

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
OCTOBER 16, 2013**

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

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

ABSENT: Zuniga, Shafer, Connor

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-286 | 326 Callaghan Ave. |
| 2. Case No. 2013-339 | 733 E. Woodlawn |
| 3. Case No. 2013-330 | 139 North Drive |
| 4. Case No. 2013-331 | 206 Devine |
| 5. Case No. 2013-345 | 726 E. Woodlawn |
| 6. Case No. 2013-332 | 218 Produce Row |
| 7. Case No. 2013-269 | 115 Plaza de Armas |
| 8. Case No. 2013-284 | 202 King William |
| 9. Case No. 2013-317 | 2909 Mission Rd. |
| 10. Case No. 2013-342 | 215 E. Kings Hwy |
| 11. Case No. 2013-328 | 131 Princess Pass |
| 12. Case No. 2013-334 | 247 E. Rosewood |
| 13. Case No. 2013-336 | 401 Villita |
| 14. Case No. 2013-211 | 800 E. Market |
| 15. Case No. 2013-340 | 925 S. St. Mary’s |
| 16. Case No. 2013-343 | 519 Roosevelt |
| 17. Case No. 2013-344 | 1500 Saltillo |

Items 7, 8, 13, and 15 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

7. HDRC NO. 2013-269

Applicant: Allison Chambers

Address: 115 Plaza de Armas

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

Construct a CPS vault at the rear of the building at 115 Plaza de Armas. The proposed vault will be freestanding, with stucco and D'Hanis tile exterior and it will be screened by a metal fence. It will be adjacent to an existing brick wall, but will not attach to the existing wall.

FINDINGS:

- a. The scope of work being performed to restore the Plaza de Armas buildings and convert them for use by the City of San Antonio, including restoration of the storefront, installation of new doors and canopies and modifications to the existing fenestration, was approved by the HDRC on May 1, 2013. At that time, the applicant planned to construct a below grade CPS vault. However, the vault has had to be revised and is now proposed to be above ground behind the existing buildings.
- b. The proposed vault will be located at the rear of the existing historic structures, consistent with several previous rear one-story additions. The proposed location will minimize the visibility of this structure and preserve the historic urban design characteristics of the site, in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction Section 6.A and with the UDC Section 35-642.a.2.
- c. The location for the proposed vault faces Calder Street, which functions as an alley adjacent to the San Pedro Creek, which may be redeveloped in the near future. The proposed metal fencing around this vault structure will help screen the new structure from view from the creek.
- d. The proposed vault will be screened by the proposed metal fence as well as an existing brick wall along the north side, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 6.B.ii.
- e. Archaeological investigation will be required to be performed as part of the construction of the proposed vault, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 8.
- f. To help integrate the proposed vault with its immediate context, the color of the stucco on this new structure should match the color of the stone on the adjacent building.

Staff recommends approval based on findings b, c, and d with the following stipulations:

- 1. That archaeological investigation be performed in the vault location in conjunction with the construction of the vault based on finding e.
- 2. That the color of the stucco on the exterior of the vault match the existing stone of the adjacent building based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Judson and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to approve approve based on findings b, c, and d with the following stipulations:

- 1. That archaeological investigation be performed in the vault location in conjunction with the construction of the vault based on finding e.
- 2. That the color of the stucco on the exterior of the vault match the existing stone of the adjacent building based on finding f.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED.

8. HDRC NO. 2013-284

Applicant: Juan M. Fernandez

Address: 202 King William

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Restore the front of the home to its 1904 layout. In 1904/1905, according to Sanborn maps and an existing historic photograph, the home had a full width, two story front porch with a central portion which curved outward. Currently the home has a small, central front porch with curved steps. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the full width front porch based on the existing historic images.
2. Rehabilitate an existing rear addition to create more distinction between the original home and the addition. By 1904, this home had an L-shaped footprint with the rear ell on the east side of the property. A 1971 addition filled in the "L", creating a rectangular footprint. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate this later addition, installing horizontal lap siding and new windows. Most of the proposed new windows will maintain the same proportions as the windows on the historic home, with larger glazed areas at the rear of the structure adjacent to a proposed patio with a flat roof supported by simple columns.
3. Demolish the existing rear carriage house and salvage the materials.
4. Construct a new detached carport/study. The proposed new structure will be behind the main house, on the southeast corner of the site facing Turner St. which runs along the east side of the property. It will have be two stories with a metal gable roof.
5. Install a new 4 foot tall, front yard wood picket fence with simple pickets and a new 6 foot tall horizontal wood privacy fence on the east side of the rear yard.

