

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
OCTOBER 7, 2015**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 2:00 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, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

ABSENT: Zuniga, Rodriguez, Judson

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2015-363 | 200 Navarro St. |
| 2. Case No. 2015-400 | 317 Lexington |
| 3. Case No. 2015-398 | 1617 W. Commerce St. |
| 4. Case No. 2015-373 | 505 E. Evergreen |
| 5. Case No. 2015-375 | 227 Daniel St. |
| 6. Case No. 2015-376 | 3006 Broadway |
| 7. Case No. 2015-377 | 311 Gorman |
| 8. Case No. 2015-379 | 2127 W. Summit |
| 9. Case No. 2015-385 | 7618 S. Presa |
| 10. Case No. 2015-387 | 129 Crofton |
| 11. Case No. 2015-388 | 210 Devine |
| 12. Case No. 2015-386 | 2231 SE Military |
| 13. Case No. 2015-389 | 3436 Roosevelt |
| 14. Case No. 2015-390 | 233 Bushnell |
| 15. Case No. 2015-391 | 500 E. Martinez |
| 16. Case No. 2015-392 | 400 S. Alamo |
| 17. Case No. 2015-396 | 231 E. Carolina |
| 18. Case No. 2015-380 | 225 W. Mistletoe |

Items 2, 5, 13, 14, and 15 were 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 based staff recommendations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. 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.

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

Carol Wood spoke in opposition. She finds that the ramp can be avoided at the location.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

5. HDRC NO. 2015-375

Applicant: Lance Williamson

Address: 227 Daniel St.

The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification at 227 Daniel.

FINDINGS:

a. The scope of work consists of various items that have been administratively approved, or have been noted by the applicant to be soon applied for. This scope of work includes electrical and mechanical upgrades, insulation, sidewalk repair, wood window repair, exterior and interior repairs and painting.

b. 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.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2015-389

Applicant: Erik Serna/Villa Park Architecture

Address: 3436 Roosevelt Ave.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a restaurant with approximately 1,200 square feet of retail space at 3436 Roosevelt. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of dark bronze aluminum storefront, a metal framed canopy with a metal roof, stucco, berridge metal and an EIFS cornice. Signage, site lighting and landscaping are not a part of this request.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed construct a restaurant with approximately 1,200 square feet of retail space at 3436 Roosevelt. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of dark bronze aluminum storefront, a metal framed canopy with a metal roof, stucco, berridge metal and an EIFS cornice. This particular section of the Mission Historic District features a mix of commercial properties featuring various materials, setbacks and dates of construction.

b. Generally, the applicant has setback the building to be consistent with other commercial buildings found along Roosevelt as well as oriented the primary entrance toward the street. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A. and 1.B.

c. The applicant has proposed a building mass and scale that is appropriate for the given lot and generally is appropriate for its setting. Staff finds that this is appropriate.

d. New construction should not feature a building to lot ration of more than fifty percent total coverage. The applicant has proposed a building to lot ratio well below this fifty percent and is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i.

e. The applicant has proposed materials to consist of dark bronze aluminum storefront, a metal framed canopy with a metal roof, stucco, berridge metal and an EIFS cornice. Generally each of these materials are appropriate given Roosevelt’s commercial context. While EIFS and metal siding are generally not appropriate in historic districts, staff finds that in this commercial setting these materials are appropriate.

f. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i., non-residential parking should be located at the rear of the site to minimize its view from the public right of way. The applicant has proposed to locate all onsite parking to the rear of the site to be buffered by the proposed new construction. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. At this time, the applicant has not requested for approval of signage, site lighting or landscaping at this location. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Historic Design Guidelines regarding all signage, site lighting and landscaping.

h. The property is in the Mission Historic District and is adjacent to the Mission Parkway National Register of Historic Places District. It is also in close proximity to Mission San Jose, a UNESCO World Heritage Designated Site, the San Jose Acequia, and previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX563 and 41BX267. Therefore, archaeological investigations may be required for the project area.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through f with the stipulation that an archaeological investigation may be required.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted based on findings a through f with the stipulation that an archaeological investigation may be required.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

14. HDRC NO. 2015-390

Applicant: Rich Walker – COSA Library

Address: 233 Bushnell

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a new ornamental black iron fence that would run along the property line between Shook Avenue and the playground.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to install a new ornamental black iron fence adjacent to the playground area on the portion of the property line of Landa library at 233 Bushnell. The addition is meant to address safety concerns and prevent children from running onto Shook Avenue.

b. The applicant is proposing to install the new fence along the side of the property that runs along Shook Avenue and is not near the front of the structure. The total length of the fence is 110 feet by 6 feet and creates an L-shape at the north east corner of the property. While front yard fencing is not typical in Monte Vista, this proposed fence is appropriate given the unique conditions of the site and the specific need due to the non-residential use.

c. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i. and v., new fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character and should be constructed of materials that are similar in scale, texture, color and form as those historically used in the district, and are comparable with the main structure. The proposed fence would be four (4) feet high and constructed of ornamental black iron, which is comparable to the existing fence on the property. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

15. HDRC NO. 2015-391

Applicant: City of San Antonio

Address: 500 E. Martinez St.

Applicant is requesting conceptual approval for a temporary parking lot located at 500 E Martinez Street (NCB 901), which is bound by Cesar Chavez, S Alamo, S Presa, and E Martinez Streets. The applicant has noted that none of the existing trees nor the PASA art piece will be removed. This will be a paid parking lot and will be operated by the City's Parking Division.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a temporary parking lot at 500 E Matinez to provide automobile parking adjacent to the new Yanaguana Garden Park and the Lavaca and Southtown. The applicant has noted that this temporary parking lot will exist until the property is redeveloped.
- b. The site currently features approximately twelve moderately sized trees, all of which the applicant has noted will remain on the site. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.i.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.i. the preferred location for off street parking is at the rear of the site behind primary structures. Given the unique nature of this site being an island and the proposed temporary status of the parking lot, staff finds this placement of parking appropriate.
- d. The required buffering and screening of off street parking is noted in both the UDC Section 35-510 and the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.i. The applicant has noted that the proposed parking lot will be landscaped to meet these requirements. This is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC.
- e. The applicant has noted that the proposed parking lot will be adequately lit and provide adequate handicap and compact car designated parking. This is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the applicant provide information regarding lighting as well as other site elements on a detailed site plan prior to returning to the HDRC.
- f. The property is adjacent to the La Villita National Register of Historic Places District, the Lavaca National Register of Historic Places District, and the King William National Register of Historic Places District. It is also within the Lavaca Local Historic District. In addition, a portion of the Madre Acequia traverses the project area. The Madre Acequia is a designated Local Landmark. Moreover, the property is within the site boundaries of previously recorded archaeological site 41BX303 and in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX591 and 41BX2068. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area.

