

HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

February 21, 2018

HDRC CASE NO: 2018-007
ADDRESS: 527 E HUISACHE AVE
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: NCB 3090 BLK 6 LOT 26
ZONING: MF-33 H
CITY COUNCIL DIST.: 1
DISTRICT: Monte Vista Historic District
APPLICANT: David Bogle, R.A., AIA/SYNCRO Architecture Studio
OWNER: Grant Garbo
TYPE OF WORK: Construction of a rear addition, construction of front porch, exterior alterations, hardscaping and landscaping
APPLICATION RECEIVED: February 02, 2018
60-DAY REVIEW: April 03, 2018
REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition to measure approximately 1507 square feet.
2. Construct a new front porch with an ADA accessible ramp to measure approximately 459 square feet in footprint.
3. Relocate an existing window on the west elevation and install new fenestration.
4. Install new fiber cement siding on the existing structure where required.
5. Install a walkway and landscaping buffer in the front yard.
6. Install a new sidewalk to match the existing sidewalk configuration and materiality in the district.
7. Extend the existing concrete ribbon driveway through the site to the rear alley.
8. Install new hardscaping in the rear of the lot to accommodate four parking spaces, an accessible parking space and drop off area, and accessible route. The hardscaping will include a mixture of impervious poured concrete and pervious gravel.
9. Install a rear curb cut off the existing alleyway.

APPLICABLE CITATIONS:

Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 2, Exterior Maintenance and Alterations

1. Materials: Woodwork

A. MAINTENANCE (PRESERVATION)

- i. *Inspections*—Conduct semi-annual inspections of all exterior wood elements to verify condition and determine maintenance needs.
- ii. *Cleaning*—Clean exterior surfaces annually with mild household cleaners and water. Avoid using high pressure power washing and any abrasive cleaning or striping methods that can damage the historic wood siding and detailing.
- iii. *Paint preparation*—Remove peeling, flaking, or failing paint surfaces from historic woodwork using the gentlest means possible to protect the integrity of the historic wood surface. Acceptable methods for paint removal include scraping and sanding, thermal removal, and when necessary, mild chemical strippers. Sand blasting and water blasting should never be used to remove paint from any surface. Sand only to the next sound level of paint, not all the way to the wood, and address any moisture and deterioration issues before repainting.
- iv. *Repainting*—Paint once the surface is clean and dry using a paint type that will adhere to the surface properly. See *General Paint Type Recommendations* in Preservation Brief #10 listed under Additional Resources for more information.
- v. *Repair*—Repair deteriorated areas or refasten loose elements with an exterior wood filler, epoxy, or glue.

B. ALTERATIONS (REHABILITATION, RESTORATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION)

- i. *Facade materials*—Avoid removing materials that are in good condition or that can be repaired in place. Consider exposing original wood siding if it is currently covered with vinyl or aluminum siding, stucco, or other materials that have not achieved historic significance.
- ii. *Materials*—Use in-kind materials when possible or materials similar in size, scale, and character when exterior woodwork is beyond repair. Ensure replacement siding is installed to match the original pattern, including exposures. Do

not introduce modern materials that can accelerate and hide deterioration of historic materials. Hardiboard and other cementitious materials are not recommended.

iii. *Replacement elements*—Replace wood elements in-kind as a replacement for existing wood siding, matching in profile, dimensions, material, and finish, when beyond repair.

6. Architectural Features: Doors, Windows, and Screens

A. MAINTENANCE (PRESERVATION)

i. *Openings*—Preserve existing window and door openings. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way.

ii. *Doors*—Preserve historic doors including hardware, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures.

iii. *Windows*—Preserve historic windows. When glass is broken, the color and clarity of replacement glass should match the original historic glass.

iv. *Screens and shutters*—Preserve historic window screens and shutters.

v. *Storm windows*—Install full-view storm windows on the interior of windows for improved energy efficiency. Storm window may be installed on the exterior so long as the visual impact is minimal and original architectural details are not obscured.

B. ALTERATIONS (REHABILITATION, RESTORATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION)

i. *Doors*—Replace doors, hardware, fanlight, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures in-kind when possible and when deteriorated beyond repair. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, ensure features match the size, material, and profile of the historic element.

ii. *New entrances*—Ensure that new entrances, when necessary to comply with other regulations, are compatible in size, scale, shape, proportion, material, and massing with historic entrances.

iii. *Glazed area*—Avoid installing interior floors or suspended ceilings that block the glazed area of historic windows.

iv. *Window design*—Install new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair.

v. *Muntins*—Use the exterior muntin pattern, profile, and size appropriate for the historic building when replacement windows are necessary. Do not use internal muntins sandwiched between layers of glass.

vi. *Replacement glass*—Use clear glass when replacement glass is necessary. Do not use tinted glass, reflective glass, opaque glass, and other non-traditional glass types unless it was used historically. When established by the architectural style of the building, patterned, leaded, or colored glass can be used.

vii. *Non-historic windows*—Replace non-historic incompatible windows with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building.

viii. *Security bars*—Install security bars only on the interior of windows and doors.

ix. *Screens*—Utilize wood screen window frames matching in profile, size, and design of those historically found when the existing screens are deteriorated beyond repair. Ensure that the tint of replacement screens closely matches the original screens or those used historically.

x. *Shutters*—Incorporate shutters only where they existed historically and where appropriate to the architectural style of the house. Shutters should match the height and width of the opening and be mounted to be operational or appear to be operational. Do not mount shutters directly onto any historic wall material.

7. Architectural Features: Porches, Balconies, and Porte-Cocheres

A. MAINTENANCE (PRESERVATION)

i. *Existing porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres*—Preserve porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres. Do not add new porches, balconies, or porte-cocheres where not historically present.

ii. *Balusters*—Preserve existing balusters. When replacement is necessary, replace in-kind when possible or with balusters that match the originals in terms of materials, spacing, profile, dimension, finish, and height of the railing.

iii. *Floors*—Preserve original wood or concrete porch floors. Do not cover original porch floors of wood or concrete with carpet, tile, or other materials unless they were used historically.