FINDINGS:

- a. An application for this scope of work was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 10, 2013. At that time, the committee noted concern over the proposed carport and study structure, discussing its potential impact on views of the home from Turner St. and suggesting that it be oriented in a similar way to the existing carriage house to help minimize the visual impact from the public right-of-way and maintain views of the historic main structure. The committee welcomed rehabilitation of this home, particularly the reconstruction of the full width front porch, which may have been designed by Atlee B. Ayres. The committee did not indicate any concerns with the proposed modifications to the existing rear addition.
- b. The HDRC heard this request on September 18, 2013, at which time the applicant chose to withdraw the request and return to the Design Review Committee for further discussion to address the concerns raised, particularly regarding the proposed accessory structure which faces Turner St. and the treatment of the existing 1971 rear addition to the main house.
- c. This revised application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 24, 2013. The committee found that either reorienting the proposed one story accessory building to follow the rear property line or decreasing the footprint by making it two stories respond to the concerns raised previously, noting that two story accessory structures are not uncommon in the King William Historic District. The committee also noted that more definitive drawings will be required in order to receive approval from the full Commission, indicating that the scale presented in the drawings is somewhat misleading and that the fenestration on the proposed accessory structure still has to be worked out to make sure it is appropriate for the site.
- d. According to the King William Historic District survey, the home at 202 King William was built c.1890. A single story home also appears on the 1873 bird's eye view map of San Antonio. At some point between 1873 and 1890, this home was either demolished and replaced with the home that currently stands on this property or it was incorporated into the structure that stands today.
- e. This home first appears on the 1896 Sanborn map. At that time, the house was listed as two stories with a full width, two story front porch and a single story rear addition on the west side of the rear façade. According to this map, there were several small accessory structures on the property. On the 1904 Sanborn map, the one story rear addition is gone and the

home has an L-shaped footprint with the rear ell extending from the east side of the rear façade. This map also shows the front porch as having a central portion which curves outward and no accessory buildings are shown. The 1912 Sanborn map shows the house as having a rectilinear front porch and a two story rear accessory structure.

f. Staff finds that the proposal to reconstruct the front porch of this home to its 1904 appearance is appropriate and based on historic photographs of the structure, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.v.

g. The proposal to remove the existing siding on the 1971 rear addition and replace it with horizontal wood siding will help create a visual distinction between the original house and the later construction, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation number 9. Similarly, there is a strong precedent for using wood siding on a rear addition to a historic masonry structure.

h. Similarly, staff finds that the revised proposal for fenestration on the existing rear addition that is a contemporary interpretation of the historic windows on the original structure is appropriate and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Sections 4.A.ii and 4.A.iii.

i. The existing carriage house, while it appears to be of historic age, has been modified from what appears on the Sanborn maps and is in a state of extreme disrepair, constituting a loss of significance as defined in the UDC Section 35-614.c.

j. Staff finds that demolishing this building and reusing the materials onsite is appropriate and in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 3.B.i.

k. There is no real consistency in garage/accessory building orientation along Turner St.

l. Staff concurs with the overall findings of the second Design Review Committee meeting on September 24, 2013, that the revised two story accessory structure is appropriate and addresses the concerns raised about proximity and impact on the main house.

m. The proposed two story accessory building relates to the historic home in terms of its massing, form and character, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Sections 5.A.i and .A.iii.

n. The proposed front and rear yard fencing is appropriate and in keeping with similar examples throughout the King William Historic District in terms of design, materials, and height, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, Section 2.B.

1. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings e and f.

2. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings g and h.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Approved as submitted based on findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to approve as submitted based on findings a through n.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

13. HDRC NO. 2013-336

Applicant: Geof Edwards

Address: 401 Villita St.

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

At Villita Street side:

1. Remove existing metal and concrete bollards and replace with new pneumatic bollards.
2. Remove a portion of existing clay paving and replace with new drivable paver; new paver color to match existing clay paving.
3. Remove existing ashtrays.
4. Remove existing concrete planters.
5. Restore existing ornamental wooden doors and windows. Replace existing glass with 1" insulated glass.
6. Repair existing paving grade outside main entry doors to slope away from building.
7. Provide new panic hardware to one of the two entry gates to courtyard.

At courtyard side:

8. Remove existing non-complaint ramp and replace with new code-complaint ramp. Provide new handrails to match existing.
9. Remove existing non-complaint inlet grate covers and replace with new code-complaint covers.
10. Repair and stabilize existing masonry screen wall.
11. Remove existing single pane hollow metal windows behind masonry screen wall and replace with new 1" insulated glass and custom aluminum frames to match existing window profile and color.
12. Remove existing single pane hollow metal windows under canopy and replace with 1" insulated glass with custom aluminum frames to match existing window profile and color.
13. Remove existing exterior p-lam doors under canopy and replace with new wood doors to match originals.
14. Repair and paint existing 30' taillight poles.
15. Remove a portion of existing planting area and replace with six small planting areas.
16. Remove existing 72" high metal fence facing the River Walk and replace with 42" high metal rails; new rails to match existing.
17. Modify height of existing concrete wall by steps to River Walk. Existing wall height is approximately 74" from courtyard elevation, new height to equal 45" approximately. Concrete wall to be covered with ½" stucco and painted. New wall cap to match existing wall clay caps.
18. Remove existing 72" high metal gate to River Walk and replace with new 42" high metal gate; new gate to match existing.

At service yard side:

19. Remove existing hollow metal doors and frames and replace with new hollow metal doors and frames to match existing.
20. Remove existing screening wood fence and replace with new stucco-on-emu screening wall.

