



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
April 21, 2021

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met via videoconference on Wednesday, April 21, 2021.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Zumarán, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, Bowman, and Laffoon.

Absent: None.

** 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:

Newly appointed Commissioner Steven D. Zumarán joined Historic Design Review Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Item 4: Conservation Society supports the project.
- Item 7: Lisa Lynn supports staff recommendations except for stipulation 1 and 5..
- Item 10: Scott Albert supports staff recommendations.
- Item 11: Andrea Martinez- supports project
- Item 13: Scott Albert- supports staff recommendations.
- Item 15: Conservation Society- opposes project, but supports with staff recommendations.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| ○ Item 1, Case No. 2021-168 | 128 E MAGNOLIA AVE |
| ○ Item 2, Case No. 2021-132 | 150 CROFTON |
| ○ Item 3, Case No. 2021-186 | 2115 N IH 35 |
| ○ Item 4, Case No. 2021-184 | 212 E DEWEY PLACE |
| ○ Item 5, Case No. 2021-169 | 229 ISABEL ST |
| ○ Item 6, Case No. 2021-183 | 306 E CAROLINA ST |
| ○ Item 8, Case No. 2021-166 | 3331 ROOSEVELT AVE |
| ○ Item 9, Case No. 2021-167 | 3903 N ST MARY'S ST |
| ○ Item 10, Case No. 2021-167 | 406 N PINE ST |
| ○ Item 11, Case No. 2021-171 | 501 S JOSEPHINE TOBIN |
| ○ Item 12, Case No. 2021-188 | 514 MADISON ST |
| ○ Item 13, Case No. 2021-098 | 911_913_915_917 N PINE |

- The Commission pulled item 7, 14, and 15 for discussion.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1-6 and 8-13 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Zumarán, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer
NAY: None
ABSENT: None
RECUSE: Laffoon

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 0 NAY. 0 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM 7. HDRC NO. 2021-163
ADDRESS: 312 MISSION ST
APPLICANT: Charles Riley

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

1. Construct a new wooden, uncovered front porch atop the existing concrete steps.
2. Extend the side shed roof and modify the side porch configuration.
3. Modify the rear fenestration.
4. Replace an exterior side door with a window to be salvaged from the rear of the structure.
5. Remove a non-original rear porch and construct a new rear porch.
6. Install a new driveway.
7. Install new wrought iron front yard fencing, to include a slightly recessed front driveway gate.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 312 Mission St is a residential structure with a duplex configuration constructed circa 1925 in the Craftsman style. The structure features a symmetrical front façade with two front doors, a cross gable configuration with a standing seam metal roof, and original one over one windows with screens. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District. The structure also features a contributing rear garage structure.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 13, 2021. The DRC encouraged the applicant to retain the symmetry of the existing front porch stairs by constructing a reversible wooden deck atop the existing concrete steps and installing paired front stairs fronting the street, with stair widths that match the door width closely. In terms of the porch railing design, the DRC was generally in favor of a shorter, historically-common three foot height, or a taller railing that included detailing to minimize its visual impact. The DRC suggested that the front porch width should be no wider than the front façade and the rear porch be separate with its own defined set of stairs.
- c. FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS - The applicant has submitted two iterations of front porch modifications. One proposal incorporates a wooden front porch constructed atop the existing stairs to generally match the existing width of the front porch, with a central front staircase measuring 5 feet in width. A second proposal connects a new front porch to the existing side porch, with a primary staircase located on the corner of the structure, along with a front porch width that extends beyond the width of the façade. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the primary building and historic patterns in the district. The applicant has submitted several examples of historic structures with front porches in the immediate vicinity. Staff finds that the first option is the most consistent with the Guidelines with the reconfiguration of the front staircase to two staircases, smaller in width, that are centered on the existing front doorways to maintain the character defining symmetry of the porch.
- d. SIDE PORCH MODIFICATIONS - In the applicant’s first proposal as noted in finding c, the applicant has proposed to extend the shed roofline of the existing side porch. The porch base will be modified to be wider to accommodate the extended roof line, to include new skirting, siding, decking, stairs, and railings. The

extension will allow primary access to the existing side door but will not be tied into the new proposed front porch. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, porches should be retained. New elements should be compatible with the primary historic structure. Staff generally finds the request appropriate for the site and the structure.

- e. **REAR FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** - The applicant has proposed to remove two existing windows on the rear elevation and install a sliding glass door. One of the windows to be removed, which appears to be a one over one original wood window, will be used to replace an existing side door as noted in finding e. Staff generally finds the request to be appropriate due to the minimal visibility of the rear façade, but finds that the other window to be removed, as well as the side door, should be retained and stored on site for future use.
- f. **SIDE DOOR REPLACEMENT** - As noted in finding d, an existing side door, located towards the rear of the home, will be replaced with an original wood window to be relocated from the rear façade. Staff finds the request appropriate.
- g. **REAR PORCH** - The applicant has proposed to remove an existing non-original rear porch and construct a new rear porch. Based on the submitted site plan and elevations, staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **DRIVEWAY** - The applicant has proposed to install a new driveway. The current driveway features a concrete curb cut leading to a dirt single-width driveway. Staff finds that the new concrete driveway is appropriate based on the existing driveway pattern on the block provided that the driveway is a maximum of 10 feet in width with a curb cut that flares no wider than 12 feet.
- i. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to construct new front yard fencing. The fencing will be made of black wrought iron and will be a maximum of 4 feet in height. Based on the submitted site plan, the fencing will jog back slightly at the driveway. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, fencing should be installed only if it existed historically or there is an established precedent for fencing on the block. The neighboring structure features similar wrought iron front yard fencing and there are examples elsewhere in the vicinity. Staff finds the proposal acceptable with the condition that the driveway gate is set behind the front façade of the structure to align with OHP’s fencing policy and guidelines.
- j. **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL** – The application includes additional items that are eligible for administrative approval, including the installation of a rear inground pool, front and rear landscaping, window and door repair, garage repair, and siding rehabilitation.