B. ALTERATIONS (REHABILITATION, RESTORATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION)

i. *Front porches*—Refrain from enclosing front porches. Approved screen panels should be simple in design as to not change the character of the structure or the historic fabric.

ii. *Side and rear porches*—Refrain from enclosing side and rear porches, particularly when connected to the main porch or balcony. Original architectural details should not be obscured by any screening or enclosure materials. Alterations to side

and rear porches should result in a space that functions, and is visually interpreted as, a porch.

iii. *Replacement*—Replace in-kind porches, balconies, porte-cocheres, and related elements, such as ceilings, floors, and columns, when such features are deteriorated beyond repair. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, the design should be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish.

iv. *Adding elements*—Design replacement elements, such as stairs, to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Do not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance.

v. *Reconstruction*—Reconstruct porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns.

Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Additions

1. Massing and Form of Residential Additions

A. GENERAL

i. *Minimize visual impact*—Site residential additions at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. An addition to the front of a building would be inappropriate.

ii. *Historic context*—Design new residential additions to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block. For example, a large, two-story addition on a block comprised of single-story homes would not be appropriate.

iii. *Similar roof form*—Utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure for additions.

iv. *Transitions between old and new*—Utilize a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms.

B. SCALE, MASSING, AND FORM

i. *Subordinate to principal facade*—Design residential additions, including porches and balconies, to be subordinate to the principal facade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass.

ii. *Rooftop additions*—Limit rooftop additions to rear facades to preserve the historic scale and form of the building from the street level and minimize visibility from the public right-of-way. Full-floor second story additions that obscure the form of the original structure are not appropriate.

iii. *Dormers*—Ensure dormers are compatible in size, scale, proportion, placement, and detail with the style of the house. Locate dormers only on non-primary facades (those not facing the public right-of-way) if not historically found within the district.

iv. *Footprint*—The building footprint should respond to the size of the lot. An appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within historic districts. Residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size.

v. *Height*—Generally, the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure. The maximum height of new additions should be determined by examining the line-of-sight or visibility from the street. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure.

3. Materials and Textures

A. COMPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

i. *Complementary materials*—Use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure.

ii. *Metal roofs*—Construct new metal roofs in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. Refer to the Guidelines for Alternations and Maintenance section for additional specifications regarding metal roofs.

iii. *Other roofing materials*—Match original roofs in terms of form and materials. For example, when adding on to a building with a clay tile roof, the addition should have a roof that is clay tile, synthetic clay tile, or a material that appears similar in color and dimension to the existing clay tile.

B. INAPPROPRIATE MATERIALS

i. *Imitation or synthetic materials*—Do not use imitation or synthetic materials, such as vinyl siding, brick or simulated stone veneer, plastic, or other materials not compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure.

C. REUSE OF HISTORIC MATERIALS

i. *Salvage*—Salvage and reuse historic materials, where possible, that will be covered or removed as a result of an addition.

4. Architectural Details

A. GENERAL

i. *Historic context*—Design additions to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. Consider character-

defining features and details of the original structure in the design of additions. These architectural details include roof form, porches, porticos, cornices, lintels, arches, quoins, chimneys, projecting bays, and the shapes of window and door openings.

ii. *Architectural details*—Incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found on the original structure should not be used to avoid drawing undue attention to the addition.

iii. *Contemporary interpretations*—Consider integrating contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for additions. Use of contemporary window moldings and door surroundings, for example, can provide visual interest while helping to convey the fact that the addition is new.

5. Mechanical Equipment and Roof Appurtenances

A. LOCATION AND SITING

i. *Visibility*—Do not locate utility boxes, air conditioners, rooftop mechanical equipment, skylights, satellite dishes, cable lines, and other roof appurtenances on primary facades, front-facing roof slopes, in front yards, or in other locations that are clearly visible from the public right-of-way.

ii. *Service Areas*—Locate service areas towards the rear of the site to minimize visibility from the public right-of-way. Where service areas cannot be located at the rear of the property, compatible screens or buffers will be required.

B. SCREENING

i. *Building-mounted equipment*—Paint devices mounted on secondary facades and other exposed hardware, frames, and piping to match the color scheme of the primary structure or screen them with landscaping.

ii. *Freestanding equipment*—Screen service areas, air conditioning units, and other mechanical equipment from public view using a fence, hedge, or other enclosure.

iii. *Roof-mounted equipment*—Screen and set back devices mounted on the roof to avoid view from public right-of-way.

Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 5, Guidelines for Site Elements

1. Topography

A. TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES

i. *Historic topography*—Avoid significantly altering the topography of a property (i.e., extensive grading). Do not alter character-defining features such as berms or sloped front lawns that help define the character of the public right-of-way. Maintain the established lawn to help prevent erosion. If turf is replaced over time, new plant materials in these areas should be low-growing and suitable for the prevention of erosion.

ii. *New construction*—Match the historic topography of adjacent lots prevalent along the block face for new construction. Do not excavate raised lots to accommodate additional building height or an additional story for new construction.

iii. *New elements*—Minimize changes in topography resulting from new elements, like driveways and walkways, through appropriate siting and design. New site elements should work with, rather than change, character-defining topography when possible.

2. Fences and Walls

A. HISTORIC FENCES AND WALLS

i. *Preserve*—Retain historic fences and walls.

ii. *Repair and replacement*—Replace only deteriorated sections that are beyond repair. Match replacement materials (including mortar) to the color, texture, size, profile, and finish of the original.

iii. *Application of paint and cementitious coatings*—Do not paint historic masonry walls or cover them with stone facing or stucco or other cementitious coatings.

B. NEW FENCES AND WALLS

i. *Design*—New fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure.

ii. *Location*—Avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them.

iii. *Height*—Limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. If a taller fence or wall existed historically, additional height may be considered. The height of a new retaining wall should not exceed the height of the

slope it retains.

iv. *Prohibited materials*—Do not use exposed concrete masonry units (CMU), Keystone or similar interlocking retaining wall systems, concrete block, vinyl fencing, or chain link fencing.

v. *Appropriate materials*—Construct new fences or walls of materials similar to fence materials historically used in the district. Select materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district, and that are compatible with the main structure. Screening incompatible uses—Review alternative fence heights and materials for appropriateness where residential properties are adjacent to commercial or other potentially incompatible uses.

C. PRIVACY FENCES AND WALLS

i. *Relationship to front facade*—Set privacy fences back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence.

ii. *Location* – Do not use privacy fences in front yards.

