



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
March 03, 2021

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met via videoconference on Wednesday, March 3, 2021.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Velasquez, Arreola, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

Absent: Gibbs, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Grube and Bowman.

** Interpreter services are available during the meeting. The meeting is also being recorded in Spanish.*

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:

Chairman Fetzer provided a statement regarding meeting and appeal processes, time limits and decorum.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Items 44 has been withdrawn by the applicant.

** Commissioner Grube joined the meeting.*

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Item 4: Paul Kinnison and Tony Garcia recommends denial of application.
- Item 6: Scott Rhett supports staff recommendations.
- Item 17: The Conservation Society of San Antonio supports staff's findings and looks forward to the development; King William Association is in supports of the request; and Peter Seilig opposed to development, and the department has received over a 100 voicemails in opposition.
- Item 21: King William Association concurs with staff recommendations about the tree to be preserved and windows.
- Item 27: Cosima Colvin- supports request for landmark designation.
- Item 28: Paul Kinnison- supports staff recommendations to deny application.

ITEM 1. Briefing on Proposed Code of Conduct for the Historic Design and Review Commission

- Assistant City Attorney Camila Kunau with the Office of the City Attorney presented the commission with a proposed Code of Conduct for HDRC for review, and consideration and adoption at the next HDRC meeting. Similar guidance is anticipated to be proposed City Council and other City boards and commission in order to ensure professional, fair, efficient and ethical deliberative processes at City public meetings.
- Commissioner Grube asked for clarification on a point of order motion and the protocol to proceed with discussion, which Ms. Kunau provided.
- Commissioner Velasquez suggested adding a statement that says, "There is nothing saying that we are not doing everything perfect already." And, he expressed concerns regarding the motivation and intent of the proposed rules.

ITEM 2. Amendment of the 2021 Historic and Design Review Commission Schedule of Hearing Dates to add a hearing on March 31, 2021 .

MOTION: Commissioner Fernandez moved to amend the HDRC 2021 Schedule to add March 31st. Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

Commissioner Velasquez mentioned that he brought to staff's attention that March 31st is an optional Cesar E. Chavez holiday in the State of Texas.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: Velasquez.
ABSENT: Gibbs, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYE. 1 NAY. 4 ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- Item 3, Case No. 2020-323 435 MISSION ST
- Item 5, Case No. 2020-175 311 REFUGIO ST
- Item 6, Case No. 2021-065 1024 DAWSON ST
- Item 7, Case No. 2021-020 231 W AGARITA AVE
- Item 8, Case No. 2021-066 239 W WILDWOOD
- Item 9, Case No. 2021-067 603 CEDAR ST
- Item 10, Case No. 2020-317 210 CALLAGHAN AVE
- Item 11, Case No. 2021-050 131 LOVERA BLVD
- Item 12, Case No. 2021-049 202 BUSHNELL
- Item 13, Case No. 2020-123 4674 S PRESA ST
- Item 14, Case No. 2021-071 1926 W SUMMIT AVE
- Item 15, Case No. 2021-062 318 CALLAGHAN AVE
- Item 16, Case No. 2021-101 516 KING WILLIAM
- Item 18, Case No. 2021-095 1101 IOWA ST
- Item 19, Case No. 2021-094 2515 E EVANS RD
- Item 20, Case No. 2021-093 2244 ORR, Cable Westwood Park
- Item 22, Case No. 2021-030 547 DONALDSON AVE
- Item 23, Case No. 2021-087 220 BROADWAY
- Item 24, Case No. 2021-085 4002 ROOSEVELT AVE
- Item 25, Case No. 2020-470 2300 BROADWAY
- Item 26, Case No. 2021-078 1815 FREDERICKSBURG RD
- Item 27, Case No. 2021-070 1109 W CRAIG PLACE

- The Commission pulled items 4, 17, 21, and 28 for discussion.
- Item 44 was withdrawn by applicant.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 3, 5-16, 20, and 22-27 with staff stipulations.

Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
 NAY: None.
 ABSENT: Gibbs, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM 4. HDRC NO. 2021-056
ADDRESS: 134 W MISTLETOE
APPLICANT: Lyndsay Thorn

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform the following modifications to the west elevation of the primary structure:

1. Relocate the existing side access door.
2. Install an ADA accessible wheelchair ramp on the side façade.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 134 W Mistletoe is a 2 ½ residential structure constructed circa 1920 in the Craftsman style. The home features woodlap and wood shake siding, a hipped roof, and prominent front porch. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **DOOR RELOCATION AND FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to relocate the existing side access door approximately 8’-8 ½” to the south to replace an existing window. A smaller window will also be removed that is currently adjacent to the existing door. The door is to be relocated to accommodate a new ADA ramp. While altering existing openings is generally discouraged, staff finds that the discreet location of this modification on a side façade, as well as its minimal impact to the overall historic character and fenestration pattern of the building, is appropriate.
- c. **ADA RAMP** – The applicant has proposed to construct a wooden ADA ramp on the west elevation of the home. According to the applicant, these modifications are to allow the owners more accessible entry to the house, while preserving the historic front entrance and providing an opportunity for an accessible restroom off the kitchen at the previous location of the existing door and stairs. A similar railing to the existing will be installed, and the same colors as existing will be maintained on all exterior modifications. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, the preferred location of new ramps is at the side or rear of the building when convenient for the user. Minimize the damage to the historic character and materials of the building and sidewalk while complying with all aspects of accessibility requirements. As noted in finding b, altering existing doors is generally discouraged, staff finds that the discreet location of this modification on a side façade, as well as its minimal impact to the overall historic character of the building, is consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the request items based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

i. That the windows be salvaged and stored on site to be used for repairs or in future construction projects.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Paul Kinnison and Tony Garcia recommends denial of application.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to refer to the Design Review Committee to include a site visit.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon,
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Gibbs, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 29. HDRC NO. 2021-032
ADDRESS: 337 E SUMMIT AVE
APPLICANT: Samuel Asvestas/MONTEVISTA FOUNDATION INC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof in a galvalume finish.
2. Replace 22 single hung, single lite, aluminum windows with 22 single hung, single lite, black aluminum Don Young windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 337 E Summit is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1970 in the Ranch style. The home features a brick façade, side-gable roof configuration with asphalt shingles, and aluminum windows. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. HISTORY OF METAL ROOFING – Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920s, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to its fire resistance, ability to be customized in regard to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation.
- c. SITE CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – According to Sanborn Maps, most homes in this subdivision of Monte Vista, which was constructed in the 1960s and 1970s, were originally constructed with composition shingle roofs. The use of composition shingle roofs appears to have been a consistent design decision during the development of this area. Nearly all of the structures of this era retain their original shingle roof or their roofs have been replaced in-kind with an asphalt shingle product.
- d. ROOF REPLACEMENT – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should only be installed on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style, construction period, or district. Staff finds

that a metal roof is not a material rooted in the historic precedent of the development of this portion of the neighborhood. If approved, this house would be the only one of its construction era on this block with a metal roof. Staff does not find the roof replacement consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. **ALUMINUM WINDOWS** – In general, the use of aluminum windows in new construction became more prevalent during the post-war construction boom and grew in popularity into the mid-20th century. The quality, durability, and repairability of these windows is less than their wood predecessors which were constructed by hand using quality, old-growth lumber. Wood windows were designed to be integral to the structure in which they were installed and were intended to be repaired and maintained over time. In contrast, aluminum windows cannot be easily spot-repaired once they fail, were factory-produced, and were generally not integral to the overall intentional design of the structures in which they were installed. Aluminum windows are also more susceptible to condensation as a result of their materiality which can contribute to long-term damage of other elements. A proposed replacement window product that is in keeping with the architectural style or construction period of the house and maintains a similar visual appearance could be considered consistent with the Guidelines, even in circumstances where original aluminum windows are present.
- f. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has requested to replace all existing aluminum windows in the primary structure with new windows, with the exception of the double-height windows located to the right of the front door. The aluminum windows will match the proportion, configuration, detailing, and inset of the existing windows as closely as possible, but will be black in color instead of the existing aluminum silver finish. The applicant has noted that several of the windows exhibit evidence of improper repairs, painting of the exterior frames, and the deterioration or loss of functional elements. Based on these observations, staff finds that the replacement with the requested product is acceptable and will not result in the loss of character defining features or high-quality historic material.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Item 1, Staff does recommend the replacement of the shingle roof with a metal roof based on findings a through d. The replacement of the roof in-kind with new asphalt shingles is eligible for administrative approval.

