

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
NOVEMBER 18, 2015**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:17 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, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

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. 2015-446 | 1833 E. Houston St. |
| 2. Case No. 2015-448 | 614 Whiting |
| 3. Case No. 2015-449 | 1502 W. Rosewood Ave. |
| 4. Case No. 2015-436 | 714 E. Evergreen |
| 5. Case No. 2015-454 | 307 W. Mulberry Ave. |
| 6. Case No. 2015-042 | 112 Lindell Place |

Item 6 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 Cone to approve the remaining cases on the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2015-042

Applicant: Jim Bailey – Alamo Architects

Address: 112 Lindell Place

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

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

FINDINGS:

General Findings:

- a. The rehabilitation and new construction currently proposed at 112 Lindell Pl was originally heard by the Design Review Committee on January 27, 2015, as part of an application for conceptual approval. That meeting primarily focused on the design and concerns of the neighborhood. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed rehabilitation and new construction was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 4, 2015. At that hearing, a number of individuals from the River Road Neighborhood Association voiced their concern over the proposed design, the possibility of additional traffic and the preservation of the existing tree canopy. The request was referred to the Design Review Committee by the HDRC at that hearing.
- b. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed rehabilitation and new construction was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on March 24, 2015. At that meeting, the DRC reviewed a modified site plan which addressed many of the neighborhood's and HDRC's concerns including the preservation of a mature anacua tree, proposed parking and the proposed vehicular circulation.

c. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed rehabilitation and new construction was heard a second time by the Historic and Design Review Commission on April 11, 2015, where the project received conceptual approval with the stipulations that the owner's team make due diligence to meet with the neighborhood in person regarding their concerns over the current request and that the applicant attend the Design Review Committee.

d. This request for final approval has been scheduled to be reviewed by the Design Review Committee on November 17, 2015.

Findings related to request item #1:

e. The existing structure at 112 Lindell was constructed circa 1950 and includes additions that have been subsequently added and have been determined to be non-contributing based on physical and historical documentation. These additions include a rear addition on the east façade, a patio addition on the north façade, a consecutive front porch on both the west and north sides and a swimming pool located north of the patio addition. The applicant is proposing to alter the existing structure by removing each of the previously noted non-contributing elements. Non-contributing elements do not require proof of economic hardship based on UDC Section 35-614(f).

f. The existing structure has a façade of stucco covered masonry. The applicant has proposed to keep this existing façade as well as make the necessary repairs to restore it to its original state. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Alterations 2.B.

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

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

Findings related to request item #2:

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

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

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

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

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

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

o. At the roof top level, the applicant has proposed a patio. Per perspectives provided by the applicant, the proposed patio as well as enclosed access stair are modestly designed as to not negatively impact the structure. This proposal is appropriate.

p. Since receiving conceptual approval, the applicant has modified the proposed new construction's east façade, primarily regarding the second floor's window fenestration. Previously, the applicant had proposed four groupings of double, one over one windows and two, one over one windows at the ends of each wall plane. To increase privacy along the east elevation where the property abuts a single family residence, the applicant has reduced the amount of windows and overall size of two window groupings. Staff finds this appropriate.

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

r. The applicant has proposed to construct a privacy fence along the east side of the property. The applicant has noted that the proposed fence will be six (6) feet in height until and will not progress to the front yard. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

s. The applicant has provided a detailed landscaping plan noting lawn areas covering the majority of the lot. The applicant has also noted landscaping materials as well as their locations on the property. These materials include flowering trees, planting beds with decomposed granite, pervious pavement, vines that are to provide a vegetation buffer for the rear privacy fence and landscape boulders. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

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

u. The applicant has proposed a driveway that is approximately twelve (12) feet in width. Per the Guidelines, driveway widths should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. While the applicant has proposed a driveway that is wider than recommended, staff finds that given the nontraditional materials and design of the driveway, the additional width is appropriate. The applicant has noted that the proposed driveway is to be curved and pervious, limiting stormwater runoff, perceived noise, visual access and traffic speed.

v. The applicant has proposed on-site parking for eleven (11) vehicles. The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. and B. in regards to off-street parking state that parking areas should not be added within the front yard setback, off-street parking should be accessed from alleys or secondary streets rather than from principal streets whenever possible and that off street parking should be screened. The applicant has designed the proposed parking to be tucked under the second floor of the proposed new construction that is to be screened by welded wire mesh on a stall frame with green screen paint in addition to arched openings and landscaping materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

w. The applicant has proposed to include three (3) ADA dedicated parking spaces to be accessible from the alley. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that these parking spaces comply with the Guidelines for Site Elements 8. A., B., and C. in regards to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance.