At all sides:

21. Repair and paint existing lantern poles.
22. Repair existing electrical outlets.
23. Repair existing bronze step lights.
24. Remove selected existing ceiling mounted lights and replace with new efficient lighting.
25. Remove existing flood lights and replace with new efficient lighting.
26. Repair selected existing hose bibs and hydrants.
27. Repair existing wall sconces.
28. Repair and paint existing lantern poles.
29. Remove existing tailpipes from abandoned downspouts and patch masonry at wall.
30. Remove all existing surface mounted exterior speakers.
31. Remove existing damaged clay paving and replace with new paving to match existing.
32. Replace existing landscape material at selected planters.

FINDINGS:

- a. Overall, the proposed exterior maintenance and alterations are minimal and will enhance the pedestrian experience along this portion of the River Walk and in La Villita. Where replacement of materials is proposed, in-kind materials have been selected consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.
- b. Character-defining features of the Assembly Building, such as light fixtures, ornamental doors and clay tile ornamentation will be retained and restored in the proposal.
- c. The lowering of the existing fencing along the river side of the property will enhance views to and from the River.
- d. The addition of stucco to existing concrete retaining walls creates texture and introduces indigenous materials to the river side of the property consistent with UDC Section 35-674(d).

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

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

RECUSED: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2013-340

Applicant: Montgomery Howard

Address: 925 S. St. Mary's

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Construct a new 30,000 square foot building on the southern portion of the Bonham Academy campus. The proposed structure will be two stories and will include five classrooms, a faculty work center, two science classrooms, music, art, a black box theatre, and a computer lab. The existing portables on this area of the campus will be removed. The proposed structure will use buff and red colored masonry and brick to match existing school buildings and incorporate colored panels to relate to the surrounding neighborhood. The south and north walls of the structure are proposed to be flat seam metal panels. The main mass of the proposed new building will be set back from S. St. Mary's Street while the black box theatre will project toward the street at the northeast corner of the building.

In conjunction with this construction, an existing 1996 addition on the campus will be renovated to house an administrative suite, cafeteria and kitchen. Repairs will also be performed to some existing wood windows on the campus.

FINDINGS:

- a. A request by the same applicant to construct a larger new building in this location was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 24, 2012. At that time, the committee commended the applicant for the extensive process of study involved in the design of this new building and the fact that the proposal is sensitive to the context without trying to replicate a historic building. The committee noted concern over the punched openings on the east, street-facing façade of the structure in terms of the change in the fenestration pattern. The committee also noted some concern over the rear elevation and the fact that it does not break down in scale to address the residential structures behind the building.

b. The previous request received conceptual approval from the HDRC on August 15, 2012, with three stipulations: that the building incorporate more pedestrian-scaled elements along S. St. Mary's Street such as landscaping or street trees; that upon returning for final approval, the applicant explore more articulation on the façade in terms of brickwork or patterning to help relate to the historic structures on the campus; and that the property located at 114 Cedar behind the school be included as part of the site plan for approval.

c. This revised request for new construction was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 8, 2013. The committee noted that the revised proposal has a repetitiousness and simplicity that do not compete with the existing campus buildings. Similarly, the reduced scope meets concerns from the neighborhood regarding the size and scale of the previous proposal. The committee noted that it will be important to maintain the crispness of the roofline and not to clutter or compromise that with rooftop mechanical equipment. There was also discussion about the colored exterior on the black box theatre and how best to maintain it if vandalized. Staff noted concern over the lack of articulation on the S. St. Mary's Street (east) façade. The committee found that planting some additional small trees may help soften the street edge of the proposed building and that incorporating some fenestration into the south wall of the building would help bring natural light into the internal corridor.

d. The main building on the Bonham Academy campus first appears on the 1896 Sanborn map, listed as a public school with windows on all sides. Since that time, this original structure has remained largely unchanged. According to the 1912-1951 Sanborn map, additions were constructed on the campus in 1914 and 1930. A 1996 gymnasium was also constructed to the south of the original building. The proposed new classroom building will be to the south of the existing 1996 structure.

e. Although the revised design is pulled further back from S. St. Mary's Street, it does not address the stipulation approved by the HDRC on August 15, 2012, concerning the pedestrian scale on this side of the structure.

f. The proposed structure addresses neighborhood concerns about the proximity of the structure to adjacent residential properties to the west of the campus.

g. The use of color on this structure relates to existing precedents in the neighborhood.

h. The proposed structure is consistent in terms of building height with the other campus buildings, in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 2.A.i.

i. The proposed orientation and setback of the new structure are consistent with the other buildings on the campus, in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 1.A.

j. The proposed structure relates to the existing campus building in terms of the horizontal datum lines incorporated into the configuration of the façade, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Sections 2.A.iii and 2.C.ii.

k. The proposed fenestration on the structure is commercial in appearance and does not respect the proportion of wall to window space established by the existing, historic campus buildings, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 2.C.i.

l. The proposed new structure is oriented toward the adjacent campus buildings, rather than toward the street. While this is not inappropriate and will avoid confusion about the main campus entry points, staff finds that more articulation in terms of fenestration, architectural detailing, and landscaping should be incorporated on the S. St. Mary's Street façade to help create a more pedestrian scale where this building meets the street. Similarly, the incorporation of appropriate street furniture may also help soften the edge between the proposed building and the street.