If the HDRC finds that a standing seam metal roof is appropriate, staff recommends that the following stipulation apply:

- i. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof featuring panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth without striation or corrugation. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. An on-site inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications. All chimney, flue, and related existing roof details must be preserved.

Item 2, Staff recommends approval based on findings a through b with the following stipulations:

- i. That the replacement product matches the existing proportion, dimensions, proportion, configuration, and inset of the existing windows as closely as possible. Existing openings on the structure should not be enlarged or minimized to accommodate a replacement product. A window schedule and detailed product specifications shall be submitted to staff for review and approval that indicates all configurations to be installed in the structure.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 1 and 2 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Gibbs, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: The **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 30. HDRC NO. 2021-027
ADDRESS: 520 LEIGH ST
APPLICANT: LABOR STREET COMMONS LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting final approval to construct a new 2-story single family residence at the lot addressed 520 Leigh St. Some of the schematic documents include conceptual information about a new 3-story multifamily residential structure in the center-rear of the lot addressed 606-608 Labor St, as well as renovation work and rear additions to three 1-story historic structures on the same parcel, two of which are located along the Labor St frontage. These scopes are not included in the current request.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting final approval to construct one 2-story structure on the lot addressed 520 Leigh. This lot was originally part of a contiguous parcel previously addressed 606-608 Labor, located within the Lavaca Historic District, which has been subdivided. The proposed 2-story single family residence will have a footprint of approximately 1,262 square feet. While the parcel addressed 520 Leigh has pedestrian access via a small pathway connecting to Leigh St, the proposed 2-story structure’s vehicular access is through the 606-608 Labor parcel, which currently features three historic 1-story, single family structures, two of which front Labor St.
- b. SCOPE - Some of the schematic documents include conceptual information about a new 3-story multifamily residential structure in the center-rear of the lots addressed 606-608 Labor, as well as renovation work to the existing three historic structures, two of which are located along the street frontage on Labor. Based on the submitted context renderings, the applicant may bring a future request forward for 2-story rear additions to the existing 1-story historic structures. These scopes are not included in the current request for work at 520 Leigh. As proposed, the included site plan with the footprint of the proposed 3-story multifamily structure is not consistent with the Guidelines, and the scale of the multifamily structure, along with the scale of the additions for the historic structures fronting Labor, may not be appropriate. An approval for the scope included in the request item for this case (520 Leigh) does not imply approval or endorsement of the schematic site plan of the adjacent lots, tracts, or parcels addressed 606-608 Labor, including any new site work, renovations, exterior modifications, additions, hardscaping, landscaping, or new construction. A separate application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is required to initiate review of work on the adjacent lots.
- c. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – As noted in finding a, the parcel addressed 520 Leigh is currently surrounded on all sides by other parcels, with vehicular access provided through the lots addressed 606-608 Labor and an additional narrow easement extending from the lot to Leigh St. The lot was previously part of a contiguous parcel addressed 606-608 Labor,

which was formally replatted sometime in the past two years. The lot previously featured six residential structures, three of which were deemed non-contributing by the Office of Historic Preservation in 2019 and subsequently demolished. The remaining structures were constructed circa 1925 and are contributing to the Lavaca Historic District. In addition to this parcel, 520 Leigh is surrounded on all sides by extant structures, including a recent 3-story residential structure to the south, a 1930s-era 1-story convenience store at the corner of Leigh and Labor to the immediate north of the site, a midcentury-era 1.5 story clinic across the street on Labor, a 1-story historic structure to the north along Leigh, a vacant parcel to the immediate north of the site, and a series of residential new construction project along Leigh to the west. The property is one lot from the intersection of Labor and Leigh to the north.

- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 28, 2020. At this time, the lot addressed 520 Leigh was still part of the parcel addressed 606-608 Labor, and the full scope listed in finding b was included for consideration. The DRC noted the unique context of the site, including the variety of construction typologies and periods of construction that immediately surround the site. The DRC’s feedback largely focused on the then-proposed 3-story multifamily structure in the center of the lot, including modifying roof forms to visually reduce the proposed massing and revisiting the proposed window patterns and types to be more in keeping with historic precedents. The DRC also provided similar feedback for the windows for the proposed residential single family structure, along with exploring a screening solution to visually minimize the view of the new structure from Leigh St, as the lot between Leigh St and the proposed new construction is vacant. The applicant met again with the DRC on February 9, 2021, to discuss the current proposal. The DRC stressed the importance of providing renderings or line-of-sight studies from Labor, Devine, and Leigh streets to visually demonstrate the impact of the new residential structure on the surrounding context. The DRC agreed that the overall height of the proposed structure may be appropriate for the site based on surrounding 2-story primary and accessory structures, but wanted to see additional documentation that demonstrated the impact on 1-story structures on Labor and Leigh. The DRC also recommended adjusting the overall roof forms to visually minimize the scale of the structure.
- e. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The proposed structure is located towards the rear of the property and do not feature primary street frontage. The applicant has proposed to orient the 2-story single family residence towards the street. While staff finds that the previous structures on the lot featured both street-facing and interior-facing orientations, staff finds that the proposed massing and scale of the proposal in conjunction with the orientation inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SCALE & 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. This block of Labor features a 3-story recently constructed structure immediately to the north, as well as multiple historic structures, both residential and commercial, most of which are 1-story. While the proposed height of the new construction may be consistent with the Guidelines given the existence of a two-story historic structure on the block, staff is concerned regarding the proposed proportions of the new construction relative to the development pattern of the lot, which originally featured 1-story structures.

- g. MASS – Historically, rear accessory structures in historic district feature a scale that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the massing of the rear structure to be inconsistent with the Guidelines based on the contextual information provided and historic precedents in the district.
- h. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant’s proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. 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. Based on the submitted elevations, the proposed foundation is slab-on-grade with a minimal rise. Staff finds that the applicant should utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed a multi-slope roofline. The primary roofline is a side gable with a low-sloping shed roof extending to the north. . Staff generally finds these roof forms to be consistent based on the surrounding context, but finds that in context with the proportions of the home, additional roof solution should be explored to visually reduce the mass of the flat roof portion, primarily on the north and east elevations.
- k. 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. Per the elevations that the applicant has submitted, staff finds the proposed windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. The proposed sizes, configurations, and rhythm are not found historically within the district.
- l. PORCH MASSING – The applicant has proposed a front porch that consists of a stoop and roof element that is attached to the front façade of the historic structure. Porches found historically within the district feature massing that is incorporated into the massing of the structure, rather than simply attaching to the front façade, particularly in the case of two story structures. Staff finds that the proposed porch massing should be incorporated into the overall design of the structure and feature porch configurations and details that are historically found in the district.
- m. 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. Staff does not find the lot coverage consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. MATERIALS – At this time the applicant has not submitted final information regarding materials. Staff finds that all siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure, a thickness of $\frac{3}{4}$ ”, mitered corners and a smooth finish. Any stucco elements should feature a true trowel application and finish in lieu of EFIS or a similar product. 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 proposed aluminum clad wood windows, which may be consistent with staff’s stipulations. However, the proposed windows in terms of pattern, detailing, configuration, proportion, and inset are not consistent with the Guidelines.
- p. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in the previous findings, staff finds that many of the proposed architectural details, including porch massing, roof massing, and window proportions are inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that these elements should be modified.
- q. DRIVEWAY AND SITE ELEMENTS – The applicant has provided the location of walkways and driveways. Per the applicant, the proposed structure will be accessed through the center of the adjacent parcels addressed 606-608 Labor. There is not a precedent for this kind of access in the historic district, and the separate parcels creates a condition whereby a change of ownership could render the proposed rear structure inaccessible without an agreement for access.