3. Landscape Design

A. PLANTINGS

i. *Historic Gardens*—Maintain front yard gardens when appropriate within a specific historic district.

ii. *Historic Lawns*—Do not fully remove and replace traditional lawn areas with impervious hardscape. Limit the removal of lawn areas to mulched planting beds or pervious hardscapes in locations where they would historically be found, such as along fences, walkways, or drives. Low-growing plantings should be used in historic lawn areas; invasive or large-scale species should be avoided. Historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50%.

iii. *Native xeric plant materials*—Select native and/or xeric plants that thrive in local conditions and reduce watering usage. See UDC Appendix E: San Antonio Recommended Plant List—All Suited to Xeriscape Planting Methods, for a list of appropriate materials and planting methods. Select plant materials with a similar character, growth habit, and light requirements as those being replaced.

iv. *Plant palettes*—If a varied plant palette is used, incorporate species of taller heights, such informal elements should be restrained to small areas of the front yard or to the rear or side yard so as not to obstruct views of or otherwise distract from the historic structure.

v. *Maintenance*—Maintain existing landscape features. Do not introduce landscape elements that will obscure the historic structure or are located as to retain moisture on walls or foundations (e.g., dense foundation plantings or vines) or as to cause damage.

B. ROCKS OR HARDSCAPE

i. *Impervious surfaces* —Do not introduce large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces where they were not historically located.

ii. *Pervious and semi-pervious surfaces*—New pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible, and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. If used, small plantings should be incorporated into the design.

iii. *Rock mulch and gravel* - Do not use rock mulch or gravel as a wholesale replacement for lawn area. If used, plantings should be incorporated into the design.

C. MULCH

Organic mulch – Organic mulch should not be used as a wholesale replacement for plant material. Organic mulch with appropriate plantings should be incorporated in areas where appropriate such as beneath a tree canopy.

i. *Inorganic mulch* – Inorganic mulch should not be used in highly-visible areas and should never be used as a wholesale replacement for plant material. Inorganic mulch with appropriate plantings should be incorporated in areas where appropriate such as along a foundation wall where moisture retention is discouraged.

D. TREES

i. *Preservation*—Preserve and protect from damage existing mature trees and heritage trees. See UDC Section 35-523 (Tree Preservation) for specific requirements.

ii. *New Trees* – Select new trees based on site conditions. Avoid planting new trees in locations that could potentially cause damage to a historic structure or other historic elements. Species selection and planting procedure should be done in accordance with guidance from the City Arborist.

iii. *Maintenance* – Proper pruning encourages healthy growth and can extend the lifespan of trees. Avoid unnecessary or harmful pruning. A certified, licensed arborist is recommended for the pruning of mature trees and heritage trees.

4. Residential Streetscapes

A. PLANTING STRIPS

i. *Street trees*—Protect and encourage healthy street trees in planting strips. Replace damaged or dead trees with trees of a similar species, size, and growth habit as recommended by the City Arborist.

ii. *Lawns*—Maintain the use of traditional lawn in planting strips or low plantings where a consistent pattern has been retained along the block frontage. If mulch or gravel beds are used, low-growing plantings should be incorporated into the design.

iii. *Alternative materials*—Do not introduce impervious hardscape, raised planting beds, or other materials into planting strips where they were not historically found.

B. PARKWAYS AND PLANTED MEDIANS

i. *Historic plantings*—Maintain the park-like character of historic parkways and planted medians by preserving mature vegetation and retaining historic design elements. Replace damaged or dead plant materials with species of a like size, growth habit, and ornamental characteristics.

ii. *Hardscape*—Do not introduce new pavers, concrete, or other hardscape materials into parkways and planted medians where they were not historically found.

C. STREET ELEMENTS

i. *Site elements*—Preserve historic street lights, street markers, roundabouts, and other unique site elements found within the public right-of-way as street improvements and other public works projects are completed over time.

ii. *Historic paving materials*—Retain historic paving materials, such as brick pavers or colored paving, within the public right-of-way and repair in place with like materials.

5. Sidewalks, Walkways, Driveways, and Curbing

A. SIDEWALKS AND WALKWAYS

i. *Maintenance*—Repair minor cracking, settling, or jamming along sidewalks to prevent uneven surfaces. Retain and repair historic sidewalk and walkway paving materials—often brick or concrete—in place.

ii. *Replacement materials*—Replace those portions of sidewalks or walkways that are deteriorated beyond repair. Every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material.

iii. *Width and alignment*—Follow the historic alignment, configuration, and width of sidewalks and walkways. Alter the historic width or alignment only where absolutely necessary to accommodate the preservation of a significant tree.

iv. *Stamped concrete*—Preserve stamped street names, business insignias, or other historic elements of sidewalks and walkways when replacement is necessary.

v. *ADA compliance*—Limit removal of historic sidewalk materials to the immediate intersection when ramps are added to address ADA requirements.

B. DRIVEWAYS

i. *Driveway configuration*—Retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives. Incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration.

ii. *Curb cuts and ramps*—Maintain the width and configuration of original curb cuts when replacing historic driveways. Avoid introducing new curb cuts where not historically found.

C. CURBING

i. *Historic curbing*—Retain historic curbing wherever possible. Historic curbing in San Antonio is typically constructed of concrete with a curved or angular profile.

ii. *Replacement curbing*—Replace curbing in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Where in-kind replacement is not be feasible, use a comparable substitute that duplicates the color, texture, durability, and profile of the original. Retaining walls and curbing should not be added to the sidewalk design unless absolutely necessary.

7. Off-Street Parking

A. LOCATION

i. *Preferred location*—Place parking areas for non-residential and mixed-use structures at the rear of the site, behind primary structures to hide them from the public right-of-way. On corner lots, place parking areas behind the primary structure and set them back as far as possible from the side streets. Parking areas to the side of the primary structure are acceptable when location behind the structure is not feasible. See UDC Section 35-310 for district-specific standards.

ii. *Front*—Do not add off-street parking areas within the front yard setback as to not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape.

iii. *Access*—Design off-street parking areas to be accessed from alleys or secondary streets rather than from principal streets whenever possible.

B. DESIGN

i. *Screening*—Screen off-street parking areas with a landscape buffer, wall, or ornamental fence two to four feet high—or a combination of these methods. Landscape buffers are preferred due to their ability to absorb carbon dioxide. See UDC

Section 35-510 for buffer requirements.

- ii. *Materials*—Use permeable parking surfaces when possible to reduce run-off and flooding. See UDC Section 35-526(j) for specific standards.
- iii. *Parking structures*—Design new parking structures to be similar in scale, materials, and rhythm of the surrounding historic district when new parking structures are necessary.

8. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance

A. HISTORIC FEATURES

- i. *Avoid damage*—Minimize the damage to the historic character and materials of the building and sidewalk while complying with all aspects of accessibility requirements.
- ii. *Doors and door openings*—Avoid modifying historic doors or door openings that do not conform to the building and/or accessibility codes, particularly on the front façade. Consider using a discretely located addition as a means of providing accessibility.

B. ENTRANCES

- i. *Grade changes*—Incorporate minor changes in grade to modify sidewalk or walkway elevation to provide an accessible entry when possible.
- ii. *Residential entrances*—The preferred location of new ramps is at the side or rear of the building when convenient for the user.
- iii. *Non-residential and mixed use entrances*—Provide an accessible entrance located as close to the primary entrance as possible when access to the front door is not feasible.

C. DESIGN

- i. *Materials*—Design ramps and lifts to compliment the historic character of the building and be visually unobtrusive as to minimize the visual impact, especially when visible from the public right-of-way.
- ii. *Screening*—Screen ramps, lifts, or other elements related to ADA compliance using appropriate landscape materials. Refer to Guidelines for Site Elements for additional guidance.
- iii. *Curb cuts*—Install new ADA curb cuts on historic sidewalks to be consistent with the existing sidewalk color and texture while minimizing damage to the historical sidewalk.

OHP Window Policy Document

Recommended stipulations for replacement: Individual sashes should be replaced where possible. Should a full window unit require replacement, inserts should

- Match the original materials;
- Maintain the original dimension and profile;
- Feature clear glass. Low-e or reflective coatings are not recommended for replacements;
- Maintain the original appearance of window trim or sill detail.

Windows used in new construction should:

- Maintain traditional dimensions and profiles;
- Be recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended;
- Feature traditional materials or appearance. Wood windows are most appropriate. Double-hung, block frame windows that feature alternative materials may be considered on a case-by-case basis;
- Feature traditional trim and sill details. Paired windows should be separated by a wood mullion. The use of low-e glass is appropriate in new construction provided that hue and reflectivity are not drastically different from regular glass.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 527 E Huisache is a 1-story duplex constructed in the 1950s. The structure does not appear on a 1951 Sanborn Map. The home features simplified Craftsman and Midcentury Modern influences, including a low-sloped gable roof with overhanging eaves and window screens with geometric proportions. The home is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant presented a different proposal to the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on October 4, 2017. The request was denied. The applicant modified their proposal and met with the

Design Review Committee (DRC) on October 24, 2017. The discussion focused primarily on a design for a new front porch addition. The applicant presented various conceptual options, of which one the DRC found most favorable. The design retained the existing shed awnings over the two front doors and incorporated a wider and deeper shed awning to create a true front porch condition. The applicant met with the DRC again on January 10, 2018, to consider a full HDRC application for conceptual approval. The DRC recommended reducing the number of columns on the new front porch awning to reduce the visual impact and establish a more consistent rhythm. Regarding the front yard hardscaping and parking proposal, the DRC requested a calculation of impervious cover versus grass/landscaping for the January 17, 2018, hearing. They also recommended retaining the existing curb cut at 10 feet instead of widening it to accommodate additional cover. The DRC recommended exploring design solutions that pushed the front parking to the rear of the lot, beyond the existing footprint of the historic structure. Comments included that the current configuration creates a “street” condition through the site and is inconsistent with the development pattern of the block. The DRC also expressed concern about the feasibility of the grading of the proposed front parking condition. The application was denied at the January 17, 2018, hearing. The applicant submitted an updated design proposal for consideration at the February 21, 2018, hearing. The applicant met with the DRC on February 14, 2018. The DRC inquired about the footprint of the addition relative to the existing structure, how many employees would be parking at the facility at one time, and how the existing alleyway will serve as a functional commercial access for cars. The DRC suggested that the applicant clarify the condition of the alleyway in their exhibits. The DRC also commented on the extension of the existing ribbon driveway through the site to the alley, which is not a condition found in the vicinity within the district. The DRC discussed the front yard proposal and suggested that the applicant forgo the installation of a retaining wall and seek to retain the berm detailing of the existing yard and double walkway. The DRC also suggested that any new landscaping also be minimal and compatible with the existing streetscape condition. The DRC also discussed the detailing of the new porch and suggested that it be similar to the existing two porch overhangs, as these elements contain a bulk of the Midcentury detailing that makes the property unique.

Findings for the primary structure, items #1 through #3:

- d. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to the primary structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double or exceed the size of the primary structure. The proposed addition approximately doubles the size of the primary structure, which measures a total of 1507 square feet. This is 82 feet less than the existing structure, which is a total of 1589 square feet as indicated on the submitted drawings. However, the historic structure has a small footprint relative to other historic homes in the area, including historic 1-story homes on nearby Kings Ct and E Mulberry. In terms of total lot coverage, homes on E Huisache and E Mulberry feature additions that are nearly double the size of the existing structure, or contain rear accessory structures that feature a footprint close to that of the historic home. Additionally, both the east and west elevations of the proposed addition are set back from the historic structure, with the east elevation set back significantly. Staff recommends approval based on the context-specific considerations of the lot and the district.
- e. **ROOF** – The existing rear elevation of the historic primary structure features a gable roof. The proposed addition features a single gable, is 1-story in height, and is slightly shorter than the existing structure’s roofline. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to install a new composition shingle roof on the addition to match the existing composition shingle roof on the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL** – The proposed addition will require the removal of two existing casement windows and two aluminum sliding glass doors on the rear of the facade. The applicant has proposed to reuse the two casement windows on the rear addition, which is appropriate. The applicant is also proposing to relocate an existing casement window, remove an existing door, and modify an existing small opening on the west elevation. The Historic Design Guidelines state that existing original openings should be preserved on the historic structure. Staff finds that the removal of the door and small opening is acceptable, but finds that the original casement window should remain in place. The existing location of the two casement windows on the west elevation mirrors that of the east elevation and is evidence of the original duplex function and design of the historic structure.
- h. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed door and window proportions on the rear addition

that are generally consistent with proportions on the primary structure and those found within the district. However, the size, configuration, and material are not definitively indicated in the application.