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through f with the stipulations that the applicant provides detailed information regarding landscaping, buffering and screening, lighting and handicap parking prior to returning to the HDRC and that an archaeological investigation is required.

Staff finds that a temporary parking lot is appropriate as long as needed; however, staff finds that a two year time frame for a Certificate of Appropriateness is appropriate. If parking is needed after two years from the date of permit issuance, staff recommends the applicant reapply for parking at this location.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2015-342

Applicant: Michael Britt

Address: 914 & 916 N. Mesquite

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Construct a new single family residence on the vacant lot at 916 N Mesquite, near the Lamar / Mesquite intersection. The applicant has proposed materials to include cedar lapped siding, corten corrugated metal, wood windows and a corrugated galvalume metal roof.
2. Construct an accessory structure on the vacant lot at 914 N Mesquite, south of the primary lot. The accessory structure is to feature materials consistent with that of the primary structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- b. This case was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on September 2, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 16, 2015, where committee members noted that the location of the accessory structure was appropriate, metal siding in this location is appropriate, that the applicant needed to address issues regarding window fenestration and incorporate traditional window heights into the design.
- c. The Dignowity Hill Historic District was originally developed between 1877 and 1940 and features a number of traditional architectural styles including Folk Victorian, Queen Anne and Craftsman among others. Each of these architectural styles feature character defining elements that are both unique to Dignowity Hill and San Antonio. Size, scale and form, along with materials contribute to the consistency and appropriateness of a design when considering its construction in one of San Antonio's Historic Districts.
- d. The applicant has proposed to construct two structures on the vacant lots at 914 and 916 N Mesquite. The applicant has proposed for the primary structure, a single family home to feature a setback and orientation that is consistent with those of the structures to both the north and south. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.
- e. Regarding the accessory structure at 914 N Mesquite, given its location on a lot individual to itself, the design of the accessory structure should be approached as one of a primary structure. Setbacks should be consistent with of primary structures found throughout the district as noted in the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.
- f. The primary entrance for historic structures should be oriented toward the primary street. The applicant has taken a contemporary approach to the primary building entrance, however, has oriented it toward N Mesquite. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i.
- g. Regarding height, the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction in historic districts should feature a height and scale similar to those found throughout the district. The applicant has proposed a structure with a height that is generally consistent with the predominant building height in the vicinity. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. The applicant has proposed a foundation height that is consistent with the precedent set throughout the district. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii.
- i. 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, a side gable roof and a contemporary flat roof between the two traditional roof forms. While there is no precedent for a flat roof in the district, staff finds that this contemporary interpretation on a traditional house form is appropriate.
- j. Regarding the proposed roof form of the accessory structure, the applicant has proposed a sloped roof, which is not appropriate given the precedent set for primary roof forms of historic houses throughout the neighborhood. Staff finds that a front gable roof would be more appropriate given the similarity between the proposed structure at 914 N Mesquite and shotgun homes found throughout the district.
- k. 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. The applicant has noted a number of window openings, however, many feature locations and dimensions that are not consistent with those found throughout the district. Staff recommends the applicant revisit the proposed window configuration to incorporate more traditionally sized and placed windows.

l. 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.

m. The applicant has proposed materials which include cedar lapped siding, corten corrugated metal, wood windows and a corrugated galvalume metal roof. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i., materials that are complementary to those of the district should be used in new construction. Staff finds that the proposed cedar siding is appropriate, however there is no precedent for corten corrugated metal siding nor perforated corrugated metal. Regarding the proposed corrugated galvalume roof, new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion to metal roofs containing use panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, ensure that seams are an appropriate height (1 to 2 inches), use a crimped ridge seam that is consistent with the historic application, use a low profile ridge cap and use a galvalume finish.

n. New construction in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the neighborhood. The applicant has presented a contemporary interpretation of many traditional architectural elements that while might not be currently found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District, are of high quality. Staff finds that through the incorporation of traditionally scaled window openings as well as materials that are appropriate for a historic district, the applicant will have presented a successful project.

o. The applicant has noted rainwater cisterns that are to be located at the rear of both the primary and accessory structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. Staff recommends that the applicant provide additional information regarding the location and screening of other mechanical equipment per the Guidelines for New Construction 6.B.

p. The applicant has proposed to mount solar collectors on the south slope of the accessory structure’s roof. The proposed panels will be mounted flush to the roof as well as visible from the public right of way. Given this structure’s contemporary design, staff finds this location appropriate.

q. The applicant has provided a site plan noting the preservation of numerous existing trees and the installation of a decomposed granite walk way. Staff recommends the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan prior to retuning to the HDRC.

r. Staff finds that the applicant’s request for the construction of two dwelling units on two lots is appropriate, however, both units should contain setbacks and architectural elements that are consistent with the neighborhood and Historic Design Guidelines.

s. At this time, the applicant has not been able to meet with the Design Review Committee, however, the applicant has provided information regarding existing materials throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District as well as existing setbacks of primary and accessory structures.

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the site design, massing, form, contemporary interpretations on a traditional architectural style and the proposed roof form of the primary structure proposed at 916 N Mesquite. Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the accessory structure proposed at 914 N Mesquite. Staff recommends that the applicant address inconsistencies with the Historic Design Guidelines, primarily setbacks and roof form.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2015-264

Applicant: Stephen Green

Address: 810 N. Olive

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct three attached, two story units with two car garages on the vacant lot at 810 N Olive. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of brick, Hardie Board siding, vinyl windows and composite shingles.