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

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 as submitted based on findings a through w with the stipulation that the excavations meet all requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Article 6, Sections 35-630, 35-634, 35-675 and 35-606.

Daniel Ortiz presented on behalf of the owner/applicant.

Jim Bailey, Alamo Architects, project architect, presented on changes that have occurred since conceptual approval.

Donna Martin opposes. Donna Martin indicated she has met with Jim Bailey and Asher Reilly and has shown them what the impact of the construction would be on her property.

Mark Cannan, attorney for neighborhood association, spoke in opposition. Mark Cannan was yielded time by 13 individuals. Mr. Cannan spoke on the 1/3 demolition of the existing structure. The process has been evaded, avoided and ignored UDC regulations and the policies of the board.

Raleigh Wood spoke in opposition.

Jim Cullum spoke in opposition. Jim Cullum indicated that 96% of the homeowners in River Road oppose the new construction.

Bill Sibley spoke in opposition.

Myfe Moore spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve as submitted based on findings a through w with the stipulation that the excavations meet all requirements for archaeology outlined in UDC Article 6, Sections 35-630, 35-634, 35-675 and 35-606.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

7. Approval of the remainder of the 2015 HDRC Schedule of Meetings and the 2016 HDRC Schedule of Meetings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve HDRC meeting schedule with the stipulation that the application deadline for November 23 be changed to November 30, 2015.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

8. HDRC NO. 2015-273

Applicant: Timothy Turner

Address: 151 E. Gramercy Pl

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval for the following work at 151 E Gramercy Place:

1. Install wrought iron fence with stone pillars across the front yard and along Gramercy driveway. The proposed pillars will be 55" tall and the fence posts 52" tall;
2. Modify the roof of a small addition at the northeast corner of the house to match the bellcast or flared portion of the historic roof. A low sloped section over the addition will tie the new bellcast portions into the original valley;
3. Install gutters around the perimeter of the house using a roof-mounted hangar system. The original fascia and trim will not be modified to accommodate the gutters; and
4. Expand and modify the existing rear landing and stairs at rear kitchen door to include a new landing, ADA ramp, and circular stairway. The proposed landing and ramp will be wood framed with piers located at least 12" from the house walls. Final flooring materials have not been selected by the applicant. The wall materials will be salvaged rubble stone to match the home.

FINDINGS:

a) The HDRC approved several requests made by the applicant on October 21, 2015. The currently-requested items were either denied or referred to an on-site visit by the Design Review Committee. The Design Review Committee met on the property at 151 E Gramercy Place on November 10, 2015. The applicant placed temporary pilasters to provide a mock up of the proposed front yard fence. The applicant noted that the front yard fence would provide much needed security and yard space. It was noted that the design of the fence would be predominately open. One commissioner noted that there were not many historic fences on this block of Gramercy. While the proposed fencing along McCullough was acceptable, there was concern regarding the proposed fence along Gramercy. The committee also reviewed the proposed expanded landing and ADA ramp at the rear of the house. Staff had previously supported the request. The commissioners were concerned with the amount of historic material which would potentially be impacted by the proposal. A suggestion was made to leave a space between the bay window and wall to the south of the proposed ramp to limit the amount of building exterior which would be permanently impacted by the proposal. The commissioners were previously not in support of proposed changes to the original roof line. A less-intrusive solution was recommended which would limit the extent to which the original roof would be altered. Given the new information provided and changes to the previously-denied items, the HDRC may take action on all of the current requests.