- i. **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The existing structure features asbestos lap siding with a wide exposed profile of approximately 12 inches. The applicant has proposed to remove the siding on the rear, west, and east elevations and install lap fiber cement siding on both the existing structure and the addition. The applicant has proposed to retain the asbestos siding on the front elevation if the new construction does not require its removal due to impact. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate and finds that smooth boards and an exposure of no more than 8 inches should be used.
- j. **TRANSITIONS BETWEEN OLD AND NEW** – The proposed addition will be inset on the west façade from the historic structure by approximately two feet. On the east façade, the structure will be inset by approximately 10 feet. According to Guideline 2.A.v for Additions, rear additions should utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a detail at the seam of the historic structure and addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. The proposal meets this Guideline.
- k. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has not indicated the location of new mechanical equipment in the submitted drawings, but has stated that they will be located on the east façade of the rear addition towards the back of the lot. The applicant is responsible for providing this information, including screening method, on all appropriate documents for final approval.
- l. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition keeps with the Craftsman and Midcentury Modern influences of the historic home without detracting from its significance. Staff finds the proposed addition's architectural details generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. **FRONT PORCH** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch. The front façade currently contains two small shed awnings above each door, which will be preserved. The proposal will add a new shed awning that spans between the two existing awnings. The new awning will extend approximately double the width of the existing awnings to engage the streetscape and create a true covered porch condition. The proposal also includes extending the concrete porch decking towards the street for a total footprint of 459 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new porch elements, including stairs and related elements, should be simple and not distract from the historic character of the building and should be architecturally appropriate for the home. Historic examples on the block that contain wide porches incorporate alternate roof forms, such as a simple shed or hip, or exhibit roof proportions that mimic the primary gable. Additionally, because the existing structure is set back from the front façades of its neighbors, the extended footprint of the porch will not protrude past neighboring historic structures. Staff finds the porch and footprint to be conceptually consistent.
- n. **FRONT ADA RAMP** – The applicant has proposed to install a new ADA accessible ramp on the front façade of the existing structure. The ramp will be covered by the proposed porch and will be located on the eastern edge of the structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the preferred location of new ramps on a residential structure is at the side or rear of the building when convenient for the user. However, the applicant has modified the ramp's design from their previous submissions to create a ramp that is light in its design and minimally intrusive from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent.

Findings for site elements, items #4 and #5:

- o. **DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing concrete ribbon driveway through the lot to connect to the rear alley. The driveway will create a through-site condition. No modifications to the width or configuration of the ribbons or the existing curb cut and apron are proposed. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the historic alignment, configuration, and width of driveways should be preserved. The predominant development pattern is a front driveway that terminates at a rear accessory structure. In some cases, alley access is provided to rear accessory structures. There is no precedent in the neighboring blocks of E Husiache and E Mulberry for the driveway to extend through the site. Staff does not find the proposal appropriate.
- p. **FRONT WALKWAY MODIFICATIONS AND LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed front yard modifications to accommodate a new accessible front walkway. The proposal includes modifying the steps of the eastern walkway, the installation of a new walkway, and a landscaping. The proposed modifications are minimal and retain the existing berm condition that is a character defining feature of the site. The proposal also retains a majority of the two existing concrete walkways leading to the existing front doors, which is also character defining and indicative of the structure's historic use as a duplex. Staff finds the front yard modifications appropriate.
- q. **SIDEWALK** – The applicant has proposed to install a new concrete sidewalk in the front yard of the property. A

sidewalk does not presently exist. The sidewalk will match the existing sidewalk on the adjacent property in terms of width, configuration, and concrete aggregate and coloration as closely as possible. Staff finds the proposal appropriate for the site based on existing context within the district.

- r. **REAR HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to install a rear hardscaping to accommodate parking, an accessible walkway, and an ADA accessible drop-off area. The hardscaping will be a combination of pervious (gravel) and impervious (concrete) coverage. The impervious concrete will connect to the proposed extended ribbon driveway and create an ADA accessible parking space with a drop of zone, located adjacent to the rear alley. The concrete will extend from this parking area to create an accessible walkway to the rear entrance of the proposed new addition. The pervious gravel will be located to the west of the proposed new addition and will create space for three parked cars. An additional gravel space will be added east of the concrete ADA parking space. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, off street parking should be located at the side or rear of a structure whenever possible. There is also evidence of existing parking pads along the alley. Staff finds that the concept of a rear parking area is generally consistent with the Guidelines, but the rear hardscaping as proposed, when coupled with the proposed addition's impervious cover, removes a significant portion of the rear landscape. While some properties on E Huisache, Kings Ct, and E Mulberry feature extensive hardscaping in the rear of the lot, the predominant development pattern is a rear yard with a majority grass or trees and other plantings with rear accessory structures or additions. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the amount of hardscaping due to the additional impervious changes proposed to the lot.
- s. **REAR CURB CUT** – The applicant has proposed to install a new rear curb cut and apron to provide access to the rear parking pads. While the submitted site plan does not indicate the dimension of the width of the curb cut, it appears to extend from the eastern edge of the lot to approximately eight feet from the western edge of the lot. This totals approximately 75% of the width of the rear lot line. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new curb cuts should not be introduced where historically found. If introduced, they should be consistent with historic curb cuts in the district. There is evidence of curb cuts that are wider than ten feet along the rear alley, but there is no precedent for a rear curb cut that extends nearly the full width of the lot to provide direct access to parking pads. Staff finds that applicant should explore ways to reduce this width.
- t. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not provided a detailed landscaping plan. The applicant is required to provide this information for final approval, to include grading information, specific hardscaping locations and dimensions, and the location and species of all plants.

RECOMMENDATION:

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


- 1. That the applicant retains the location of the existing casement window on the west elevation as noted in finding g.
- 2. That the applicant reduces the length of the ribbon driveway extension to be more consistent with development patterns in the district as noted in finding o.
- 3. That the applicant reduces the amount of hardscaping in the rear of the lot as noted in findings r and s.
- 4. That the applicant reduces the rear curb cut width to be more consistent with the development pattern of the alleyway and the neighborhood as noted in finding s.

CASE MANAGER:

Stephanie Phillips

CASE COMMENTS:

The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on October 24, 2017; January 10, 2018; and February 14, 2018. The discussions, as well as an overall case history, are outlined in finding c.



