

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 4, 2015**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner 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. 2015-433  | 819 E. Magnolia Ave.    |
| 2. Case No. 2015-437  | 102 Armour              |
| 3. Case No. 2015-440  | 9822 Espada Rd.         |
| 4. Case No. 2015-426  | 106 Alamo Plaza         |
| 5. Case No. 2015-427  | 516 E. Houston          |
| 6. Case No. 2015-428  | 210 Devine              |
| 7. Case No. 2015-429  | 801 – 815 S. St. Mary’s |
| 8. Case No. 2015-444  | 129 E. Rosewood         |
| 9. Case No. 2015-D04  | 505 E. Travis           |
| 10. Case No. 2015-439 | 237 Palo Blanco         |
| 11. Case No. 2015-268 | 123 May                 |
| 12. Case No. 2015-299 | 320 E. Locust           |
| 13. Case No. 2015-442 | 221 King William        |

Item 11 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.**

**11. HDRC NO. 2015-268**

Applicant: Loren Drum  
Address: 123 May

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 32’ x 40’ accessory structure that is to front May. The applicant has proposed materials to include cedar planks and wood windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. This request was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission on July 1, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. On July 7, 2015, the Design Review Committee review committee noted that this structure in its proposed size might be larger than typical, but given its location would not overwhelm the primary historic structure. The DRC did note the concern of the scale of the structure in relationship to other structures along Goodloe Alley as well as the surrounding context.
- b. The lot on which the applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure is bordered by May to the south, Goodloe to the east and E Houston to the north. The applicant has proposed to locate the structure to front May, the rear of the lot as it would be addressed from E Houston. Staff finds this location for an accessory structure appropriate.

c. Consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, new outbuildings should be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of height, massing and form. The proposed structure will be taller and appear larger than the main house; however it will be located on the opposite side of the property which will reduce the appearance of height compared to the main house. Although the proposed garage will be surrounded by mostly vacant lots, the existing adjacent structures are one and one-half story houses along Goodloe Alley and across May Street. Due to its location on the site and surrounding context, staff finds the additional height appropriate.

d. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new garages should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The particular section of Dignowity Hill features various architectural styles, all of which are modest, similar to that of the proposed accessory structure.

e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction windows and door openings should be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principle historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions. The proposed design is consistent with the guidelines.

Staff finds the applicant’s proposal to locate this accessory structure at the rear of a lot that fronts E Houston appropriate and recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted based on findings a through e.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**14. HDRC NO. 2015-400**

Applicant: Jonathan Branson

Address: 317 Lexington

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an ADA ramp accessing a street-facing storefront entrance to the Cadillac Lofts Building. The ramp will feature a handrail and will be approximately 4 feet wide.

**FINDINGS:**

a) According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new ADA features should minimize damage to the historic character and materials of the building and sidewalk. The proposed ramp does not require any permanent alterations to the existing storefront. It can be removed in the future without any damage to the historic structure. There no historic sidewalk features are evident at this location.

b) The public sidewalk at this location is 9’-9”. The proposed installation will allow approximately 69 inches of passage around the ramp.

c) At the October 21, 2015, HDRC hearing, the applicant withdrew the request in order to research additional way to comply with the American Disabilities Act. Since that time, the applicant has resubmitted the original request.

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve as submitted based on findings a and c.

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

**NAYS: Lazarine**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**15. HDRC NO. 2015-431**

Applicant: Nettie Hinton

Address: 509 Burleson

Withdrawn per the applicant.

**16. HDRC NO. 2015-430**

Applicant: Susan Spitzer

Address: 234 Willow Dr.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: Repair the existing siding, front porch and other wood elements and replace the existing wood windows.

1. Repair the existing wood siding to match the original.
2. Repair the existing standing seam metal roof.
3. Replace the existing wood privacy fence with a new wood privacy fence at the sides and rear of the property.
4. Install a 48" tall wrought iron fence at the front and front sides of the property to replace an existing 42" tall wood fence.
5. Replace the existing 4" x 4" wood front porch columns with 6" x 6" wood front porch columns and install porch railing.
6. Install new front and rear doors.
7. Replace the original wood windows with vinyl windows.
8. Install a 20' x 20' concrete parking slab at the rear of the property.
9. Install a 20' x 10' concrete wood deck.

**FINDINGS:**

a. Many of the requested items were done prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. All of the associated application fees have been paid and at this time the applicant is seeking to obtain the necessary Certificate of Appropriateness for the work at 234 Willow.

b. The applicant has proposed to repair the existing wood siding to match the existing as well as to perform repairs to the existing standing seam metal roof. Both of these requests are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

c. At the sides and rear of the property, the applicant has proposed to replace the existing wood privacy fence with a new wood privacy fence. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.i.

d. At the front and side front of the property, the applicant has proposed to replace the existing 42" tall wood fence with a new, 48" tall wrought iron fence. The applicant has provided information regarding the proposed fences detailing. Staff finds this request appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

e. The applicant has proposed to perform various front porch modifications including the replacement of the existing 4" x 4" wood columns with new 6" x 6" wood columns and the installation of front porch railing. Per the photos of the columns that have been installed, staff finds that the applicant's request to replace the existing 4" x 4" columns appropriate. Regarding the proposed front porch railing, the applicant has provided an example of existing front porch railing which staff finds appropriate.

f. Currently, there is no front door to the house. The applicant has proposed to install a new leaded glass door as well as install a new door at the rear of the house. While the installation of a new door may be appropriate, the applicant needs to provide this information to staff for staff's review.

g. According to the Guidelines, wood windows should only be replaced when their condition has deteriorated to a point that is beyond repair, those original windows should be replaced with windows that are in kind. The original wood windows have been removed and replaced with one over one vinyl windows. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Original wood windows should only be replaced when damaged beyond repair. When this is the case, they should be replaced with in kind windows, not vinyl or aluminum windows.

h. The applicant has proposed various scopes of work at the rear of the property including the installation of a concrete parking pad, the installation of a rear deck and landscaping work, all of which the applicant should provide additional information for including a site plan. Once a site plan has been provided, various items could be approved administratively.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #5 based on findings a through e. Staff does not recommends approval of items #6 through #9 based on findings f through h. Staff recommends the applicant provide information regarding the proposed replacement doors, a site plan noting the proposed concrete parking pad, rear deck and landscaping materials.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve items 1 through 5. Denial of items 6 through 9.

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

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**17. HDRC NO. 2015-438**

Applicant: Susan Furman – Furman Properties, Inc.

Address: 1123 Burnet St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to enclose an existing window opening on the front facade as well as replace the front and rear doors.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to remove the two, existing metal doors and install a wood door at the front entrance and another steel door at the rear entrance. The applicant's proposed front door replacement is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Given that the current rear door is a metal door, the applicant's proposal to replace it with a new metal door is appropriate.
- b. Currently on the front façade, a metal window exists where an original door opening would have been located. This is shown not only be the common example found throughout San Antonio of a street facing front door and side facing front door, but also in this particular instance by the single step located beneath the window. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door opening should be preserved. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the existing opening, potentially installing a door to return the front façade to its original state.

Staff recommends approval of the installation of both the front wood door and the rear metal door. Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the existing window opening on the front façade. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the existing opening, potentially installing a door to return the front façade to its original state.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset to November 18, 2015 so that the applicant may be present.

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

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**18. HDRC NO. 2015-435**

Applicant: Manny Garcia

Address: 411 Cedar St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install three new doors as well as three column capitals at 411 Cedar.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install three new doors to the façade of the house at 411 Cedar; two to the front façade at the second level balcony and one on the north façade of the house. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., historic doors should be preserved and if replaced, should be replaced with doors that are of appropriate materials and style. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding any replacement doors as well as information regarding to condition of the original doors.

- b. The original front porch featured 5 Corinthian column capitals, two of which the applicant has preserved, however, the applicant has replaced the front three capitals with replacement capitals that are not matching in profile, detail, nor material. Per the Guidelines for

Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.A.ii., wood elements should be replaced in kind, matching the existing profile, dimensions, material and finish of the historic element. The applicant's replacement capitals are not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant repair the original, damaged column capitals. If the original columns are beyond repair, the applicant should replace them with wood columns that are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations that match in profile, material, dimension and finish as the original capitals.

Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding any replacement doors as well as information regarding to condition of the original doors and that the applicant replace the current, non original column capitals with column capitals that are consistent with the original.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor reset to November 18, 2015 so that the applicant may be present.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**19. HDRC NO. 2015-368**

Applicant: Daniel Diaz

Address: 1014 Burnet St.

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. 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

November 4, 2015

6

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 Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to refer to DRC.

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

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**20. HDRC NO. 2015-425**

Applicant: Peggy Brimhall – Rising Barn

Address: 1008 Dawson

Withdrawn by the applicant.