FINDINGS:

a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. This request for Conceptual Approval of the construction of three attached, two story units at 810 N Olive was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 23, 2015. At that meeting, committee members made comments regarding the applicant providing more

information regarding materials, site design, porch and column detailing and window and door specifications.

c. This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on August 5, 2015, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee. At the August 25, 2015, meeting of the Design Review Committee, committee members noted that the revisions to the design were appropriate and that they applicant had presented appropriate massing and materials.

d. The applicant has proposed a setback of thirty (30) feet. Existing setbacks on both the north and south sides of the vacant lot features both setbacks that are approximately thirty-five (35) feet. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i and ii. and the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff recommends that the applicant provide staff and the HDRC with information showing setbacks in the vicinity of the proposed structure to ensure that the applicant is consistent with the historic setbacks in the neighborhood.

e. 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 each unit to front N Olive, one of which features a front porch while the other two feature more contemporary covered entrances. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

f. 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. If the proposed new construction is to exceed that of adjacent historic buildings by more than one-half story, wall-plane offsets and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition are recommended. This particular section of Dignowity Hill predominantly single height structures, however, staff finds that the applicant's proposal for additional height is appropriate.

g. The applicant has proposed a structure which is typically wider than the historic example set forth in Dignowity Hill. To separate the façade, the applicant has incorporated a projecting double height porch, recessed balconies and windows that are grouped similar to the traditional grouping found in a single family structure. This approach helps to mitigate the width, however, staff recommends that the applicant provide information showing width of adjacent and surrounding properties to ensure that the proposed design is consistent with the character of the district before any approvals are granted.

h. A similar roof form to others found throughout the district should be incorporated into the design of new construction. The applicant has proposed both front and side gables with a pitch that is comparable to those found historically in the district. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i.

i. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. states that window and door openings of new construction should features a similar proportion to those of historic structures found throughout the district. The applicant has proposed to arrange windows in groupings of three as well as incorporate wood screens, both of which are found prominently throughout Dignowity Hill. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. The vacant lot at 810 N Olive features approximately 22,500 square feet. The applicant has proposed total lot coverage including the proposed new construction and onsite parking at approximately 7,500 square feet. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction and appropriate for the given site.

k. The applicant has proposed a number of exterior materials which include brick, Hardie Board siding, white vinyl windows, and composite shingles. While brick is not predominantly found as a primary façade material in Dignowity Hill, staff finds that its use is appropriate if used in combination with other potential contemporary materials.

l. The applicant has proposed to install white vinyl windows. While the applicant will also install wood window screens, the use of vinyl windows is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A., nor appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows.

m. The applicant's proposal to use a composite shingle roof is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.iii.

n. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A., new construction in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context of the neighborhood. The applicant has proposed various simple architectural details with complementary materials, complementary window arrangements, a traditionally dimensioned front porch and a complementary roof form. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

o. The applicant has provided a detailed landscaping plan that retains much of the existing front and rear yard turf and includes native xeric plant materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A.

p. The applicant has proposed three concrete sidewalks that are four feet in width along with an asphalt driveway that is ten feet in width. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i.

q. The applicant has proposed for the entrances to the three garages to be at the rear of the proposed new construction. While this placement is appropriate, the proposed garage doors are not, nor are they consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v.

Staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the garage door materials and detailing.

Staff commends the applicant on addressing various inconsistencies with the Guidelines regarding massing, form and architectural details, however, at this time, staff does not recommend conceptual approval. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following inconsistencies with the Historic Design Guidelines prior to returning to the HDRC.

- i. That the applicant provide staff and the HDRC with information showing setbacks in the vicinity of the proposed structure to ensure that the applicant is consistent with the historic setbacks in the neighborhood as noted in finding d.
- ii. That the applicant provide information showing the width of adjacent and surround properties to ensure that the proposed design is consistent with the character of the district before any approvals are granted as noted in finding g.
- iii. That the applicant install wood windows as noted in finding l.
- iv. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the garage door materials and detailing as noted in finding q.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2015-316

Applicant: S. Rapier

Address: 628 E. Guenther St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a roof mounted solar photovoltaic system on the south side of the primary historic structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to mount a solar photovoltaic system to the roof at the south side of the single story historic structure. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i., solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to minimize visibility from the public right of way. While the applicant has proposed a mounting location on the south roof pitch, the proposed system would be clearly visible from the public right of way. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.
- b. Staff finds that an appropriate solution could potentially be found in the shifting of the panels further toward the rear of the side roof pitch and lower the visibility from the public right of way.

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2015-345

Applicant: Scott Carpenter – Seventh Generation Design

Address: 321 E. Locust

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a two story townhome totaling approximately 3,386 square feet. The applicant has proposed materials including Hardi Board siding, western cedar posts and rafters, double hung aluminum windows, a main roof of composition shingles, a porch roof of a standing seam metal roof and two, detached garages.

FINDINGS:

- a. The request for conceptual approval was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 11, 2015, where committee members noted that the proposed new construction is best to be designed to read as one façade rather than two and that a site plan showing the proposed new construction in relationship to the neighboring existing structures was needed.
- b. The request for conceptual approval was listed on the September 2, 2015, HDRC Agenda, however at that meeting the applicant withdrew the request. Since that time, the applicant has addressed many of staff concerns which were noted in staff's recommendation for conceptual approval. At this time, the applicant has requested to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- c. The historic setback of historic homes along E Locust is approximately fifty-one feet from the street. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately fifty feet to be consistent with the historic precedent set along the block face. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i.
- d. 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 both primary entrances of the duplex to be oriented toward E Locust and feature a front porch and front porch overhang that are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. The applicant has proposed a front porch depth of eight feet for both units. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. 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 Tobin Hill features a number of two story historic structures as well as modest single story historic structures; both of which neighbor the proposed new construction. Staff finds that the proposed height of two stories is appropriate at this location as well consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii.
- f. Generally, foundation heights of new construction should be within one foot of floor to floor heights on historic adjacent structures. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of one foot and floor to floor heights of approximately ten feet. This is consistent with the historic examples on the block as well as the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii.
- g. 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 feature a hipped roof with both front and small rear gable. Historic structures throughout Tobin Hill, particularly those featuring two or more stories feature complex roof forms which often include both hipped and gabled roofs. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i., however, staff finds that the applicant's proposed rafter tails lack the proper depth that historically accompanies a bungalow. A proper rafter tail depth would be 18" to 24".
- h. 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. The applicant has provided information regarding window and door openings that generally are consistent with the Guidelines, including both single and double width windows, traditional door openings and contemporary window openings that accompany contemporary front porch elements.
- i. Many lots in this section of Tobin Hill feature the primary historic structure, a moderately sized front yard, a larger rear yard and a rear accessory structure with rear alley access. The applicant, to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.D.i., has proposed site coverage to be consistent with the examples found throughout the district.
- j. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new construction should feature materials that complement the type, color and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of Hardi Board siding, western cedar posts and rafters, a main roof of composition shingles and a porch roof of a standing seam metal roof. These materials are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.
- k. The applicant has proposed to install double hung aluminum windows. The Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i. states that materials that complement those found historically throughout the district should be used. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows to be fully consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.
- l. The applicant has provided an example (Exhibit S4-B0.06) of non wood windows that have been installed in new construction located within Historic Districts. This application of non wood windows creates a façade that lacks depth with windows that are flush with the window trim and siding. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows that are inset at least two inches to provide depth and architectural compatibility with the existing historic structures found throughout the district.
- m. Architecturally, new construction should respect the historic context of the district while being designed to reflect their time. The applicant has a roof form, window and door openings and has incorporated materials that are generally complementary of the district while introducing contemporary elements that distinguish it from existing historic structures. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.i.