Flex Viewer

Powered by ArcGIS Server

Printed: Sep 26, 2017

The City of San Antonio does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. The City does not warrant the completeness, timeliness, or positional, thematic, and attribute accuracy of the GIS data. The GIS data, cartographic products, and associated applications are not legal representations of the depicted data. Information shown on these maps is derived from public records that are constantly undergoing revision. Under no circumstances should GIS-derived products be used for final design purposes. The City provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.



E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

E Mulberry Ave

Kings Ct

Kings Ct

Kings Ct

Kings Ct

Stadium Dr

Stadium Dr

E Huisache Ave

E Huisache Ave

E Huisache Ave

E Huisache Ave

E Huisache Ave

E Huisache Ave

527 East
Huisache Avenue

WhiteStone Wealth
Management Services

TEXIIM



525 East Huisache Avenue

HDRC Application

~~February 2, 2018~~ February 16, 2018 (**revision in boldface**)

DESCRIPTION of WORK

525 East Huisache Avenue(a.k.a., 527 E. Huisache) is a wood-framed, single-story, two-family (side-by-side duplex) structure with the two front doors facing the street. The building is set back approximately 50 feet from the street (curb), which is approximately 15 feet further than the adjacent houses and most of the structures along this block of East Huisache.

The building appears to be original construction dating from mid-1950's, and is characterized by the 3-1/2 in 12 moderately-sloped and single-gabled roof, two (2) shed porch covering roofs with angled 4x4 columns/posts and exposed 4x4 beam and 2x6 roof rafters and eave boards. Fiber-cement composition shingle siding makes up the majority of the exterior wall finish, except for an 18" high rustic-faced Roman brick wainscot on the front façade. From the brick proportion to the roof slope and large louvered attic vent, the building presents a horizontality typical of mid-century residential design.

The Project is an adaptive-reuse to create a ten - resident assisted-living facility. **Site development in the front yard will be minimal.** Building massing and materials of exterior alterations will be distinct from the existing structure, yet will be complementary and will not occlude the original building's dominance of the site. A rear addition, smaller, lower and more narrow than the original footprint, will expand the building envelope to accommodate the interior facility program. A front porch addition is proposed to enhance the existing, somewhat barren front façade, and to contribute to an active streetscape.

Rear Building Addition: The addition to the rear, north side of the building will be only barely visible from the street. A setback to 5' from the western property line will be used, which offsets from the existing structure's west façade by about 2'. Similarly, the east side is offset from the existing building west façade as the addition is more narrow than the front, existing structure. The roof will be lower than the existing structure's roof, and will follow the same slope and orientation of its gable.

Front Porch Addition: An overall lightness of structure is proposed for the new porch roof, with a compatible sloped shed roof positioned between and slightly higher than the existing pair of front porch roofs which will remain. New columns and porch roof framing will relate strongly to the existing porch construction in visual terms through similar configuration of members, though slightly larger members may be required to meet current structural engineering code. Both existing front doors will remain, the easternmost becoming the front entrance and the westernmost being permanently closed from the interior. Existing faux shutters will be removed.

The Design Team (Architect, Civil Engineer and Registered Accessibility Specialist) has reviewed the Project with Fire, Zoning, Traffic, CPS, and other CoSA departments for compliance.

Monte Vista Historic District: Guidelines

..."differing properties are knitted together by rich array of landscape and streetscape features such as uniform rows of trees, parks, sidewalks, walls, and fences."

1. District Development ca. 1890 – ca. 1930
 - a. This property was constructed post-period of significance
 - b. This property is classified as "non-contributing" per National Register

MASSING and FORM of RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS

General

1. Minimize Visual Impact
 - a. Front porch addition is diminutive and responsive to the existing front porches. It is lower than the existing roof line, and does not compete with the existing main roof gable.
 - b. Front porch in shed form is the least imposing form explored and was preferred by DRC (mtg 1)
 - c. Rear addition is scarcely visible from the public realm / streetscape
2. Historic context
 - a. Front porch and rear additions are designed in keeping with the design character of the existing structure.
 - b. Front porch will enhance the existing structure and create more compatibility with the surroundings, as all homes on the block have front porches.
3. Similar roof form
 - a. Same roof pitch (3 ½:12) will be used for the rear addition
 - b. Same roof pitch as existing shed porch roofs will be used on the front porch
4. Transition between old and new
 - a. A setback and minor change in detailing will differentiate the rear addition from the existing structure.
 - b. The new front porch framing will be similar in size and configurations, but will likely be slightly larger, both in scale with the larger roof form and to comply with current structural building code requirements.
 - c. Clear visual distinction will be apparent on close examination of the structure, while casual observation likely will allow a "wholeness" to be the overall impression.

Scale Massing and Form

5. Subordinate to principal façade

- a. Addition is behind and inset (scarcely visible from public realm / front)
 - b. Porch addition relates to existing porch covers, and least imposing form (shed roof) relating to existing mid-century form
6. Footprint
 - a. Responsive to size of lot
 - b. Appropriate yard to building ratio is consistent with existing nearby multifamily structures/lots
 - c. Rear addition is smaller than the existing footprint, and remains practically out of sight from the street
7. Height
 - a. Addition is consistent with, and lower than the existing building height
 - b. There will be practically no visibility of the rear addition from the street

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND NOTES

Monte Vista District Notes from Design Guidelines

Landscape and Streetscape features

“grass lawn and ornamental planting. Along some streets, lawns have a gently-sloped berm or a brick, stone, or concrete retaining wall.” (pictured: stone retaining wall at sidewalk at W. French Pl and Belknap Ave.)

Excerpts from the District’s website (emphasis added): About MVHA

“To encourage the preservation of the distinctive heritage of the Monte Vista area; to keep the physical identity of the late nineteenth-early twentieth century district intact; and to educate the public, especially the youth, with knowledge of our inherited **neighborhood values which contribute to a wholesome urban environment.**”

Monte Vista Neighborhood

Monte Vista is comprised of 100 city blocks on the northern edge of downtown San Antonio. The neighborhood, which has been preserved as the Monte Vista National Historic District, is currently home to around 3,000 San Antonians.

Architectural diversity is a hallmark of the district. More than two dozen architects captured the essence of a range of national architectural trends, creating **a mix of distinctive homes that give Monte Vista its unique character and appeal.**

- [Home](#)
- [Helpful Numbers](#)
- **Senior Citizens**

Senior Citizens

Miderian Care Nursing Home

Phone: 210-735-9233

[Senior Citizens](#)

(This one Just CLOSED) [Morningside Ministries at Chandler Estate](#)

Phone: 210-737-5247, <https://www.mmliving.org/communities/chandler-estate/>


[MVHA Business 5 Year Member](#) | [Senior Citizens](#)

San Pedro Manor


Phone: 210-732-5181

[Senior Citizens](#)


525 E Huisache - Location Maps




525 E Huisache - Location Maps



525 E Huisache - Location Maps



525 E Huisache - Location Maps





525 East Huisache Ave
Location aerial photo

Legend
525 E Huisache Ave


Google earth

syncro architecture studio
David Bogle, R.A. AIA
727 west french place
san antonio, tx 78212

525 East Huisache Ave
Location aerial photo

Legend
525 E Huisache Ave

Monte Vista Historic District



525 East Huisache Ave
Location aerial photo

Legend
525 E Huisache Ave

525-527 E Huisache Ave
Zoning, Parcel: MF-33
Zoning, block, vicinity: MF-33, Commercial



525-527 E Huisache Ave
Zoning, Parcel: MF-33
Zoning, block, vicinity: MF-33, Commercial

525 East Huisache Ave
Location aerial photo

Legend
525 E Huisache Ave



Non-Contributing
per National Register of Historic Places – Monte Vista Residential Historic District

525 East Huisache Ave
Location aerial photo

Legend
525 E Huisache Ave



Non-Contributing
per National Register of Historic Places – Monte Vista Residential Historic District



525 East Huisache Ave
Location aerial photo



Non-Contributing

per National Register of Historic Places – Monte Vista Residential Historic District

525-527 E Huisache Ave (highlighted on National Register map overlay above)

Property Type: Residential/Duplex


Built: Circa 1955

Stylistic Influence: Contemporary

Category: Non-Contributing (as shown on map overlay, above)



525-527 E Huisache Ave
Contours: 1-foot interval
Orientation: area drains to the east



525-527 E Huisache Ave

Contours: 1-foot interval

Orientation: area drains to the east



525-527 E Huisache Ave
View looking north, northwest

525 E Huisache



SYNCRO architecture studio









525 E Huisache, Block of

North side of E Huisache Ave. – 410 Kings Ct. on right (looking northwest at intersection of Kings Ct.)



525 E Huisache, Block of

North side of E Huisache Ave. – 503 (looking east, northeast)





525 E Huisache, Block of

North side of E Huisache Ave. – 519 (beige), 523 (green)







525 E Huisache, Block of

North side of E Huisache Ave. – 519 (beige), 523 (green)





525 E Huisache, Block of

North side of E Huisache Ave. – 543, 547, and 551 (houses left to right) looking northeast, commercial building (far right, facing access road and TX SH 281)







525 E Huisache, Block of

South side of E Huisache Ave (looking southwest at intersection of Kings Ct.)



SYNCRO architecture studio





525 E Huisache - 520-new house



















525 E Huisache - Context-Alley

Accessory structures, vehicular access at west end of block. Alley continues right side of photo to King's Court (properties on King's Court, looking southwest)





NOT for REGULATORY APPROVAL, PERMITTING or CONSTRUCTION

This sketch is for preliminary review of design intent.

SK - 08

page 1 of 2

date: 15 February 2018

Ohana Homes Assisted Living - Front Yard Perspective



NOT for REGULATORY APPROVAL, PERMITTING or CONSTRUCTION

This sketch is for preliminary review of design intent.

Ohana Homes Assisted Living - Front Yard Perspective

SK - 08

page 2 of 2

date: 15 February 2018



1 Site Plan - Proposed Option 5
1/8" = 1'-0"


EXISTING BUILDING AREAS

Name	Area	Calculated Area
Existing		
Existing Building	1580 SF	1580 SF
Existing Porch 2	33 SF	16 SF
Existing Porch 1	33 SF	16 SF
Existing Area		1613 SF


ADDITION BUILDING AREAS

Name	Area	Calculated Area
Addition		
Addition	1507 SF	1507 SF
Porch Addition	326 SF	163 SF
Addition Area		1670 SF
Total Area		3283 SF

* Calculated Porch Areas = 1/2 Porch Area




1 Building Areas
1/8" = 1'-0"







④ Elevation - Existing - North
1/4" = 1'-0"




③ Elevation - Proposed - North
1/4" = 1'-0"




② Elevation - Existing - South
1/4" = 1'-0"




① Elevation - Proposed - South
1/4" = 1'-0"




③ Elevation – Proposed – West Copy
1/4" = 1'-0"




② Elevation – Existing – East
1/4" = 1'-0"



④ Elevation – Existing – West
1/4" = 1'-0"



① Elevation – Proposed – East
1/4" = 1'-0"



① Front Yard Cross Section Existing
1/2" = 1'-0"

AA5 - Site Cross Section Existing

Scale As Indicated (Sheet Size: 22X34)

synco architecture studio

David Bogle, R.A. AIA

727 west french place
san antonio, tx 78212


Ohana Homes Assisted Living


Grant Garbo

525 East Huisache St
San Antonio, TX

Pre-Design

2018_02_06





① Front Yard Cross Section Option 5
1/2" = 1'-0"

AA6 - Site Cross Section Option5

Scale As Indicated (Sheet Size: 22X34)

syncro architecture studio

David Bogle, R.A. AIA

727 west french place
san antonio, tx 78212

Ohana Homes Assisted Living


Grant Garbo


525 East Huisache St

San Antonio, TX


Pre-Design

2018_02_06






1 Gross Areas
3/32" = 1'-0"



2 Covered Areas Existing
3/32" = 1'-0"



5 Front Yard Area Option 5
3/32" = 1'-0"


COVER AREA STUDY - OPTION EXISTING		
Name	Type SAS	Area
Back Area		
BACK IMPERVIOUS COVER	Back Area	96 SF
BACK IMPERVIOUS COVER	Back Area	96 SF
BACK IMPERVIOUS COVER	Back Area	70 SF
BACK IMPERVIOUS COVER	Back Area	70 SF
		332 SF
Foot Print		
PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE	Foot Print	1589 SF
		1589 SF
Front Area		
WALKWAY	Front Area	126 SF
WALKWAY	Front Area	127 SF
EXISTING RIBBON DRIVEWAY	Front Area	132 SF
		386 SF
		2308 SF

COVER AREA STUDY - LOT TOTAL AREA		
Name	Type SAS	Area
BACK YARD	Back Area	3805 SF
PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE	Foot Print	3226 SF
FRONT YARD	Front Area	1969 SF
		9000 SF

