should be preserved

2-6. Staff recommends approval of items 2-6 as submitted based on findings c-d.

7. Staff recommends approval based on finding e of the changes to window and door openings located at the rear addition or to those that have already been modified with the stipulation that the applicant submit a window and door schedule for review prior to final approval.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset to May 20, 2015

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**28. HDRC NO. 2015-092**

Applicant: Ramiro Zapata

Address: 223 E. Summit

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

- 1. Construct a 2,478 sq.ft. addition to the Activity Center Building.
- 2. Provide additional handicap parking with accessible path
- 3. Replace roof on existing building, replace existing windows to match existing, install new canopies over existing doors, and install new gutters.
- 4. ADA improvements

**FINDINGS:**

- a. A request for demolition of the rectory building and new construction in its location was heard by the HDRC on August 7, 2013. The request was referred to a task force to ensure that all alternatives to demolition were examined. At that time, some of the alternatives presented included adding to the existing gym building behind the rectory.
- b. The project received conceptual approval on March 18, 2015, with the stipulation that the new parking area is screened from view.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should be located at the side or rear of a structure to visualize the impact from the street. Although the proposed addition will be located along the front of the building, the building is set back from the street and any modifications will not be highly visible or impact the continuity of the district which is consistent with the guidelines. In addition, multiple additions and modifications have been made previously to this structure.
- d. New additions should be clearly identified as new according to the Guidelines for Additions. The proposed stone cladding will match the existing walls of the building and blend in with the original wall to the east. However, the proposed massing which is set below the main building volume and is separated on the west side by the existing canopy breaks the mass and provides a clear differentiation between new and old.
- e. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, new parking areas should be located at the rear of the site and hidden from the street. Parking areas to the side of a structure are acceptable when location behind the structure is not feasible. Although the proposed location will be visible from the street, it is set back into the site and will not adversely impact the continuity of the street.
- f. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new parking areas should be screened from view. The proposed design does not incorporate any screening which is not consistent with the guidelines.
- g. Non-historic windows should be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the architectural style of the building as recommended by the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. The windows being replaced are located on a non-contributing structure. The proposed windows are consistent with the guidelines.

May 5, 2015

7

h. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, new ramps should be unobtrusive and minimize visual impact. In addition, ramps should be screened from view using landscape materials. The proposed ramp does not obstruct view of any historic structure; however no screening has been proposed which is not consistent with the guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of items 1 and 3 as submitted based on findings b, c, and f.

Staff recommends approval of item 2 based on findings d-e with the stipulation that the new parking area is screened from view.

Staff recommends approval of item 4 based on finding g with the stipulation that the new ramp is screened from view.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulations: a. The new parking area is screened from view b. The new ramp is screened from view c. The size of the new parking and ramp is reduced and submitted to staff for approval the applicant submitted revised drawings showing a reduced parking area and ramp on 5/7/15.

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**29. HDRC NO. 2015-176**

Applicant: Paul Vidal

Address: 559 E. Huisache Ave.

**Withdrawn per the applicant.**

**30. 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. The project was reviewed by the HDRC on April 15, 2015, at that time the project was referred to the Design Review Committee. The DRC reviewed revised drawings submitted by the applicant on April 21, 2015. The Committee expressed concern about the appearance of the panels, the fact that the roof is intact and a character defining feature of the small house, and that there does not seem to be a way to conceal the panels from view.

b. 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 east side 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 findings a-b. Staff recommends that other possible solutions such as locating some of the panels on the rear porch are explored.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant denial based on findings a and b.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**31. HDRC NO. 2015-150**

Applicant: Michael Higgins/Green Star Solutions

Address: 112 W. Magnolia

May 5, 2015

8

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install solar panels on the side and rear facing 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 majority of the panels will be hidden from view and located towards the rear of the structure. However, some of the panels on the east side of the house will be visible from the street.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on finding a. Staff recommends that panels on the east side of the structure are relocated to the garage if possible to minimize view from the street.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset to May 20, 2015.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**32. HDRC NO. 2015-182**

Applicant: Brad Westphall

Address: 130 Gramercy Pl E.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Approval to demolish a rear addition and construct a new 2,259 sq.ft. two story room addition

**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 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.

c. 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.

d. The proposed addition will match the roof form of the historic structure which is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.

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. As presented, the west wall of the addition is flush with the west side of the original house which is not consistent with the guidelines. In addition, the proposed stucco cladding on the addition will blend in with the original walls which will further conflict with the guidelines.