n. Mechanical equipment should be located at the rear of the property and be screened from the public right of way. The applicant has proposed a rear wood fence and has sited HVAC equipment where it will be screened by the rear wood fence. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B.

o. The vacant lot is currently void of existing trees except for a Crape Myrtle at the public right of way along E Locust. The applicant has noted proposed sidewalks and the front and rear yard on the provided site plan, mulch beds featuring various low growing plant materials near the public right of way and small species trees such as Mexican Olives, Orchids and Texas Mountain Laurels in the mulch bed located closest to the front porches. Between both front yard mulch beds and in the rear yard, the applicant has proposed areas of Bermuda grass. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

p. As previously mentioned, the applicant has proposed to construct a detached garage to serve both units at the rear of the property to be accessed from the rear alley. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i., garages and outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal facade in terms of their height, massing and form as well as footprint. The applicant has designed the proposed garage to be slightly narrower than the width of the proposed structure and approximately seventeen feet in height compared to the primary structure's height of approximately twenty-eight feet. In addition to this, the proposed garage is less than forty percent of the proposed primary structure's footprint. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

q. The applicant has proposed for the detached garage to feature materials matching those of the proposed primary structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii.

r. The applicant has proposed to set back the garage approximately five feet from the rear alley. Setbacks for rear garages throughout Tobin Hill vary, however the predominant location is adjacent to the rear alley with a setback of less than five feet. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed setback is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.ii. The applicant will need to obtain a variance for the proposed setback.

s. Due to the proposed width of the rear garage and the need to accommodate parking for two individual units, the applicant has proposed garage doors that at the proposed width are not of a traditional scale, however, staff finds that the applicant has proposed appropriate detailing for the doors. Generally, staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i. as noted in finding j and k..
- ii. That the applicant address the lack of depth associated with the current rafter tail design as noted in finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Lazarine and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve as submitted with stipulations that the applicant use wood window screens, address the wall depth and a thicker trim.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2015-358

Applicant: Sarah Villarreal

Address: 645 E. Park

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

- 1a. Construct a 396 square foot addition at the rear of the existing structure.
- 1b. Construct a 168 square foot addition at the rear of the existing structure.
- 2a. Rehabilitate the existing enclosed front porch and obtain the proper permitting.
- 2b. Demolish the existing front porch's enclosure to restore it to its original state.
- 3. Install a new driveway and retaining wall at the front of the property.

At this time, the applicant is only requesting approval of the proposed footprint of the additions.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has received administrative approval for a number of rehabilitative requests including foundation repair, roof replacement, siding repair and replacement, chimney repair and the rehabilitation of the rear accessory structure.

b. In addition to the rehabilitation of the primary historic structure and rear accessory structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to contain materials to match those of the house. The applicant has proposed two options; option one consists of a 186 square foot addition and option two, which consists of a 396 square foot addition. At this time, the applicant is requesting conceptual approval of only the proposed addition's footprint.

c. The applicant has proposed to site both options of the proposed addition at the rear and has proposed a footprint that is appropriate for the existing lot size. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A. and B., however, staff recommends that the applicant incorporate a transition from the historic structure to the addition, either in the form of a setback or a change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and addition to be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv.

d. The applicant has noted that the proposed materials for both options will match those in kind of the primary historic structure and that the addition will be complementary of the primary structure regarding materials. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. and 4.A.i. and ii. Staff recommends that the applicant provide building elevations and a roof plan at the appropriate time.

e. At the front of the primary historic structure currently exists an enclosed front porch which previously was enclosed without the proper permitting. The current owner and applicant has proposed two options to remedy the current situation. Option one is to rehabilitate the porch in its current configuration and obtain the proper permitting and option two is to remove the existing enclosure and restore the porch to its original state.

f. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.i. front porches should not be enclosed. Furthermore, porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original. Staff recommends that the applicant remove the non contributing porch enclosure and restore the porch to its original state.

g. At the front, south west corner of the site, the applicant has proposed to remove a portion of the existing retaining wall and install a driveway and new retaining wall. Currently, the property does not feature off street parking. Staff finds that the modification of the existing, non contributing retaining wall is appropriate, as well as the installation of a front driveway, however, the applicant's proposed location is not. Historically, driveways throughout Tobin Hill have been located to the side of the historic structure. The applicant's current proposal has located the proposed driveway at the front of the historic structure.

h. Given the applicant's unique site constraints, if the HDRC finds that a front driveway is appropriate, staff recommends that the applicant adhere to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B. regarding driveway configuration and curbing.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of both rear addition options' footprints; listed as items 1a. and 1b. Staff recommends conceptual approval of request item 2a., the restoration of the front porch to its original state. Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of request item 3, the installation of a front driveway.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant conceptual approval with larger addition, rehab of front porch and no driveway.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

24. HDRC NO. 2015-355

Applicant: Douglas McCormick
Address: 407 Mission St.

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

1. Modify the front façade to restore it to its original arrangement, featuring a single front door with two windows.
2. Repaint the exterior of the house.
3. Construct a screened, rear porch.
4. Remove the non original rear porch addition.
5. Demolish a non original rear accessory structure.
6. Install new, aluminum windows to the rear façade.
7. Receive Historic Tax Certification

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to restore the front, street facing façade. Within the restoration, the applicant has proposed to eliminate a non original front door opening, maintain the current location of the front porch steps and install a window consistent with what is historically appropriate. Staff finds this request appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant install a wood window in the existing door’s location.
- b. The applicant has proposed to repaint the exterior of the house as well as replace many damaged or rotten wood elements to match the existing. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1. A. and 1.B.
- c. The applicant has proposed to remove a non original rear porch and construct a new, rear screened porch. The applicant has proposed for the new rear porch to consist of 4” x 6” inch wood posts and a screening material which has not been specified. Staff finds that the location, footprint and massing of the proposed screened porch addition are consistent, however, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the selected screen material.
- d. At the rear of the structure the applicant has proposed to make various exterior modifications to accommodate the proposed rear addition. Within this request, the applicant has proposed to include non original window and door openings and install new, aluminum windows. Staff finds that the enclosure of non original window and door openings is appropriate to accommodate the rear addition, however, the installation of aluminum windows is not appropriate according to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. and vii. An appropriate window material would be wood.
- e. Currently, the property features an accessory structure towards the rear of the property, consistent with the location of contributing accessory structures throughout King William. At this time, staff does not find that its removal is appropriate. If demolition is necessary, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the loss of structural integrity or a non contributing status.
- f. The applicant has requested Historic Tax Certification, however, at this time has not met the thirty percent investment of the appraised value. Staff recommends the applicant submit additional financial information addressing the entire scope of rehabilitation in order to receive Historic Tax Certification.