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings f-j, with the following stipulations:

1. The fenestration pattern and articulation on the S. St. Mary's Street façade continue to be studied based on findings k and l.
2. Further development of the space between the proposed building and S. St. Mary's Street in terms of landscaping or street furniture be completed prior to returning for final approval based on findings e and l.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to grant conceptual approval based on findings f through j, with the following stipulations:

1. The fenestration pattern and articulation on the S. St. Mary's Street façade continue to be studied based on findings k and l.
2. Further development of the space between the proposed building and S. St. Mary's Street in terms of landscaping or street furniture be completed prior to returning for final approval based on findings e and l.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

18. HDRC NO. 2013-320

Applicant: Elizabeth J. Dalton

Address: 410 Mission St

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

1. Replace the front lawn at 410 Mission Street with "Texas blend rock" with decomposed granite walkways. Metal edging will be implemented to secure the rocks in place.
2. Construct a wood pergola over the front entrance to the house. The pergola extends from the front of the house and is supported by 3 wood posts. It features a flat roof covered in lattice.

FINDINGS:

- a. A proposal to completely replace the front yard with rocks and gravel was heard by the HDRC on October 2, 2013. At that hearing, the Commission voted to refer this case to the Design Review Committee.
- b. The Design Review Committee met on site to review this request on October 8, 2013. At that meeting, it was noted by the committee members present that gravel is an appropriate material in limited areas, particularly around the building perimeter. All those present agreed that the areas closer to the street should be replaced with landscaping. The applicant provided an updated landscaping plan that is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. The committee expressed support for the new plan which incorporated plantings in the front yard and parkway space. It was recommended that the applicant maintain the decomposed granite walkway in its current location provided that the metal edging was set further into the ground to reduce its profile. The applicant agreed that lowering the metal edging would be attempted.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.ii, wholesale replacement of lawn space with rocks or hardscape should be avoided or limited to areas that are not highly visible. The widespread use of rock mulch, as originally proposed, is not consistent with this guideline.
- d. Xeric landscapes which incorporate areas of pervious or semi-pervious gravel are appropriate within the King William Historic District. However, selected materials should be consistent with those found historically. The originally requested rock blend consists of larger, river rocks which would not have been used historically.
- e. The landscape design submitted by the applicant on October 8, 2013, incorporates some hardscape material with plantings consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.iii.
- f. The use of metal edging to retain the rocks in place creates a raised condition along the street and sidewalk edges. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 4.A.iii. If the larger rocks are removed per the updated proposal, the metal edging could either be lowered around the new landscaping beds or removed completely.

- g. Staff inquired with the applicant about the front porch pergola that appears in the photos received with the application for installation of the rock hardscaping. Staff has found no record of review or approval, and satellite imagery indicates an asphalt roof once existed where the lattice roof is now located. At the October 2 hearing, the applicant indicated that the pergola has been there for several years, but has not been able to provide any evidence of an approval. No permits for its construction are on file with Development Services.
- h. The design of the pergola is not typical for historic front porches, and is more commonly used for backyard shelters in non-historic construction.
- i. The original front porch of the structure has been previously enclosed. It appears in its current condition is survey photos for the King William Historic District designation which date back to the 1980s. Because the porch is enclosed, the attachment of the wood pergola does not destroy or obscure any original features of the house. The non-original front entrance is set on grade, so there is no opportunity for a traditional porch.
- j. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, new porch elements should be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. The pergola is simple in design and meets this guideline. However, staff finds that the pergola could be altered to be more consistent with those found historically. For example, historic pergolas would not have featured lattice, and would have exposed rafter ends. Additionally, the bottoms of the balusters should terminate at the bottom rail, and not extend to the ground. Finally, the addition of a fourth column would create symmetry with the doorway.
- k. The pergola is currently painted a brown color. This color mimics the color of natural wood, giving the pergola a rustic appearance. A lighter color, such as white to match the trim on the house, would allow the pergola to become less distinguishable as a non-contributing element and help it to better blend with the house.

1. Staff recommends approval of the updated site plan submitted on October 8, 2013, with the stipulation that the existing metal edging be set lower in the ground or removed in the newly landscaped areas based on findings e and f.

2. Staff does not recommend approval of the pergola based on findings g and h. If the HDRC finds that the circumstances of this case warrant the approval of the pergola, then staff recommends the added stipulations that the lattice is removed, that the rafters feature exposed ends, that the bottoms of the balusters are trimmed to terminate at the bottom rail, that a fourth column is added to the structure to create symmetry with the doorway, and that the pergola is painted white based on findings j through k.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve Item 1 revised plan as submitted. Item 2 – Approval of pergola with staff recommendations and additional stipulation that the roof be standing seam metal or pergola may be removed.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

19. HDRC NO. 2013-253

Applicant: ADA Inc.

Address: 654 Leigh St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to implement the following revisions to a previous approval to construct a 2-story, single family residence on a vacant lot at 654 Leigh St:

- 1. Reconfigure front porch to include an inset porch with exposure to the 2nd floor balcony. Entry doors will consist of full-light double doors;

- 2.Reconfigure the fenestration pattern on the north (front) façade to include two fixed, picture windows and atwo-over-one sliding window;
- 3.Expand the balcony on the west façade and add three fixed, picture windows;
- 4.Add an additional row of small, fixed windows on the east façade; and
- 5.Incorporate cedar siding as an exterior material.

FINDINGS:

- a. This request was initially given final approval by the HDRC on September 4, 2013, with the stipulations that the roof form be altered from a single slope and that one-over-one windows with traditional dimensions be used on the front façade based on findings b and c cited below.
 - b. As originally submitted, the proposed new construction featured a single slope roof with the taller end oriented towards the highway. Removing the parapet from the previous design, per DRC recommendation, reduced the overall profile of the structure. However, the single sloped roof was still a departure from existing conditions found in nearby historic properties and was not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i. The approved drawings submitted on September 6, 2013, feature a gabled roof consistent with the guidelines and meet the stipulations required in the September 4 approval.
 - c. As originally submitted, the proposed new construction featured fixed aluminum windows and horizontal sliding aluminum windows. New construction should feature a fenestration pattern that is in consistent with those found in nearby historic properties in order to conform to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. New windows should feature traditional window sizes and configurations in order to conform to this guideline. The approved drawings submitted on September 6, 2013, feature one-over one windows consistent with the guidelines and meet the stipulations required in the September 4 approval.
 - d. The current proposal maintains the approved roof form.
 - e. The current proposal does not maintain the approved fenestration pattern for the north (front) façade. Instead, the current proposal features large fixed windows and a two-over-one sliding window. These windows do not conform to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i.
 - f. The current proposal introduces an inset front porch and exposed second floor balcony to the north (front) façade. Full-light double doors are proposed to serve as the main entry. A single-leaf entry is more common within the Lavaca Historic District and would be more consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i. Additionally, the approved design featured a small, shed-roofed porch that is more consistent with others in the Lavaca Historic District.
 - g. The current proposal introduces cedar siding as an exterior material in addition to stucco. Wood siding is a material that is commonly found in the Lavaca Historic District and is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.
 - h. The current proposal introduced new, tall fixed windows on the east façade. These windows do not conform to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i.
 - i. The current proposal introduces an additional row of fixed windows on the west façade. This revision is consistent with the previous approval.
- 1.Staff does not recommend approval based on finding f. The previously-approved porch is more consistent with the Guidelines and should be maintained in the design.
 - 2.Staff does not recommend approval based on finding e. The pattern previously-approved fenestration pattern is more consistent with the Guidelines and should be maintained in the design.
 - 3.Staff recommends approval of alterations to the west façade with the stipulation that new windows feature traditional dimensions and configurations, such as a one-over-one window, based on finding h.
 - 4.Staff recommends approval of new windows on the east façade as submitted based on finding i.

5. Staff recommends approval of the cedar siding based on finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

20. HDRC NO. 2013-283

Applicant: Nick Naik

Address: 408 E. Houston

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

1. Demolish three individual landmarks.
2. Construct a new 10 story hotel. The proposed hotel will be clad in brick and stucco and will have a rooftop pool.

FINDINGS:

- a. A demolition application for the three buildings at 408-416 East Houston was approved by HDRC on October 17, 2007. At that time it was determined that the buildings had lost their significance and that the original storefronts, believed to have been in place behind the false fronts at the time of designation, are no longer extant and most of the original material has been replaced. The proposed replacement building received approval from HDRC on November 5, 2008. The approved 14 story hotel design was never built and the applicant is returning to receive HDRC approval on a different design.
- b. The project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 13, 2013. At that time, there was concern regarding windows facing the Maverick building to the west and the interruption of the pedestrian sidewalk by the driveway. The applicant was encouraged to study the possibility of vehicular access through College Street, articulation on the lower floors facing College Street and provide more indication of mechanical systems.
- c. The project received conceptual approval on September 4, 2013, which included the following stipulations: exploring the possibility of vehicular access through College Street, align the fenestration pattern on the west side of the front façade as close as possible to the adjacent Maverick building, use window proportions that follow nearby historic facades, more articulation is incorporated on the east and south elevations to avoid large expanses of blank walls, and information on location of mechanical systems is submitted during final approval.
- d. The project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 8, 2013. At that time, concern was expressed regarding narrowing the sidewalk and that incorporating a curbless drive might be more appropriate. It was also recommended to center the driveway in order to increase the distance between the curb and an existing tree.
- e. The design was revised to include changes to the fenestration pattern, window proportions that follow nearby historic facades and more articulation on the south façade. In addition, a vehicular circulation diagram studying the feasibility of accessing the site through College Street was presented.
- f. Although as proposed, the driveway transparency and finishes will enhance the pedestrian experience, careful consideration should be taken to not detract or cause adverse effect with the interruption of the sidewalk and the introduction of a driveway. Although this condition is found on other hotels downtown, the effect of the vehicular access on the pedestrian circulation should be minimized. If access through Houston Street is necessary, a one car entrance that

then flares out into two lanes should be used instead of a double drive entrance. In addition, the introduction of a driveway and a queuing area at this location will severely impact the pedestrian circulation along Houston Street and significantly reduce the sidewalk width. If queuing vehicles obstructing the street is a concern, vehicles should either be pulled in all the way into the driveway and parking area or be directed to go around the block until the driveway is accessible. No reduction of the sidewalk should exist at any point

Staff recommends approval based on the findings above with the following stipulations:

1. Center the driveway between the two columns to provide better pedestrian circulation.
2. Remove the queuing area on the street in order to avoid reducing the sidewalk width and maintain the pedestrian space.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to approve a single entrance and with staff's recommendations.

AYES: Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: Cone, Judson

RECUSED: Laffoon

THE MOTION CARRIED.

21. HDRC NO. 2013-311

Applicant: Patrick Wheeler

Address: 323 Bushnell

Postponed by the applicant.

22. HDRC NO. 2013-338

Applicant: The Saint Fern Holdings

Address: 629 Burnett

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

1. Replace the existing standing seam metal roof with an architectural shingle roof on the church and pastor house. The proposed roof color will be weatherwood.
2. Demolish an existing addition. The addition is poorly constructed and is pulling on the church and the pastor house.
3. Open enclosed entry porch on the pastor house. The existing stucco will be removed to uncover the wood structure underneath.
4. Reconfigure fenestration pattern. Windows will be restored to their 1924 appearance. The restored windows will be slightly larger with a pointed arch top. The original stained glass design will be replicated based on photographs taken before all the glass was stolen, using a colored vinyl film mounted on the inside.
5. Install two 6'x8' wood fixed windows on the east elevation of the church. The windows will have a stained glass pattern in vinyl to match other windows.
6. Remove stucco to uncover wood siding underneath. Missing wood siding will be installed to match existing.

FINDINGS:

- a. The church building and parish house were constructed for the St. John's Episcopal Church in 1924. According to a historic photo submitted by the applicant, the church originally had a standing seam metal roof, lap siding and large windows with a pointed arch top. The church has a gothic revival style.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, roofs should be replaced in kind. Although metal is the original roofing material on the church, shingles are a common roofing material on Gothic Revival buildings and are not incompatible with the architectural style. In this case, using a different material will not diminish the integrity of the building or cause adverse affect.
- c. As shown on the 1911-1951 Sanborn Maps, the connector piece between the main building and the parish house was built sometime after 1951. Demolishing this later addition will not adversely affect the integrity of the property.
- d. It is likely that the current configuration of the entry to the parish house is the original configuration as it appears on the 1911-1951 Sanborn Maps. Opening the entry and removing the enclosure will highly alter the configuration of the main entry and adversely affect the integrity of the parish house. If security is an issue, installing a set of double doors to close off the opening would be more appropriate.
- e. Interior pictures submitted by the applicant show that the original window openings are still in place behind the stucco façade. Restoring the original window configuration is appropriate in this case. However, as indicated by the Standards for Rehabilitation No. 3, creating a false sense of history should be avoided. Although replicating the original stained glass detail is appropriate, using a synthetic film on the inside of the glass without the soldering between the pieces will produce a different effect.
- f. Creating new window openings on a prominent façade should be avoided. The proposed fixed windows are not compatible with the style or period of construction of the building and are not commonly used window types in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed changes to the fenestration pattern along the east façade of the main structure are not compatible with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Restoring the original set of three windows on this façade would me more appropriate.
- g. Removing the stucco to uncover the original wood siding is appropriate and recommended by the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations.

Staff recommends approval of items 1, 2, 4 and 6 as submitted based on findings b, c, e and g.

Staff does not recommend approval of items 3 and 5 based on findings d and f. If additional windows are needed on the east façade of the church, restoring the three original windows on this façade would be recommended.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve items 1,2,4,and 6 with staff stipulations. Denial of item 5. Denial of item 3 unless evidence is provided to staff demonstrating that the porch was originally open.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.**23. HDRC NO. 2013-333**

Applicant: Tim McGovern

Address: 245 W. Wildwood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a galvalume or champagne color standing seam metal roof. The proposed roof will have a ridge cap vent and pencil ribs.

FINDINGS:

- a. Olmos Park Terrace was originally platted in 1931 by the Northside Improvement Company, with developer H.C. Thorman as president. Houses developed by H.C. Thorman were constructed of stone veneer over reinforced concrete with attached garages. According to the 1938 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the house at 245 W. Wildwood was built ca. 1938 as part of the Olmos Park Terrace development in an English stone cottage style.
- b. Consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, a standing seam metal roof is a compatible roofing material to a stone cottage style house.
- c. According to the 1911-1951 Sanborn Maps the house originally had a composition roof. English stone cottages throughout the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District historically had shingle roofs. A standing seam metal roof is not a typical roofing material found on stone houses within the district.
- d. Consistent with the Guidelines for Maintenance and Alterations Checklist for Metal Roofs, new metal roofs that adhere to the guidelines can be approved as long as the installation of a metal roof is appropriate for the style and period of construction. The checklist includes using a crimped ridge seam consistent with the historic application or a low-profile ridge cap with no ridge cap vent or end cap if a crimped ridge is not used.
- e. Attics were historically vented through gable vents. Ridge vents are predominantly exhaust devices that are commonly used on modern roofs. If sufficient intake air is not available, commonly provided through soffit vents on modern houses, air will be pulled from the interior conditioned spaces into the attic. Installing a ridge vent in this case will not be an efficient ventilation strategy and could potentially damage the historic resource.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on the findings above. Staff recommends an in kind replacement. If a standing seam metal roof is approved, staff recommends including the following stipulations:

- 1. Panels are 18-21” wide with seams no taller than 2”
- 2. A double munch seam or a low profile ridge cap with no ridge vent or end cap is used instead of a ridge cap vent

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve based on findings a through e with staff recommendations.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

24. HDRC NO. 2013-337

Applicant: Walter Stricker

Address: 534 Leigh

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install cedar shingles over the existing wood drop siding at 534 Leigh Street.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 534 Leigh Street was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and has been altered over time. However, the existing wood drop siding is likely either original or similar to the original materials.

- b. According to the applicant, the existing wood siding is in need of repair. As a solution, the requested cedar shingles would be installed over the existing siding.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B., existing materials that can be repaired should be preserved in place. If repair is not possible, the Guidelines state that replacement materials should be in-kind and match the profile, dimensions, material and finish of the original siding.
- d. The proposed cedar shingles are not an in-kind replacement for wood drop siding as they do not match the profile, dimensions and finish of the original materials and are not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations i.B.ii.
- e. Although the original siding would remain with the structure, the installation of new shingles over the existing siding would cause further damage and would also significantly alter the appearance of the structure.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings c through e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to deny based on findings c through e.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Salas, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

25. HDRC NO. 2013-335

Applicant: Thomas Bradley

Address: 322 W. Kings Hwy

Withdrawn by the applicant.

26. HDRC NO. 2013-329

Applicant: Andrew Douglas

Address: 135 E. Commerce

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Rehabilitate the existing structure at 135 E. Commerce, known as the Witte Building. The existing structure has been modified from its original appearance and neglected for many years. The applicant proposes to restore the front (south) façade of the structure to its historic appearance, with the reconstruction of the historic decorative parapet wall shown in existing historic photographs of the structure. The applicant also proposes to remove several rear additions that have been constructed over time to the river-facing (north) façade of the building.
2. Construct new metal balconies on the north and west sides of the building. The applicant also proposes to construct one small, projecting balcony and install a flat canopy at street level on the south façade of the structure, facing E. Commerce St.

3. Remove an existing Hugman retaining wall and cantilevered walkway which runs along the west side of the existing building and connects the existing pedestrian bridge across the main river channel with E. Commerce St. While the proposed modification changes how a pedestrian accesses the Riverwalk from E. Commerce St., the applicant proposes to construct new stairs leading from the southwest corner of the site down to the Riverwalk level where a pedestrian could then walk north along the river and connect with the existing pedestrian bridge. The proposed new stairs will extend into the City-owned portion of the Riverwalk, supported from below with a decorative masonry column. In removing the existing Hugman wall and walkway, the applicant proposes to construct a new river level terrace on the west side of the building extending to the point where the wall currently sits. The proposed terrace will wrap the west and south sides of the building and will be elevated from the Riverwalk path level.

FINDINGS:

- a. The Design Review Committee met with the applicant on April 23, 2013, to discuss potential rehabilitation of the Witte Building and removal of the CPS vault that was located between the Witte Building and the San Antonio River. At this meeting, the committee discussed possibly opening the existing wall rather than demolishing the whole feature. The committee also noted that there is a somewhat similar situation at the Presa St. bridge with a ribbon of walkway at street level.
- b. The Design Review Committee reviewed this project again on May 21, 2013. At that time the applicant presented two options: one in which the existing wall was left in place but penetrated to create an indoor/outdoor river level space and another option in which the walkway and wall were removed and replaced with a light river level deck. The committee noted concern about the loss of public street level access to the bridge that would occur with the second option. The committee also noted concern about the demolition of a Hugman feature without investigation into whether it can withstand modification, such as creating openings to an interior space. The committee noted that the importance of this location is the cantilevered walkway at street level and every effort should be made to preserve that. The committee identified potential ways forward including leaving the features in place and creating penetrations in the wall or removing a portion of the wall and walkway and leaving a remnant as a sculptural element to help tell the story of the development of this area of the Riverwalk.
- c. This project was reviewed by the Design Review Committee a third time on June 11, 2013. At that time, the applicant indicated that some work had been done to determine cost estimates for investigative work into the structural makeup of the existing wall. The committee noted that the connection between the Witte Building and the dam is important as is the connection between the street and the dam. The applicant indicated that the depth of the wall may inhibit creating openings and may create a dark, recessed river level interior space. The committee noted that losing the street level access to the Riverwalk at this location is problematic since that is the existing walkway's reason for being. There was some discussion about whether it would be possible to retain the curved portion of the walkway and connect that to a new, light street level walkway to maintain the public access component.
- d. The Design Review Committee performed a site visit to the property 135 E. Commerce on June 14, 2013. The committee again noted that while there are still several structural unknowns, creating openings in the existing wall would be preferable to demolishing the wall and walkway altogether. The committee also noted that if a scheme that leaves in place a remnant of the feature were proposed, the remnant should become a sculptural element and retain enough to understand what was here originally. The committee found that the applicant is proposing two major changes: removing a Hugman feature and altering the public access to the Riverwalk. Any proposal for this project should be able to address these concerns.
- e. This project was reviewed a fifth time by the Design Review Committee on September 4, 2013. At this meeting, some investigation had been performed into the structure of the wall. According to the engineer, maintaining the wall will be significantly more expensive than demolishing it due to the need to investigate and verify its makeup. The committee noted that this feature, as well as much of the rest of Hugman's Riverwalk, was designed to be utilitarian. There was discussion around the idea that if this feature no longer serves a function related to flood control, perhaps the proposed development may be more beneficial to the city than the Hugman feature. The committee found that losing the entire wall and walkway as well as losing the public street level access are significant modifications and not in keeping with the original intent and design of the Riverwalk and that keeping at least a portion of these original features would be something they would be willing to consider.
- f. As early as the 1885 Sanborn map, a building with a similar footprint to the existing Witte Building is shown on this

property. It is clear that significant alterations have been made to the building over time in terms of the footprint and particularly the rear (north) elevation, but from the 1885 Sanborn map to the 1911-1951 Sanborn map through today, there is a building on this property that maintains a consistent overall size and configuration to what is there now.

g. Over time, the context surrounding this site has changed significantly with the construction of the river channel that currently runs along the west side of this property. The building itself has undergone significant modifications as well, including the removal of historic rear balconies, the construction of various unsympathetic rear additions, and modifications to the front façade.

h. The proposal to rehabilitate the Witte Building, including reconstructing the historic, decorative parapet on the front façade and removing the existing rear additions to expose the rear façade of the original building, is appropriate and in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 10.B.ii.

i. The proposed flat awning at street level on the front of the building is minimal in design. The provided renderings indicate that it will not obscure any existing architectural detailing on the storefront, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Sections 11.B.ii and 11.B.v. g, but more detailed information pertaining to the proposed materials and installation method should be provided for final approval. According to the survey form for the Witte Building, the existing ground level store front is not original to the structure.

j. Based on an existing historic photograph of the front of the Witte Building and on information from the survey form for this structure, there may have been a balcony on that side similar to what is being proposed. Staff finds that the proposed street-facing, third floor balcony is in keeping with style and character of the building and is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations Section 7.B.v. More information regarding the materials and details of the proposed balcony will be required for final approval.

k. The proposed reconstruction of the historic rear wood balconies on the Witte Building is based on photographic evidence provided by the applicant, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.v.

l. While the proposed new balconies on the west side of the Witte Building are not based on any evidence of historic balconies on this side of the structure, they are consistent with the rear balconies that existed previously, in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.iv. Similarly, the introduction of new balconies is in keeping with the Design Objectives for the RIO-3 District as outlined in UDC Section 35-670.b.C.

m. While modification of some original Hugman features on the Riverwalk has been approved by the Office of Historic Preservation and the HDRC in the past, wholesale demolition of features has not.

n. Although the existing space between the Witte Building and the San Antonio River, which formerly housed a CPS vault, is in need of improvement and does not have a strong relationship with the river, demolishing a Hugman feature is prohibited in the Unified Development Code without proof of unusual or compelling circumstances, as per UDC Section 35-680.b. According to this section, the Commission shall be guided in its recommendation based on criteria related to the significance of the feature in question. In this case, staff finds that although the walkway and wall are not remarkable in terms of their design, they do represent a rare example of a street level pedestrian connection to the Riverwalk, consistent with the UDC Section 35-680.b.D.

o. The proposal to remove the existing Hugman cantilevered walkway and wall will alter the Hugman-designed flood gate/bridge in a way that the applicant has not fully developed. It is not clear how the newly exposed "end" of the flood gate would be treated. As seen in the original Hugman drawings, the walkway railing proposed for demolition is connected seamlessly into the flood gate by the curve in the railing and a small set of curved steps. A possible compromise solution would be to maintain these stairs and at least a portion of the walkway to avoid the complete loss of this feature while still allowing for some modifications.

p. This is one of the few locations on the Riverwalk where there is a street level connection to a pedestrian bridge. There are other examples of original Hugman cantilevered walkways, such as the section adjacent to the Embassy Suites Hotel.

q. There is a precedent for creating openings or similarly modifying an original Hugman feature on the Riverwalk anstaff finds this to be a more appropriate approach than demolishing this historic feature. Altering the current condition rather than removing would help to reinforce the character of the Riverwalk in that the less formal or rear of the buildings

traditionally faced the river.

r. Based on quotes from Hugman provided by the applicant, it is clear that he saw his work as being a framework for development along the Riverwalk and that this area in particular was designed for utilitarian purposes to act as a flood channel. Staff finds, however, that removing elements such as this cantilevered walkway and supporting wall that were original to the Riverwalk will erode the body of Hugman's work which has largely remained intact since its construction.

s. If the wall is approved for removal, the proposed new stair is appropriate for this location. While it draws design cues from historic features on the Riverwalk, it is distinguishable as a more recent addition and does not create a false sense of historical development, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 10 and the UDC Section 35-674.f.

1. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings f-h.

2. Staff recommends approval based on findings i-l with the stipulation that more detail be presented for final approval regarding the materials and installation method for the proposed balconies and the proposed street-facing flat canopy.

3. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings n-r at this time. The removal of an original Hugman feature is strongly discouraged by the UDC and should not be taken lightly or come without exploring every possible alternative to complete demolition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Feldman and seconded by Commissioner Judson to grant conceptual approval of item 1 and 2 with staff recommendation. Approval of item 3 as presented by the applicant.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Valenzuela, Feldman

NAYS: Laffoon, Guarino, Salas

THE MOTION CARRIED.

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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:30P.M.

APPROVED


Tim Cone
Chair