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

- i. That the applicant design the porch to align with the width of the front façade and feature stairs located on center with the existing front doors with a maximum width of 4 feet each. The porch should be installed over the existing concrete stairs in a manner that is reversible. The applicant should retain the concrete walkway or repour the walkway if replaced. Updated documents of both the front and side porches are required to be submitted prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submits a detail elevation drawing of the front porch railings for staff review and approval. The proposed railings should feature both a top and bottom rail. The bottom rail should feature a vertical orientation and should be installed approximately three to four inches above the porch decking. Both top and bottom rails should be constructed from 2x4” members.
- iii. That the applicant retains the window and door to be removed and stores them on site for future use as noted in finding d.
- iv. That the driveway be a maximum total width of 10 feet with a curb flaring to no wider than 12 feet.
- v. That the front driveway gate be recessed behind the front plane of the primary structure. An updated site plan is required to be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Lisa Lynn- KWA- concurs with staff recommendations, but doesn’t support item with stipulations 1 and 5.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1-4 with staff stipulations and item 5 as submitted.

Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Zumarán, Carpenter, Grube, Bowman, Fetzner, and Laffoon
NAY: Velasquez
ABSENT: None

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 1 NAY. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2019-139

ADDRESS: 913,914, 919 Rogers Ave; 913, 919, and 925 E Carson; 808 and 918 Quitman;
512, 514, and 516 Pierce

APPLICANT: Ashley Fairmont

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a five story, multi-family residential structure on the vacant lots bounded by E Carson to the south, Quitman to the north and Pierce Avenue to the East. The closure of Rogers Alley has been approved by City Council. The proposed new construction will feature 281 residential units and commercial space.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a five story, multi-family residential structure on the vacant lots bounded by E Carson to the south, Quitman to the north and Pierce Avenue to the East. The closure of Rogers Alley has been approved by City Council. The proposed new construction will feature 281 residential units and commercial space.
 - b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval on April 3, 2019, for the proposed new construction and the relocation of a single family residential structure, previously located at 516 Pierce. Conceptual approval was issued with the following stipulations:
 - i. That windows, such as aluminum clad wood windows be installed that feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails should be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
 - ii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.
 - iii. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted to the HDRC when returning for final approval.
 - iv. That additional detailing and cladding options should be presented for the proposed parking structure to ensure that adequate automobile screening is provided.
- Final approval of the relocation of the structure at 516 Pierce was approved on February 19, 2020.
- c. 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. On E Carson, the applicant has proposed setbacks that appear to be greater than those of historic structures on the block. Additionally, on Quitman and Spofford, the proposed site plan notes a setback that is greater than those of historic structures found on these blocks. Staff finds the proposed setbacks to be appropriate.
 - d. ENTRANCES – According the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. primary building entrances should be orientated towards the primary street. The applicant’s proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. ENTRANCE MASSING – While the applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature multiple stories in height, the applicant has incorporated entrance massing – include porch-like elements and human scaled openings into the street facades. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The immediate vicinity features commercial structures that feature between two and five stories in height. While there are one story, single family residential structures also located in the immediate vicinity, staff finds that the proposed new construction’s primary massing will be located adjacent to existing, multi-story structures. Staff finds the proposed scale and mass to be appropriate.
- g. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed roof forms that primarily consist of flat roofs with parapet walls. These roof forms are found historically throughout the immediate area; specifically on E Carson, E Grayson and N New Braunfels.
- h. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area; however, at this location, historic commercial structures occupy much larger percentages of their lot than single-family residential structures. Staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include various colors of thin brick and metal cladding materials. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the commercial materials found historically throughout the district. Staff finds that the proposed thin brick feature corner pieces that feature a return as a traditional brick profile would feature.
- j. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of vinyl windows. Generally, staff finds that all windows should be consistent with staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction and be non-manufacturer’s white, be recessed within openings (approximately 2 inches), feature no faux divided lights, and feature equal sash sizes.
- k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate. On E Carson and Spofford, the applicant has proposed porch and yard elements that relate to those of single-family, historic structures found historically on the block. Additionally, the applicant has incorporated profiles and architectural details that are found on historic commercial structures on N New Braunfels into the design. Staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate.
- l. PARKING – The applicant has noted structured parking to be clad with brick, metal panels and storefront systems at the street level. The applicant has also noted the installation of landscaping elements on the parking structure. Staff finds that all parking should be screened, whether through landscaping elements or building materials, specifically as viewed from E Carson, to the fullest extent possible. Additionally, staff finds that additional screening should be added to the parking garage on the north (Quitman) façade. Where vegetation is proposed, a landscaping detail is to be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- m. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 6., all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment where it cannot be viewed from the public right of way.
- n. SIGNAGE – Staff finds that the detailed, master signage plan for the proposed development should be submitted at a later date to the Commission. The applicant should design and scale signage appropriately for the historic district.

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

- ii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.
- iii. That all parking be screened, whether through landscaping elements or building materials, specifically as viewed from E Carson, to the fullest extent possible. Additionally, staff recommends that additional screening should be added to the parking garage on the north (Quitman) façade. Where vegetation is proposed as a screening element, a landscaping detail is to be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- iv. Windows should be non-manufacturer’s white, be recessed within openings (approximately 2 inches), feature no faux divided lights, and feature equal sash sizes.