b) In general, site improvements may be performed with little impact to historic resources. However, the addition of new elements such as fencing has the potential to reduce the visibility of buildings within a historic district and alter the streetscape. New site elements should complement, not detract from, historic site elements, the character of the historic structure they serve, and the surrounding district. When considering specific site elements, the surrounding context is important, since the integrity of various elements varies from block-to-block.

c) The Guidelines for Site Elements recommend avoiding installing fences in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Throughout the Monte Vista Historic District, most residential properties do not have front yard fences. Sloping, open lawns are the typical way properties in this district meet the street. Two houses on this block of Gramercy (106 and 135 W Gramercy) feature low, ornamental fences in the front yards. However, these properties are not within close enough proximity to 151 E Gramercy to warrant a similar installation. In addition, according to Section 35-514 of the Unified Development Code the maximum allowable fence height on a front yard is 4ft. The proposed fence will exceed the UDC allowable height, and if approved by the HDRC, its construction may require a variance.

d) The applicant wishes to alter the existing roof form in order to remove a flat-roof condition at an addition to the northeast corner which is prone to water infiltration and to resolve a condition which prevents the installation of gutters on the house. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs should be preserved when replacement is necessary. Alteration of the roof on the 1957 addition is appropriate and consistent with the guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed alterations will minimally impact the original roof line and will not be easily viewed from the street. The gutters can be installed with no permanent impact to the fascia and will not obscure any architectural details.

e) According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, damage to the historic character and materials and modifications to existing door openings should be minimized when compliance with accessibility requirements is necessary. In addition, new ramps should be located at the side or rear of the building, designed to complement the historic character of the building, be visually unobtrusive to minimize visual impact, and be screened from view. The proposed modifications to the rear kitchen door landing and entrance are consistent with the guidelines in terms of their location. Similar proposals are often found to be appropriate when they do not impact a primary façade. The existing stone knee wall which defines the northern side of the landing will be maintained in place, will the remainder will be removed to accommodate the expanded landing and ramp. While alterations to the original landing and stairs are necessary in order to execute the proposed changes, the overall proposal does not impact a primary façade and the proposed landing and ramp can be removed with little impact to the exterior walls.

1. Staff does not recommend approval of a front yard fence based on finding c.
- 2-3. Staff recommends approval of the roof modifications and gutters based on finding d.
4. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding e.

Timothy Turner, owner, read into the record a letter from 2012 to City Council related to the Historic Design Guidelines.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Salmon to grant denial of item 1. Approval of items 2-4 with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

9. HDRC NO. 2015-395

Applicant: Jenny de la Rosa

Address: 321 Burleson St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a single story residence at 321 Burleson. The applicant has proposed materials to include wood and Hardi Board siding, wood windows and a composition shingle roof.

FINDINGS:

a. This request for final approval was heard originally for conceptual approval at the October 7, 2015, HDRC hearing where the request was withdrawn by the applicant. Since that time, the applicant has met with staff and resubmitted an HDRC application for final approval. This request has been scheduled to be reviewed by the Design Review Committee on November 17, 2015.

b. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately twenty-five (25) feet from Burleson, consistent with the existing, historic structures on the block. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. The Guidelines for New Construction state that primary building entrances, porches and landings should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the primary entrance of the house to be oriented toward Burleson. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i.

d. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. This particular section of Dignowity Hill features homes that are modest in size and predominately one floor in height. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to be one story in height and approximately eighteen (18) feet in height. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

e. Foundation heights of new construction should be within one foot of floor to floor heights on historic adjacent structures. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii.

f. New construction in historic districts should include a similar roof form to those found historically throughout the district. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to include a front gable roof as well as a hipped roof. Both of these forms are found throughout the district, however, typically not together. Generally, a front gable is accompanied by a side gable, not a hipped roof.

g. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. states that window and door openings of new construction should feature a similar proportion to those of historic structures found throughout the district. Staff finds that generally the applicant has presented window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines.

h. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of wood and Hardi Board siding, wood windows and composition shingles. These materials are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.

i. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.D.i., new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. New construction in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the neighborhood. The applicant has provided information regarding materials that are complementary of the historic context throughout the neighborhood, however, staff has concerns regarding the proposed roof form as noted in findings f. Staff recommends that the applicant address this inconsistency in order to be fully consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

k. Mechanical equipment should be located at the rear of the property and be screened from the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for appropriately locating and screening mechanical.

l. The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Site Elements regarding landscaping.