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 based on findings a through c with the following stipulations to be met prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness:

- i. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed new columns and their detailing to be architecturally appropriate.
- ii. That the applicant provide additional information regarding the selected screen material.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #4 through #7 based on findings a d and e. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows rather than aluminum, that the applicant provide additional information regarding a loss of structural integrity or non contributing status regarding the proposed demolition of the existing accessory structure and that the applicant provide additional financial information regarding Historic Tax Certification.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Salmon to refer to DRC.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2015-351

Applicant: Steven Martin
 Address: 130 E. Kings Hwy

Withdrawn by the applicant.

26. HDRC NO. 2015-348

Applicant: Thomas Bergo

Address: 2042 W. Gramercy Place

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct an addition at the rear of the existing structure.
2. Remove, replace and reconfigure the existing concrete driveway.
2. Replace both aluminum and wood windows at the side and rear of the house as well as modify existing window openings to accommodate smaller windows.
3. Demolish and reconstruct the rear accessory structure.
4. Xeriscape the site.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed a rear addition to be ten feet in depth to feature stucco siding, double doors, four rear windows and a rear deck. Generally, the proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A. and 1.B. regarding general massing, a similar roof form, transitions between old and new building forms, massing, the proposed footprint and height.
- b. Along with the rear addition, the applicant has proposed various utility tasks which staff finds appropriate. Regarding the proposed reconstruction of the rear deck, staff finds this request appropriate, given the non contributing status of the rear porch, however, the applicant should provide staff with detailed drawings should the proposed width, height and depth of the deck.
- c. The applicant has not noted that new windows will be installed, however had not noted a particular material. Staff recommends the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i.
- d. The structure currently features a mixture of original wood windows and vinyl replacement windows, all of which the applicant has proposed to remove. Furthermore, the applicant has proposed to modify original window openings and install new windows to increase energy efficiency and security. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., original window openings should be preserved and per 6.A.iii., historic windows should be preserved. Staff finds that the replacement of the existing vinyl windows with new wood windows to match the existing wood windows is appropriate, however, the replacement of the existing wood windows and the modification of window openings is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. The applicant has noted fire damage to the rear accessory structure as well as the need to raise the garage approximately 1 ½ feet to 2 feet. The applicant has noted that the demolition of the existing accessory structure and its replacement with a new accessory structure is the most economically efficient. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A.i. states that outbuildings should be preserved where they remain. If the applicant would like to pursue demolition, staff recommends the applicant submit an economic case for demolition per UDC Section 35-614.
- f. Along with the replacement of the rear accessory structure, the applicant has proposed to replace the existing driveway, raise it to the approximate height of the proposed new garage; 1 ½ feet to 2 feet above its current elevation. The applicant has also proposed to widen the existing driveway where possible to prevent mud from developing at the sides. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., existing driveway configurations should be repaired and retained. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet in width. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a detailed site plan noting the current width of the driveway in addition to a proposed width. The proposed new width, if no wider than 10 feet may be appropriate, however, staff finds that the raising of the driveway would create a retaining wall like feature which is not appropriate.
- g. The applicant has proposed to xeriscape the property as much as possible to reduce the need for irrigation. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 1.A.i., historic topographies should be retained and 3.A.ii., historic lawns should be retained. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan for staff and the HDRC's review.

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on findings a through c with the stipulation that the applicant install wood windows and that detailed dimensions and drawings be presented for the reconstruction of the rear deck. Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 through #5 based on findings d through g. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the original window openings as well as an existing wood windows, that the applicant submit an economic case for demolition per UDC Section 35-614 in regards to the demolition of the accessory structure, that the applicant repair the existing driveway in place and retain its historic profile and that the applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan regarding any proposed xeriscaping.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED**27. HDRC NO. 2015-320**

Applicant: White Conlee Builders, Ltd.

Address: 1515 Mission Rd.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of site and building layout for the proposed MELA development. The applicant has proposed to construct five, three and four story residential apartment structures, a clubhouse, a commercial pet daycare and miscellaneous residential structures.

FINDINGS:

- a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- b. This address falls within the buffer zone of the designated World Heritage areas. The applicant is responsible for complying with all regulations and meeting any design standards associated with the designation.
- c. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 7, 2015, where committee members noted that overall the proposed development would be welcomed to the area.
- d. On August 19, 2015, a request for conceptual approval of site design, building placement and façade arrangement was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission. At that hearing, concern was voiced by citizens as well as the commission and the request was referred to the Design Review Committee to resolve inconsistencies with the Unified Development Code as well as the Historic Design Guidelines.
- e. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on August 25, 2015, where committee members noted that the updated site plan provided information regarding a San Antonio Water Service easement, suggested the applicant maximize golf course views, noted that the development presented a non-urban design, that the design should include urban gestures, that a figure ground diagram should be developed and that the previously presented façade arrangement was not appropriate given the proximity of this property to the San Antonio River, San Antonio Missions National Park and location within the Mission Historic District.
- f. The current request for conceptual approval of site design and building placement was to be reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 8, 2015, however, the committee did not meet at that time. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 16, 2015, where committee members noted that the applicant had addressed staff's stipulations and concerns, that a reasonable representation of site constraints had been shown and that the applicant should meet with the Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association.
- g. At this time, the applicant has proposed to develop approximately thirteen of the twenty acres on the property. Phase one, as the applicant has shown as this time is to have five, three and four story buildings, a two story clubhouse, surface parking and various amenities located on the northern half of the site leaving the southern portion undeveloped. The applicant has provided information regarding various San Antonio Water System utility easements and a tree preservation plan; both of which have determined the layout of various structures on the northern portion of the site, referred to a Phase 1 in the application documents.
- h. While at this time the applicant is proposing to develop only the northern portion of the site, staff finds that the northern portion will actively effect the design of the southern portion of the site and recommends that the applicant provide a master plan including information regarding the southern portion of the site, which will interact with the San Antonio River as well as the Mission Reach of the San Antonio Riverwalk. Any approval associated with Phase 1 does not provide authority over future site or building design associated Phase 2.
- i. Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has provided a site plan that has noted sidewalk connections across the property and has connected the various functions of the site in a coordinated system incorporated an interior courtyard and an exterior, perimeter path. This is consistent with the UDC.
- j. Paving materials used for pedestrian walkways are to be visually and texturally different than those used for automobile traffic and parking. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Section 35-672(a)(3) regarding paving materials.
- k. The applicant has noted two curb cuts in the provided site plan; both for automobile traffic to access surface parking lots. Per the UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(B), curb cuts may be no larger than twenty-five (25) feet. The applicant is responsible for complying with this

section of the UDC.