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 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.

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

a. The new addition is differentiated from the old

b. Fenestration pattern on the addition is revised so that it is more consistent with fenestration pattern on the main house

c. Information on proposed windows and doors is submitted for approval

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

May 5, 2015

9

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**33. HDRC NO. 2015-155**

Applicant: Michael Stein

Address: 518 E. Park Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 4ft tall wrought iron front yard fence.

**FINDINGS:**

a. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, front yard fences should not be installed where one did not historically exist or introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. A high concentration of front yard fences exists on this block of East Park; however most houses with front yard fences on this block are located on the north side of the street. In addition, very few front yard fences exist on either side of the street on the adjacent blocks to the east and west. The south side of East Park is predominantly open and installation of a front yard fence at this location would break the continuity of the south side of the street.

b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements, front yard fences should be similar to those used in the district, use materials that are compatible with the house, and be limited to 4ft. in height. The proposed wrought iron fence is in keeping with the guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding a.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

**AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine, Rodriguez, Feldman, Judson NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**Commissioner Rodriguez left HDRC 4:45 p.m.**

**34. HDRC NO. 2015-177**

Applicant: Christian Oviatt

Address: 849 E. Commerce St.

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

1. Install a horizontally oriented internally illuminated channel letter cabinet sign displaying "Margaritaville" totaling eight (8) square feet at the river level. The sign will be mounted to the limestone façade of the mall.
2. Install a vertically oriented internally illuminated blade sign displaying "Jimmy Buffet's Margaritaville", "Restaurant + Bar" and "Live Music" and will total twenty-five (25) square feet. The proposed blade sign will be mounted to a column perpendicular to E Commerce.
3. Install a horizontally oriented internally illuminated channel letter sign displaying "Jimmy Buffet's Margaritaville" that is to include the complete branding logo featuring a blue parrot, palm trees, waves and a setting sun and will total twenty-five (25) square feet.
4. Construct a covered patio extension in the area of the existing planter at the river level that is to include themed railing and awning structure along the mall's façade at the river level.

**FINDINGS:**

a. Conceptual approval for the placement and square footage of the proposed signage at 849 E Commerce and the San Antonio River Lagoon was approved on October 17, 2012.

b. The applicant has proposed to install a horizontally oriented internally illuminated channel letter cabinet sign displaying "Margaritaville" totaling eight (8) square feet at the river level. The sign will be mounted to the limestone façade of the mall. According to the UDC Section 35-678(c)(1), the size, scale, height, color and location of signs shall be harmonious with, and properly related to, the overall character of the district and structure. Staff finds that a reverse channel letter sign with halo type lighting would be more

appropriate and consistent with other river level signage.

c. The applicant has proposed to install a vertically oriented internally illuminated blade sign displaying “Jimmy Buffet’s Margaritaville”, “Restaurant + Bar” and “Live Music” and will total twenty-five (25) square feet. The proposed blade sign will be mounted to a column perpendicular to E Commerce as well as a horizontally oriented internally illuminated channel letter sign displaying “Jimmy Buffet’s Margaritaville” that is to include the complete branding logo featuring a blue parrot, palm trees, waves and a setting sun and will total twenty-five (25) square feet. According to the UDC Section 35-678(c)(1), the size, scale, height, color and location of signs shall be harmonious with, and properly related to, the overall character of the district and structure. At this location, staff finds the applicant’s proposal of two internally illuminated channel letter signs appropriate given the existence of other similar signs and the non-historic status of the structure to which they will be mounted.

d. The applicant has proposed to construct a covered patio extension in the area of the existing planter at the river level that is to include an awning with themed railing. The applicant has proposed for the canopy to include a teak wood finish, a teak wood wainscoting, metal bamboo style railing, a standing seam metal roof, string lights and a lime clock. The applicant’s proposed materials as well as lighting proposal are consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(d) regarding materials and finishes, and UDC Section 35-674(g) regarding awnings, canopies and arcades.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant consider an aluminum, reverse channel letter halo lit sign that would be more appropriate at the river level than the proposed internally lit channel letter sign.

