

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
JULY 17, 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, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor
ABSENT: Salas, Feldman

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

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2013-214 | 116 W. Woodlawn |
| 2. Case No. 2013-205 | 103 W. Grayson |
| 3. Case No. 2013-206 | 128 Adams |
| 4. Case No. 2013-209 | 213 Madison |
| 5. Case No. 2013-208 | 207 Wickes |
| 6. Case No. 2013-210 | 100 W. Houston |
| 7. Case No. 2013-211 | 800 E. Market |
| 8. Case No. 2013-207 | 308 Willow |
| 9. Case No. 2013-196 | 408 Dwyer |
| 10. Case No. 2013-193 | 2815 Mission Rd. |
| 11. Case No. 2013-203 | UDC Amendments |
| 12. Case No. 2013-194 | 310 Refugio |

Items 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor
NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2013-205

Applicant: Chris Erk

Address: 103 W. Grayson

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval for an expansion to the previously-approved scope of work at 103 W Grayson. The current request includes the addition of a 2nd-level cedar deck over the flat roof of an existing building as well as an elevated deck surrounding the existing heritage oak tree. The proposal also includes the installation of a new, 2-story structure on the northwest corner of the property composed of shipping container

FINDINGS:

- a. A site visit was conducted by the Design Review Committee and the City Arborist on July 9, 2013, in order to assess the impact of the proposal to the existing heritage oak tree. A method for the installation of the four proposed piers was described which included removing dirt from around base of the tree to identify major root systems. These roots will be avoided when the drilling for the footings occurs. Each hole would be no wider than 8 inches in diameter and would extend 20-30 feet below grade. During the visit, it was noted that the tree had previously been completely surrounded by impervious concrete. The concrete has been removed as a result of this ongoing project, and the tree is in a much healthier state. It was determined that the installation of 4 piers in the method presented would not greatly impact the tree. There was some concern over future damage to the tree that could be potentially caused by patrons. Future signage encouraging the respect of the tree was encouraged.
- b. The existing heritage oak at this property is a significant feature along the River Walk, and its ongoing protection and reservation should be a priority. Staff finds that the proposed elevated deck will bring patrons up into the canopy and facilitate an interactive experience with the tree. Footings for the deck will be installed in a manner that is as minimally-invasive as possible. Attention will be given to the mulched bed around the base of the tree to prevent future foot traffic and other stressors. The overall improvements to the site will provide a healthier environment in which the tree can continue to thrive.
- c. Overall, the proposed expansion of the approved deck adds an interesting element to the property that maintains a human scale, consistent with the design objectives for RIO-2.
- d. Historically, the Taco Land site has had an eclectic mix of building types and imagery. The proposed shipping containers will maintain the existing street edge contribute to the eclectic ambiance of the site. The containers are minimally-invasive and can be removed in the future.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulations that any revisions to the design that occur as a result of exploratory measures be coordinated with OHP staff in order to obtain the necessary approvals.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to refer to the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

6. HDRC NO. 2013-210

Applicant: Linda Pace Foundation, Kelly O'Connor

Address: 100 W. Houston

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

Install a temporary mural adjacent to Main Plaza. The proposed Arturo Herrera mural, Adam, will be installed by the Linda Pace Foundation and will be in place for three years. It will be 97 feet 9 inches wide by 25 feet 6 inches tall and will be painted directly on an existing, painted wall which faces N. Main Avenue. The existing wall is part of the Frost Bank parking garage and is adjacent to an existing two story historic building.

FINDINGS:

- a. The proposed mural will have no permanent effect on any existing structure. It will consist of paint applied to a surface that is already painted and after 3 years, the wall be painted to look the way it does now.