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Per the UDC, construction documents that are eighty percent complete are required for final approval. Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant incorporate a roof design more consistent with those found throughout the neighborhood.
- ii. That the applicant provide elevations of each façade that are consistent with the modified roof form noted in the front elevation.
- iii. That the applicant provide a landscaping plan noting the location of any proposed mechanical equipment as well as other landscaping elements and materials.

The applicant should provide this information to staff prior to returning to the HDRC.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

10. HDRC NO. 2015-368

Applicant: Daniel Diaz

Address: 1014 Burnet

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

1. Install a 13' x 13' front porch deck
2. Install a new craftsman style door.
3. Perform exterior medications to the primary historic structure, including repairing the original siding, trim and soffits.
4. Install vinyl windows into the primary historic structure.
5. Install wooden front porch columns.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an addition at the rear of the primary historic structure at 1014 Burnet on November 5, 2014. Since that approval, the applicant has performed exterior modifications to the primary historic structure, constructed a front porch and constructed a rear deck without a Certificate of Appropriateness. While the requested work has been completed, Office of Historic Preservation staff reviews all requests as if they are new requests where work has not started.
- b. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on November 4, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request has been scheduled to be reviewed by the DRC on November 17, 2015.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, in kind materials should be used when original wood siding and other wood elements are deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant has repaired the existing wood siding, trim and other wood elements in a manner that is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The applicant has installed a new, Craftsman style door to replace the existing, non contributing door. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. At the front of the primary historic structure, the applicant has constructed a front deck measuring 13' x 13' as well as constructed front porch columns. The applicant has constructed the front deck of wood and has installed Craftsman style columns. While the applicant's proposal of a craftsman style column is appropriate, the constructed dimensions, particularly the width is not appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant modify the constructed width of the front porch columns to be proportionally accurate and architecturally consistent with the Craftsman style.
- f. The existing windows in the primary historic structure were aluminum casement windows. The applicant has removed these windows and installed vinyl windows, which are not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. A stipulation of the approval of the addition was to install wood window screens to cover the new, vinyl windows, which the applicant has not yet met. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood screens on the addition be adhere to the previously approved design and stipulations.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant install wood window screens on both the addition as originally stipulated.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #4 and #5, the installation of the vinyl windows and the front porch columns. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows as well as modify the width of the proposed columns to include an architecturally and historically correct proportion.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to reset to December 2, 2015 so that the applicant may be present.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

12. HDRC NO. 2015-417

Applicant: Eddie Daley

Address: 3211 Roosevelt Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate and perform exterior modifications to an existing mobile structure and install a new, pre-engineered metal building.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to relocate the existing mobile trailer office from the current location in front of the existing storage building to 30'-0" in front of the new concrete slab. Along with this relocation, the applicant has proposed to paint and add stone veneer to the base of the trailer as well as paint the existing shed to match.
- b. The applicant has proposed to orient the proposed pre-engineered metal building and relocated mobile trailer toward Roosevelt to generally be consistent with the predominant setbacks found along Roosevelt.
- c. The Guidelines for New Construction state that primary building entrances, porches and landings should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the mobile trailer's primary entrance to front Roosevelt, consistent with the Guidelines regarding entrance orientations.
- d. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. Staff finds that at a height not exceeding that of a one story traditional structure, the proposed mobile trailer and pre-engineered building are consistent with the Guidelines regarding height.
- e. Per the Guidelines, materials that complement those found historically throughout the district should be used in new construction. These materials would include wood siding, standing seam metal roofs, shingle roofs and wood windows. The applicant's proposal of a pre-engineered building as well as modifications to an existing, mobile trailer are not consistent with the Guidelines regarding materials. Staff recommends the applicant adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A. regarding materials.
- f. The Guidelines for New Construction 4.A. addresses architectural details and historic context. Staff finds the addition of stone veneer to a pre-engineered structure is an inappropriate proposal which visually competes with nearby historic structures. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. While the existing, mobile trailer on site is a non contributing element, staff finds that any modifications or relocations of non contributing structures should comply with the Historic Design Guidelines.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with stipulations: The applicant has approval to house the existing mobile trailer as well as the pre-engineered building on site for three (3) years from the date of approval, November 15, 2015, with the stipulation that the applicant construct a thirty (30) inch high stone wall to front the public right of way. The stone wall shall be approved by the HDRC.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2015-445