Staff recommends approval of items #2 through #4 based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:

i. That the proposed lime clock that is to be mounted at the river level on the proposed awning addition be indirectly lit and be constructed of aluminum.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**35. HDRC NO. 2015-164**

Applicant: Meredith Siegel/Sprinkle & Co. Architects

Address: 1111 S. Alamo

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

Construct a 750 square foot rooftop addition to the St. Scholastica Convent / Liberty Bar at 1111 S Alamo. The structure will include a standing seam metal roof, wood clad windows, stucco cladding, wood columns, beams and trim and metal pipe struts for roof overhand support.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant received conceptual approval of the proposed rooftop addition on October 14, 2014, with the stipulations that the roof maintain a symmetrical form based and that the proposed standing seam metal roof meet the specifications for historic metal roofs, including the use of a double muntz ridge seam.
- b. The historic St. Scholastica Convent / Liberty Bar building was constructed circa 1939 and features portions that predate the primary structure. The building features a strictly symmetrical façade with a central pediment entry. During the process of conceptual approval, both the HDRC and Office of Historic Preservation staff expressed concern over the asymmetrical design of the proposed addition’s roof. It was recommended that the applicant redesign this aspect of the addition.
- c. The Guidelines for Additions 2.A. states that new additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should be placed at the side or rear of the building whenever possible and should provide a transition between old and new. While the proposed addition is a rooftop addition, a setback of approximately fourteen (14) feet from the historic structure’s front side and an approximately eight (8) foot setback at the sides provides a transition between old and new that staff finds appropriate given his unique location for an addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The applicant has proposed for the height of the addition to be thirteen (13) feet tall. The approximate height of the existing, primary structure is approximately thirty-six (36) feet. The proposed height of the addition is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.B.i which states that the height of additions should be limited to no more than 40 percent of the height of the original structure.

e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i, materials that match in type, color and texture should be used while including an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure. While the proposed addition's stucco facades do not match those of the original structure in regards to color, the difference in color provides the needed distinction and is appropriate. Staff finds that the use of standing seam metal roof, stucco façade, wood clad doors and windows and the metal pipe struts are consistent with the Guidelines.

f. One of the stipulations included in the conceptual approval of this addition was the redesign of the roof line to a symmetrical form. The applicant has stated that the complete redesign of the roof line would be detrimental to the design given that the roof height would inevitably need to be raised to accommodate a new plate height of ten (10) feet. To compensate for this, the applicant has modified the overhands to promote a sense of symmetry at the front façade and has chosen a 1 – 1 ½" standing seam metal roof with folder over ribs / double munching at the ridgelines and eaves. The applicant has also taken steps to reduce the overall visual weight of the roof including using smaller dimension rafter tails and a knife-edge hemmed eave. While the applicant has taken numerous steps to improve the visual cohesiveness of the proposed roof line and façade, staff finds that the asymmetrical qualities of the proposed addition distract from the original, historic façade.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding f. Staff recommends that the applicant meet with the Design Review Committee to find a solution regarding a complementary roof line.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1 based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant consider an aluminum, reverse channel letter halo lit sign that would be more appropriate at the river level than the proposed internally lit channel letter sign.

Staff recommends approval of items #2 through #4 based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:

i. That the proposed lime clock that is to be mounted at the river level on the proposed awning addition be indirectly lit and be constructed of aluminum.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve the updated drawings submitted 5/6/15.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**36. HDRC NO. 2015-141**

Applicant: Travis Jeakins/Woodbine Development

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

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the structure at 114 Soledad commonly known as the Solo Serve building with the exception of the stone retaining wall. The stone retaining wall on the river side constructed circa 1914 is to remain.
2. Partially demolish the structure at 130 and 134 Soledad Street commonly known as the Clegg Company Building, Veramendi Palace, Kennedy Building and the San Antonio Print Building and construct a new building complex. The applicant is proposing to retain the Soledad Street facades of each.
3. Rehabilitate the Book Building, which will become the primary entrance to the new hotel lobby. The applicant is also proposing a one floor addition at the roof of the Book Building.
4. Construct a 252 room AC by Marriott hotel on the River Walk at the corner of Soledad and Houston Street. The hotel is to contain twelve levels of hotel rooms, eight levels of above ground parking to be accessed from Soledad Street and retail space at both the street and Riverwalk levels for a total of 21 levels including the Riverwalk Level.

**FINDINGS:**

General Findings:

a. The Design Review Committee as well as the Designation and Demolition Committee have reviewed the proposed redevelopment of the Solo Serve site numerous times over the past six months, most recently, January 27, 2015. At that meeting, committee members expressed concerns over the existing flood walls, the loss of the Clegg Building, the proposed addition to the Book Building, façade

definition on Soledad and the overall material colors of the façade. A site visit was held on January 30, 2015 with Design Review Committee members, Office of Historic Preservation Staff and members of the development and design teams.

b. The Historic and Design Review Commission reviewed this request for demolition and new construction on April 15, 2015. At that hearing, the applicant presented both the Case for Demolition as well as new construction to the Commission. Commissioners were accepting of the proposed new construction, however had concern over the lack of a developed replacement plan for the southern most section of the Solo Serve structure. The applicant has proposed for a residential or commercial tower, a second phase to the development, however no in depth details or plans were provided to staff or the HDRC.