l. Regarding onsite parking, surface parking areas are to be located toward the interior of the site or to the side or rear of a building and shall be screened or buffered from view of public streets and the San Antonio River if they are located within a fifty-foot setback from the edge of the river ROW use and within a twenty-foot setback from a property line adjacent to a street use. The applicant has proposed surface parking adjacent to a street use. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3) and has provided information regarding the screening of surface parking.

m. Per the UDC Section 35-673(b), 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. For projects with two or more buildings on a site, buildings should be clustered to create active open space such as courtyards along the street and river edges. The applicant has arranged four interior buildings to create an interior courtyard featuring a swimming pool and has provided information regarding site constraints which prevent the creation of additional active spaces regarding the northern edge of the site. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to develop and implement active spaces along Mission Road as this is a requirement of the UDC.

n. The UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(A) both state that a building's orientation as well as primary entrance should be toward the street. In addition to this, the Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, Guidelines for New Construction 1.A. and B. state that a building's orientation as well as primary entrance should be oriented to be consistent with the building orientation found throughout the district; toward the street. Staff finds that a consistent building orientation throughout the proposed site would be appropriate and consistent with both the UDC and the Historic Design Guidelines. If the applicant is unable to orient primary entrances toward the street, staff recommends that the applicant orient primary entrances toward pedestrian walkways and active spaces, not surface parking.

o. The UDC Section 35-673(c) provides guidelines regarding the preservation of the existing natural contours and distinct character of the San Antonio River. The applicant is responsible for coordinating with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.

p. According to the UDC Section 35-673(e)(1), no more than seventy-five percent of the landscape materials, including plants, shall be the same as those on adjacent properties and (e)(2)(A) which states that planting requirements in RIO- 4, RIO-5, and RIO-6 should continue the restoration landscape efforts along the river banks. For RIO-4, sixty percent of the river bank is to be landscaped. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC at the time of the proposed development of phase one.

q. The applicant has noted per the site plan that the proposed development is to include various paved walkways and a paved, interior courtyard. Per the UDC Section 35-673(g), in RIO-4, a maximum of six hundred square feet is allowed for a single paving material before the paving material must be divided or separated with a paving materials that is different in texture, pattern, color or material and that a maximum of one hundred linear feet is allowed in a walkway before the pattern must change in materials. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

r. The applicant has proposed a perimeter fence of stone and wrought iron. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(h).

s. The applicant has proposed street furnishings along the perimeter of the property along the San Antonio River. Per the UDC, street furnishings shall be made of wood, metal, stone, terra cotta, cast stone, hand sculpted concrete or solid surfacing materials. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the UDC.

t. The applicant has not specified a distinct lighting scheme at this time. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-673(j) in regards to lighting.

u. Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen various mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. The applicant has not specified the exact location of all mechanical and service equipment, however the applicant should provide a method of buffering and screening any visually obtrusive equipment from the public right of way prior to returning for final approval.

v. Bicycle parking helps promote a long term sustainable strategy for development in RIO Districts. The applicant is responsible for providing bicycle parking in well let and accessible areas on the site per UDC Section 35-673(o) and 35-526.

w. As mentioned in finding a, conceptual review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback) and specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding. The applicant should actively work with Office of Historic Preservation staff, the Design Review Committee, the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association and the San Antonio River Authority to develop a project that is consistent with the UDC as well as the Historic Design Guidelines. A complete master plan is recommended to address concerns shared by each of these entities which will lead to a successful development of both phase one and phase two.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed site design and building layout with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant provide a master plan including information regarding the southern portion of the site, which will interact with the San Antonio River as well as the Mission Reach of the San Antonio Riverwalk as noted in finding h.

- ii. That if the applicant is unable to orient the primary entrances toward a developed street, that the applicant orient primary entrances toward pedestrian walkways and active spaces, not surface parking as noted in finding n.
- iii. That the applicant continue to develop and implement active spaces along Mission Road as noted in finding m.
- iv. That the applicant continue to coordinate with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.
- v. That the applicant actively work with Office of Historic Preservation staff, the Design Review Committee of the Historic and Design Review Commission, the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association and the San Antonio River Authority.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant conceptual approval of site and buildings layout with the stipulation that the building be oriented with Mission Road.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2015-324

Applicant: Nicole McLeod

Address: 434 Furr Dr.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to rehabilitate the rear accessory structure at 434 Furr.

FINDINGS:

- a. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 25, 2015, where committee members noted that the raising of the interior floor is needed, that the existing carriage doors could be repaired and that the widening of the existing front door for ADA access was appropriate.
- b. The applicant has proposed to rehabilitate the rear accessory structure at 434 Furr. Within this rehabilitation, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing wood siding and replace with Hardi Board siding, install new attic vents, install a new door and sidelight, install wood front deck and steps, install a new shingle roof and construct a wall behind the existing carriage doors.
- c. The applicant has proposed to install a new composite shingle roof as well as a new attic vents. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A.ii.
- d. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A.ii., existing historic materials should be repaired. If existing materials are beyond repair, new materials that match the existing in color, durability and texture should be used. Staff does not find the wholesale replacement of the existing wood siding appropriate. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing siding and replace what is damaged beyond repair.
- e. The applicant has proposed to install a new, wider front door as well as a sidelight to the left of the door. Given its location where it will not be viewed from the public right of way and the narrow width of the existing front door, staff finds this request appropriate. If possible, staff recommends that the applicant salvage the existing wood door.
- f. The applicant has noted that the new raised floor will be approximately one foot above grade. The applicant has proposed to install a front porch deck and railing to accommodate access to the raised finish floor and front door. The applicant has noted that the proposed deck will be wood. Staff finds this proposal appropriate and consistent with the materials proposed throughout the project.
- g. The applicant has noted that one of the existing wood windows is to be restored while the other is to be replaced. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, wood windows should be repaired unless they are damaged beyond repair. If this is the case, staff recommends the applicant provide information to that effect.
- h. The applicant has proposed to restore the existing wood carriage doors and frame and insulate a new wall in the existing door openings. The applicant's proposal to retain the existing carriage doors is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.B.i. In this case, staff finds the framing of the existing openings appropriate given this accessory structure's location at the rear of the lot.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant restore the existing wood siding and not replace it in whole.
- ii. That the applicant restore both wood windows rather than only one.
- iii. That the applicant make an attempt to salvage the existing wood door.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2015-383

