



# CITY OF SAN ANTONIO OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

## HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

November 18, 2015

**HDRC CASE NO:** 2015-042

**ADDRESS:** 112 LINDELL PLACE

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** NCB 6204 BLK 5 LOT 1

**HISTORIC DISTRICT:** River Road

**PUBLIC PROPERTY:** No

**APPLICANT:** Jim Bailey/Alamo Architects - 1512 S Flores

**OWNER:** Asher Reilly/Reilly Brothers Property Co. - 700 N St Mary's

**TYPE OF WORK:** New construction, Repair and Maintenance

### REQUEST:

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

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

### FINDINGS:

#### General Findings:

- a. The rehabilitation and new construction currently proposed at 112 Lindell Pl was originally heard by the Design Review Committee on January 27, 2015, as part of an application for conceptual approval. That meeting primarily focused on the design and concerns of the neighborhood. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed rehabilitation and new construction was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 4, 2015. At that hearing, a number of individuals from the River Road Neighborhood Association voiced their concern over the proposed design, the possibility of additional traffic and the preservation of the existing tree canopy. The request was referred to the Design Review Committee by the HDRC at that hearing.
- b. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed rehabilitation and new construction was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on March 24, 2015. At that meeting, the DRC reviewed a modified site plan which addressed many of the neighborhood's and HDRC's concerns including the preservation of a mature anacua tree, proposed parking and the proposed vehicular circulation.
- c. The request for conceptual approval of the proposed rehabilitation and new construction was heard a second time by the Historic and Design Review Commission on April 11, 2015, where the project received conceptual

approval with the stipulations that the owner's team make due diligence to meet with the neighborhood in person regarding their concerns over the current request and that the applicant attend the Design Review Committee.

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

Findings related to request item #1:

- e. The existing structure at 112 Lindell was constructed circa 1950 and includes additions that have been subsequently added and have been determined to be non-contributing based on physical and historical documentation. These additions include a rear addition on the east façade, a patio addition on the north façade, a consecutive front porch on both the west and north sides and a swimming pool located north of the patio addition. The applicant is proposing to alter the existing structure by removing each of the previously noted non-contributing elements. Non-contributing elements do not require proof of economic hardship based on UDC Section 35-614(f).
- f. The existing structure has a façade of stucco covered masonry. The applicant has proposed to keep this existing façade as well as make the necessary repairs to restore it to its original state. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Alterations 2.B.
- g. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3, the original shape, line, pitch and overhangs of historic roofs should be preserved as well as other distinctive roof features and vents. The applicant has noted that the original roof features will be preserved which is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has proposed to reroof the existing structure with a standing seam metal roof. Currently, the structure features an asphalt shingle roof. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi. states that metal roofs should only be used on structures that historically have a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. While this structure historically would not have had a metal roof, staff finds that the use of a metal roof is appropriate in this setting.
- h. With any substantial rehabilitation of a historic property, all original window and door openings, as well as historic windows and doors should be preserved. Where the original windows and doors are no longer in place, or are damaged beyond repair, the applicant should replace those windows with windows that are in kind and typical of the architectural style of the building. The applicant has proposed to preserve all existing window and door openings which is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i,ii,iii. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B. in regards to any replacement windows or doors that are needed.

Findings related to request item #2:

- i. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A., front facades of new buildings should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings and should be oriented to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The applicant has oriented the north façade of the proposed structure to align with the existing homes found along E Woodlawn. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. The proposed structure, while at two stories in height shares a similar height to other structures found in the near vicinity, notably the multi-family residence across E Woodlawn from the proposed structure. The applicant has aligned the floor heights of the proposed structure with that of the existing house on the property, implemented a series of variations in building massing and has utilized the use of a standing seam metal roof to provide a visual transition and a variation in scale of the proposed structure. This consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A in regards to scale and mass.
- k. The applicant has noted that the proposed structure will feature a similar roof form, pitch, overhang and orientation as that of the existing house as well as others found in the River Road Historic District. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.
- l. The Guidelines for New Construction 2.D. in regards to lot coverage state that new construction should be

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

- m. The applicant has proposed to use materials that consist of stucco, shake siding, painted 4 inch lap siding, wood for the construction of a trellis, wood columns, a standing seam metal roof and welded wire mesh on a steel frame to serve as screening and railing at balconies and stairways. These proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A. in regards to the use of new materials.
- n. The proposed structure features a series of architectural features related to both the massing and form as well as the proposed materials that provide historic context and complement the other structures in the River Road Historic District. The use of modern materials are presented in a contemporary manner and are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.
- o. At the roof top level, the applicant has proposed a patio. Per perspectives provided by the applicant, the proposed patio as well as enclosed access stair are modestly designed as to not negatively impact the structure. This proposal is appropriate.
- p. Since receiving conceptual approval, the applicant has modified the proposed new construction's east façade, primarily regarding the second floor's window fenestration. Previously, the applicant had proposed four groupings of double, one over one windows and two, one over one windows at the ends of each wall plane. To increase privacy along the east elevation where the property abuts a single family residence, the applicant has reduced the amount of windows and overall size of two window groupings. Staff finds this appropriate.
- q. The applicant has noted that the mechanical equipment for the proposed new construction will be located on the roof. The applicant has also noted that the proposed parapet has been designed to not only completely screen the mechanical equipment from the public right of way, but to also provide noise abatement. The proposed location and screening methods of the mechanical equipment are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and 6.B.
- r. The applicant has proposed to construct a privacy fence along the east side of the property. The applicant has noted that the proposed fence will be six (6) feet in height until and will not progress to the front yard. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- s. The applicant has provided a detailed landscaping plan noting lawn areas covering the majority of the lot. The applicant has also noted landscaping materials as well as their locations on the property. These materials include flowing trees, planting beds with decomposed granite, pervious pavement, vines that are to provide a vegetation buffer for the rear privacy fence and landscape boulders. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- t. The applicant has provided a tree survey locating all existing trees on the property including an anacua tree located on the north side of the property which the applicant has proposed to preserve. This is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D. as well as the UDC Section 35-525 in regards to tree preservation. Future species selection and planting procedure should be done with guidance from the City Arborist.
- u. The applicant has proposed a driveway that is approximately twelve (12) feet in width. Per the Guidelines, driveway widths should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. While the applicant has proposed a driveway that is wider than recommended, staff finds that given the nontraditional materials and design of the driveway, the additional width is appropriate. The applicant has noted that the proposed driveway is to be curved and pervious, limiting stormwater runoff, perceived noise, visual access and traffic speed.
- v. The applicant has proposed on-site parking for eleven (11) vehicles. The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. and B. in regards to off-street parking state that parking areas should not be added within the front yard setback, off-street parking should be accessed from alleys or secondary streets rather than from principal streets whenever possible and that off street parking should be screened. The applicant has designed the proposed parking to be tucked under the second floor of the proposed new construction that is to be screened by welded wire mesh on a stall frame with green screen paint in addition to arched openings and landscaping materials. This is consistent with

the Guidelines.

- w. The applicant has proposed to include three (3) ADA dedicated parking spaces to be accessible from the alley. The applicant is responsible for ensuring that these parking spaces comply with the Guidelines for Site Elements 8. A., B. and C. in regards to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance.
- x. The UDC Section 35-675 states that an HDRC application for commercial development projects within a river improvement overlay district shall be reviewed by the city archaeologist to determine if there is potential of containing intact archaeological deposits. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC as well as Sections 35-630, 35-634 and 35-606.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

Approved with staff's stipulations.

For:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shanon Shea Miller". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Shanon" being more prominent.

Shanon Shea Miller  
Historic Preservation Officer