COVER AREA STUDY - OPTION 5		
Name	Type SAS	Area
Back Area		
BACK IMPERVIOUS COVER	Back Area	961 SF
		961 SF
Foot Print		
PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE	Foot Print	3085 SF
		3085 SF
Front Area		
PORCH	Front Area	459 SF
WALKWAY	Front Area	245 SF
EXISTING RIBBON DRIVEWAY	Front Area	132 SF
		837 SF
		4882 SF

FRONT YARD PAVED AREA	
UDC TABLE 515.5	MAX FRONT YARD PAVED AREA EQUALS (-) 50% OF FRONT YARD AREA.
FRONT YARD AREA = 1,969 SF	
50% OF 1,969 SF = 984.5 SF	
MAX ALLOWABLE PAVED AREA = 984.5 SF	
Option 5 - 837/1,969 SF = 42.5%	
TOTAL INTRODUCED COVERED AREA AND PERCENTAGE COVER	
TOTAL INTRODUCED COVERED AREA EQUALS (-) TOTAL PROPOSED COVERED AREA - TOTAL EXISTING COVERED AREA	
TOTAL EXISTING COVERED AREA = 2,308 SF	
TOTAL PERCENTAGE COVERED EQUALS (-) (TOTAL COVERED AREA / LOT AREA) X 100	
TOTAL LOT AREA = 9,000 SF	
Option 5 - TOTAL PROPOSED COVER AREA = 4,882 SF	
TOTAL INTRODUCED COVER AREA= 2,574 SF	
TOTAL PERCENTAGE COVERED= 54%	

FRONT YARD PAVED AREA = 42.5%
TOTAL PERCENTAGE COVERED AREA = 54%





① Visibility Study – Option 5 2

AAB - Visibility Study Option 5

Scale As Indicated (Sheet Size: 22X34)

syncro architecture studio

David Bogle, R.A. AIA

727 west french place
san antonio, tx 78212

Ohana Homes Assisted Living

Grant Garbo

525 East Huisache St

San Antonio, TX

Pre-Design

2018_02_06



① Visibility Study – Option 5 1

AAS - Visibility Study Option 5

Scale As Indicated (Sheet Size: 22X34)

syncro architecture studio

David Bogle, R.A. AIA

727 west french place
san antonio, tx 78212

Ohana Homes Assisted Living

Grant Garbo

525 East Huisache St

San Antonio, TX

Pre-Design

2018_02_06



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
**OFFICE OF HISTORIC
PRESERVATION**

**Historic and Design Review Commission
Design Review Committee
Report & Recommendation**

DATE: 2/14/18 HDRC Case# 2018-007

ADDRESS: 527 E. HUISACHE Meeting Location: 04P

APPLICANT: DAVID BOGLE

DRC Members present: LAZARINE, LAFFDON

Staff present: PHILLIPS

Others present: _____

REQUEST: EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, REAR ADDITION,

FRONT LANDSCAPING/HARDSCAPING, REAR HARDSCAPING

COMMENTS/CONCERNS: TWO EMPLOYEES - TWO DESIGNATED
VISITOR PARKING - IN THE REAR.

REDUCED OVERALL FOOTPRINT BY 21 FEET.


WILL REPLACE WITH SHINGLE VERSUS PLANK ON EXISTING
STRUCTURE.

DL: WILL THICKNESS OF PORCH MATCH EXISTING PORCHES?

DB: YES, 2x6.

KEEP CHAMFERED EDGES. EDGE DETAIL. →

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE [] DISAPPROVE []**
APPROVE WITH COMMENTS/STIPULATIONS:


Committee Chair Signature (or representative)

Date

RETAINING WALL ALLOWS FOR ~~PARK~~ ACCESSIBLE SIDEWALK.

KEEP EXISTING WALL CONDITION VERSUS RETAINING.

DL: DO YOU NEED DRIVEWAY TO GO ALL THE WAY THROUGH?

DB: WOULD LIKE IT FOR PARKING AND PARALLEL PARKING-
ACCESS ONLY. EXISTING DRIVEWAY DOES NOT FACTOR INTO
8x22' PARKING PARALLEL. PARKING REQ

DL: IS ALLEY COMMERCIALLY VIABLE? OR SHOULD HAVE
THAT CLARIFIED.

BE READY TO DISCUSS GRADE CHANGES.

WINDOWS: REPLACING SMALLER WINDOW + DOOR.

DL: SIDE FACADES DO GIVE A COMMERCIAL LOOK.

MOVING OPENINGS IS ALWAYS A CONCERN WITH THE
COMMISSION. POSSIBLY REUSE ASSEMBLY / PARTS / PIECES.

LANDSCAPING:

LOOK AT REST OF BLOCK, PICK UP ON EXISTING. NOTHING
ELABORATE.



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
**OFFICE OF HISTORIC
PRESERVATION**

**Historic and Design Review Commission
Design Review Committee
Report & Recommendation**

DATE: 1/10/2018 HDRC Case# _____

ADDRESS: 527 E HUISACHE Meeting Location: _____

APPLICANT: DAVID BOGLE / SYNCO ARCHITECTURE STUDIO

DRC Members present: GRUBE, FISH

Staff present: STEPHANIE PHILLIPS

Others present: _____

REQUEST: FRONT PORCH + REAR ADDITION, HARDSCAPING +
LANDSCAPING, EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS

COMMENTS/CONCERNS: _____

Column amount - maybe reduce number. Depth = 12' feet.

Shin behind front edge of neighboring structures.

- 12' wide throat driveway including nbbs. Adding
6' of pavement. Curb cut will be increased (most
likely) to accommodate.

AG: Show percentage of concrete/grass in front
yard. Present curb cut as 10' →

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE [] DISAPPROVE []**
APPROVE WITH COMMENTS/STIPULATIONS:

Committee Chair Signature (or representative)

1-10-18
Date

AG: ~~Explore~~ pushing parking to rear. Wall is fine.

Parking in rear for additional req's. 5 total spaces.

3 visitor spaces - should be communicated in meeting. Deliveries can occur thru alley.

CF: Grade issue @ front as well. Essentially proposing through parking through site. *explore different parking solution*

Addition: on

plan as designed doesn't allow for the accessibility in the back. Will need to provide equal access at another entrance if parking needs to be moved.