Findings related to request item #1:

1a. 114 Soledad, commonly known as the Solo Serve building was constructed circa 1920 and is a local historic Landmark. Staff from the Office of Historic preservation as well as Design Review Committee Members have visited the site numerous times throughout the past 10 years and have found the structure to have lost significance and it's demolition and replacement with a new structure to be appropriate.

1b. Although the full Solo Serve building will be demolished, except for the stone retaining wall, only the northern portion of the site will be developed. The applicant has indicated that a future phase for the project may include a residential component at the southern portion of the site. However, plans for the southern portion of the site have not been fully developed at this time. Staff understands that this open space will be likely be utilized during construction. However, there is general concern regarding the period of time in which the lot may remain vacant or used for parking and storage. UDC Section 35-672(b)(2) prohibits the lot from having a primary use of parking. Staff encourages the applicant to submit additional details regarding the future treatment of this area and a projected timeline for development for consideration by the HDRC.

1c. A detailed demolition plan with a proposal for salvaging will be required before a Certificate of Appropriateness may be issued. While the applicant has indicated that the historic stone retaining wall along the River Walk will be retained, the extent of the demolition of the Solo Serve building and its adjoining stone wall remains unclear. Any historic construction materials, such as the stone foundation elements which are likely remnants of the original Bexar County Courthouse, should be salvaged and stored on site for future integration into the development.

1d. In regards to the documentation of the demolition of any historic landmark, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-614 prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Findings related to request item #2:

2a. 130 and 134 Soledad, commonly known the Clegg Company Building, Kennedy Building, Veramendi Palace and the San Antonio Print Building was constructed circa 1910 and is a local historic Landmark. The applicant has proposed to restore the Soledad Street facades and to incorporate them into the design of the proposed hotel, however, the existing structures totaling 6 levels and approximately 35,000 square feet will be demolished in their entirety other than the proposed restoration of the facades. The preservation of the existing facades is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10. A and B.

2b. The loss of a historic landmark constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. 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 applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 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;*

[The applicant claims that without the demolition of 130 Soledad, the owner would not be able to develop an economically viable project at this location. The applicant claims that renovating and re-tenanting the existing improvements to the structures is not financially feasible and would result in a value well below the value of the underlying land. A 2015 summary of the fair market value of the structures and property, including the Solo Serve Building was determined to be \$6,964,750.00. The 2014 assessed value for 130 and 134 Soledad was \$1,373,800. The applicant has provided a 2012 income and expense statement for the structures at 130 and 134 Soledad and has noted a net income of minus \$152,016.73.]

*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;*

[The applicant claims that due to issues related to the structure of the existing building as well as existing constraints, it is not feasibly possible to increase the density on the site while maintaining the existing structures. While the structural integrity of 130 and 134 is intact, it cannot support the additional loading that added vertical density would require. In addition, water damage to the roof and second floor of the Veramendi Palace have made them both unsafe. The facades of each require minor repairs, but overall are in good condition. While the applicant's proposal of additional density in the form of height above the location of the existing structures is not possible with their retention, their adaptive reuse for an alternate proposal is possible, according to the engineering report. The applicant should provide information regarding the exploration of an adaptive reuse that would preserve more of the existing structures at 130 and

134 prior to requesting their demolition. The applicant should also explore the local, state and federal rehabilitation incentives that are accessible through the rehabilitation, restoration and adaptive reuse of historic structures.]

*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.*

[While the applicant has not actively marketed the site to potential purchasers, a history of projects have been proposed at this site by multiple owners that have been not been successful due to a lack of feasibility or economic hardships. The applicant as indicated that under the current proposal for demolition of the 114, 130 and 134 Soledad additional density could be added while preserving the existing facades leading to a successful redevelopment of the site.]