Applicant: John Bonillas – County Wide Exteriors

Address: 239 W. Hermosa

The applicant is requesting Conceptual Approval for construction of a 20'x20' carport that will extend outward from the existing attached garage. The applicant has proposed materials to include yellow pine, cedar posts and steel R-panels.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to construct a carport addition in front of the existing two-car garage of 239 W Hermosa. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A, i., additions should be located to the rear of the existing historic structure whenever possible in order to minimize views from the public right-of-way. The proposed addition would sit in front of the existing garage and is not consistent with the Guidelines.

b. Regarding materials, the applicant has proposed the use of gray steel R-panels for the roof of the addition, yellow pine for framing and cedar wood for the posts of the carport. The existing house and garage at 239 W Hermosa is composed of painted brick and an asphalt shingle roof. According to the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. new materials should match in type, color and texture, and must also be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. The use of steel R-panels and wood as primary materials is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend Conceptual Approval based on findings a and b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

30. HDRC NO. 2015-393

Applicant: Marcelo Andonie – MSG Management

Address: 929 E. Crockett

Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct two single family, two-story detached homes on a vacant lot. The two houses will feature lap siding and shingle roofs.

FINDINGS:

a. This request for Conceptual Approval of the construction of two detached, single family houses at 929 E Crockett was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 9, 2015. At that meeting, committee members stated that elements of the design did not emulate historic character nor meet the Historic Design Guidelines.

- b. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on July 21, 2015. At that meeting, committee members noted that the proposed footprint is appropriate, that the proposed elevations are modest and nicely detailed, that the street elevations need more fenestration and that the proposed non wood windows should contain proportions comparable of wood windows.
- c. The applicant received conceptual approval of the construction of two detached, two-story houses on August 5, 2015, with the stipulations that the applicant continue to address window fenestration and façade arrangement prior to returning to the HDRC, that the applicant provide staff with a site plan noting the location of all mechanical equipment and that the applicant provide staff with an elevation and information regarding the materials of the proposed rear yard fence.
- d. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately ten feet for both houses from N Hackberry as well as a ten foot setback from E Crockett. The applicant's proposed setbacks are both appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i and ii.
- e. 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 both houses to be orientated toward N Hackberry, both of which will feature a covered front porch and front porch columns. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i.
- f. 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. Staff finds that through the use of step downs in building height, the applicant has provided a visual transition to relate the proposed two story houses to the existing one story houses in the vicinity. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii.
- g. 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.
- h. 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 and a series of roof slopes that complement those found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i.
- i. 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 the applicant has been able to accomplish this while incorporating contemporary interpretations regarding window sizing and placement. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. While the applicant has proposed window and door openings that staff finds appropriate, the applicant has proposed vinyl windows and doors to be installed throughout the house. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i., materials that match the type, color and texture or materials found throughout the district should be used. Staff finds that appropriate window and door materials would consist of wood.
- k. 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.
- l. New construction in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the neighborhood. The applicant has proposed various simple architectural details with complementary materials and contemporary architectural forms including attached side carports which staff finds appropriate. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A. and 4.A.
- m. Mechanical equipment should be located at the rear of the property and be screened from the public right of way. The applicant has noted that all mechanical equipment will be screened by a rear privacy fence to be no taller than six feet in height. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- n. The applicant has provided a landscaping plan which shows the preservation of seven oak trees as well as a proposed turf layout, a walkway of decomposed granite and decomposed ribbon driveways. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A. and 5.B.i.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through m with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant install wood windows and doors to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i., as noted in findings j.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with the windows submitted and with a thicker wood trim.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

31. HDRC NO. 2015-394

Applicant: Celia Mendoza

Address: 609 E. Guenther

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to selectively demolish a non historic rear addition and construct a new, second story addition to the rear of the historic structure. The new addition is to be located above the non historic portion of the house.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 609 E Guenther currently features a non historic rear addition that the applicant has proposed to selectively demolish. Staff finds this request appropriate.
- b. The applicant has proposed to construct a new second story addition to the rear of the primary historic structure to be located above the existing non historic addition. Given its location at the rear of the property and the existing heights of roof located throughout the King William Historic District, staff finds this request appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i. and ii. Staff finds that the proposed addition's height in relationship to the original structure's height may appear over dominating and requests that the applicant provide a line of site study regarding the height of the rear addition to that of the original structure.
- c. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a rear gabled roof as well as various transitions between the primary historic structure and the proposed addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii and iv.
- d. Generally, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 1.B. in the fact that the applicant has proposed an addition whose façade is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure, has located the addition at the rear, has proposed an appropriate footprint and has a height which staff finds appropriate.
- e. The applicant has proposed materials consisting of salvaged wood lap siding, new wood board and batten siding a composition shingle roof and aluminum clad wood windows. Generally, these materials are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions, however, staff recommends that the applicant install wood windows to be consistent with the window materials found throughout King William.
- f. According to the Guidelines for Additions 4.A., additions should be designed to reflect their time while incorporating contemporary interpretations of traditional architectural elements. Staff finds that the applicant has proposed siding, a façade arrangement and architectural forms that are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval with the stipulation that the applicant provide a line of site study to ensure that the proposed addition's roofline will not be superior to that of the original house when viewed from the public right of way.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Salas, Feldman
NAYS: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

32. HDRC NO. 2015-372

Applicant: Robert Webber

Address: 223 Quentin Dr.

Withdrawn by the applicant.