**21. HDRC NO. 2015-412**

Applicant: Adam Ochoa – AO Design

Address: 418 Donaldson Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace existing asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal roof.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The house at 418 Donaldson was built ca. 1928 and is an example Tudor architecture. Tudor style homes typically feature cedar shingle, slate or thatched roofs.

b. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920's, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to their fire resistance, ability to be customized in regards to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation.

c. A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on October 1st to extend the rear gable roof as seen in the exhibits.

d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs should only be used on structures that historically had a metal roof and where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. The proposal to replace the existing shingle roof with a metal standing seam roof is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.i, iv and vi and is inappropriate for the architectural style of the house.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a, b and d.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

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

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

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**22. HDRC NO. 2015-441**

Applicant: Adam Ochoa – AO Design

Address: 2131 W. Gramercy Place

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing shingle roof on the main house and garage with standing seam metal the color of charcoal grey.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The house at 2131 W Gramercy Place was built ca. 1947 and is an example of neoclassical architecture.
- b. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920's, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to their fire resistance, ability to be customized in regards to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs should only be used on structures that historically had a metal roof and where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. The proposal to replace the existing shingle roof with a metal standing seam roof is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.i, iv and vi.
- d. Historically metal roofs are not typically seen on neoclassical structures. In this instance, staff would find it appropriate to maintain asphalt shingles on the section of the roof that is in the public right of way and install standing seam on the rear portions of the house that are not in the public right of way.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff would find it appropriate to install standing seam metal roofing on the portions of the house that are not in the public right of way.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to grant denial based on findings a through c.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**23. HDRC NO. 2015-395**

Applicant: Jenny de la Rosa

Address: 321 Burleson

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.
- 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 Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to refer to the DRC.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**24. HDRC NO. 2015-135**

Applicant: Ntando McIntosh

Address: 932 Burnet

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a three story accessory structure at the rear of the property at 932 Burnet. The proposed accessory structure will feature enclosed parking for three vehicles, second level living space and an attic. Materials are to match those of the primary historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on April 15, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request was heard by the Design Review Committee on April 21, 2014, where committee members noted that the proposed accessory structure was large in comparison to the existing historic structure and that the applicant should provide additional information regarding how the proposed accessory structure would relate to the existing historic structure.

b. This request was heard a second time by the Design Review Committee on July 7, 2015, where committee members noted that the proposed size of the accessory structure was okay given the size of the lot and that the applicant needed to provide more information regarding the proposed materials and their detailing. The DRC also recommended that the applicant meet with the Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association.

c. This request was heard a third time by the Design Review Committee on October 14, 2015, where committee members noted that the overall height of the accessory structure is inappropriate, that an accessory structure should be subordinate to the primary historic structure, that the proposed dormers were too strong, that the overall height should be reduces and that the proposed massing was too impactful to the site.

d. This section of Dignowity Hill features modest primary structure, often in the Folk Victorian architectural style, often times featuring less than a 1,000 square foot footprint. The lots on which these structures are located often feature accessory structures appropriately sized for their lots, typically with footprints no larger than 150 square feet.

e. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A., new garages and outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form. At three stories and nearly the width of the entire site, the applicant’s proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines.

f. New accessory structures should not be larger in plan that 40 percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint. With a footprint of 1,000 square feet, the applicant’s proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii.

g. The applicant has proposed materials to include Hardi Board siding and a standing seam metal roof. At this time the applicant has not specified materials for the proposed doors, garage doors nor windows. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows and doors as well as wood carriage doors to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., iv. and v.

h. Setbacks and orientations of accessory structures should be consistent with those historically found throughout the district. The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure at the rear of the property, consistent with the historic examples found throughout Dignowity Hill. Staff finds this location appropriate.

Staff does not recommend conceptual approval based on findings d through g. Staff recommends the applicant propose an accessory structure that is consistent with the examples set throughout Dignowity Hill as described in the Historic Design Guidelines. The applicant’s current proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines nor the example set throughout the neighborhood in terms of height, width, mass or scale.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to grant denial based on findings d through g.

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

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

**25. HDRC NO. 2015-432**

Applicant: Jim Poteet – Poteet Architects

Address: 415 Cedar St.

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

- 1. Rehabilitate the primary historic structure.
- 2. Demolish an existing, non contributing addition.
- 3. Convert an existing, roofless concrete block accessory structure into an outdoor screened room.
- 4. Receive Historic Tax Certification.
- 5. Construct a new, two story addition at the rear of the primary historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The house at 415 Cedar is of the Folk Victorian style and was constructed circa 1920. The property currently features a rear addition constructed circa 1960 that the applicant has proposed to remove as well as a rear concrete masonry unit accessory structure which the applicant has proposed to rehabilitate into a screened room and storage area.

b. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 27, 2015. At that meeting, committee members noted that the overall size of the addition’s windows were larger than appropriate, that the applicant should show the proximity of other houses in a diagram, that the applicant’s proposed materials are appropriate, that the addition’s ridgeline is generally appropriate being lower than that of the primary historic structure’s and that additional perspectives and a line of sight study should be provided. At a site visit on October 27, 2015, Design Review Committee members noted that the proposed addition will be hidden by the primary historic structure and neighboring structures.