2c. Staff finds that the applicant seems to be building a legitimate claim for an economic hardship based on Criterion A, B and C. However, staff finds that further explorations may indicate whether additional sections of the Clegg Building (portions of each the Veramendi Palace, Kennedy Building and the San Antonio Print Building) can be retained, particularly if the preservation of additional portions is eligible for local, state and federal tax incentives. The applicant should document an attempt to reuse more of the historic buildings by taking advantage of the 20% federal tax credit and 25% state tax credit. While preservation of more of the buildings may increase cost, this might be offset by the use of the tax credits. Staff recommends that the applicant explore document consideration of retaining additional portions of the existing structures, such as only the taller portion of the Clegg Building adjacent to the river instead of the Soledad elevations, and other possible alternatives. as well as the complete adaptive reuse of the Clegg Building that would result in its preservation. The applicant should demonstrate that they have exhausted all options for reuse before economic hardship is granted.

2d. If the HDRC finds that the claim for an economic hardship has been thoroughly substantiated in the application and at the public hearing and that the conditions of UDC 35-614 which would warrant demolition apply, a recommendation for approval of the request for demolition will not authorize the issuance of a demolition permit. A permit will not be issued until replacement plans for the new construction are approved and all applicable fees are \ collected. The UDC states that permits for demolition and new construction shall be issued simultaneously if the requirements for new construction are met, and the property owner provides financial proof of his ability to complete the project.

2e. In regards to the documentation of the demolition of any historic landmark, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-614 prior to the issue of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

#### Findings related to request item #3:

3a. The applicant has proposed the Book Building, which will become the primary entrance to the new hotel. The applicant's proposal to rehabilitate the facades of the Book Building is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A. and B.

3b. The applicant has proposed to construct a one floor addition on the roof of the Book Building. The applicant's proposal to locate the addition at the roof of the Book Building, set back from the original, existing cornice is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A. regarding the mass and form of mixed use additions.

3c. According to the Guidelines for Additions, the height of rooftop additions should be no more than 40 percent of the height of the original structure. In addition to this, full-floor rooftop additions that obscure the form of the original structure are not appropriate. The applicant's proposal is appropriate in both height and scale and is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.B.

3d. The applicant has proposed for the addition's materials to be primarily a glass curtain wall system. While a curtain wall system is not similar in materials to the brick and stone façade of the Book Building, staff finds that the glass curtain wall system is appropriate due to the distinct separation between the existing, historic structure and the new addition.

3e. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A., additions should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context, should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with those of the original structure and should feature contemporary interpretations. The applicant has proposed a similar floor height, has incorporated a complementary window arrangement and has proposed a cornice and roof line that is complementary of the existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

3f. The applicant has not specified the location of any mechanical equipment or roof appurtenances associated with the proposed addition. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Additions 5.A. and B. prior to returning for final approval.

#### Findings related to request item #4:

4a. The applicant has proposed a restaurant and outdoor seating area at the Riverwalk level at the rear of the proposed hotel tower. The proposal is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672(a)(2) in regards to pedestrian circulation and linking the various functions and spaces on a site with sidewalks in a coordinated system. UDC Section 35-672(a)(5) addresses pedestrian access along the Riverwalk pathway and how it shall not be blocked by queuing, hostess stations and tables and chairs. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section in addition to UDC Section 35-672(l) in regards to providing a connection to the publicly owned pathway along the river.

4b. Given its unique placement at the corner of Soledad and E Houston as well as its placement on the San Antonio River, this proposal will be the focal point of many views. According to the UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), properties that appear to be the terminus at the end of the street or at a prominent curve in the river shall incorporate into their design an architectural feature that will provide a focal point at the end of the view. The proposed hotel tower is consistent with this section in many regards including additional height, change of color or material and the addition of other design enhancement features.

4c. The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study of both the summer and winter solstices indicating the impact that the proposed tower will have on solar access to the river. As shown in the solar study, the applicant's request is consistent with the UDC.

4d. According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The applicant has proposed to restore this existing, historic facades at street level, which not only is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, but is specific in providing a unique pedestrian entrance. This is also consistent with the UDC Section 35-673.

4e. The applicant has proposed to retain the existing trees in the public right of way along the Riverwalk and to plant new trees at the proposed rooftop terrace that is to be incorporated into the proposed rooftop addition to the Book Building This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(f) in regards to plant materials. The applicant should provide a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.

4f. The applicant has proposed to create two outdoor dining areas at the Riverwalk level. While no paving material has been specified, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(g) in regards to paving materials. In addition to this, the applicant is also responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-673(i) in regards to street furnishing at both the Riverwalk level as well as the street level.

4g. Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. While a detailed lighting design has not been proposed at this time, the applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to lighting.