- r. DOCUMENTATION - The applicant has provided a proposed site plan, elevations, and various renderings showing the proposed structure as well as structures and additions that do not currently exist and have not been reviewed or approved by the Office of Historic Preservation or the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC). Staff strongly recommends that the applicant provides accurate existing site analysis documentation, including current photos of area structures and accurate line-of-sight studies and renderings of the current context versus the proposed context.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through r. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant provides a comprehensive site analysis, including photos of area structures, line-of-sight studies, perspectives from both Labor and Leigh streets that show the height and scale of existing structures versus proposed developments, and documentation indicating the heights and massing of nearby structures as they currently exist as noted in finding r.
- ii. That the proposed structure be reduced in height and massing to be consistent with rear accessory structures found historically within the district (subordinate to primary structures), as noted in findings f and g.
- iii. That the applicant utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate roof forms that are more consistent with the surrounding historic context as noted in finding j.
- v. That the applicant incorporate appropriate window sizes and proportions and modify the overall fenestration pattern as noted in finding k.
- vi. That the applicant incorporate appropriate front porch massing as noted in finding l.

If the HDRC finds the request consistent and recommends final approval, any additional development represented on an adjacent parcel or parcels is not approved and requires a separate request for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Any approvals are exclusively tied to improvements on the parcel, tract, or property addressed 520 Leigh.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio-support staff recommendations to deny application approval.

* *Commissioner Gibbs joined the meeting.*

1st MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve as submitted by the applicant. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

VOTE:
AYE: Velasquez and Arreola,
NAY: Fernandez, Fish, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
ABSTAIN: Gibbs
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: The MOTION FAILED with 2 AYE. 5 NAY. 1 ABSTAIN. 3 ABSENT.

2nd MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved for conceptual approval with stipulation 1,3,4, and 5; and modify stipulation 2 that the applicant continue to explore reduction of massing on Leigh street direction.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
 NAY: None.
 ABSTAIN: Gibbs.
 ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 1 ABSTAIN. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 31. **HDRC NO. 2021-033**
ADDRESS: 324 E ROSEWOOD AVE
APPLICANT: Matt Bishop/BEXAR DIVERSIFIED MF-1 LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing tile roof with a composition shingle roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 324 E Rosewood is a 2-story, multi-family structure constructed circa 1930. It first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The structure has an asymmetrical u-shape plan and features a flat roof with mansard slopes and red clay or ceramic tiles, a pitched tile porch roof, a secondary front gable porch awning, a stone veneer, and one-over-one windows. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing red clay or ceramic tile roof with a composition shingle roof to match other stone veneer properties on the block. Guideline 3.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that roofing materials should be replaced with in-kind materials whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Historic materials such as slate or clay tiles should be retained and re-used when large-scale replacement of roof materials other than asphalt shingles is required. The existing clay roof tiles are severely damaged and require replacement. Furthermore, Guideline 3.B.iv states that new roofing materials should match the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile and style or materials should be selected that are consistent with the building style when in-kind replacement is not possible. The 1951 Sanborn map shows that the original roof was composition; however, the Sanborn map may have referenced the material of the flat roof portion of the structure. Staff finds the request is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the installation of a material, such as pressed metal, that is similar in appearance to the existing tile would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through b. Staff recommends that the roof is replaced with in-kind materials or a material similar in appearance to the existing tile.

If the HDRC finds roof replacement with composition shingles appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the replacement composition shingles are similar in appearance to the existing tile and are verified by staff. The applicant is required to submit final material specifications to staff for review and approval.
- ii. That the applicant maintains the existing ridge detailing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations 1 and 2.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman

ACTION: The **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYE. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 32. HDRC NO. 2021-053

ADDRESS: 311 MUNCEY

APPLICANT: Anthony Chen/Aeonium Investments, LLC

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

1. Modify the fenestration on the north elevation by increasing the size of one original window opening, and by removing two existing window openings at a rear, enclosed porch.
2. Modify the fenestration on the south elevation by removing one existing window opening.
3. Replace the existing, wood front door.
4. Construct a rear addition to feature 432 square feet at the rear of the historic structure located at 311 Muncey, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

The applicant has agreed to repair all wood windows, repair the standing seam metal roof and install a standing seam metal roof on the addition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear addition to feature 432 square feet at the rear of the historic structure located at 311 Muncey, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The structure at 311 Muncey was constructed circa 1925 in Craftsman style. The structure currently features an eyebrow porch roof and a side gabled primary roof. At this time, the applicant has proposed a number of exterior modifications to the historic structure, as well as a rear addition. The applicant is not requesting window replacement at this time.
- b. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS (North elevation) – The applicant has proposed to modify the fenestration on the north elevation by increasing the size of one original window opening, and by removing two existing window openings at a rear, enclosed porch. Additionally, the applicant has submitted an alternative proposal that includes the installation of a new window profile beneath the side gable. The Guideline for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that historic window openings should be preserved. Staff does not find the removal of original window openings nor the introduction of new openings to be appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS (South elevation) – The applicant has proposed to modify the fenestration on the south elevation by removing one existing window opening. The Guideline for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that historic window openings should be preserved. Staff does not find the removal of original window openings to appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.

- d. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to relace the existing, wood front door with a fiberglass door. Staff finds the proposed replacement to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the existing, wood door should be repaired. If the door is beyond repair, it should be replaced with a matching wood door.
- e. REAR 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 not feature a footprint so large as to double the historic structure’s footprint. Generally, the proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the applicant should ensure a visual break is present on the right (north) elevation to separate the addition from the new construction.
- f. REAR ADDITION (Materials) – The Guidelines for Additions note that additions should feature similar architectural details and materials as the historic structure. As noted in finding a, the historic structure at 311 Muncey is a Craftsman style structure. The applicant has proposed to install an asphalt shingle roof and matching wood siding (117). The historic structure currently features a standing seam metal roof, and the roof of the proposed addition should match that.
- g. REAR ADDITION (Fenestration and window materials) – The applicant has submitted two options for fenestration for the rear addition. Both options propose fenestration profiles that are inconsistent with those found historically within the district through the incorporation of contemporary window sizes and blank walls that are void of fenestration. Staff finds that window openings that match those of the primary historic structure in profile and size should be incorporated into the design. Staff finds that at least two window openings should be added to the right elevation. Regarding window materials, the applicant has submitted a number of window materials for the proposed addition. Staff finds the Jeld-Wen product to be most consistent with staff’s standard specifications for windows in additions.
- h. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Per the Guidelines, additions should 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. As noted in finding h, staff finds that window openings that match those of the primary historic structure in profile and size should be incorporated into the design. Staff finds that at least two window openings should be added to the right elevation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, fenestration modifications to the north façade, as noted in finding b. Staff recommends that the historic façade be maintained as it exists.
- 2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, fenestration modifications to the south façade, as noted in finding c. Staff recommends that the historic façade be maintained as it exists.
- 3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #5, door replacement. Staff recommends that the existing door be repaired.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of item #5, the construction of a rear addition based on findings g through j with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant should ensure a visual break is present on the right (north) elevation to separate the addition from the new construction.
 - ii. That a standing seam metal roof is installed to match that of the primary historic structure.

- iii. That window openings that match those of the primary historic structure in profile and size be incorporated into the design. Staff recommends that at least two window openings should be added to the right elevation.
- iv. That a wood window is installed in the addition that is consistent with staff's standards for windows in additions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio and Scott Albert- concurs with staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to refer to the Design Review Commission.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: Velasquez.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 1 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 33. HDRC NO. 2021-037
ADDRESS: 830 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: Francis Muzquiz

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an ADA accessible ramp at the front of the house.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 830 Dawson was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features a traditional L-plan with a front facing gable flanked by an inset porch with wood lap siding, and wood sash windows.
- b. HISTORIC ELEMENTS – Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.A.i, applicants should minimize damage to the historic character and materials of the building while complying with all aspects of accessibility requirements. Staff finds that no historic elements should be damaged by the ramps contact with the porch.
- c. LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the ramp beginning at the east side of the porch and ending back at the centered walkway. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.ii., the preferred location for ramps on residential structures is on the side or rear of the structure when convenient for the user. Staff finds that the ramp entrance from grade should be oriented from the side yard as it approaches the front or rear porch, rather than in the front lawn as proposed.
- d. DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a ramp design that feature metal construction with three 3-foot wide slopes and two 4-by-5-foot landings for turning. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 8.C.i., applicants should 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. Staff finds that the metal provides contrast to the historic structure and should instead feature wood construction.

- e. **SCREENING** – Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 8.C.ii., applicants should screen ramps, lifts, or other elements related to ADA compliance using appropriate landscape materials. Staff finds that the installation of additional landscaping items would further screen the proposed ramp.
- f. **PERMENANCE** – While the rear yard or rear yards are the most appropriate location for a ramp per the Guidelines, staff finds that when no longer needed by the current residents, the ramp can be removed and the historic structure can be returned to its previous configuration.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the proposed ramp based in finding b through f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the ramp entrance from grade should be oriented from the side yard as it approaches the front or rear porch, rather than in the front lawn as proposed.
- ii. That ramp should feature wood construction instead of metal. An updated design should be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to installation.
- iii. That additional natural landscape features be considered for additional screening in the front yard.
- iv. That when no longer needed by the current residents, the ramp can be removed and the historic structure can be returned to its previous configuration.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Scott Albert supports staff recommendations but is concerned with the ramp.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve as submitted with the additional stipulation 4 when the ramp is no longer needed it be disassembled.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Grube, and Bowman.

ACTION: The **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 34. HDRC NO. 2021-060
ADDRESS: 302 LEIGH ST
APPLICANT: DUPONT WILLIAM A & KATHRYN KANZLER

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install new front and side yard fencing in a fully metal, cattle panel style measuring 3’-6” in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 302 Leigh is a 1-story single family structure constructed circa 1920 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features woodlap siding, a primary hipped roof with a side gable featuring decorative wood shingles, and multi-lite wood window screens with a diamond pattern. The home is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. **FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed to install a new metal frame front and side yard fence with square wire grid panels measuring 3’-6” in height. The house is located on a corner lot and the proposed fencing will extend from the neighboring property line on Leigh to behind the bay window on the side elevation facing Eager St. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should appear similar to those used

historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, materiality, and character. Staff finds that cattle panel fencing is generally appropriate for the district, but finds that the posts and rails should be wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence, which is more consistent with fence materials historically used in the Lavaca Historic District.

- c. FENCE LOCATION –According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should follow historic fence placements in the district. The proposed fence will follow the established fence line along Leigh St and will extend beyond the side bay window along Eager St. A privacy fence measuring 6’-0” in height will continue the fence line along Eager St and turn to meet the rear accessory structure, which is eligible for administrative approval. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the installation of front and side yard fencing based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

- i. That posts and rails be wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence style as noted in finding b.
- ii. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with stipulation 2.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Grube, and Bowman.

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.

ITEM 35. HDRC NO. 2021-057
ADDRESS: 1235 E CROCKETT ST
APPLICANT: Kali Tripp/Tripp Flip, LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the eastern front door opening on the historic structure at 1235 E Crockett, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 1110 Virginia is a one-story Craftsman single-family residence constructed in c. 1910. The home features one-over-one wood windows, a cross gable roof covered with composition shingles and supported by wood brackets, a front porch and porte cochere supported by paired square columns. The home is contributing to the Knob Hill Historic District.
- b. The historic structure located at 1235 E Crockett first appears on aerial photographs at its current location in 1986. The structure was relocated to its current location at an undetermined time; speculatively during the construction of Fairchild Park, where a number of historic structures were removed from their original locations. The original structure located at 1235 E Crockett is noted on the 1931 Sanborn Map as “partly burned” and was no longer present at the lot by 1952. OHP staff has not found a reference to the historic structure in its original location; however,

there is a duplex structure found on the 1912 and 1952 Sanborn Map. Interior framing suggests that the structure may have featured a recessed front porch with street facing and side yard facing front doors; however, this has not been verified via Sanborn Maps or other historic information.

- c. **DOOR REMOVAL** – The Historic Design Guidelines note that original window and door locations should be preserved as they exist. Staff has not found sufficient evidence that alludes to the historic structure having not been a duplex. Staff finds that maintaining both front doors provides an architectural reference to the structure’s historic form.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed door removal based on findings b and c.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio and Scott Albert- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve as submitted.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 8 AYE. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 36. HDRC NO. 2021-051
ADDRESS: 315 W HUISACHE AVE
APPLICANT: Larry Curtis/CURTIS LARRY G & JOSEPHINE F

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

1. Install a 4-foot-high wrought iron front yard fence and driveway gate
2. Replace the existing concrete front walkway with brick pavers
3. Complete landscaping modifications

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 315 W Huisache is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style. The structure features a composition shingle roof with two high-pitch front gables with gable vent details, an arched entry opening, an asymmetrical wrap-around front porch, and divided lite windows. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot-high wrought iron front yard fence with a driveway gate and pedestrian gate. Guideline 2.B.i for Site Elements states that 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. According to Guideline 2.B.iii for Site Elements the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited 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. While the design and height of the proposed front yard fence is appropriate for the Monte Vista Historic District, the streetscape along W Huisache features predominantly open yards or yards landscaped with box hedges or short retaining walls. The applicant has provided evidence of existing wrought iron fences at nearby properties; however, these two existing fences are installed on properties in proximity to a non-residential property. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

- c. FENCE LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the 4-foot-high wrought iron fence around the perimeter of the front yard, 4 feet from the sidewalk. The proposed front yard fence will turn in at the driveway and terminate in a driveway gate at the front façade wall plane. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements states that fence or wall installation should be avoided 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. If a front yard fence is installed on the property, staff finds the location and placement of the driveway gate appropriate due to the unique site conditions of the property.
- d. FRONT WALKWAY REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing concrete front walkway with patterned brick pavers. Guideline 5.A.i for Site Elements states that historic sidewalk and walkway paving materials—often brick or concrete—should be retained and repaired in place. According to Guideline 5.A.ii for Site Element, when replacing those portions of sidewalks or walkways that are deteriorated beyond repair, every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- e. LANDSCAPING MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to relocate existing bushes, remove old yard growth, and install drought tolerant plants inside the front yard fence and on the outside of the front yard fence. The applicant has submitted a list of proposed drought tolerant plants, but has not submitted a landscaping plan at this time. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a landscaping plan to staff for review and approval. The landscaping plan should retain at least 50 percent of green space.
- f. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL – The applicant has proposed to install an irrigation system. This scope of work is eligible for administrative approval and does not require review by the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of the front yard fence installation based on findings a through c. If the HDRC is compelled to approve the front yard fence installation, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed driveway gate is located behind the front façade wall plane. The applicant is required to submit an updated site plan showing the relocation of the driveway gate behind the front façade wall plane to staff for review and approval.
- ii. That the final construction height of the approved gate and fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the gate and fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

Item 2, staff does not recommend approval of the brick walkway installation based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant repairs and replaces the existing concrete walkway with in-kind material and matches the existing footprint and design.

Item 3, staff does not recommend approval of landscaping modifications based on finding e. The applicant is required to submit a landscaping plan to staff for review and approval. A landscaping plan that retains at least 50 percent of green space is eligible for administrative approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Paul Kinnison and Charlie Fulton- concurs with staff recommendations.