- v. That the proposed thin brick feature corner pieces that feature a return as a traditional brick profile would feature.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Gibbs moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Zumarán, Carpenter, Grube, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon
NAY: None
ABSENT: None

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 11 AYE. 0 NAY. 0 ABSENT.**

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2021-164

ADDRESS: 315 E PECAN ST

APPLICANT: Tobin Hays/Ford, Powell and Carson Architects and Planners

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace all existing six over six wood windows on the 1920s Parish Hall and 2012 addition with new aluminum clad wood windows to match the historic windows in profile, inset, configuration, and detailing.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property addressed 315 E Pecan St is the site of St. Mark’s Episcopal Church. The church was constructed circa 1877 and was designed by Richard Upjohn in the Neogothic style. The property also contains a Parish Hall constructed circa 1920 and additional ancillary buildings. The site is an individually listed local landmark and was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1998. The applicant is requesting approval to replace all six over six wood windows in the circa 1920 Parish Hall with new Marvin brand aluminum clad windows to match the existing size, proportion, configuration, inset, and divided lite details as closely as possible.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on site on April 14, 2021. Representatives from the parish, architectural team, and general contracting team were present. The DRC observed a majority of the first floor windows from the interior and exterior, several of the stairwell windows from the interior, and observed upper level windows at a distance from the exterior and interior. The DRC observed several window assemblies on various floors that exhibited missing glass and other damage from a scaffolding collapse at a neighboring structure in 2019. There were also some windows that featured dry rot, incompatible repair techniques like caulking and putty infill, and missing muntins on the interior and exterior. Overall, DRC found that a majority of the windows were in repairable condition based on the observable conditions on the site, but recognized that some damage may be presently concealed by paint, previous repairs, and the observable distance for upper level windows.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND MAINTENANCE – The applicant has expressed concern to staff regarding the need to improve the energy efficiency of the structures, as well as minimize maintenance over time, especially on the upper floors of the Parish Hall that are difficult to access without scaffolding. In terms of efficiency, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a building. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. The original windows feature single-pane glass which is subject to radiant heat transfer. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows, and thermal shades. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. Over 112 million windows end up in landfills each year, and about half are under 20 years

old. Historic wood windows were constructed to last 100+ years with old growth wood, which is substantially more durable than modern wood and clad products, and original windows that are restored and maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan, around 10-20 years, and cannot be repaired once they fail. On average, over the lifetime of an original wood window, replacement windows will need to be again replaced at least 4 times. The total lifecycle cost of replacement windows is also much more energy intensive than the restoration of existing windows, including material sourcing, manufacture, transportation, and installation. Finally, window repair and restoration utilizes the local labor of craftspeople. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of original windows whenever possible.

- d. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing six over six wood windows on the circa 1920s Parish Hall and circa 2012 addition with new Marvin brand aluminum clad wood windows to match the historic as closely as possible in proportion, size, inset, configuration, and detailing. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, wood windows should be repaired in place and restored whenever possible, unless there is substantial evidence that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. If a window assembly is deemed irreparable, the window should be replaced in-kind in terms of materiality, configuration, inset, proportion, style, and detailing. As noted in finding b, staff concurs with the applicant that several windows exhibit conditions that make them eligible for replacement. These assemblies are located in various portions of the buildings. Staff finds that the applicant should prioritize restoration of the original wood windows on the first floor and may submit a proposal for relocation of upper floor windows to replace first floor windows that are deteriorated beyond repair (more than 50 % of original wood components require replacement) as noted in the recommendation. Staff finds the upper floor windows eligible for replacement with the requested aluminum clad windows as long as the replacement product can match the size, configuration, true divided lights, and inset as demonstrated by the applicant.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of window replacement based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant restores the original wood windows on the first floor as noted in finding d. If, when undergoing repair, the applicant finds evidence of deterioration beyond repair of an assembly (more than 50 percent of original wood components require replacement) on the first floor, the applicant may relocate repairable windows from the upper floors or other portions of the building where matching windows are available. Updated repair and/or relocation plans are required to be submitted to staff over the course of construction for review and approval, in addition to extensive documentation illustrating deterioration beyond repair.
- ii. That the new replacement windows for the upper stories match the existing in terms of size, configuration, true divided lights, and inset. Openings shall not be modified to accommodate stock sizes. Final drawings and product specifications are required to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, and a mock up must be installed on site for field verification.
- iii. That any other existing windows to be replaced and not relocated be carefully removed and oh stored on site for future use.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society of San Antonio- opposes projects, but supports staff recommendations.

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

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 1 NAY. 0 ABSENT.**

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2021-173
ADDRESS: 1206 W. AGARITA AVE
APPLICANT: OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

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

FINDINGS:

- a. On November 4, 2020, the Historic and Design Review Commission approved a Finding of Historic Significance for the property at 1206 W Agarita. On December 17, 2020, City Council approved Resolution 2020-12-17- 0057R initiating a change in zoning for the property to include a historic landmark overlay. As a step in the zoning process, a recommendation regarding the proposed designation is required from HDRC.
- b. On January 20, 2021, the Historic and Design Review Commission reviewed City Council’s resolution to initiate a change in zoning for the property to include a historic landmark overlay and recommended approval of the request at that time. Subsequent to that hearing, staff continued to meet with the property owner, who opposes designation. Based on these conversations and in an effort to balance the desires of the neighborhood with the desires of the property owner, staff is presenting a new proposal as a potential compromise by redrawing the boundary of the proposed landmark to include only the lots on which the historic structure stands, Lots 5 and 6, Block 21, NCB 1806. The proposed boundary follows the parcel boundary as seen on the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, included on page 23 of this recommendation.
- c. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.
- d. City Council has the ultimate authority to approve the historic designation zoning overlay. A recommendation from HDRC will be forwarded to City Council.
- e. City Council has the ultimate authority to approve the historic designation zoning overlay. A recommendation from HDRC will be forwarded to City Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends that the Historic and Design Review Commission recommend approval of historic landmark designation of 1206 W Agarita, NCB 1806 block 21 lots 5 and 6, based on findings a and b.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society of San Antonio- supports landmark designation; and, Cosima Colvin- concerns about building code.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations 5 and 6.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

** Commissioner Fernandez left meeting at 4:30 p.m.*

ITEM 17 . HDRC NO. 2021-084
ADDRESS: 1206 W AGARITA AVE

APPLICANT: Rodrigo Velazquez de Leon

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

1. Modify the front porch fenestration including removal of 1 door and 2 windows, the relocation of 1 door, steps railing, and a new column.
2. Replace all existing aluminum and vinyl windows with new vinyl windows (PLYGEM 1100).

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 1206 W Agarita was constructed circa 1922 in the Craftsman style, twin footprint to 1200 W Agarita, and is pending historic designation by the Zoning commission for individual landmark status. The one-story single-family structure features a primary front-facing gable form with a subordinate full-width gable over the covered wraparound porch with two front doors, as well as square Craftsman columns, brackets, wood lap siding. Many of the windows have been replaced with aluminum or vinyl windows in their original opening.
- b. **ENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the front porch fenestration including removal of 1 door and 2 windows, the relocation of 1 door, steps, railing, and a new column. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., applicants should reserve existing window and door openings and avoid filling in historic door or window openings and avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. Additionally, the Guidelines 7.A.i, applicants should also preserve porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres and should not add new porches, balconies, or porte-cocheres where not historically present. Staff finds the proposed modifications drastically changes the front character-defining features of the Craftsman style structures including: removal of secondary door opening, separation of the 4 ganged windows, and displacement of the centered door, railing, and steps from the existing walkway.
- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing non-original windows with new vinyl windows (PLYGEM 1100). Replacement of non-conforming windows with new appropriate windows that adhere to the Standard Specifications for Window Replacement are eligible for administrative approval. Staff finds the proposed windows do not adhere the specifications regarding sash profile and depth, color finish, and nailing fins. While no material is prohibited for replacing non-conforming or missing windows, staff finds that aluminum, or aluminum-clad wood, or fully wood windows more commonly adhere to all of the specifications than their vinyl counterparts.
- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** - The request was deferred to a Design Review Committee site visit, which was held on April 14, 2021. At the site visit, committee members suggested that the applicant should reconsider interior furniture layout prior to making irreversible exterior and structural changes to the fenestration of the structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of front porch fenestration modifications based on finding b. All existing window and door openings should be restored in placed unless expressed approved by the commission – during interim control period or historic designation.

Staff does not recommend approval of replacing with PLYGEM 1100 based on finding c regarding sash profile and depth, color finish, and nailing fins. Windows that adhere to the Standard Specifications for Window Replacement are eligible for administrative approval, which are typically aluminum, aluminum-clad wood, or fully wood products.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

VOTE: AYE: Fish, Gibbs, Zumarán, Carpenter, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer
NAY: Laffoon

ABSTAIN: Velasquez and Arreola
ABSENT: Fernandez

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 1 NAY. 1 ABSENT. 2 ABSTAIN.**

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2020-573
ADDRESS: 115 CALLAGHAN AVE
APPLICANT: Adan Ochoa/AO Design, LLC

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

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

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 115 Callaghan is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1910 in the Queen Anne style. The home features a primary hipped roof configuration with projecting front and side gables, woodlap siding, an asymmetrical wraparound front porch with ginger-breading, and original wood windows. The structure is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant was referred to the January 27, 2021, Design Review Committee (DRC) at the January 20, 2021, HDRC hearing. The DRC encouraged incorporating traditional window proportions and patterns and providing additional documentation and analysis that conveyed the deep setback of the proposed side addition. The DRC explored the impacts of both a side addition and rear addition and encouraged the applicant to return to another subcommittee meeting. The applicant also attended the March 24, 2021, DRC meeting. The DRC was generally in favor of the proposed addition footprint, but suggested aligning the addition’s front columns with the existing column patterns on the primary structure and again providing additional documentation that conveyed the visual impact of the setback from the street. The DRC remained concerned about the potential impact of front yard parking.
- c. FOOTPRINT – The applicant as proposed to construct a new addition to the primary structure totaling approximately 1,066 square feet. The existing primary structure’s square footage is approximately 1,639 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new additions should not double the footprint of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds that the proposal generally meets this guideline, as noted in finding b, does not find the location of the addition appropriate.
- d. ORIENTATION AND SETBACK – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the rear and side of the structure. The eastern façade of the addition will extend beyond the existing side façade of the historic house substantially, visually doubling the width of the house. Additions should be located at the rear of the structure whenever possible and should be inset behind the front façade to minimize the impact on the public streetscape. While the dimension is not indicated, the addition extends well beyond the east façade. Staff finds that the addition should be reconfigured to minimize its impact on the historic façade of the primary structure, and reconfigured to extend towards the rear of the lot, to be more consistent with the Guidelines and the development pattern of the district.
- e. SCALE – The proposed addition is 1-story and will be slightly shorter than the primary historic structure’s tallest ridge. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Staff finds a 1-story structure consistent with the Guidelines in terms of height, but as noted in finding c, the location of the addition extends well beyond the existing east façade. Staff finds that the shifting of the rear addition will help minimize the scale of the addition from the public right-of-way.
- f. FENESTRATION – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, openings in new construction should use traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. The applicant is requesting one over one wood windows. Staff generally finds the requested fenestration pattern to be appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

- g. MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed to use woodlap siding in a profile to match the existing structure, shake skirting, asphalt shingle roofing, and fully wood windows. The applicant has also proposed to install a vertical trim piece where the addition and original structure meet. Staff finds this generally appropriate.
- h. ROOF FORM – The proposed rear addition will utilize a gable roof form with a height that is lower than the primary hip of the structure. Staff finds the rear roof form to be generally appropriate. Based on the drawings, the applicant has also proposed to replicate a historic soffit detail that is unique to the original structure. Staff finds that this detail should be simplified to help distinguish the addition from the original structure due to the strong similarities already included in the addition’s form and materiality.
- i. ROOF FORM – The proposed rear addition will utilize a gable roof form with a height that is lower than the primary hip of the structure. Staff finds the rear roof form to be generally appropriate. Based on the drawings, the applicant has also proposed to replicate a historic soffit detail that is unique to the original structure. Staff finds that this detail should be simplified to help distinguish the addition from the original structure due to the strong similarities already included in the addition’s form and materiality.

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

- i. That the applicant reconfigures the addition footprint to minimize its impact on the front façade and eliminate the front yard parking condition as noted in findings c and d.
- ii. That all windows feature a one over one configuration and traditional sills and trim details.
- iii. That the applicant utilizes wood siding with a profile similar to the historic structure on the addition and utilizes a composite siding with a maximum reveal of 4 inches with a smooth finish for the skirting. No faux grain is to be used. Composite shingles should feature a smooth finish.
- iv. That the applicant submits final window specifications to staff for review and approval. Windows should be fully wood and feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. White color is not allowed, and color selection should be presented to staff. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

1st MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item1 with stipulations 2-4
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

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

VOTE: AYE: Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Zumarán, Carpenter, Grube, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fernandez.

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT.**

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2021-165
ADDRESS: 222 BROOKS ST
APPLICANT: Office of Historic Preservation

REQUEST: The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property located at 222 Brooks St.

FINDINGS:

- a. On February 3, 2021, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation by Jenny Hernandez on behalf of the property owner of the structure at 222 Brooks, located in the Government Hill neighborhood of City Council District 2. OHP staff researched the property to determine eligibility during the 30- day review period provided by UDC 35-455. OHP contacted the owner on March 1, 2021, to inform him that preliminary evidence suggested the home may be significant and to arrange a site visit.
- b. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- c. **DEMOLITION AND DESIGNATIONS COMMITTEE:** The Demolition & Designation Committee (DDC) held a virtual site visit on March 24, 2021. Notes are included in the case file.
- d. **HISTORIC CONTEXT:** The property at 222 Brooks is a single-story, four-bay National Folk residence with Folk Victorian influence built c. 1892. It is located in the Government Hill neighborhood of City Council District 2. Yul.Lozano and Cynthia Voorhees currently own the property. The property first appears in the 1892 City Directory as home to the Petit Family—Leon, Adlaide, daughter Mary, and son Charles. Leon worked first as a machinist, then as an engineer for the Southern Pacific Railroad. After Leon moved in about 1901, three other Southern Pacific employees rented the home, conveniently located just north of the Southern Pacific tracks (now owned by Union Pacific), in quick succession. The house is built in the National Folk style, popular in the U.S. from c. 1850-1930, with Folk Victorian influence. The gable-front family of National Folk, exemplified by 222 Brooks, was a popular choice for “narrow urban lots,” first in the Northeast and later in “expanding southern cities in the late 19th century.” The subject structure has decorative shingles in the front gable, a characteristic of the Folk Victorian form.
- e. **SITE CONTEXT:** The property at 222 Brooks is a single-story, four-bay National Folk residence with Folk Victorian influence built c. 1892. It is located in the Government Hill neighborhood of City Council District 2. The structure is on the south side of Brooks St, on a block bounded to the north by Brooks St, the east by N Pine St, the south by Duval St, and the west by N Olive St. This part of the Government Hill neighborhood is bordered by Interstate 35, Interstate 281, Union Pacific Railroad’s East Yard, and N New Braunfels Ave. The Government Hill Historic District is on the opposite side of I-35 from the subject structure, and the Dignowity Hill Historic District is to the south on the other side of the rail yard. There is a cluster of individual local historic landmarks along Austin St, three blocks west of the subject structure. Brooks St itself is two blocks long, running east to west between N Hackberry and N Pine. The property has a low concrete-covered wall with limestone and bricks visible below the concrete that runs along the front of the parcel and wraps around the northeast and northwest corners. A chain-link fence runs the remaining perimeter of the parcel. A concrete path and stairs lead from the street to the concrete front porch.
- f. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:** The subject structure is front gabled with a composition shingle roof and a separate corrugated metal shed roof over the front porch supported by metal columns. A metal

balustrade runs along the edge of the patio and down each side of the front steps. Four-over-four wood windows flank a pair of front doors with transoms. The front doors are boarded with plywood. The house is clad in wood lap siding and has decorative shingles in the front gable. Windows are four-over-four with wood sashes where visible; some windows retain their one-over-one wood screens. Character-defining features of 222 Brooks include the endgabled roof form, decorative shingles in the gable of the primary (north) elevation, four-over-four wood windows, one-over-one wood screens (where present), and the low stone and brick wall clad in concrete along the north end of the parcel and wrapping around the northeast and northwest corners.

- g. EVALUATION: In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. Staff evaluated the structure against all 16 criteria and determined that it was consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b):
5. **Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;** the house is built in the National Folk style, popular in the U.S. from c. 1850-1930, with Folk Victorian influence.
 11. **It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States;** 222 Brooks is situated just north of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks and served as housing for SPRR employees for at least its first two decades.
 13. **It bears an important and significant relationship to other distinctive structures, sites, or areas, either as an important collection of properties or architectural style or craftsmanship with few intrusions, or by contributing to the overall character of the area according to the plan based on architectural, historic or cultural motif;** the property is situated directly between two local historic districts, Dignowity Hill and Government Hill, and contributes to an understanding of the development of the neighborhood.
- h. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.
- i. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the Commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of a Finding of Historic Significance and direction to process a request on behalf of the HDRC to City Council to consider a resolution to initiate designation of 222 Brooks St based on findings a through g.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society of San Antonio- supports findings of historic significance.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to refer the item to the Design Review Committee with a site-visit. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT.**

ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2020-462
ADDRESS: 815_819 QUITMAN ST
APPLICANT: Mark Sullivan

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval to construct a 3200 square private studio structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct a new two-story commercial structure on the vacant lot at 815-819 Quitman. The lot is located within the Government Hill Historic District. The lot is surrounded by existing industrial and utilitarian structures to the immediate east and north, and vacant lots to the west and south. The lot currently features natural plants and gravel with a front 6-foot tall wrought iron fence.
- b. **NEW CONSTRUCTION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 80-foot wide by 40-foot deep, two-story metal warehouse structure with limestone masonry cladding, a metal roof, metal garage and pedestrian doors, with metal sliding windows. The structure will be placed on concrete pad with 3-foot wide perimeter sidewalks to the front and sides, with 9 front-loading parking spaces, and a 20-foot wide centered driveway entry from Quitman St.
- c. **SETBACK** – At this time, the applicant has not annotated the precise setback measurements. Per the submitted site plan, the structure is to be placed toward the rear half of the property with an estimated front setback of approximately 80- feet from Quitman St. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.i., applicants should align front facades of new buildings with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, applicants should use the median setback of buildings along the street frontage where a variety of setbacks exist. Refer to UDC Article 3, Division 2. Base Zoning Districts for applicable setback requirements. Staff finds that commercial structures within the district are set immediately adjacent to the front right-of-way whereas utilitarian structures such as the Army Lodge at 1306 E Grayson features a deep setback with a pedestrian walkway to the front and parking to the side and rear. Staff finds that that if the deep front setback is used as proposed, then the site plan should feature reduced parking pad paved area where it currently depicts a nearly full width paved area with 4 parking spots set to the west property line.
- d. **ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed to orient the front façade toward Quitman street with two front pedestrian doors and a garage door. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., applicants should orient primary building entrances, porches, and landings to be consistent with those historically found along the street frontage. Typically, historic building entrances are oriented towards the primary street. Staff finds that while the pedestrian doors are consistent with the Guidelines, the proposed front loading garage doors should be relocated to the side or rear.
- e. **HEIGHT AND SCALE** – At this time, the applicant has not annotated the precise maximum height at the ridge line. Per the submitted drawings, the ceiling height is at least 18-feet tall and begins to slope into a gable. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., applicants should design new construction so that its height and overall scale are consistent with nearby historic buildings. 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. In commercial districts, building height shall conform to the established pattern. If there is no more than a 50% variation in the scale of buildings on the adjacent block faces, then the height of the new building shall not exceed the tallest building on the adjacent block face by more than 10%. Staff finds that a two-story height structure may be appropriate provided that the massing and form relates to structures found historically within the district.
- f. **TRANSITIONS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii., applicants should utilize step-downs in building height, wall-plane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition when the height of new construction exceeds that of adjacent historic buildings by more than one-half story. The applicant has incorporated a front metal canopy over the pedestrian doors and windows as suggested by the Design Review Committee, which staff finds appropriately to create visual transition between building heights as well as punctuate the front fenestration between pedestrian and garage entrances.
- g. **FOUNDATION AND FLOOR HEIGHT** – At this time, the applicant has not annotated the precise height of the proposed foundation height. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., applicants should align foundation and floor-to-floor heights (including porches and balconies) within one foot of floor-to-floor heights on adjacent historic structures. Staff finds that a foundation detail that is consistent with those found

historically for commercial structures in the district should be used. Typically, brick will meet the ground at grade with no exposed foundation.

- h. ROOF FORM – The proposed new structure features a simple turned gable. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i., applicants should incorporate roof forms—pitch, overhangs, and orientation—that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. Roof forms on residential building types are typically sloped, while roof forms on nonresidential building types are more typically flat and screened by an ornamental parapet wall. While staff finds that large gable warehouses are not found in the district and that a flat roof building with a parapet wall is more appropriate for the proposed commercial structure – previous discussions at commission hearings and committee meetings produced support the low slope hipped roof as they are found in the district.
- i. FENESTRATION – The applicant has proposed to install sliding windows on the first and second floors approximately every 20-feet on center. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., applicants should incorporate window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Windows, doors, porches, entryways, dormers, bays, and pediments shall be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has revised the fenestration to feature equidistant and aligned window openings between the first and second “floors” on each side. The final window product should adhere to the *Standard Specifications for Windows in New Construction*.
- j. FAÇADE CONFIGURATION – The proposed new structure features two front pedestrian doors, a garage door to the side, and sliding window throughout. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.ii., the primary façade of new commercial buildings should be in keeping with established patterns. Maintaining horizontal elements within adjacent cap, middle, and base precedents will establish a consistent street wall through the alignment of horizontal parts. Avoid blank walls, particularly on elevations visible from the street. No new façade should exceed 40 linear feet without being penetrated by windows, entryways, or other defined bays. While staff finds that the proposed façade is atypical with the traditional commercial structure and should instead feature a tradition storefront system with secondary windows featuring vertical sash or casement configuration -- previous discussions at commission hearings and committee meetings produced support the proposed fenestration if the windows are properly spaced and aligned between floors and sides.
- k. LOT COVERAGE- The proposed new structure features a 3200 square foot rectangular footprint. The combined lots at 815-819 Quitman features a total of approximately 11500 square feet. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. 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 finds the proposed lot coverage consistent with the Guidelines.
- l. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to construct a metal warehouse structure with brick masonry cladding, metal garage doors, pedestrian doors, and windows, and a metal roof. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i., applicants should use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. For example, corrugated metal siding would not be appropriate for a new structure in a district comprised of homes with wood siding. Staff finds that the brick masonry cladding relates to existing commercial and industrial historic structures in the district.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed construct a new two-story commercial structure to feature a turn-ed gable metal warehouse form with brick masonry cladding, sliding windows, and frontloading garage door, and metal canopy. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.i., applicants should design new buildings to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. previous discussions at commission hearings and committee meetings produced support for the architectural details with the inclusion of the front metal canopy which the applicant has included in the latest revised plans.
- n. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

- o. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant first submitted an incomplete application on October 5, 2020. After meeting with staff to improve the application materials, the request was first heard at the December 16, 2020 hearing, where it was deferred to a Design Review Committee meeting. At the January 6, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting, the attending members and staff addressed each finding and produced support for the brick masonry cladding, reduce front parking, an aligned fenestration pattern, and the addition of a front metal canopy. The applicant submitted revised materials on January 28, 2021 which was reviewed for the February 3, 2021 commission hearing. At the last hearing, the applicant was referred to committee again with revised application materials. Staff provided a comprehension application material guide on February 4, 2021 to which the applicant submitted updates once again on March 22, 2021. At this time, staff finds that the concepts discussed at previous commission hearings and committee meetings have been generally addressed. Staff finds that revised materials are sufficient to receive a staff recommendation for conceptual approval. Per the applicant, the selected manufacture, Mueller, Inc would only be able to produce the construction drawings after documentation of conceptual approval is provided.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends conceptual approval based on the findings. The following stipulations should be addressed prior to receiving a recommendation for final approval:

- i. If the deep front setback is used as proposed, then the site plan should feature a reduced parking pad paved area by half, where the plan currently depicts a nearly full width paved area with 4 parking spots set to the west property line.
- ii. The final window product should adhere to the *Standard Specifications for Windows in New Construction*.
- iii. That the applicant submits at least 80% sufficient construction documents as required by the Unified Development Code for final approval and permitting. Per the applicant, the selected manufacture, Mueller, Inc would only be able to produce the construction drawings after documentation of conceptual approval is provided.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to COA with stipulations 1-3 and staff to review drawings. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT.**

ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2020-478
ADDRESS: 1038 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: ricardo mccullough/mccullough design associates

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct two, 1-story residential structures and two, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 1038 Dawson, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct two, 1-story residential structures and two, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 1038 Dawson, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – This lot is currently void of any structures. This lot is bounded by Dawson Street to the north, an unnamed alley to the east, and Dawson Alley to the south. Lots on the south side of this block of Dawson do not feature driveways on Dawson Street, but rather feature driveway access on Dawson Alley.

- c. PREVIOUS REVIEW – This request was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Committee on March 17, 2021, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.
- d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on March 24, 2021. At that meeting, the committee provided feedback regarding building elevations, fenestration patterns, massing and architectural details. This request was reviewed again on April 14, 2021, where committee members suggested revisions to the massing, porch profile and fenestration patterns.
- e. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION (Dawson Street) – 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. Staff finds that the proposed new construction should feature setbacks that are greater than those found historically on the block. As proposed, the new construction features setbacks that are greater than the setback of the neighboring structure to the immediate west. Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate.
- f. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION (Dawson Alley) – The applicant has proposed to locate one, 1-story structure and one, 2-story structure on Dawson Alley. Per the setback diagram, both structures will feature setbacks that are generally consistent with those of the existing structure (primarily accessory structures) on the alley; however, both structures will be orientated toward Dawson Street. Staff finds that the structures should be oriented toward the alley.
- g. SCALE & MASS (Dawson Street) – 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 Dawson features all one-story residential structures with the exception of the two-story residential structure at the corner of Dawson and N Palmetto. The applicant has proposed to construct one, 1-story structure and one, 2-story structure on Dawson Street. The applicant has proposed to site the one story structure adjacent to a historic one story structure and the two story structure adjacent to the proposed one story structure and a vacant lot. Staff finds the proposed massing to be appropriate.
- h. SCALE & MASS – Regarding massing on the alley, the applicant has proposed to construct one, 1-story structure and one, 2-story structure. The 2-story structure will be located at the interior (west) of the site on Dawson Alley. Generally, staff finds the massing on the alley to be appropriate.
- i. 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; however, staff finds that the introduction of a double entrance is atypical for historic structures within the district, in regards to the proposed entrances of the two story structure. Historically, houses with two front doors feature one that faces the street and one that faces the side yard (within the porch’s recess). Staff finds that the applicant should explore this configuration, if two doors are needed for duplex units.
- j. 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. Per the submitted construction documents, the applicant has proposed foundation heights that are at least one (1) foot in height. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include hipped and gabled roofs. Each of these roof forms are found historically within the district.
- l. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has incorporated window openings that are generally consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that all windows should feature historic profiles, including one over one profiles that are equal. Unequally sized sashes should not be used. Additionally, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to the 2-story structure’s side facades. The applicant has proposed a second floor window on the front façade that per the site plan, is design to be located at two party walls. Staff finds that all construction documents should accurately depict what is proposed.
- m. PORCHES – The applicant has proposed for the two, 1-story structures to feature porches that are integral to the massing of the house. Staff finds this to be appropriate; however, the applicant has proposed for the two, 2-story structures to feature porches that consist of stoops with roofs with a minimal inset. Staff finds that porches