33. HDRC NO. 2015-370

Applicant: Gabriel Sanchez

Address: 418 E. Myrtle

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to rehabilitate the primary historic structure as well as construct an accessory structure featuring 500 square feet at 418 E Myrtle.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct an accessory at the rear of the property at 418 E Myrtle. The applicant has noted that the proposed accessory structure will feature materials consisting of Hardi Board siding, Hardi Board trim and an asphalt shingle roof. Each of these materials is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. and complement the primary historic structure on the property. The applicant has not noted a window material for the accessory structure. Staff finds that wood windows are appropriate.
- b. Consistent with the precedent set throughout the neighborhood as well as the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B., the applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure toward the rear of the property. While the applicant has adhered to a setback of ten feet, the precedent throughout Tobin Hill is to locate rear accessory structures at the rear property line. Staff recommends the applicant locate the proposed accessory structure at the property line and seek a variance.
- c. The applicant has proposed to incorporate appropriately sized window and door openings that complement those of the primary historic structure as well as other historic structures in the immediate vicinity. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. On the east façade, the applicant has proposed to enclose non original open air porch. The applicant has proposed to relocate three existing wood windows from the rear of the house to the side where they will be incorporated into the closing of the non original open air porch. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations state that existing window and door openings should not be enclosed. Staff finds that the relocation of the existing windows from the rear of the structure to the side is appropriate, however, the applicant should retain the existing window openings. Wood windows should be installed at both locations.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install wood windows into the proposed accessory structure and primary historic structure.
- ii. That the applicant retain the existing window openings at the rear of the structure.
- iii. That the applicant located the accessory structure at the rear property line to be consistent with the historic example set in the neighborhood.
- iv. That the applicant install windows on the northern façade to address the lack of façade separation.

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, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

34. HDRC NO. 2015-401

Applicant: Leo Parker

Address: 714 N. Pine

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 28 wood windows in the house at 714 N Pine with low-e vinyl replacement windows.

FINDINGS:

- a) Staff commends the applicant for undertaking the rehabilitation of this structure which has previously been threatened with demolition. The house has suffered a fire, and many of the windows on the second story have been damaged beyond feasible repair.
- b) A site visit by staff revealed that many of the first floor elements, including original wood work and windows remain intact. The majority of the original wood windows are large, one-over-one double hung windows with the exception of the formal dining room which features a decorative divided-lite top sash. Staff finds that the majority of the first floor windows can be repaired.
- c) Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved. If deteriorated beyond repair, they should be replaced in kind to match existing in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. The proposed vinyl windows are not consistent with the historic design guidelines, and are not an appropriate replacement for windows that are deteriorated beyond repair.
- d) Given the circumstances where substantial deterioration has occurred prior to the current owner's investment, staff finds that replacement with a more affordable vinyl window is appropriate for non-original windows in the rear, added portions of the house. The applicant should consider repairing and relocating salvageable wood windows to the front of the home where possible.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on finding c:

- 1. The salvageable original windows on the first floor are recommended to be repaired rather than replaced.
- 2. Original windows that are damaged beyond repair are recommended to be replaced with compatible wood windows instead of the proposed vinyl windows. If the HDRC approves the applicants request for vinyl windows, staff recommends the added stipulation that the applicant select a window product that features a block frame that can be set within the existing openings versus a product with a flush flange or nailing strip. All replacement windows should be simple, one-over-one designs versus a faux divided-lite design.
- 3. Staff recommends that the non-original windows on the 2nd-floor addition be replaced with vinyl windows meeting the specifications noted above. Final approved specifications must be verified by staff prior to purchase and installation.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

35. HDRC NO. 2015-399

Applicant: Carlos Flores

Address: 221 King William

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

- 1. Remove two (2) mature pecan trees from the back yard and add three (3) new trees.
- 2. Construct an 8' privacy fence on the south and west sides of the backyard.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to remove two (2) mature pecan trees from the rear yard. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.i. and iii. existing mature and heritage trees should be preserved and protected from damage as well as be properly maintained. The applicant's proposal to remove these two trees is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- b. Concerning the applicant's proposal to add new trees to a historic property, the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.ii. specifies adding new trees in locations that would not potentially cause damage to a historic structure or other historic elements. It also states that species selection and planting procedures should be done in accordance with guidance from the City Arborist.
- c. The applicant has proposed to extend the height of the existing rear yard fence from six (6) feet to eight (8) feet at the west and south sides of the yard. According to the UDC Section 35-514 (c)(1) no fence or wall shall be erected or altered in any side or rear yard to exceed a height of six (6) feet. This proposal is not consistent with the UDC because the fence height restriction specifies no more than six (6) feet at the side or rear yard.

Staff does not recommend approval for items 1 and 2 based on findings a and c. Staff recommends that the applicant provide the following documentation prior to returning to HDRC:

- i. An arborist report detailing the health and overall condition of the existing pecan trees in question by a certified, licensed arborist.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to reset to October 21, 2015 so that the applicant may attend.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

36. HDRC NO. 2015-395

Applicant: Jenny de la Rosa

Address: 321 Burleson

Withdrawn by the applicant.

37. HDRC NO. 2015-367

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 811-815 N. St. Mary's

The applicant is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property at 811-815 N. St. Marys.

FINDINGS:

- a. The two-story structures at 811 and 815 N. St. Mary's Street were built by 1950 as indicated on historic Sanborn Maps. 815 N. St. Mary's first appears in the San Antonio City directory in 1946 as the location for the Great American Life Insurance Company. For the greater part of the next two decades the building housed the Security Finance Company until approximately 1972, when Frances Tarlton "Sissy" Farenthold used the building as her election campaign headquarters during her bid to become Texas Governor. While the lower floors were leased to businesses, the upper floor housed apartments..
- b. The property at 815 N. St. Mary's is especially notable for its Streamline Art Moderne architecture. The horizontally oriented building features the hallmark styling and materials of the period: smooth, rounded walls, stucco with horizontal lines, steel joists, tile curtain wall, casement windows on both levels, glass-block windows built into the curved corner facades, parapet, eyebrow and distinctive pigmented structural glass and a corneroriented entrance.
- c. The property contributed to the establishment of St. Mary's as North/South Corridor per historical accounts.
- d. The property was identified as a potential resource during the River North Survey in 2009.
- e. The property is well-located on the site and could be incorporated into a larger development.
- f. As referenced in the applicable citations, 811-815 N. St. Mary's meets UDC criterion [35-607(b)5], [35-607(b)6], [35-607(b)7], [35-607(b)8], [35-607(b)11] for a finding of historic significance in the process of seeking designation as a local historic landmark. In order to be eligible for landmark designation, a property must meet at least three of the criteria, 811-815 N. St. Mary's meets 5.
- g. Staff finds that 811-815 N. St. Mary's is a contributing building to the N. St. Mary's corridor, and its preservation as a historic landmark enhances the quality and character of the corridor.
- h. Historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its corridors. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects
- i. The property owner has submitted an application for demolition of both structures on the property.

October 7, 2015

23

j. The mural on the rear structure at 811 N. St. Mary's is not considered historic. It was commissioned for the 2014 Luminaria and was intended to be temporary street art.

Staff recommends approval of land marking based on findings a-h..

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to refer to an onsite DDC meeting.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Salmon, Cone, Lazarine, Salas, Feldman

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 7:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