4h. The UDC Section 35-673(l)(3)(A) addresses access to the public pathway along the river. The applicant has proposed to include dining areas at the Riverwalk level, therefore a clearly defined architectural element from the site onto the public right of way must be included into the design. The applicant has complied with this section by including both architectural elements in the form of the restoration of the existing wall and the inclusion of a courtyard as seen in the Riverwalk Level floor plan.

4i. The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section.

4j. According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a "human scale". To comply with this, an building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed to restore the existing, historic facades which utilizes not only an existing historic structure, but also provides a human scale at the street and Riverwalk level. This is consistent with the UDC.

4k. According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards in which this proposal complies. Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. While the current proposal is taller than fifty (50) percent of the other facades along the block face, staff finds that there are other buildings of similar height in the area, providing examples of additional height and that a proposed height of approximately 240 feet is appropriate at this location.

4l. In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous materials and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC.

4m. According to the UDC Section 35-674 in regards to façade composition, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. The applicant has proposed a variation in roof height and materials approaching the building's terminus on the east elevation, north elevation and west elevation. The south elevation, compared to the other three does not adequately address this requirement. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC regarding façade composition.

4n. Regarding façade composition, specifically window fenestration, the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) states that windows shall be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls, should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them and shall be used in hierarchy to emphasize their importance on the façade. The applicant met each of these requirements and is consistent with the UDC.

4o. In its proposed application, the parking garage currently serves as one of the proposed tower's facades. The applicant has submitted information regarding the potential screening of the garage, however staff would like more information regarding screening materials, their application and façade lighting.

4p. The applicant has proposed for a loading dock to be positioned on Soledad Street within the site. As it is currently proposed, service vehicles would exit the site onto Soledad Street. The applicant has proposed for the entrance to the loading dock to be approximately 25 feet in width. The introduction of a large entrance way adjacent to the parking garage entrance holding approximately 200 vehicles presents a hazard and deters pedestrian traffic. Staff recommends that the applicant formulate a plan of action to address the proposed loading dock entrance, or propose a disguise to maintain the street wall and limit its use to non peak hours.

4q. 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.

4r. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.

4s. UDC Section 35-680 requires the protection of Robert Hugman and WPA-era elements on the River Walk. There is known WPA-era construction at the river level adjacent to the Book Building. While the majority of these elements appear to be retained in the proposal, it is unclear in the renderings provided what alterations to these features will be necessary in order to accommodate changes to the courtyard at the Book Building. A detailed plan for alterations to the River Walk path and walls and this location must be reviewed before a Certificate of Appropriateness may be issued.

1. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the demolition of the structure at 114 Soledad except for the stone retaining wall, commonly known as the Solo Serve Building due to its current non-contributing status based on findings 1a through 1d.

2. While staff finds that an economic hardship may exist for these buildings, staff does not recommend conceptual approval of request item #2, the demolition of 130 and 134 Soledad (referred to as the Clegg Building, Kennedy Building, Veramendi Palace and San Antonio Print Building) at this time based on findings 2a through 2e. The demolition of historic landmarks constitutes an irreplaceable and irreversible loss to the quality and character of the City of San Antonio and must be a last resort. Staff recommends that the applicant explore all incentives and resources that may facilitate the preservation of these structures or a greater portion of the structures. All incentives and resources should be fully explored in order to substantiate a claim for economic hardship. If the applicant has already completed this analysis, documentation of such should be provided for the record. Once substantiated, economic hardship may be granted.

3. Staff recommends conceptual approval of request item #3, the restoration and rehabilitation of the Book Building as well as the construction of a one story addition on the roof based on findings 3a through 3f.

4. If the demolition requested in items #1 and #2 are approved by the HDRC, then staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed development with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant return to the Design Review Committee to resolve certain aspects of the new construction including, but not limited to lighting design, the façade arrangement of the tower, the façade arrangement of the parking garage, details and design of the proposed courtyards at the Riverwalk level, the placement of the proposed loading dock entrance, landscape design and the placement of mechanical and service equipment.

ii. That the applicant provide information to the City Archaeologist in regards to the archaeological requirements stated in the UDC Section 35-675. All excavations must meet the requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Sections 35-630, 35-634, 35-675 and 35-606.

iii. That the applicant coordinate with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve items 1, 2, 3, 4 with staff recommendations.

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

**NAYS: Guarino, Lazarine**

**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 7:00 P.M.

APPROVED

  
Michael Guarino  
Chair