- c. The applicant has proposed to restore the front porch to its original state, replace the missing foundation skirting, install a new standing seam metal roof, restore each of the existing wood windows and wood doors, repair all of the rotten wood siding to match the existing and repaint the façade. Each of these requests are consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.
- d. At the rear of the primary historic structure exists an addition built circa 1960 which the applicant has proposed to demolish. Staff finds this proposal appropriate, however, recommends that the applicant salvage any wood siding materials, wood windows and wood doors to be reused throughout the proposed project.
- e. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a new, two story addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., residential additions should be located at the rear of the primary historic structure to minimize view from the public right of way. The applicant has located the proposed addition at the rear of the existing structure, however, staff is concerned with the overall height of the proposed structure. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a line of sight study to ensure that the proposed addition will not impact the street facing façade of the primary historic structure.
- f. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., new residential additions should be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block. This block of Cedar is primarily composed on single story structures, however, there are examples of multi story residential structure in the immediate vicinity of 415 Cedar. While multi level residential structures exist in the vicinity, staff finds that a two story addition at the proposed height at the rear of the single story historic structure is not appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant provide additional perspectives to ensure that the proposed addition will not negatively impact the historic structure's appearance from the public right of way.
- g. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature both a gabled and shed roof. Staff finds the combination of these two roof forms appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii.
- h. The applicant has proposed for the addition's to feature a change in materials as well as a modified roof form and plane from that of the original structure to provide a transition for the primary structure to the addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv.
- i. Additions should be designed in a manner that their massing should be subordinate to that of the principle facades. The applicant has provided an elevation of the front elevation which displays the proposed addition being seen from the public right of way, above the roof line of the historic structure. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.i.
- j. While the applicant has not provided staff with specifics regarding the proposed square footage of the addition, the applicant has provided a site plan noting the added footprint to the site. While the added footprint is larger than typical for a rear addition, staff finds it appropriate given the amount of side yard that will remain lawn area.
- k. Generally, the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. While the applicant has proposed for the addition's ridge line to be below that of the tallest ridge line of the primary structure, the majority of the addition will be taller than the primary historic structure. As noted in finding e, staff recommends the applicant provide additional perspectives to ensure that the proposed addition will not negatively impact the historic structure's appearance from the public right of way.
- l. The applicant has proposed materials that are generally consistent with the Guidelines including a standing seam metal roof and wood siding. The applicant however has proposed for the first level of the addition to be clad in stucco, a material which staff finds is not appropriate for the King William Historic District nor consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant also provide additional information regarding the proposed windows, their framing and materials.
- m. Staff finds that generally the applicant has incorporated contemporary interpretations that complement the primary historic structure, however, staff has concerns over the proposed window fenestration of the addition, particularly the size and grouping of window openings. Staff recommends the applicant propose window openings that complement the rhythm and fenestration commonly found throughout King William.
- n. At the rear of the property the applicant has proposed to rehabilitate an existing, roofless accessory structure constructed of concrete masonry units. The applicant has proposed to infill the existing openings, create new openings, install a copper screen in the existing openings and install a new standing seam metal roof. The applicant has also proposed to stucco over the existing CMU walls. This structure was at one time used as a garage. Staff finds the proposed modifications appropriate, including covering the existing walls with stucco given the location and non contributing status of the structure.
- o. The applicant has also requested Historic Tax Certification for which the majority of the work consists of the restoration of the primary historic structure.
- p. The applicant has met all of the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photos and invoices.

At this time, staff does not recommend final approval of items #1 through #5. Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations. The applicant should provide the following information to Office of Historic Preservation staff as well as the Historic and Design Review Commission prior to receiving final approval:

- i. A line of sight study to ensure that the proposed addition will not impact the street facing façade of the primary historic structure as noted in finding e.
- ii. Additional perspectives to ensure that the proposed addition will not negatively impact the historic structure's appearance from the public right of way as noted in finding k.
- iii. Additional information including a window study regarding the proposed windows, their framing and materials as well as their appropriateness for the King William Historic District as noted in findings l and m. Windows that contain proportions that relate to or are derived from historic examples located throughout King William are appropriate. While contemporary interpretations of historic windows openings may be used, staff finds that appropriate window openings and proportions may reduce the overall perceived weight and mass of the proposed addition. Diagrams as well as additional architectural documents should be provided.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted except for the proposed window. The applicant must return to the HDRC for approval of window openings and materials.

**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 5:30 P.M.

APPROVED

  
Michael Guarino  
Chair