Applicant: Nuala Benson

Address: 118 Potomac St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a five foot tall, front yard wrought iron fence on the property at 118 Potomac.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install a front yard wrought iron fence on the property at 118 Potomac in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Along this block of Potomac, front yard fences are not common.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii., new front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. While there are front yard fences present throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District and the proposed wrought iron material is appropriate, front yard fences are not historically present on this block of Potomac.
- c. The applicant has noted that the proposed front yard fence is to be five (5) feet in height. The Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii. notes that the height of front yard fences should not exceed four (4) feet in height. The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff recommends the applicant install a privacy fence in the side and rear yard that is not to exceed six (6) feet in height nor proceed into the front yard past the front façade of the historic primary historic structure.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to approve with the stipulation that the front yard fence not exceed four (4) feet in height.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2015-452

Applicant: Michael Villarreal

Address: 639 Mission St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a side yard privacy fence and front yard fence. The proposed side yard privacy fence will be an extension of a wood privacy fence that has been administratively approved to replace an existing chain link fence. The applicant has proposed for the side yard privacy fence to be six feet in height and the front yard fence to be three feet in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 639 Mission sits at the corner of Eagleland Drive and Mission Street at the southern border of the King William Historic District. Front yard fences are common along Mission Street as well as throughout the King William Historic District. Rear and side yard privacy fences are common, however, in unique situations such as this one where the side yard abuts the public right of way at a street, privacy fences are not common. Furthermore, architecturally, the structure at 639 Mission features a wrap-around porch in which the house presents two front facades; one to Mission Street and one to Eagleland Drive. Site elements should respond accordingly to the architecture of the primary historic structure on the property.
- b. The site currently features a chain link fence in the side and rear yard that begins at the rear of the primary historic structure, extends to the public right of way along Eagleland to the rear property line enclosing the rear yard as well as an accessory structure. The applicant has received Administrative Approval to replace this existing chain link fence with a wood privacy fence not to exceed six (6) feet in height.
- c. The applicant has proposed to install a wood picket fence to extend from the location of the existing fencing along the public right of way at Eagleland and along Mission Street, acting as a front yard fence. The applicant has proposed for the side yard fence to be six (6) feet in height from the current fencing location until it reached the side porch of the primary historic structure where the height of the fence is to reduce to three (3) feet in height. The applicant has proposed for a fence height of three (3) feet along Mission Street.
- d. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should appear similar to those used historically throughout the district in terms of scale, transparency and character and should be located only where fences historically exist. While there are various properties in the King William Historic District that feature front and side yard fence, most do not feature a side yard that abuts the public right of way. Staff finds the proposed front yard fencing appropriate in terms of materials and height, however, staff finds that a wood privacy fence in the side yard that is six (6) feet in height that extends to the side porch is not appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the front yard fence at the proposed height of three (3) feet. Staff recommends approval of the side yard fence with the stipulation that the fence be a maximum of (3) feet in height the entire length. The applicant is responsible for coordination with the City's Transportation and Capital Improvements department regarding visibility impacts to drivers approaching the intersection of Mission Street and Eagleland Drive.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2015-453

Applicant: Benjamin Lopez

Address: 1010 Burnet St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing windows with aluminum double hung windows. The existing windows consists of both original wood windows and replacement vinyl and aluminum windows.