1st MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve item 2 and 3 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Velasquez and Arreola.
NAY: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon .
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION FAILED with 2 AYE. 6 NAY. 3 ABSENT**

2nd MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to refer to Design Review Committee.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: Velasquez.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 1 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 37. HDRC NO. 2021-048
ADDRESS: 510 E CARSON
APPLICANT: Jed Singa-Craddock

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

1. Construct a 4-foot tall, wrought iron front yard fence of 510 E Carson
2. Replace the existing fence in the rear yard with a new 6-foot tall, wood privacy fence that includes the enclosure of the rear dwelling structure, addressed 511 Colita, on the same lot.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 510 E Carson was constructed circa 1915 in the Folk Victorian style and contributes the Government Hill Historic District. The one-story structure features a wraparound porch, hipped roofs, wood lap siding, wood sash windows, and hipped shingle roofs. The property also features a rear dwelling structure addressed 511 Colita, which was constructed circa 1915 in the Craftsman style and also contributes to the Government Hill Historic District. The one-story structure features a single hipped shingle roof with an inset sideflanking porch, wood lap siding, and wood sash windows.
- b. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot tall, wrought iron fence in the front yard of 510 E Carson and a 6-foot tall, rear wood privacy fence from the rear yard of 510 E Carson to the front yard of 511 Colita.
- c. DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron front yard 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. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Staff finds that the wrought iron fence is appropriate to the Folk Victorian style and found within the Government Hill Historic District.

- d. **LOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard fence including a gate spanning across the front of the front of the driveway. 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 walls should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. Staff finds that fences are found within the district and that unobstructed front lawns are not a character defining feature of this block of the district. Additionally, while front driveway gates are atypical, staff finds that the wraparound porch condition allows for installation front gate instead of turned and set behind the front façade plane of the house.
- e. **HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed to install a fence 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; the appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Staff finds that the proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulation that electrical and mechanical equipment, is used, should be set behind the fence and minimally visible.
- f. **PRIVACY FENCE** – The applicant has proposed to install a 6-foot tall solid rear privacy fence the rear yard of 510 E Carson to the front yard of 511 Colita. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 6.C.ii., applicants should not use privacy fences in front yards. While current conditions features 511 Colita as a rear structure to the primary structure 510 E Carson, staff finds that 511 Colita was historically a primary structure and that both neighboring structures to the left and right on Colita feature matching orientation facing the street. Staff finds that a 6-foot rear privacy fence may be appropriate behind the front façade planes of both houses on the property. However, fences past the either front façade planes should feature the appropriate height below 4-feet and design appropriate to their respective style: wrought iron with Folk Victorian and wood picket with Craftsman.

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

- i. That 6-foot tall rear wood privacy fences should terminate behind the front façade of both structures at 510 E Carson and 511 Colita, rather than fully enclose 511 Colita as a rear accessory structure.
- ii. That front yard fences past both structure’s front façade planes should feature the appropriate height below 4- feet and a design appropriate to their respective styles.
- iii. That any mechanical equipment or solar collectors for the gate, if used, should be set behind the fence for minimal visibility.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None .

MOTION: Commissioner Fish move to approve with staff stipulations 1-3.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: None.

ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 8 AYE. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 38. **HDRC NO. 2021-054**
ADDRESS: 215 LOSOYA ST
APPLICANT: CESAR CARRILLO/Landry's Inc

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

1. Remove paint from the existing brick, repoint grout, and seal to restore the historic brick façade.
2. Clean all stone masonry elements, including banding, window molds and cornice details.
3. Paint all wood windows, wood doors, wood trim and iron hooks, and stain balcony railings.
4. Install a new fabric awning on the river façade.
5. Install a wall mounted sign above the Losoya Street entrance to read “King Ranch Texas Kitchen”. The proposed sign will feature internally illuminated channel letters with white plexi faces. The proposed sign will feature an overall width of 8’ – 4” and an overall height of 3’ – 4” for a total size of approximately twenty-eight (28) square feet.
6. Install a double-sided, hanging sign on the Losoya Street façade to read “King Ranch Texas Kitchen”. The proposed sign will feature wood and aluminum construction. The proposed sign will feature an overall width of 3’ – 0” and an overall height of 2’ – 0” for a total size of twelve (12) square feet, including both sides.
7. Install an externally illuminated, double-sided sign on an existing sign post on the River Walk façade to read "King Ranch Texas Kitchen". The proposed sign will feature wood and aluminum construction. The proposed sign will feature 1’ – 6” in height and 2’ – 3” in width for a total size of approximately 7 square feet, including both sides.
8. Install a post-mounted pedestrian menu board at the River Walk level. The proposed menu board will feature a size of 1’ – 4” in width and 1’ – 6” in height for a total size of two (2) square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting rehabilitative scopes of work and signage at 215 Losoya, located within the Alamo Plaza Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 3.
- b. REPAIR & MAINTENANCE – The applicant has proposed to remove paint from the existing brick, repoint grout, perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the existing brick, clean stone masonry elements, and paint all wood trim, windows and doors, and stain the existing balcony railing. Staff finds the proposed scopes of work to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Additionally, staff finds that paint removal from historic brick should be done in a manner that does not damage the brick. Sanding or high pressure sand blasting or pressure washing should not be performed.
- c. AWNING INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, fabric awning on the river façade with a new fabric awning. Staff finds the proposed replacement to be appropriate.
- d. SIGNAGE – The Guidelines for Signage 1.A.i. notes that each structure will be allowed one major and two minor signs, not to exceed a total of fifty (50) square feet. The applicant has proposed an amount of signage that is consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. SIGNAGE (Losoya Street wall sign) – The applicant has proposed to install a wall mounted sign above the Losoya Street entrance to read “King Ranch Texas Kitchen”. The proposed sign will feature internally illuminated channel letters with white plexi faces. The proposed sign will

feature an overall width of 8' – 4" and an overall height of 3' – 4" for a total size of approximately twenty-eight (28) square feet. The Guidelines for Signage 1. note that signage for historic properties should not feature materials such as plastic or fiberglass, and should not feature indirect lighting. Additionally, the Guidelines for Signage 3.A.iii. note that the use of projecting and wall-mounted signs should be limited to building forms that historically used these types of signs, most typically commercial storefronts. This block of Losoya is void of wall signs as each building features a projecting blade sign. Staff finds a wall sign in this context on this block to be inappropriate. Additionally, as proposed the wall signage is not consistent with the Guidelines as the Guidelines recommend against internal illumination and plastic channel letter faces.

- f. SIGNAGE (Losoya Street hanging sign) – The applicant has proposed to install a double-sided, hanging sign on the Losoya Street façade to read “King Ranch Texas Kitchen”. The proposed sign will feature wood and aluminum construction, and indirect lighting. The proposed sign will feature an overall width of 3' – 0" and an overall height of 2' – 0" for a total size of twelve (12) square feet, including both sides. This sign is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage.
- g. SIGNAGE (River Walk façade) – The applicant has proposed to install an externally illuminated, double-sided sign on an existing sign post on the River Walk façade to read "King Ranch Texas Kitchen". The proposed sign will feature wood and aluminum construction. The proposed sign will feature 1' – 6" in height and 2' – 3" in width for a total size of approximately 7 square feet, including both sides. Staff finds the proposed signage to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Signage and the UDC Section 35-681.
- h. SIGNAGE (Menu board) – The applicant has proposed to install a post-mounted pedestrian menu board at the River Walk level. The proposed menu board will feature a size of 1' – 4" in width and 1' – 6" in height for a total size of two (2) square feet. The proposed menu board is consistent with the UDC Section 35-681.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #4 and #6 through #8 based on findings a through d and f through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That paint removal from historic brick and masonry be done in a manner that does not damage the brick. Sanding or high pressure sand blasting or pressure washing should not be performed, as noted in finding b.
- ii. That the proposed wall sign on the Losoya Street façade feature all metal construction with indirect or external illumination, as noted in finding e.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #5, the proposed wall sign, based on finding e.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

1st MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 1-4 and 6-8 with staff stipulations and deny item 5.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

VOTE:
AYE: Fernandez, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
NAY: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, and Arreola .
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, and Bowman.

ACTION: The MOTION FAILED with 4 AYE. 4 NAY. 3 ABSENT

2nd MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to refer to Design Review Committee.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez Arreola, Grube.
NAY: Fetzner and Laffoon.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYE. 2 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 39. HDRC NO. 2021-042
ADDRESS: 917 HAYS ST
APPLICANT: Matthew & Somer Barburek

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

1. Install simplified front porch columns
2. Remove front gable detailing
3. Install front wood planters
4. Install rounded rear porch steps
5. Install a wood-frame cattle panel rear porch handrail
6. Install faux stone rear porch decking
7. Modify the fenestration pattern on the rear addition
8. Historic Tax Verification

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 917 Hays is a 1-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1935 in the Craftsman style. The structure retains several original elements that are characteristic of the Craftsman style, including a primary front gable configuration, gable vent, several original windows, and a chimney on the west elevation. The home is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. COMPLIANCE – Per the application materials for Historic Tax Verification submitted on January 12, 2021, staff found that several scopes of work were completed by the previous property owner prior to or outside of approval. The property received OHP and HDRC approval for a variety of rehabilitation work that was completed between 2017 and 2019. The applicant is requesting approval of these scopes of work that were completed prior to their purchase of the property so that the property will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive.
- c. FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The existing front porch condition includes the previous installation of simplified wood front porch columns. The previous applicant received approval to install chamfered wood columns at the front porch. The previously existing porch columns were non-original wrought iron columns. Guideline 7.A.ii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that 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. While the existing columns are not the columns that were previously approved for installation, staff finds the existing columns are more appropriate than the previously existing columns. Staff finds the existing front porch columns generally appropriate.
- d. FRONT FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS – The previously existing front gable detailing was removed prior to approval. The elevation drawings that were submitted to staff for review were overall lacking in detail and the previously existing front gable detail does not appear on the

- previously approved drawings. Staff finds that the gable detail should be restored on the front façade.
- e. **PLANTER INSTALLATION** – The applicant has installed wood planters along the front façade. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, the foundation should be kept clear of vegetation and moisture collection near the foundation should be avoided. Staff finds that the planters should be installed in such a way that limits the risk of moisture collection at the skirting and foundation.
 - f. **REAR PORCH STEP INSTALLATION** – The existing rear porch condition includes rounded concrete porch steps. Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that replacement elements, such as stairs, should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. While the rear porch is not visible from the public right-of-way, staff finds that the existing rear porch steps installed by a previous applicant are inappropriate.
 - g. **REAR PORCH HANDRAIL INSTALLATION** – The existing rear porch steps feature a central wood-frame cattle panel handrail. Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that replacement elements, such as stairs, should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. While the rear porch is not visible from the public right-of-way, staff finds that the existing rear porch handrail installed by a previous applicant is inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
 - h. **REAR PORCH DECKING INTALLATION** – The existing rear porch features a faux stone decking. Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that replacement elements should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. While the rear porch is not visible from the public right-of-way, staff finds that the existing rear porch decking installed by a previous applicant is inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
 - i. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATONS** – The existing rear elevation currently features the unapproved installation of an octagonal window and a fenestration pattern that differs from the elevation drawings submitted for the HDRC-approved rear addition. Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new windows should be installed 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. The rear elevation previously approved by the HDRC featured two sets of ganged one-over-one windows and a rear French door. The existing elevation features one set of ganged one-over-one windows, two one-over-one windows, an octagonal window, and a single full-lite rear door. While the rear elevation is not visible from the public rightof- way and the rear elevation is an addition to the historic structure, staff finds the octagonal window inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
 - j. **HISTORIC TAX VERIFICATION** – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the property. The scopes of work include foundation repair, roof replacement, a comprehensive interior remodel, upgrades to plumbing, HVAC, and electrical, the installation of six windows, the in-kind replacement of front porch elements, and siding replacement. Staff conducted a site visit on January 29, 2021 to examine the conditions of the property. Staff verifies that all work used to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive has been completed but there are several scopes of work that were completed by the previous owner without HDRC or OHP approval. The current owner is seeking approval for the previously unapproved scopes of work to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive.
 - k. With HDRC approval of the outstanding scopes of work, the applicant will have met all the requirements for Historic Tax Verification as outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has 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.

1. 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 of items 1 through 8 based on findings a through l with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant restores the gable detailing to the front façade prior to receiving the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive. The applicant will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive once property has come into compliance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Scott Albert- does not support OHP recommendations due to the nonconforming and unreviewed work.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1-8 based on staff findings with stipulation 1 that gable be restored.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzer.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, and Laffoon.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 40. HDRC NO. 2021-072
ADDRESS: ROW near 304 E Pecan
APPLICANT: Kevin Bowyer/Modus LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the streetlight at the right-of-way near 304 E Pecan with a new pole with network node equipment in accordance with *CPS Energy: Downtown Street Light Replacement Pilot Program* approved by the HDRC on August 24, 2019, (returning request 2020-19286 -MARTIN_ST_MARKS_SC).

FINDINGS:

- a. REQUEST - The applicant, Modus LLC, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing streetlight poles with a new streetlight pole that will feature network node equipment – in accordance with *CPS Energy: Downtown Street Light Replacement Pilot Program* approved by the HDRC on August 24, 2019.
- b. CASE HISTORY – The applicant has submitted a final product design that meets the stipulations of the *Pilot Program* and is eligible to request additional Certificates of Appropriateness for streetlight replacement. Proposed pole replacements located within a historic district or the RIO are escalated to commission review.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE- At the October 21, 2020 hearing, the request was referred to a Design Review Committee meeting. The DRC met with applicant on October 28, 2020. The applicant presented the 9 sites of escalated concerns from public comments and commissioners. Of the 9 sites, the DRC found that 2 of them warranted further investigation from the applicant to

explore other solutions before revision and resubmission. Those two sites include “MARTIN_ST_MARKS_SC - 304 E Pecan Street” and “SADT_FLORES_NUEVA_SC- 121 S FLORES ST” for their proximity to historic facades. The applicant has agreed to withdrawn and revise those two items. At this time, the applicant submitted a feasibility study in coordination with CPS Energy that relocation of the existing pole is not within the allowed scope of the replacement program.

- d. Request 2020-19286 - MARTIN_ST_MARKS_SC - 304 E Pecan Street - The applicant has proposed to replace the existing generic streetlight pole with a new streetlight pole with network node equipment at the right-of-way near 304 E Pecan, at (29.42919 -98.489375). The proposed pole is located in alignment to the right side of the primary entrance of St Marks Episcopal Church historic landmark. Staff finds that the proposed location does not detract from the pedestrian experience or other historic features.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval based on finding d. All stipulations from the Pilot Program and final product design continues to apply.

Work within public property is subject to the Texas Antiquities Code. Please coordinate with the City Archaeologists to determine if excavations require an archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Approval from the Historic Design Review Commission does not omit or supersede any additional permissions required by CPS Energy or related permitting City departments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio concerns about the height of the poles

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve based on staff’s findings. Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzter.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, Laffoon.

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.

ITEM 41. HDRC NO. 2021-074
ADDRESS: ROW near 121 S Flores
APPLICANT: Kevin Bowyer/Modus LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the streetlight at the right-of-way near 121 S Flores with a new pole with network node equipment in accordance with *CPS Energy: Downtown Street Light Replacement Pilot Program* approved by the HDRC on August 24, 2019, (returning request 2020-19794 -SADT_FLORES_NUEVA_SC).

FINDINGS:

- a. REQUEST - The applicant, Modus LLC, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing streetlight poles with a new streetlight pole that will feature network node equipment – in accordance with *CPS Energy: Downtown Street Light Replacement Pilot Program* approved by the HDRC on August 24, 2019.
- b. CASE HISTORY – The applicant has submitted a final product design that meets the stipulations of the *Pilot Program* and is eligible to request additional Certificates of Appropriateness for streetlight replacement. Proposed pole replacements located within a historic district or the RIO are escalated to commission review.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE- At the October 21, 2020 hearing, the request was referred to a Design Review Committee meeting. The DRC met with applicant on October 28, 2020. The applicant presented the 9 sites of escalated concerns from public comments and commissioners. Of the 9 sites, the DRC found that 2 of them warranted further investigation from the applicant to explore other solutions before revision and resubmission. Those two sites include “MARTIN_ST_MARKS_SC - 304 E Pecan Street” and “SADT_FLORES_NUEVA_SC - 121 S FLORES ST” for their proximity to historic facades. The applicant has agreed to withdrawn and revise those two items. At this time, the applicant submitted a feasibility study in coordination with CPS Energy that relocation of the existing pole is not within the allowed scope of the replacement program.
- d. Pole 9 - Request 2020-19794 - SADT_FLORES_NUEVA_SC - 121 S FLORES ST - The applicant has proposed to replace the existing generic streetlight pole with a new streetlight pole with network node equipment at the right-of-way near 121 S Flores at (29.42325 -98.49496). The proposed pole is located within the Main/Military Plaza Historic District, between to historic landmark storefronts, and RIO-7B. The proposed pole is located in alignment to the right side of the primary entrance of the Kallison Block historic landmark. Staff finds that the proposed location does not detract from the pedestrian experience o r other historic features.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval based on finding d. All stipulations from the *Pilot Program* and final product design continues to apply.

Work within public property is subject to the Texas Antiquities Code. Please coordinate with the City Archaeologists to determine if excavations require an archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Approval from the Historic Design Review Commission does not omit or supersede any additional permissions required by CPS Energy or related permitting City departments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio concerns about the height of the poles.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved for approval of relocated pole 20 ft to the south and if approved by CPS and depending on light case study..If CPS rejects relocation, the current location would be an acceptable alternate.
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzer.
NAY: None.

ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, Laffoon.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 42. **HDRC NO. 2020-196**
ADDRESS: ROW near 955 S ALAMO ST
APPLICANT: Kevin Bowyer/Modus LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new wood pole to feature network node equipment, including trenching for electrical power.

FINDINGS:

- a. PURVIEW - The applicant has proposed to install a new wood pole featuring network node equipment on the right-of-way on the north side of the 300 block of Beauregard , between cross streets Madison to the Northwest and S Alamo to the Southeast, closest to the property at 955 S Alamo. The proposed pole is located within the King William Historic District and is surrounded by individual historic landmarks in each direction. Per the Unified Development Code Sec. 37, the network node must be in compliance with Appendix A. Right-of-way network node design manual: Division IV. General Aesthetic Requirements and Division V. Additional Aesthetic Requirements in Design Districts – in addition to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements.
- b. PROJECT DESCRIPTION – The applicant has provided the following project description: “Permit # 355719. XY coordinates are 29.414028, -98.490972. The project site is located at the north side of Beauregard St and S Alamo St intersection. Currently, there is no structure existing at this location; this will be a brand new wood pole. Verizon Wireless proposes to install new wireless radios/antennas on this brand new structure. The scope will consist of the following: install antenna & associated equipment boxes, cabling, the spacing of support elements, and signage. It will also include approximately 55' trench/bore to an existing CPS utility pole to the northwest along Beauregard St for power connection. Based on previous communication with OHP, we are proposing to stealth the antenna equipment as shown in the photo sims.”
- c. LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a new wood pole featuring network node equipment on the right-of-way on the north side of the 300 block of Beauregard , between cross streets Madison to the Northwest and S Alamo to the Southeast, closest to the property at 955 S Alamo, at the approximate coordinates (29.414028, -98.490972). The proposed location is at commercial corner, adjacent to Tito’s Mexican Restaurant and across the street from Madhatter’s Tea House & Café and a corner-facing storefront building. Per the Design Manual 3.B.i., new poles must be generally located at commercial corners and intersections. While the proposed pole location does not bisect the view of a historic structure, staff finds that it still bisects a business property and is not punctuated at the commercial intersection or in-between building facades.
- d. SEPARATION – The applicant has proposed to install the new pole within the immediate block as multiple existing utility poles. Per the Design Manual 3.B.ii., new poles must be separated from existing poles by 250 feet. Staff finds that the proposed location is not separated by more than 250 feet.
- e. COLLOCATION – Per the Design Manual 3.B.iii, where a separation requirement cannot be met, new nodes are preferred to be mounted to existing poles or installed with a stealth method. Staff finds that a collocation on existing poles should be explored prior to consideration of a new

- stealth pole. A letter from the owner-operator of the existing nearby poles and/or an engineer's letter noting the feasibility of collocation will suffice as a supporting document for this finding.
- f. HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a wood pole including node equipment featuring a total of thirty feet (31') from grade. Per the Design Manual 3.B.iv., the height of new node support poles should not exceed the established predominant height of other poles and historic site elements located within 500 feet of the proposed installation. Staff finds that the proposed height is subordinate to existing poles within proximity.
 - g. DIAMETER – The applicant has proposed to install a pole that is twelve inches (12") in diameter excluding the meter boxes at the pedestrian level and the antenna cabinets at the top. Per the Design Manual 3.B.v., new poles should not exceed 8 inches (8") in diameter at the widest portion of the pole. Staff finds that the proposed pole diameter is wider than the diameter allowed by the design manual.
 - h. DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a wood pole that features three (3) service cabinets at pedestrian height (fiber demarcation point (NDP), service disconnect, and meter) and three (3) access units (radio cabinets) mounted radially at the top of the pole, capped with a cylindrical antenna. The applicant referenced existing wood utility poles in selecting the pole type in this location. Per the Design Manual 3.B.: *The Historic Preservation Officer may require concealment of the support pole in the form of aesthetically appropriate street lamps, site elements, district signage, or other stealth methods. The color of any new support pole or concealment solution shall be determined by the Historic Preservation Officer based on site specific conditions.* Staff finds that no effort has been made to conceal or relate the proposed new pole to the existing context – except the use of a wood pole and matching equipment color.
 - i. TRENCHING – The applicant has proposed to perform approximately 55' of trenching/boring to an existing CPS utility pole to the northwest along Beauregard for power connection. If approved, any disturbance of sidewalk or streetscaping should be restored to the condition prior to installation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
 - j. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of the new network pole based on findings b through h. While approval may still be issued at the commission's discretion, the following requirements have not been met per the Right-of-way Network Node Design Manual:

- i. COLLOCATION - Documented efforts to explore a nearby collocation have not been submitted.
- ii. SEPARATION – The proposed pole is not separated from existing poles by more than 250 feet.
- iii. DIAMETER – The proposed pole is not less than 8 inches at its widest portion.
- iv. DESIGN – Matching wood material to existing poles does not constitute a stealth aesthetic.

Work within public property is subject to the Texas Antiquities Code. Please coordinate with the City Archaeologists to determine if excavations require an archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Approval from the Historic Design Review Commission does not omit or supersede any additional permissions required by CPS Energy or related permitting City departments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio has concerns with the height of the poles.

MOTION: Commissioner Fernandez moved to approve based on staff’s findings.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzter.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, Laffoon.

ACTION: The **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 43. HDRC NO. 2020-195
ADDRESS: ROW near 1430 E HOUSTON ST
APPLICANT: Kevin Bowyer/Modus LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new wood pole featuring network node equipment on the right-of-way on the north side of the 800 block of E Crockett, between cross streets N Mesquite to the East and N Cherry to the West, closest to the property at 1430 E Houston, at the approximate coordinates (29.423831, -98.475992).

FINDINGS:

- a. PURVIEW - The applicant has proposed to install a new wood pole featuring network node equipment on the right-of-way on the north side of the 800 block of E Crockett, between cross streets N Mesquite to the East and N Cherry to the West, closest to the property at 1430 E Houston. The proposed location is within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Per the Unified Development Code Sec. 37, the network node must be in compliance with Appendix A. Right-of-way network node design manual: Division IV. General Aesthetic Requirements and Division V. Additional Aesthetic Requirements in Design Districts – in addition to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements.
- b. PROJECT DESCRIPTION – The applicant has provided the following project description: “Permit # 349332. XY coordinates are 29.423831, -98.475992. The project site is located near the northeast corner of the N Cherry St and E Crockett St intersection. Currently, there is no structure existing at this location; this will be a brand new wood pole. Verizon Wireless proposes to install new wireless radios/antennas on this brand new structure. The scope will consist of the following: install antenna & associated equipment boxes, cabling, the spacing of support elements, and signage. It will also include approximately 27' trench/bore to a new CPS utility pole to the east for power connection. Based on previous communication with OHP, we are proposing to stealth the antenna equipment as shown in the photo sims.”
- c. LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a new wood pole featuring network node equipment on the right-of-way on the north side of the 800 block of E Crockett, between cross streets N Mesquite to the East and N Cherry to the West, closest to the property at 1430 E Houston, at the approximate coordinates (29.423831, - 98.475992). The proposed location is mid-block, adjacent to Kerrville Bus Company and across the street from Bethel AME Church. Per the Design Manual 3.B.i., new poles must be generally located at commercial corners and intersections. While the proposed pole location does not bisect the view of a historic structure, staff finds that it still bisects a business property and is not punctuated at the commercial intersection or in-between building facades

- d. SEPARATION – The applicant has proposed to install the new pole within the immediate block as multiple existing utility poles. Per the Design Manual 3.B.ii., new poles must be separated from existing poles by 250 feet. Staff finds that the proposed location is not separated by more than 250 feet.
- e. COLLOCATION – Per the Design Manual 3.B.iii, where a separation requirement cannot be met, new nodes are preferred to be mounted to existing poles or installed with a stealth method. Staff finds that a collocation on existing poles should be explored prior to consideration of a new stealth pole. A letter from the owner-operator of the existing nearby poles and/or an engineer’s letter noting the feasibility of collocation will suffice as supporting document for this finding.
- f. HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a wood pole including node equipment featuring a total of thirty-one feet (31’) from grade. Per the Design Manual 3.B.iv., the height of new node support poles should not exceed the established predominant height of other poles and historic site elements located within 500 feet of the proposed installation. Staff finds that the proposed height is subordinate to existing poles within proximity.
- g. DIAMETER – The applicant has proposed to install a pole that is approximately twelve inches (12”) in diameter excluding the meter boxes at the pedestrian level and the antenna cabinets at the top. Per the Design Manual 3.B.v., new poles should not exceed 8 inches (8”) in diameter at the widest portion of the pole. Staff finds that the proposed pole diameter is wider than the diameter allowed by the design manual.
- h. DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a wood pole that features three (3) service cabinets at pedestrian height (fiber demarcation point (NDP), service disconnect, and meter) and three (3) access units (radio/antenna cabinets) mounted radially at the top of the pole. The applicant referenced existing wood utility poles in selecting the pole type in this location. Per the Design Manual 3.B.: *The Historic Preservation Officer may require concealment of the support pole in the form of aesthetically appropriate street lamps, site elements, district signage, or other stealth methods. The color of any new support pole or concealment solution shall be determined by the Historic Preservation Officer based on site specific conditions.* Staff finds that no effort have been made to conceal or relate the proposed new pole to the existing context – except the use of a wood pole and matching equipment color.
- i. TRENCHING – The applicant has proposed to perform approximately 27' of trenching/boring to a new CPS utility pole to the east for power connection. If approved, any disturbance of sidewalk or streetscaping should be restored to the condition prior to installation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- j. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of the new network pole based on findings b through h. While approval may still be issued at the commission’s discretion, the following requirements have not been met per the Right-of-way Network Node Design Manual:

- i. COLLOCATION - Documented efforts to explore a nearby collocation have not been submitted.
- ii. LOCATION – The proposed pole is not located at a commercial intersection and/or in-between buildings facades.
- iii. SEPARATION – The proposed pole is not separated from existing poles by more than 250 feet.
- iv. DIAMETER – The proposed pole is not less than 8 inches at its widest portion.
- v. DESIGN – Matching wood material to existing poles does not constitute a stealth aesthetic.

Work within public property is subject to the Texas Antiquities Code. Please coordinate with the City Archaeologists to determine if excavations require an archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Approval from the Historic Design Review Commission does not omit or supersede any additional permissions required by CPS Energy or related permitting City departments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The Conservation Society of San Antonio has concerns with the height of the poles.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve location in addition to add a street light. Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Grube, and Fetzer.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, Laffoon.

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYE. 0 NAY. 5 ABSENT.

ITEM 45. HDRC NO. 2021-052
ADDRESS: 418 MISSION ST
APPLICANT: Deniese Crittenden/SCHEFF DENIESE M & CRITTENDEN ROBERT JR

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 3-foot-high wrought iron front yard fence.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 418 Mission is a 2-story single family structure constructed circa 1905. The property first appears on the Sanborn map in 1912 addressed as 318 Mission. The structure features a composition shingle hip roof, wood cladding, original wood windows, and a 2-story front porch and balcony. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a 3-foot-tall wrought iron fence with a pedestrian gate and a front driveway gate at the intersection of the property line and the sidewalk. The proposed fence will feature trident finials on the fence posts. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Guideline 2.B.iii for Site Elements states that the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Staff finds that traditional wrought iron fencing is generally appropriate for the King William Historic District and the property.
- c. FENCE LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install a 3-foot-tall wrought iron fence with a pedestrian gate and a front driveway gate at the intersection of the property line and the sidewalk. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should follow historic fence placements in the district. This block of Mission Street currently features wood picket, cattle panel, garden loop, and wrought iron front yard fencing. Many of the existing fences on Mission Street feature front driveway gates; however, most of these properties feature

unique site conditions that necessitate a front driveway gate. Staff finds that the proposed front yard fence at Mission Street should turn at the driveway and the proposed driveway gate should be installed behind the front façade wall plane.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the front yard fence installation based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits an updated site plan to staff for review and approval showing that the driveway gate is located behind the front façade wall plane.
- ii. That the final construction height of the approved gate and fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Sec. 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Lisa Lynn- King William Association- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations 2 at being 4ft in height. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzter.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, Laffoon.

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYE. 0 NAY. 5 ABSENT.

ITEM 46. HDRC NO. 2021-047
ADDRESS: 2211 N ST MARYS ST
APPLICANT: Jason Balderas/S.A.C.S

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Install a front yard fence feature wrought iron design, 5-feet in height, and a sliding vehicle gate.
2. Enclose the front porch by removing the wood railing and installed wrought iron metal screens.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 2211 N St Mary’s was constructed circa 1924 in the Craftsman style, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Tobin Hill Historic District. The two-story structure features a firstfloor garage with a full width inset porch on the second floor. The structure features a number of originalCraftsman features including shake shingle columns, wood lap siding, exposed rafter tails, and eave brackets. Per the 1951 Sanborn map, the structure was historically used as an auto repair shop and is currently used as a residential structure.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit on January 21, 2021, staff found that fence posts have been installed and that thefront porch railing was removed and then full enclosed with black wrought iron screens prior to approval and permitting. Upon issuance of a Stop Work Order, the applicant submitted an application on January 22, 2021, to be heard at the next Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.
- c. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a 5-foot tall wrought iron fence across the front of the property which currently features a front-loading parking pad into a two-car garage. Given the context of the businesses on both neighboring sides and the high-density commercial corridor

of N St Marys, staff finds that the proposed height, design, and location of the fence is appropriate per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i. through v.

- d. **PORCH ENCLOSURE** – The applicant has proposed to remove the front porch railing to fully enclose with opaque wrought iron screens. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.i., applicant 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 the proposed porch modifications are inconsistent with the Guidelines and should be reversed.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of item 1. fencing as proposed based on finding c.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 2. porch enclosure based on finding d. The porch railing should be restored and the screens should be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Federica Kushner- agrees with staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 1 based on finding c, and item 2 based on finding d.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzler.
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, Bowman, Laffoon.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYE. 0 NAY. 5 ABSENT.**

ITEMS 17, 21, and 28

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to postpone items 17, 21, and 28 to the next available hearing. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYE. 0 NAY. 5 ABSENT.**

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

The Commission approved the HDRC February 3rd, 2021 meeting minutes.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Mtg Minutes 3/3/21
HDRC

APPROVED



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

Date: 3/18/21