- b. The Department for Culture & Creative Development and Public Art San Antonio's Public Art Board has reviewed this project and approved it on June 21, 2013.
- c. Staff finds that the proposed mural's temporary nature is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 10.
- d. The building upon which the mural is proposed to be placed is not a historic structure, so the proposal will have no direct impact to historic fabric in the district.
- e. According to the UDC Section 35-656, the responsibility of the HDRC is to review public art for appropriateness within local historic districts and sites. The proposed mural falls within the Main/Military Plaza Historic District and staff finds that its temporary installation will not permanently impact the historic character of this district. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on these findings.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

7. HDRC NO. 2013-211

Applicant: Populous, Sandy Eads

Address: 800 E. Market

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Expand the existing Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, adding approximately 750,000 square feet of new space and 65,156 square feet of renovated existing space. The proposed expansion will include exhibit halls, a ballroom, meeting rooms, a new entry lobby on E. Market Street, a new entry lobby on the west side of the building connecting to the Riverwalk and HemisFair Park, and a new street level pre-function concourse connecting the new North Lobby with the new West Lobby. This project works in conjunction with the Market Street realignment project and will front the newly realigned Market Street. The proposed expansion will include loading areas on the south side of the building, accessed from the west side of the site. Public art projects are proposed to be incorporated with the building design to help activate the exterior spaces being created.

FINDINGS:

- a. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 6, 2013. Overall, the committee was pleased with the proposed design, noting that the north and west entrances are elegant. The west entrance in particular has a warmth that the north entry could benefit from as well. The committee noted some concern over the proposed south entry to the convention center and whether it is large enough to accommodate the kind of traffic this building will draw both from HemisFair Park and the Alamodome. There was some discussion about landscape elements proposed at the north entry at E. Market Street and refining a materials palette for the building as well as for the landscape. The committee found that while the proposed building is iconic, it should also be uniquely San Antonian, which may come through in the use of color both in the building and in any artwork that will be incorporated into the design. The committee noted that the proposed screening along eastern façade of the building should have a pedestrian scale.
- b. Staff concurs with the findings of the Design Review Committee that the proposed north entry plaza and the west entry are elegant and appropriately scaled for their respective locations and that the south entry should be further developed to ensure that it will meet the needs of the expanded convention center in the future context of a revitalized HemisFair Park.

- c. The size of this project is very large, but staff finds that the applicant has maintained a human scale throughout the building exterior. Any proposed landscape and screening elements should continue to be developed to help reinforce that scale and soften the building's edge where it meets the public right-of-way, consistent with the UDC Sections 35-673.e & f.
- d. The proposed meeting room on the north side of the building which will extend over E. Market Street will serve as an architectural focal point, consistent with the UDC Section 35-672.c.1.
- e. The proposed west entry which will connect the convention center with the Riverwalk is smaller than the primary street-facing north entry plaza, consistent with the UDC Section 35-673.b.
- f. The public art component of this project, which is still being developed, will require separate review and approval by the HDRC.

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings b through e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Carpenter to grant conceptual approval based on findings a through f.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

11. HDRC NO. 2013-203

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

UDC Amendments

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting changes to Article VI of the Unified Development Code for clarity and consistency in applying specific design guidelines to districts or landmarks. Proposed amendments are as follows: Sec. 35-608. - Certificate of Appropriateness and Conceptual Approval - Generally. (a) In reviewing an application for a certificate of appropriateness, the historic and design review commission shall consider the current needs of the property owner and . The historic and design review commission shall also consider whether the plans will be reasonable for the property owner to carry out. If conflicting provisions of this chapter and city council approved guidelines have been approved, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall reconcile the conflict if possible so that effect may be given to each. If the conflict is irreconcilable this Chapter shall prevail. Applications shall be reviewed for consistency with the historic or district specific design guidelines adopted by City Council. The application shall be reviewed for conformance to the general rules and principles contained in the guidelines. Applications should be approved if in general conformance with the guidelines but denial of an application by the City Manager or the City Manager's designee may be based on any inconsistency or nonconformance with the approved guidelines. Where city council has adopted specific design guidelines for the district, no application shall be recommended for approval, or approved, unless the proposed application is consistent with the design guidelines. Proposed developments shall comply with the design guidelines in addition to the criteria set forth throughout this chapter; provided, however, to the extent that there is any inconsistency between a provision of sections 35-608 to 35-613 and a design guideline, the design guidelines shall control. If no design guidelines have been adopted for a historic district, the proposed development shall conform to the criteria set forth in sections 35-608 to 35-613 of this chapter.

Sec. 35-610. - Alteration, Restoration, Rehabilitation, and New Construction.

(a) In considering whether to recommend approval or disapproval of an application for a certificate to alter, restore, rehabilitate, or add to a building, object, site or structure designated a historic landmark or located in a historic district, the historic and design review commission shall be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation and provisions adopted by City Council as provided in this Article. The historic and design review commission shall also utilize the Historic Design Guidelines as adopted by the city council, and any specific design guidelines adopted pursuant to the Unified Development Code and this article. If conflicting provisions of this chapter and city council approved guidelines have been approved, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall

reconcile the conflict if possible so that effect may be given to each. If the conflict is irreconcilable this Chapter shall prevail. Applications shall be reviewed for consistency with the historic or district specific design guidelines adopted by City Council. The application shall be reviewed for conformance to the general rules and principles contained in the guidelines. Applications should be approved if in general conformance with the guidelines but denial of an application by the City Manager or the City Manager's designee may be based on any inconsistency or nonconformance with the approved guidelines. Non-public interior spaces are exempt from this section. The only interior spaces to be considered for review, and therefore not exempt, are those publicly owned spaces that are, or were, accessible to the public (e.g., lobbies, corridors, rotundas, meeting halls, courtrooms), and those spaces, both public and privately owned, that are individually designated and are important to the public because of any significant historical, architectural, cultural or ceremonial value.

(b) Signs shall conform to chapter 28 of the City Code as well as any other applicable provision of this Chapter. Additionally, if an exception from the application of chapter 28 of the City Code of San Antonio has been approved for signage in historic districts or on historic landmarks, such exception shall control remain unless removed by official action of the city council. If conflicting provisions of this chapter and city council approved guidelines have been approved, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall reconcile the conflict if possible so that effect may be given to each. If the conflict is irreconcilable this Chapter shall prevail. Applications shall be reviewed for consistency with the historic or district specific design guidelines adopted by City Council. The application shall be reviewed for conformance to the general rules and principles contained in the guidelines. Applications should be approved if in general conformance with the guidelines but denial of an application by the City Manager or the City Manager's

Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Carpenter to approve the proposed UDC amendments.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Connor

NAYS: Shafer

THE MOTION CARRIED.

12. HDRC NO. 2013-194

Applicant: Chris Krager

Address: 310 Refugio

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a new single-family residence on a vacant lot at 310 Refugio. The proposed residence will have a footprint of approximately 1,500 sf and a partial 2nd floor. The proposed residence is modern in design with a flat roof, horizontal windows and a materials palette consisting of brick, stucco and wood. The site will be treated with a permeable hardscape, box planters and tandem parking along the western property line.

FINDINGS:

a. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 9, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant illustrated that, due to the flat roof of the proposed new construction, the difference in building height from the adjacent historic structure is approximately 4 feet. The front yard setback was also illustrated to be consistent with the adjacent historic structure. Overall, the Committee expressed favor for the design and was supportive of either a brick or stone cladding option.

b. This block of Refugio is mostly intact, with two vacant lots on either side of the street. The majority of the existing residences are small Folk Victorian houses with a fairly consistent setback along the street.

c. Most homes on this block of Refugio are located along the front property line or have minimal setbacks from the street. Staff finds that the proposed front setback for the new residence is generally consistent with the block face, however there is concern that the cantilevered portion of the front façade (which extends approximately 18”) will project past the established pattern and become a distraction. Documentation provided by the applicant illustrates the visual impact of the proposed cantilever in relation to street views. While the renderings submitted illustrate that the cantilevered balcony is minimal, a greater setback from the street would be more appropriate in order to reduce the visual impact of the new construction along the block face.

d. The majority of existing homes on this block of Refugio are single-story structures, although taller, multi-family properties are located nearby. Staff finds that the proposed residence is predominately one-story, respecting the existing street conditions. As submitted, the flat roof is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i. However, the proposed flat roof helps to maintain a lower profile along the street edge, consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.

e. The proposed façade composition is a considerable departure from the precedent set by adjacent and nearby historic properties. The proposed horizontal banding and extruded windows reference a modern aesthetic that is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C. However, staff finds that there is precedent for modern design within the Lavaca Historic District, and that this type of infill is appropriate provided that other applicable guidelines are met.

f. The proposed residence features an interior courtyard. The building footprint is approximately 50% of the total parcel area, consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.

g. The proposed residence incorporates some materials that are complimentary of the Lavaca Historic District including stucco and wood. Staff finds that there is not precedent for brick veneer in single-family residences within the district and that alternative cladding should be explored to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A. The applicant has provided an option for a stacked stone veneer which staff finds to be a more compatible material than brick.

h. The proposed tandem parking is minimal and does not require the installation of additional impervious materials.

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the stipulations that the stone veneer continue to be provided as an option for the final design and that every effort be made by the applicant to increase the setback from the street.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to grant conceptual approval with staff recommendation that the stone veneer continue to be provided as an option for the final design and that every effort be made by the applicant to increase the setback from the street.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

13. HDRC NO. 2013-168

Applicant: Diane Wyrick

Address: 223 E. Summit Ave.

Postponed at the request of the applicant.

14. HDRC NO. 2013-204

Applicant: Sameer Paya

Address: 325 Lavaca

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two-story, single family residence on the vacant lot at 325 Lavaca. The house will have a single-sloped roof and a building footprint of approximately 600 sf. Proposed materials consist of vertical board and batten wood siding, horizontal wood siding, a standing seam metal roof, wood columns and metal-clad wood windows (both fixed and casement).

A 6-foot cedar privacy fence is proposed for the side and rear property lines, not to extend past the front plane of the house. A 9-foot decomposed granite driveway is proposed along the eastern property line.

FINDINGS:

- a. This application was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 9, 2013. At that meeting, the applicant presented updated drawings that illustrated increased setbacks from the side and front property lines. Overall, the Committee was in favor of the design and made no recommendations for improvement. Staff expressed concern over the lack of fenestration in the west elevation. The applicant noted that window with western exposure were not desired, and that due to the presence of a vacant lot immediately to the west of this property, there was uncertainty about the proximity of future construction.
- b. The design of the proposed new construction references an existing, two-story neighboring structure at 321 Lavaca. The proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for new construction in terms of setbacks, façade orientation, entrances, scale, mass, building to lot ratio, materials and architectural details.
- c. The single slope roof is a departure from historic precedents in the neighborhood, but is a similar height to the front-gabled structure located immediately to the east.
- d. As submitted, the west façade features a predominately blank wall. The Guidelines for New Construction C.ii requires that no new façade exceed 40 feet without being penetrated by windows. Although the proposal technically meets this guideline, staff finds that additional window openings incorporated on the west façade would be more appropriate for a structure of this size and more consistent with nearby historic properties in the district.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that additional fenestrations or architectural details are added to the west façade in order to break up the predominantly blank wall.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Carpenter and seconded by Commissioner Shafer to refer to the Design Review Committee.

AYES: Cone, Carpenter, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

15. HDRC NO. 2013-146

Applicant: Esteban Reyna

Address: 211 W. Wildwood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a ridge cap vent on a previously approved standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

a. This case was heard by the HDRC on June 5, 2013. At that time, the Commission approved the request to install a standing seam metal roof with the stipulation that the roof not have a ridge cap vent and use a double much seam with ridges less than 2” and panels that are 18-21” wide.

b. 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.

c. 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 may 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 that no ridge cap vent is installed and that other methods of venting the attic are explored.

COMMISSION ACTION:

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

AYES: Cone, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Shafer, Connor

NAYS: Carpenter

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 4:25 P.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone
Chair