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 1010 Burnet currently features the original wood windows as well as vinyl and aluminum windows. The applicant has noted that the existing windows do not properly function and are not energy efficient. The applicant has proposed to replace each of these windows with new, double hung, aluminum windows. The house currently features wood window screens, the majority of which are intact.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., historic windows should be preserved, non-historic, incompatible window should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building and new windows should match the historic windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail when the original windows are deteriorated beyond repair.

c. Per the floor plan, windows A, B, C, D2, G and H are wood windows that are in good condition. Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of these windows, but that they be repaired.

d. There are currently no windows in window openings D1 and F and window E is an existing vinyl window. Staff finds that the installation of wood windows at these locations is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the specific framing method of the proposed replacement windows. Modifications to the original window openings are neither appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of any existing windows. Staff recommends that the applicant repair all existing wood windows, noted as windows A, B, C, D2, G and H and return to the HDRC with an appropriate wood window to replace the existing, non original windows.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through d.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2015-320

Applicant: White Conlee Builders, Ltd.

Address: 1515 Mission Rd.

Case was not heard due to loss of quorum. Commissioner Guarino recused.

17. HDRC NO. 2015-447

Applicant: Ignacio Rodriguez – McChesney Bianco Architecture

Address: 2510 Kennedy Circle

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

1. Clean and repair the existing brick façade.
2. Create a new entry on the southern façade.
3. Replace the north and south entry curtain walls.
4. Replace existing stairs and ramps and install new exterior stairs and ramps.
5. Install new exterior lighting.
5. Create new window openings on the east and west facades.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is proposing to clean and repair the existing brick façade. According to the Guidelines 2.A masonry should be maintained, clear of vegetation, and not painted. Staff finds this appropriate maintenance and consistent with the Guidelines.
- b. The applicant is proposing to create a new entry on the southern façade. According to the Guidelines, historic doors and windows must be preserved. In the Design Guidelines for the School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District, the northern façade is a significant, primary façade and should not be altered, while the southern façade minor modifications are allowed. Staff finds the new entry appropriate and consistent with both the Design Guidelines for the School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District and the Historic Design Guidelines.
- c. The applicant is proposing to replace the north and south entry curtain walls. According to the Guidelines, when replacement glass is necessary use clear glass and to match the original design. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. The applicant is proposing to replace existing stairs and ramps with new aluminum stairs and ramps on North, West, and East. The applicant has proposed to install a new accessible ramp on the south façade. According to the Guidelines, elements should be replaced in-kind and match size and material. Staff finds the new stairs, ramp, and guardrails appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. The applicant is proposing to install new exterior lighting on the north façade just below the roofline. According to the Guidelines, lighting should be placed in locations that are unobtrusive in design, and that do not distract from the façade. Staff finds this request appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. The applicant is proposing to create new window openings on the east and west facades. According to Design Guidelines and Master Plan for the School of Aerospace Medicine Historic District, 5.C.2.g, a strong presence of masonry in these buildings is important to maintain. The windows proposed in the brick side facades are identical to the windows on the north and south facades. The School of Aerospace Guidelines state that new windows should be differentiated from the originals. Staff does not find the east and west façade proposals consistent with the Guidelines, nor appropriate as they potentially present a false sense of history.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on findings a through e. Staff does not recommend approval of item #5 based on findings f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through f.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2015-451

Applicant: Jose Sanchez – The Original Mexican Restaurant

Address: 528 RiverWalk

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a menu board at the Riverwalk level.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to mount a menu board to a non permanent hostess station at the Original Mexican Restaurant located at 528 Riverwalk. The applicant has proposed the menu board's display area to be two feet in width by two feet in height. The UDC allows for menu boards to be no larger than two (2) square feet. This applicant's proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- b. Per the UDC Section 35-678)(g)(2), permanently displayed menus may be properly installed inside the business' window or in an approved wall-mounted or freestanding display case adjacent to the business entrance. The applicant has proposed to mount the proposed menu board to a hostess station, which includes dimensions greater than allowed by the UDC. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval. Staff recommends that the applicant propose a menu board that is permanently located near the restaurant's entrance that does not exceed two (2) square feet.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset so that the applicant may be present.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of Meeting Minutes

- October 7, 2015
- October 21, 2015

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve October 7 and 21, 2015 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Zuniga, Lazarine

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:48 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair