



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
January 20, 2021

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, January 20, 2021, via videoconference available to the public for comment.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

- Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Item #1.** Annual Elections of Officers- appointment for Chair Fetzer and Vice Chair Carpenter
- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
 - Item #2, Case No. 2020-543 2511 N FLORES ST
 - Item #3, Case No. 2020-461 319 DELAWARE
 - Item #4, Case No. 2020-562 Multiple Locations in Downtown ROW
 - Item #5, Case No. 2020-578 320 BEAUREGARD
 - Item #6, Case No. 2021-013 432 E MULBERRY AVE
 - Item #7, Case No. 2020-580 215 LOWELL ST
 - Item #9, Case No. 2020-566 333 SADIE ST
 - Item #10, Case No. 2020-581 814 AUGUSTA
 - Item #11, Case No. 2020-549 2602 N FLORES ST
 - Item #12, Case No. 2020-556 315 W SUMMIT AVE
 - Item #13, Case No. 2020-555 505 E TRAVIS ST
 - Item #14, Case No. 2020-558 515 E COURTLAND PLACE
 - Item #15, Case No. 2021-021 310 CALLAGHAN AVE
 - Item #16, Case No. 2020-583 1011 BROADWAY
 - Item #17, Case No. 2021-007 235 MADISON ST
 - Item #18, Case No. 2021-004 211 E HUISACHE AVE
 - Item #19, Case No. 2021-016 305 BURLESON ST

- Item #20, Case No. 2020-579 111 SOLEDAD ST
- Item #21, Case No. 2021-006 220 BROADWAY
- Item #22, Case No. 2020-568 118 LOTUS ST
- Item #23, Case No. 2020-576 122 FURR DR
- Item #25, Case No. 2021-012 611 DEVINE ST
- Item #26, Case No. 2020-571 139 WICKES
- Item #29, Case No. 2021-002 928 W COMMERCE ST
- Item #30, Case No. 2020-547 124 W SUMMIT AVE

- ITEMS #8, 24, and 28 WERE PULLED FOR COMMENTS
- ITEMS #36-39 and #43 WERE WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to approve the consent Agenda items 1-7, 9-23, 25-26, and 29-30 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

Action: THE MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES, 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT.

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS

- **Item # 8. HDRC NO. 2020-525**
ADDRESS: 831 LAMAR ST
Applicant: Ron Hill

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a metal cattle panel front yard fence and gate.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 831 Lamar was constructed recently in 2020. The one-story, residential structure features Craftsman-influenced elements including a primary gable form with a subordinate front gable flanked by a covered porch.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit on November 16, 2020, staff found that a wood-framed cattle panel fence with a front driveway gate was installed prior to the issuance a Certificate of Appropriateness and permit. The property owner was cooperative and submitted an application of November 16, 2020, to be heard at the next available hearing.
- c. FENCE DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a metal framed cattle panel fence. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., new fences and walls should appear

similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character; applicants should design fences to respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. While metal-framed, cattle panel fences are atypical in historic front yards, staff finds that the proposed design may be appropriate for non-historic, infill construction if the height and configuration is consistent with the Guidelines.

- d. FENCE LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the fence around the perimeter of the front yard including a front driveway gate. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii., applicants should 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. Staff finds that front yard fences on found on Lamar and throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- e. FENCE HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence featuring a height of 4 feet. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., applicants should limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds the proposed fence height appropriate.
- f. DRIVEWAY GATE – The applicant has proposed to install a front driveway gate in a matching design. A front vehicle gate may be considered if the site features an atypical condition including: (a) a wraparound porch, (b) a narrow driveway less than 10 feet wide, and/or (c) front driveways abutting rear yards or commercial properties. Electrical, mechanical, or solar collector equipment should be concealed and minimally visible if used. Per the submitted site plan and photo verification, staff finds that the property features a narrow driveway and that a front gate would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on finding c through f with the stipulations:

- i. That the fence height is no taller than 4 feet at any portion in front of the front façade plane.
- ii. That any solar or mechanical gate equipment, if used, be concealed or minimally visible behind the fence from the public right of way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon,
Nay: Gibbs.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 1 NAY. 2 ABSENT.**

- **Item # 24. HDRC NO. 2021-009**
ADDRESS: 1206 W AGARITA AVE
APPLICANT: OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

REQUEST:

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a recommendation from the Historic and Design Review Commission regarding designation of the property at 1206 W Agarita.

FINDINGS:

- a. On November 4, 2020, the Historic and Design Review Commission approved a Finding of Historic Significance for the property at 1206 W Agarita. On December 17, 2020, City Council approved Resolution 2020-12-17- XXXXR initiating a change in zoning for the property to include a historic landmark overlay. As a step in the zoning process, a recommendation regarding the proposed designation is required from the HDRC.
- b. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.
- c. City Council has the ultimate authority to approve the historic designation zoning overlay. A recommendation from HDRC will be forwarded to City Council.
- d. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends that the Historic and Design Review Commission recommend approval of historic landmark designation of 1206 W Agarita based on finding a.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Patti Zaiontz with the Conservation Society of San Antonio- supports historic landmark designation.

- Commissioner Velasquez objected to the OHP recommendation for HL designation, citing that the owner removed his application for demolition, where such request for demolition originally prompted the neighborhood association to submit its application for HL designation. In his comments he objected to the appearance of a weaponizing of the HL app process, which sets a bad precedent by appearing to assign consequences to any citizen faulted for merely considering the demolition of their property. He also noted that all the housing stock in the area of 1206 W. Agarita meets similar criteria for HL and that designating 1206 W. Agarita alone resembled Spot Zoning.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

Nay: Velasquez and Arreola.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES AND 2 NAY. 2 ABSENT

• **Item # 27. HDRC NO. 2021-005**

ADDRESS: 119 GORMAN ST, 220 BROADWAY, 305 BURLESON ST, 310 CALLAGHAN AVE,
335 W GRAMERCY PLACE, 427 ADAMS ST, 611 DEVINE ST, AND 720 E
CARSON

APPLICANT: Various Owners- Tax Verification

REQUEST:

The applicants are requesting Historic Tax Verification for the properties listed in this request.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structures included in this request for Historic Tax Verification have each received Historic Tax Certification and are located in the Dignowity Hill, Lavaca, Monte Vista, King William, and Government Hill Historic Districts.
- b. The scopes of work submitted for each application have been verified to confirm that all proper permits and Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued and closed for all interior and exterior scopes of work used to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive.
- c. Staff conducted site visits for each property requesting Historic Tax Verification to examine the conditions of the property. Staff verifies that all work used to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive has been completed and that there are no existing violations on any of the properties included in this request.
- d. The applicants have met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification as outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and have provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer, including the submission of an itemized list of costs that meet the threshold to be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive. this hearing. On June 3, 2020, the owner replied to staff email requesting more time.
- e. Approval of Tax Verification by the HDRC for work completed in 2020 means that the property owners will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive beginning in 2021. The Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive applies to the City of San Antonio tax entity line only.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve case.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzner, and Laffoon.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.
Recuse: Carpenter

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT. 1 RESCUSAL

- **Item # 28. HDRC NO. 2020-584**
ADDRESS: 1235 E CROCKETT ST
APPLICANT: Kali Tripp/Tripp Flip, LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform modifications to the historic structure located at 1235 E Crockett pertaining to the front porch and front porch roof. Within this request, the applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch to span the approximate width of the historic structure's front façade as well as to construct a single porch roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform modifications to the historic structure located at 1235 E Crockett pertaining to the front porch and front porch roof. Within this request, the applicant has proposed to construct a new front porch to span the approximate width of the historic structure's front façade as well as to construct a single porch roof.
- b. The historic structure located at 1235 E Crockett first appears on aerial photographs in 1986. The structure was relocated to its current location at an undetermined time. The structure was originally constructed as a duplex, and currently features two separate porches, porch roofs and porch doors.
- c. PORCH CONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to eliminate the eastern most porch and to construct a new porch to span the approximate width of the historic structure. The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing western porch steps. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A.i., front porches should be preserved. While the applicant has proposed to modify the porch from its original profile, staff finds that due to the preservation of the two front doors, the structure's previous use as a duplex will still be evident. Staff finds that the proposed columns should be six inches square and feature capitol and base trim. Additionally, the proposed porch railing should be consistent with staff's specifications, featuring a 2x4 top rail, 1x2 trim beneath the top rail, 1 ½" x 1 ½" square pickets, and a notched 2x4 bottom rail. The bottom rail should be approximately 3.5 inches above the porch decking. Porch decking shall feature 1x3 porch decking, installed perpendicular to the front façade.
- d. PORCH ROOF CONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing, two porch roofs and construct one single porch roof to mirror the dimensions of the proposed porch, described in finding c. Generally, staff finds the proposed porch roof to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed columns should be six inches square and feature capitol and base trim.
- ii. That the proposed porch railing features a 2x4 top rail, 1x2 trim beneath the top rail, 1 ½” x 1 ½” square pickets, and a notched 2x4 bottom rail.
- iii. That the porch feature decking that features 1x3 members installed perpendicular to the front façade.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations 1-3 with added stipulation that wood columns and trim be consistent with the neighborhood. Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES, 0 NAY, 2 ABSENT.**

- **COMMISSIONER LAFFOON LEFT MEETING AT 4PM**
- **Item # 31. HDRC NO. 2020-527**
ADDRESS: 2620 N MAIN AVE
APPLICANT: Berkeley Lewis/Berkeley Builders, Inc.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the wood lap foundation skirting with limestone masonry skirting.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2620 N Main Ave is a 2-story multifamily structure constructed in 1909 in the Neoclassical style. The structure sits on a corner lot at the intersection of N Main Ave and E Magnolia Ave. The home features a full-height front porch with fluted Corinthian columns, a broken transom light front door configuration, and prominent front and side-facing dormers with wide trim. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. COMPLIANCE – Per the application materials for administrative approval of window restoration submitted on November 6, 2020, staff found that the skirting was recently modified from wood to limestone masonry prior to approval. The applicant submitted an application on November 23, 2020, to be heard at the next available hearing.
- c. SKIRTING – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wood lap skirting with limestone masonry skirting. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.Bi., replacement skirting should consist of durable, proven materials, and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. Staff finds that limestone masonry skirting is atypical to Neoclassical style and not found on similar

structures in the Monte Vista Historic District. Staff finds that the skirting should be restored to wood lap siding. The applicant may use a single member of smooth Hardie plank and/or concealed metal flashing at grade to mitigate water infiltration and that any other interventions should be made beneath the wood lap siding or from the interior.

- d. **CASE HISTORY** – The request was reset to the next available hearing at the HDRC hearing on December 16, 2020. The applicant has since submitted the following documents: (i) a petition of support as installed signed by 12 neighbors, (ii) a notarized statement by current property owner that the structure featured a combination of brick, metal, and wood skirting prior to wholesale replacement of limestone masonry, (iii) a notarized statement by the previous property owner that a crumbling rock wall was found during the removal of the wood skirting, (iv.) photo of similar structures with similar skirting within the historic district. Staff concurs with the additional evidence of existing portions of rock skirting at the structure as well as brick masonry skirting on similar nearby structures. However, staff finds that the limestone masonry as proposed is not consistent with established pattern in material and scale.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c. Staff concurs with the evidence of existing portions of rock skirting at the structure as well as brick masonry skirting on similar nearby structures. However, staff finds that the limestone masonry as proposed is not consistent with established pattern in material and scale – and recommends restoration of appropriate wood lap skirting or traditional brick masonry.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Velasquez to approve as submitted by applicant.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, AND 0 NAY AND 3 ABSENT**

• **Item #32. HDRC NO. 2020-540**

ADDRESS: 225 KING WILLIAM

APPLICANT: Pam Carpenter/Seventh Generation Design, Inc.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to include the repair of wood windows and doors, in-kind repair to various wood elements, installation of an architecturally appropriate foundation skirting, and the removal of the non-original front porch and construction of an architecturally appropriate porch.

2. Demolition of an existing, historic rear wing and construct a new addition in its place. This addition consists of a number of additions and has been modified since its original construction circa 1890.
3. Partial demolition of the rear porch roof and portions of the rear porches.
4. Construct a rear addition to be located where the current kitchen addition is located,
5. Construct a new fireplace and chimney at the rear of the historic structure.
6. Construct a pantry addition to the existing, brick addition.
7. Construct a new rear porch.
8. Construct a detached carport to be located in the side/rear yard.
9. Construct a storage structure in the side yard.
10. Construct a detached accessory structure at the rear of the site.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 225 King William was constructed circa 1880 and first appears on the 1896 Sanborn Map. Since its original construction, side and rear additions have been constructed, the front porch has been modified, and the structure has undergone various other modifications. This structure and its additions are contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on December 8, 2020. At that meeting, the Committee gave comments on the amount of site coverage, the placement of structures on the site, and recommended that additional information be provided for review. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC at a site visit on January 6, 2021. At that site visit, the Committee commented on the amount of lot coverage, the demolition of the rear addition, and the proposed architectural details (roof forms and materials).
- c. REHABILITATION – Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued for foundation repair, masonry repair, and wood element repair. In addition to the existing approvals, the applicant has requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for rehabilitative scopes of work including wood window and door repair, wood element repair, and foundation skirting installation. These items are eligible for Administrative Approval.
- d. FRONT PORCH CONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to remove the non-original front porch and construct an architecturally appropriate front porch, as noted in the submitted application documents. Generally, staff finds the proposed and architecturally accurate reconstruction of the front porch to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. REAR WING DEMOLITION – The applicant has proposed to demolish an existing, historic wing and construct a new rear addition in its place. The current wing consists of an original accessory structure and historic additions that are documented to be on site since the 19th Century. The applicant has submitted information detailing existing damage to the rear wing, including fire and rot damage. Staff performed a site visit on January 6, 2021, and viewed damage and deterioration to the structure, as well as exterior modifications (various window opening modifications, siding modifications). Staff finds the rear wing to be a character defining feature of the property as it tells a story of the evolution of the property over time. Based on current conditions, staff finds that significant interventions to rehabilitate the existing rear wing are needed, and supports

- the dismantling and salvaging of materials. However, staff finds that the proposed rear addition is inappropriate. A reconstruction based on historical documentation is most appropriate. If the HDRC approves an expanded rear footprint, it should be designed based on historic precedent rather than introducing new architectural forms and materials that are not historically found on the site.
- f. REAR PORCH DEMOLITION – The applicant has proposed to demolish a rear porch, to include the porch decking and roof structure to facilitate the construction of a new addition and porch. While the porch and porch roof are found in their historic location, original materials and profiles have been lost over time. Staff finds the removal of the rear porch to be appropriate.
 - g. PROPOSED REAR ADDITION (Location of existing kitchen addition) – In the location of the current kitchen addition, the applicant has proposed to construct an addition to feature approximately 1, 300 square feet. The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a flat roof and bronze aluminum siding.
 - h. PROPOSED REAR ADDITION (Location of existing kitchen addition) – The Guidelines for Additions note that additions should be sited to the side or rear of the historic structure, should be designed in keeping with the historic context of the block, should feature a similar roof form and should feature a transition between the historic structure and new addition. Additionally, the Guidelines note that additions should feature similar architectural details and materials as the historic structure on the block, and should not feature a footprint so large as to double the historic structure’s footprint. Consistent with finding e, a reconstruction based on historical documentation is most appropriate. If the HDRC approves an expanded rear footprint, it should be designed based on historic precedent rather than introducing new architectural forms and materials that are not historically found on the site.
 - i. FIREPLACE/CHIMNEY & REAR PORCH ADDITIONS – At the rear of the historic structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a new fireplace/chimney and a new rear porch. These proposed additions will be located in the location of the existing rear porch. As noted in finding f, the existing rear porch has been modified in material and form from its original design. Generally, staff finds the proposed fireplace/chimney addition and rear porch construction to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The proposed chimney should be designed in a manner that complements historic chimneys and flues on site.
 - j. PANTRY ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a small, flat roofed pantry addition at the rear of the existing, brick addition. Staff finds the massing and location of this addition to be appropriate; however, staff finds that a similar roof form and materials should be used for this addition.
 - k. CARPORT – The applicant has proposed to construct a carport to be located in the rear yard, attached to a rear accessory structure, noted in finding m. The proposed carport will feature a flat roof and materials that are consistent with those proposed throughout (bronze siding). While staff generally finds the location of the proposed carport to be appropriate, staff finds that architectural elements should be incorporated to be consistent with the Guidelines, such as like materials and roof forms as those found historically on the site.
 - l. DETACHED STORAGE ROOM – The applicant has proposed a detached storage room to be located in the side yard. The proposed storage structure will be attached to the

proposed rear pantry and porch additions by a canopy over a covered walkway. Generally, staff finds the proposed storage structure to be appropriate in size and location; however, staff finds that architectural elements should be incorporated to be consistent with the Guidelines, such as like materials and roof forms as those found historically on the site.

- m. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE (Living) – At the rear of the site the applicant has proposed to construct rear accessory structure that is to be attached to the proposed carport, noted in finding k. The proposed structure will feature a footprint of approximately 1,025 square feet (with the proposed carport, the total square footage would be approximately 1,850). The Guidelines for New Construction note that rear accessory structures should not feature a footprint that is more than forty (40) percent of that of the primary historic structures, and should feature architectural details, roofs and materials that are consistent with those found historically on the site. Staff finds that the proposed rear accessory structure is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. TOTAL LOT COVERAGE – The applicant has proposed new construction on site that totals approximately 3,475 square feet, including all proposed additions and accessory structures. The footprint of the historic structure is approximately 1,875. The proposed square footage is not consistent with the Guidelines. While the lot size may accommodate additional square footage staff finds that any additions or new construction should be designed in a manner that is consistent with the Guidelines.
- o. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted a substantial landscaping plan, as well as a tree preservation plan. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate.
- p. MATERIALS – Generally, the applicant has proposed materials that include brick, bronze panels and salvaged wood. Generally, staff finds that wood siding that matches that found historically on site would be most appropriate.
- q. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has not specified window materials at this time. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad windows should be installed that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction. These standards are found in the applicable citations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff recommends approval of the proposed rehabilitative scopes of work with the stipulation that all repair work is done in-kind. These items are eligible for administrative approval, as noted in finding c.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the dismantling and salvaging of the existing, historic rear wing.
- 3. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the rear porch and rear porch roof as noted in finding f.
- 4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the construction of a rear addition at the location of the existing, rear wing. Reconstruction of the wing based on historical documentation is most appropriate. If an expanded rear footprint is pursued, the current massing, materials and profiles of the existing wing should be prioritized in the design of a new addition at this location.
- 5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, the construction of a fireplace and chimney at the rear of the historic structure based on finding i, with the stipulations that proposed chimney should be designed in a manner that complements historic chimneys and flues on site.

6. Staff recommends approval of item #6, the construction of a rear pantry addition based on finding j with the stipulation that a similar roof form, window materials and materials should be used for this addition as found on the existing, brick addition.
7. Staff recommends approval of item #7, the construction of a new rear porch based on finding i.
8. Staff does not recommend approval of item #8, the construction of a rear yard carport based on finding k. Staff recommends that the applicant address the inconsistencies with the Guidelines for New Construction by incorporating materials, window materials, roof forms and massing that are consistent with those found historically on site.
9. Staff does not recommend approval of item #9, the construction of a detached storage structure based on finding l. Staff recommends that the applicant address the inconsistencies with the Guidelines for New Construction by incorporating materials, window materials, roof forms and massing that are consistent with those found historically on site.
10. Staff does not recommend approval of item #10, the construction of a detached rear accessory structure based on finding m. Staff recommends that the massing, footprint, materials, window materials, and roof form be amended to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.

In addition to the above recommendations, staff recommends that the applicant adhere to the Guidelines for New Construction and the Guidelines for Additions in regards to lot coverage and massing in regards to percentages of the new construction's footprints when compared to the historic structure's footprint.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved for conceptual approval on items 1-3, and 5 with staff stipulations; move to approve item 4, 9, and 10 as proposed; approve items 6-7 as presented and; approve item 8 with exception of windows for fenestrations to be consistent with guidelines.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.
Recuse: Carpenter

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES AND 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT. 1 RESCUSAL**

• **Item # 33. HDRC NO. 2020-560**
ADDRESS: 344 MARY LOUISE
APPLICANT: Joe Cano/All Pro Services of Texas

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace a detached wood pergola with an attached rear roof addition for a covered rear patio.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 344 Mary Louise was constructed circa 1940 and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The one-story, single-family structure features mosaic-cut stone veneer, steel casement windows, and a side-flanking chimney.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on December 1, 2020, staff found that a roof structure was framed toward the rear of the property at 344 Mary Louise. The applicant was cooperative to the Stop Work Order and submitted an application on December 2, 2020, to be heard at the next available Historic and Design Review Commission hearing..
- c. REAR PATIO COVER -The applicant has proposed to replace a detached wood pergola with an attached rear roof addition for a covered rear patio. The porch cover will feature matching composition shingle, a vertical wood beadboard turned gabled face, 6-inch square wood posts, will terminate at south rear and west side wall planes. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.1.A. applicants should 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. Staff finds that setting the roof addition to the rear is appropriate.
- d. ROOF DESIGN – The applicant has proposed for the porch cover to feature matching composition shingle roof with 12-3 slope, a vertical wood beadboard turned gabled face, 6-inch square wood posts, will terminate at south rear and west side wall planes. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., application utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure for additions. As constructed, the pergola’s roof features a profile that is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Additions as the proposed roof features a profile that is greater than that of the rear roof’s slope.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding d. Staff recommends that the pergola roof feature a profile and design that does not dominate the massing of the historic roof’s structure. Staff recommends that the pergola’s roof slope be modified to be subordinate to that of the historic structure’s roof at the rear of the structure.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to refer to Design Review Committee.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Gibbs, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: Velasquez.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.
Abstain: Fish

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 1 NAYS. 3 ABSENT. 1 ABSTAIN

- **Item # 34. HDRC NO. 2020-548**

ADDRESS: 2323 W GRAMERCY PLACE
APPLICANT: Michael Pensabene/Freedom Solar Power

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 21 solar panels on the existing roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 2323 W Gramercy is a 1-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1940. The house features a hip composition shingle roof with a front gable on the west side of the front façade, a prominent centrally located chimney, stone cladding, and steel windows. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. LOCATION – The applicant is requesting approval to install 21 solar panels on the existing roof. The 8 panels located on the roofline of the west elevation and the 6 panels located on the east side of the roofline will be partially visible from the public right-of-way. The remaining 7 panels will be located toward the rear of the structure and will not be visible from the public right-of-way. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i., solar collectors should be located on a side or rear roof pitch to the maximum extent possible to minimize the visibility from the public right-of-way. Staff finds that the applicant should explore the panels that will be visible from the public right-of-way to the central portion of the rear roof slope. This location appears to have adequate sun exposure. Staff finds the proposed location of the panels visible from the public right-of-way inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- c. PITCH – The panels will be installed flush with the roof pitch. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. REVERSABILITY – The panels are fully removable from the existing roof, returning the roof to its presolar panel condition. Staff finds this consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the solar panels are sited so that they are not visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant is required to submit an updated roof plan showing a solar array that is not visible from the public right-of-way for staff review and approval.
- ii. That the solar panels maintain at least 18” of separation from the roof eaves.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations 1 and 2 and added stipulation that the front facing solar panel on the west side be relocated to the north face. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT

- **COMMISSIONER GRUBE STEPPED AWAY FROM THE MEETING AT 6:00PM**

- **Item # 35. HDRC NO. 2020-561**

ADDRESS: 2030 W GRAMERCY PLACE

APPLICANT: MEYER CARL BENJAMIN

REQUEST:

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

1. Install an 18-inch retaining wall at the front yard slope featuring concrete keystone blocks.
2. Install an 8-feet by 12-feet flagstone patio in the front yard.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 2030 W Gramercy was constructed circa 1925 and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The one-story single-family structure featured a front screened porch that was removed circa 2016 and currently features stucco siding, recessed front window bays with wrought iron trim and painted brick masonry planter skirting.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit on December 1, 2020, staff found that a retaining wall and flagstone patio was installed at 2030 W Gramercy prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant submitted a complete application on December 21, 2020, to be heard at the next available Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.
- c. RETAINING WALL – The applicant has proposed to install an 18-inch retaining wall at the front yard slope featuring concrete keystone blocks.
- d. TYPOGRAPHY - Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 1.A.i. applicants should not alter character-defining features such as berms or sloped front lawns that help define the character of the public right-of-way. Staff finds that sloped lawns approaching the front sidewalk is an established historic pattern in the Monticello Park Historic District and has been generally maintained at 2000 block of W Gramercy. Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii. new walls should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. The applicant has cited similar wall installations in the surrounding blocks. Staff finds that the two retaining walls on the immediate block at 2043 W Gramercy and 2002 W Gramercy was installed prior to 2008 and outside the period of enforcement. Staff finds that the existing sloped typography should be preserved. If prevention of erosion is necessary, staff finds traditional landscape edging strips exceeding no more than 4 inches from grade is appropriate.
- e. DESIGN –Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., 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. Staff finds the generic CMU block masonry does not relate to the historic stucco structure. If the commission finds that a retaining wall is appropriate for the site, staff recommends a simple stucco or cast concrete retaining wall similar to the matching materials of the house and wall at 2002 W Gramercy.

- f. **HEIGHT** – Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., the height of a new retaining wall should not exceed the height of the slope it retains. If the commission finds that a retaining wall is appropriate for the site, the height should be reduced to a maximum height of approximately 8 inches in height or the minimal height to maintain the lawn slope.
- g. **MATERIALS** – Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2. B.i., exposed concrete masonry units (CMU), keystone or similar interlocking retaining wall systems, and concrete block are prohibited materials. If the commission finds that a retaining wall is appropriate for the site, staff recommends a simple stucco or cast concrete retaining wall similar to the matching materials of the house and wall at 2002 W Gramercy.
- h. **FLAGSTONE PATIO** – The an 8-feet by 12-feet flagstone patio in the front yard adjacent the front door and walkway. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.i., applicants should not introduce large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces where they were not historically located. Staff finds the new hardscaping to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and should be restored to a grass lawn or natural plant bed. If a mulch or rock bed is used, the total square foot of the impervious area should be reduced to an appropriate scale for front yard landscapes in the historic district.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the construction of a retaining wall based on findings b through g. Staff recommends that the existing sloped typography should be preserved. If prevention of erosion is necessary, staff finds traditional landscape edging strips exceeding no more than 4 inches from grade is appropriate. If the commission finds that a retaining wall is appropriate for the site, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. The wall design and material should feature a simple stucco or cast concrete retaining wall similar to the matching materials of the house and wall at 2002 W Gramercy – instead of the prohibited concrete keystone blocks.
- ii. The height should be reduced to a maximum height of approximately 8 inches in height or the minimal height to maintain the lawn slope.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the installation of a flagstone patio based on finding h. Staff finds that the area should be restored to a grass lawn or natural plant bed. If a mulch or rock bed is used, the total square foot of the impervious area should be reduced to an appropriate scale for front yard landscapes in the historic district.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society, Ana Farras, Barbara Glenny, Eric, Mario, Jenny Miller, Jessica Ortiz, Jordan Ellis, Laura Sanchez, and Mario Gull- support the retaining wall.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with item 1 that course in height be removed of the retaining wall and wall on the profile be tapered to a landscape plan that introduces vines; and deny item 2.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, and Fetzer.
Nay: Fish.
Absent: , Martinez-Flores, Grube, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 1 NAY. 4 ABSENT

- **COMMISSIONER GRUBE RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 6:25PM**

- **Item # 40. HDRC NO. 2020-559**

ADDRESS: 533 E CARSON

APPLICANT: Mary Vargas/VARGAS MARY JOSEPHINE

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace windows M, K and F with Pella Architectural series.
2. Relocate wood window L to window E, which was fully removed by fire damage and approved for new wood window replacement. If approved, window L would then feature the new wood window.
3. Remove west side non-historic window located in the enclosed balcony porch and replace with waterfall siding.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 533 E Carson was constructed circa 1920, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Government Hill Historic District. The two-story, multi-family structure features a wraparound porch and an enclosed balcony, a standing seam metal roof with wood shingled gable faces, wood sash windows, and a variety of wood and aluminum siding.
- b. **WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace 3 windows labeled M, K, and F in the application materials. Per the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement - Scope of Repair*: When individual elements such as sills, muntins, rails, sashes, or glazing has deteriorated, every effort should be made to repair or reconstruct that individual element prior to consideration of wholesale replacement. Staff finds that the extent of deterioration on all three windows is limited to dislocation of bottom rails in a number of sashes. Staff finds that the frames, casing, sills, and glazing are wholly intact and should be spot replaced when wood rot is found. Staff finds that individual repair and potential reconstruction of individual sashes should be considered prior to wholesale window replacement. If replacement is approved by the commission, staff finds that the submitted Pella Architectural Series windows is generally consistent with *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement*.
- c. **WINDOW RELOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to relocate wood window L to window E, which was fully removed by fire damage and approved for new wood window replacement. If approved, window L would then feature the new wood window. Staff finds window L is adjacent to window M that the historic wood window should be preserved in place to prevent further damage from relocation and retro fitting. However, if window M is approved for replacement, then staff finds that that relocation of window L appropriate to occur simultaneously.
- d. **NON-ORIGINAL WINDOW REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove the non-original, west sidefacing window on the second floor of the enclosed front balcony and infill with matching wood siding. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and

Alterations 7.B.i., applicants should 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. Staff finds that that enclosing the existing window opening with a shutter configuration or interior treatment while keeping the window opening in-place will maintain the visual appearance of a balcony and would be more appropriate than furthering the non-conforming condition of a front porch enclosure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of item 1. window replacement M, F, K based on finding b. Staff finds that individual repair and potential reconstruction of individual sashes should be considered prior to wholesale window replacement. If replacement is approved by the commission, staff finds that the submitted Pella Architectural Series windows is generally consistent with *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement*.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 2. window relocation based on in finding c. However, if window M is approved for replacement, then staff finds that that relocation of window L is appropriate to occur simultaneously.

Staff does not recommends approval of item 3 based on finding d. Staff recommends enclosing the existing window opening with a shutter configuration or interior treatment while keeping the window opening in-place will maintain the visual appearance of a balcony and would be more appropriate than furthering the non-conforming condition of a front porch enclosure.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1-3 as submitted.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT

• **Item # 41. HDRC NO. 2021-011**

ADDRESS: 1910 E HOUSTON ST

APPLICANT: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio PLLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-story residential structure at 1910 E Houston. The new construction on this lot was originally approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 6, 2018, with three other structures, one of which has been constructed. Since that time, the issued HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness has expired. At this time the applicant has noted that approval for only lot 41 is requested.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-story residential structure at 1910 E Houston. The new construction on this lot was originally approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 6, 2018, with three other structures, one of which has been constructed. Since that time, the issued HDRC Certificate of Appropriateness has expired.
- b. SETBACKS – The applicant has proposed a setback for the proposed new construction that is greater than the setback of the historic structure to the immediate south, 426 N Monumental. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate.
- c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature two stories in height and a footprint of approximately 830 square feet. Staff finds the proposed massing to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the new construction toward N Monumental. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., applicants should align foundation and floor-to-floor heights within one foot of floor-to-floor heights on adjacent historic structures. The applicant has proposed a foundation height that appears to be approximately one (1) foot in height. Staff finds that the applicant should confirm the proposed foundation height.
- f. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a front facing gabled roof with a rear hip, a gabled porch/balcony roof and a shed roof above the first level. Generally, the proposed roof forms are consistent with the Guidelines; however, their profiles are inconsistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found historically within the district. Gable returns should be eliminated from each roof. Additionally, the porch roofs should be modified (both the shed and gabled forms) to be consistent with double height roof forms found historically within the district.
- g. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed a number of windows that feature contemporary profiles and sizes. Additionally, the applicant has proposed fenestration patterns on side facades that result in unbroken wall planes. Staff finds that the applicant should install one over one wood or aluminum clad wood windows with equal sash dimensions that are comparable in size to those found historically within the district, and that additional, fenestration should be added to both the north and south facades.
- h. PORCH MASSING – Historically within historic districts, double height porches feature architectural and massing elements that are cohesive in design. Historically, double height porches share the same porch element, feature organized column arrangement and read as one form. As proposed, the applicant has designed a recessed ground level porch and a shed roof and a second story roofed balcony. Staff finds that the proposed porch and balcony should be redesigned to read as one element.
- i. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant has proposed new construction that features a building to lot ratio that is higher than that recommended by the Guidelines; however, this pattern is found historically in the immediate vicinity, specifically on N Monumental. Staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.

- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding with six (6) inch exposures, board and batten siding with battens sixteen (16) inches on center, standing seam metal roofs, staggered shake siding, wood balcony railings, and composition shingle roofing. Staff finds that the proposed composite siding should feature smooth finishes, a thickness of $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch, mitered corners, and an exposure of four inches. Board and batten siding should feature a smooth finish and boards that are 12 inches in width and battens that are approximately 1.5 inches in width. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height and a standard galvalume finish. A crimped ridge seam is to be used and if a ridge cap is requested, it must be approved by staff prior to installation. The proposed railing is to feature a 2x4 top rail, 1x2 trim beneath the top rail, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " square pickets, and a notched 2x4 bottom rail. The bottom rail should be approximately 3.5 inches above the porch decking.
- k. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has not specified a window product at this time. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff standard specifications are to be installed.
- l. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – As noted in the findings above, staff finds that the proposed first and second level porch massing as well as porch roof massing should be modified to be consistent with historic examples found in the district. Additionally, staff finds that fenestration should be added to both the north and south facades.
- m. **PARKING** – At the rear of the proposed new construction, the applicant has proposed covered parking consisting of simple shed roofs. Staff finds the proposed location and massing of the proposed covered parking to be appropriate.
- n. **WALKWAY** – Houses found historically in the district feature walkways that lead from the front porch to the right of way, regardless of a sidewalk at the right of way exists. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate a concrete walkway leading from the front porch to the right of way at the sidewalk.
- o. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has not specified landscaping materials at this point. Staff finds that information regarding landscaping should be submitted for review and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through o. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness:

- i. That the applicant provide additional information noting a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate roof forms, specifically porch roof forms and massing that is consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding f. Additionally, staff recommends that the gable returns be eliminated.
- iii. That the applicant add fenestration to the north and south facades and that all windows feature traditional profiles and equal sash sizes, as noted in finding g.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate traditional double height porch massing as noted in finding h.
- v. That the proposed composite siding feature smooth finishes, a thickness of $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch, mitered corners, and an exposure of four inches. Board and batten siding is to feature a smooth finish and boards that are 12 inches in width and battens that are approximately 1.5 inches in width. The proposed standing seam metal roof is to feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height and a standard galvalume finish. A crimped ridge seam is to be used and if a ridge cap is requested, it must be approved by staff prior to installation. The proposed railing is to feature a 2x4 top rail, 1x2 trim beneath the top rail, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " square pickets, and a notched 2x4 bottom rail. The bottom rail is to be approximately 3.5 inches above the porch decking.

- vi. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff's standards specifications for new construction are used, as noted in finding k. Additionally, staff recommends that the proposed windows feature equal sashes, traditional dimensions, and that all grouped windows are separated by mullions of six (6) inches in width. All window openings should feature traditional trim and sill details, as noted in the applicable citations.
- vii. That a front, concrete walkway be installed and that a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for review and approval, as noted in findings n and o.

A foundation inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that appropriate setbacks are being installed. The foundation inspection shall be scheduled prior to the pouring of the foundation.

A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that an industrial or large ridge cap is not installed. The roofing inspection shall be scheduling prior to the installation of roofing materials.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association- supports staff recommendations.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 with staff stipulations 1, 6-7 and with stipulation 2 that they remove the gable returns, and staff stipulations 3 approved as previously submitted and approve item 4 as previously approved, item 5 approve as previously submitted with 6 in previously submitted profile and remove reference to mitten corners .
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT**

• **Item # 43. HDRC NO. 2020-577**

ADDRESS: 255 BRAHAN

APPLICANT: Cy Goudge/JCG Homes, LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct four, 2-story residential structures with a detached garage structure at 255 Brahan, located within the Westfort Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct four, 2-story residential structures with a detached garage structure at 255 Brahan, located within the Westfort Historic District.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – 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. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – This lot is located at the corner of Brahan Boulevard and Haywood Avenue. The lot is currently void of any structures. Single-family residential structures featuring multiple stories in height are found in the immediate vicinity of this lot.
- d. **PREVIOUS REVIEW** – The Historic and Design Review Commission issued conceptual approval with stipulations for a design at this address on October 7, 2020. At that time, the applicant’s proposal included one large structure fronting Brahan and decreased setbacks. Since that time, the applicant has revised the proposed new construction to address concerns of the Commission, neighborhood and staff.
- e. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 5, 2020. At that meeting, the Committee noted that there were no concerns pertaining to the proposed site plan, building footprints, setbacks, and curb cuts. The Committee did request additional architectural documents, including a roof plan.
- f. **SETBACKS (Brahan)** – The applicant has proposed for the structure facing Brahan to feature setbacks of approximately forty-three (43) and forty-five (45) feet from the street. The applicant has provided a setback diagram noting that both structures will feature setbacks that are greater than the two historic structure’s setbacks to the immediate west. Generally staff finds the proposed setbacks for Brahan to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **SETBACKS (Haywood)** – The applicant has proposed setbacks of twenty (20) feet from the right of way on Haywood. This setback is greater than the adjacent historic structure’s setback to Haywood. Generally, staff finds the proposed setbacks on Haywood to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., applicants should limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The applicant has noted that the percentage of impervious cover from building footprints is approximately thirty-nine (39) percent of the lot. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **BUILDING SPACING** – The applicant has submitted a diagram noting the proposed building spacing on both Brahan and Haywood in comparison to building spacing in the vicinity on Brahan, Haywood and Army. Generally, the proposed building spacing on this lot is consistent with that found historically within the district.
- j. **SCALE & MASS (Height)** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Per the submitted massing models, the applicant has proposed an overall height of two (2) stories and approximately twenty-nine (29) feet in height for the southern structures and approximately twenty-four (24) feet in height for the northern structures. As noted in finding c, there are historic structures in the immediate vicinity that feature two stories in height, including the primary historic structures to the immediate north and east. Generally, staff finds that two stories in height is appropriate. Staff finds that a reduced massing of the corner structure would be most appropriate. In particular, the attached garage should be eliminated as it represents a condition that is atypical within the district.

- k. SCALE & MASS (Width) – The applicant has proposed for both southern structures to feature overall widths of approximately forty (40) feet. Per the submitted application documents, this width is generally consistent with those found historically within the district. Staff finds the proposed widths to be appropriate.
- l. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., applicants should align foundation and floor-to-floor heights within one foot of floor-to-floor heights on adjacent historic structures. At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding foundation heights. Staff finds that the applicant should utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include gabled and hipped roofs. Generally, both of these roof forms are consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the overall roof massing should be amended to be consistent with that found historically within the district.
- n. MATERIALS – The applicant has noted on the conceptual elevations that composite siding with a four inch exposure will be installed. Staff finds that all siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure, a thickness of ¾”, mitered corners and a smooth finish. Columns should be six inches square, and window materials should meet staff’s standards for windows in new construction.
- o. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted that windows are to match those found on the adjacent historic structures. Staff finds that all windows should be consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction, found in the applicable citations.
- p. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in the findings above, staff generally finds the proposed massing to be appropriate; however, staff finds that additional design consideration should be given to the roof massing of the corner structure.
- q. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a double width driveway on Haywood and a single width driveway at the rear alley. Generally staff finds the locations of the propose driveways to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the propose driveways on Haywood should be designed to appear as two separate driveway elements, to be separated by landscaping elements. Each driveway should not exceed ten (10) feet in width.
- r. PARKING & GARAGE – The applicant has proposed structured parking to be located within both structures that front Brahan as well as in a detached garage structure. Parking will primarily be accessed from a driveway at the rear alley, where garage doors face internally. On Haywood the applicant has proposed a street facing garage door. Staff finds that parking that is located within the footprint of a primary structure is atypical for the parking configuration found historically within the district; however, as the proposed parking does not face a primary street and is not found on the primary façade of the structure, staff finds that it may be appropriate. As noted in finding j, elimination of the attached garage would contribute to a reduction in overall massing.
- s. WALKWAYS – The applicant has proposed for both structures on Brahan and both on Haywood to feature front walkways that connect to the sidewalk at the right of way. Staff finds this appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed site plan, setbacks, building spacing, building footprints and general building massing based on findings a through s. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to returning to the Commission for final approval:

- i. That the applicant continue to develop roof massing as noted in finding m, particularly that of the corner structure. As currently designed, the roofs feature profiles that are atypical of those found historically within the district on two story structures.
- ii. That the applicant utilize foundation and floor heights that are consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding l.
- iii. That the applicant adhere to the materials and window standards noted in the applicable citations and in findings n and o.
- iv. That the proposed driveways on Haywood be separated by a landscaping element (as to read as two separate driveways), that no driveway exceed ten (10) feet in height, and that garage doors feature single widths, metal construction and windows.
- v. That the attached garage for the corner structure, as noted in findings j and r, be eliminated in order to reduce the massing of the corner structure.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society of San Antonio- objects to the latest development plan as they are not consistent with neighborhood plan.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved for conceptual approval with stipulations 1-4. Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT**

• **Item # 44. HDRC NO. 2020-573**

ADDRESS: 115 CALLAGHAN AVE
APPLICANT: Adan Ochoa/AO Design, LLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a rear and side addition totaling approximately 1,066 square feet.
2. Widen the existing driveway to accommodate two cars. In conjunction with the proposed side addition, the requested driveway modifications create a front yard parking condition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 115 Callaghan is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1910 in the Queen Anne style. The home features a primary hipped roof configuration with projecting front and side gables, woodlap siding, an asymmetrical wraparound front porch with gingerbreading, and original wood windows. The structure is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.

- b. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new addition to the primary structure totaling approximately 1,066 square feet. The existing primary structure’s square footage is approximately 1,639 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new additions should not double the footprint of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds that the proposal generally meets this guideline, as noted in finding b, does not find the location of the addition appropriate.
- c. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the rear and side of the structure. The eastern façade of the addition will extend beyond the existing side façade of the historic house substantially, visually doubling the width of the house. Additions should be located at the rear of the structure whenever possible and should be inset behind the front façade to minimize the impact on the public streetscape. While the dimension is not indicated, the addition extends well beyond the east façade. Staff finds that the addition should be shifted to the west to be located completely behind the façade of the primary structure, and reconfigured to extend towards the rear of the lot, to be more consistent with the Guidelines and the development pattern of the district.
- d. SCALE – The proposed addition is 1-story and will be slightly shorter than the primary historic structure’s tallest ridge. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Staff finds a 1-story structure consistent with the Guidelines in terms of height, but as noted in finding c, the location of the addition extends beyond the existing east façade. Staff finds that the shifting of the rear addition fully behind the primary structure will help minimize the scale of the addition from the public right-of-way.
- e. FENESTRATION – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, openings in new construction should use traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. The applicant is requesting one over one wood windows. Staff generally finds the requested fenestration pattern to be appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- f. MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed to use woodlap siding in a profile to match the existing structure, shake skirting, asphalt shingle roofing, and fully wood windows. The applicant has also proposed to install a vertical trim piece where the addition and original structure meet. Staff finds this generally appropriate.
- g. ROOF FORM – The proposed rear addition will utilize a gable roof form with a height that is lower than the primary hip of the structure. Staff finds the rear roof form to be generally appropriate. Based on the drawings, the applicant has also proposed to replicate a historic soffit detail that is unique to the original structure. Staff finds that this detail should be simplified to help distinguish the addition from the original structure due to the strong similarities already included in the addition’s form and materiality.
- h. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing 9’ wide concrete driveway. Based on the submitted site plan, the driveway will angle past the sidewalk to a width of 15’ to accommodate a second car. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, driveways should follow the historic development pattern of the district and be a maximum width of 10 feet. The historic development pattern of the district is primarily a single car width driveway extending to the backyard to meet a rear parking pad or garage. Rear garages are also accessed by a regularly-used alley. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the driveway should extend to the backyard to accommodate additional parking. Both request items as proposed create a

condition where the visual width of the house is doubled and front yard parking is introduced, which is not consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through g. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant reconfigures the addition footprint to be completely inset behind the eastern facade of the primary structure, to extend towards the rear of the lot versus to the side, as noted in findings c and d.
- ii. That the applicant simplifies the addition’s soffit detailing as noted in finding g.
- iii. That the applicant submits final window specifications to staff for review and approval. Windows should be fully wood and feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. White color is not allowed, and color selection should be presented to staff. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend the driveway modifications as proposed based on finding h. Staff finds that the applicant should modify their proposal to include a driveway that extends to the back of the lot to follow the historic development pattern of the district as noted in finding h.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society of San Antonio- revised plans meet preservation standards.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved for continuance of this case as to provide more information on the windows and hold virtual DRC.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT

MOTION FOR REMAINING CASES

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to postpone cases 45-47 to the next available HDRC Hearing.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The Commission approved the meeting minutes of the HDRC December 16th, 2020 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting adjourned at 7:19 PM.

APPROVED



Jeffrey Fetzer, Chair
Historic Design Review Commission
City of San Antonio

Date: 2/3/21