- should be integrated into the massing of the structure, as found historically within the district. In regards to details, porch columns should capital and base trim, chamfered corners, and should not feature faux stone.
- n. BUILDING SPACING – Per the site plan, the applicant has proposed building spacing that appears to be appropriate. The applicant has also noted a building to lot ratio that is consistent with the Guidelines.
 - o. MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has noted the installation of siding, standing seam metal roofs and composition shingle roofs. At this time the applicant has not specified materials. Wood or composition siding is appropriate in a four (4) inch exposure with mitered corners or corner trim, a thickness of ¾” and a smooth finish. Column details for each structure should be submitted to staff for review and approval.
 - p. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of wood windows. Staff finds that product specifications should be submitted to staff for review and approval that are consistent with staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction.
 - q. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As previously noted, staff finds that traditionally sized windows should be incorporated into the design and that additional fenestration and design consideration be given the side elevations of the 2-story structure. Additionally, staff finds each structure should feature a front porch with massing that is integral to that of the proposed new construction. Materials are to follow staff’s standard specifications, noted in finding p and in the applicable citations.
 - r. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – While historic structures within the district feature common architectural elements, identical structures do not appear adjacent to each other. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate architectural details that create unique designs and details for each structure.
 - s. SITE ELEMENTS (Driveways) – The applicant has proposed for a driveway to feature access to the side of the lot from Goodloe Alley. Staff finds this to be appropriate as driveways are not found historically on Dawson Street. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed driveway should be limited in width to ten (10) feet, or separated to feature two separate driveways on the alley.
 - t. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted the installation of front yard fencing, sod and landscaping. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping and fencing to be appropriate.
 - u. WALKWAY – The applicant has noted the installation of walkways within the front yard of each residential structure. This is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
 - v. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the locations of mechanical equipment at each structure; however, has not noted if the mechanical equipment will be screened. All mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way with screening elements.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan and massing with the following stipulations:

- i. That the two southern structures on Dawson Alley be reoriented to feature front facades that face the public right of way (Dawson Alley), as noted in finding e. This will also eliminate parking within the front yard, as currently proposed.
- ii. That each structure feature a front porch with massing that is integral to that of the proposed new construction, as noted in finding m.
- iii. That additional design consideration and fenestration patterns be incorporated into the side facades of the 2- story structures, potentially through the use of a wraparound porch (where the duplex structure features a side elevation that faces a side alley).
- iv. That the proposed duplexes feature entrances doors where one faces the street and one faces the side yard (within the porch’s recess, as found historically on many recessed porches within the district). Staff recommends this configuration, if two doors are needed for duplex units.
- v. That all siding feature a four (4) inch exposure, a thickness of ¾”, mitered corners and a smooth finish. Columns should be six inches square, and window materials should meet staff’s standards for windows in new construction.
- vi. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view as noted in finding v.

Staff does not recommend final approval or the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness until the stipulations noted above have been incorporated into the design and that updated, complete construction documents have been submitted for review and approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society and Scott Albert support staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 10 AYE. 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT.**

ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2021-158
ADDRESS: 631 CEDAR ST
APPLICANT: Jay Cupp

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

1. Replace the existing aluminum siding to install wood lap siding matching the historic profile
2. Replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a 50-year composition shingle roof, based on the shake shingles underneath

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure was constructed circa 1915 in the Craftsman style and first appears on the 1924 Sanborn map. The one-story single-family structure features a primary hipped roof with a centered dormer, a corner porch, aluminum covered wood lap siding, and a standing seam metal roof.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit on March 2, 2021, staff found that the standing seam metal roof and the aluminum siding has been replaced with new wood lap siding prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Upon further investigation, with the contractor, the property owner, and Development Services Department permit manager, staff concluded that the applicant was working in good faith that a permit had been issued and paid for. The applicant was cooperative to submit a complete application to be heard at the next available hearing.
- c. SIDING – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing aluminum siding with new wood lap siding matching and covering the profile of the historic wood siding underneath. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B.i., applicants should consider exposing original wood siding if it is currently covered with vinyl or aluminum siding, stucco, or other materials that have not achieved historic significance. Staff finds that removal of the aluminum siding is consistent with the Guidelines. While applying new wood siding over existing historic wood siding is atypical, staff finds that the historic resource is still maintained and an overall improvement upon the previous nonconforming condition.
- d. HISTORIC CONTEXT OF METAL ROOFS - 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 1920's, 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.
- e. ROOFING – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new composition shingle roof. By the 1924 Sanborn map, the structure had featured a non-combustible roof. The applicant has also submitted photo evidence of the wood shake shingle still present under the visible roofing material. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Alterations and Maintenance 3.B.vi. use metal roofs on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a standing seam metal roof was installed during the period of significance per finding b and

is more appropriate than installing composition shingles. In-kind replacement of a standing seam metal roof is eligible for administrative approval with adherence to the *Standard Specifications for Metal Roofs*.

- f. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE - The request was referred to a Design Review Committee site visit, which was conducted on April 14, 2021. Committee members generally supported the reroofing and siding repairs with consideration of the historic material remaining underneath and the unique circumstance of Development Services Department permitting error. The committee members, applicant and property owner also considered the stipulation to install an additional layer of 1/2" to 3/4" wood trim around the frontmost window openings to restore the historic depth profiles.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of item 1. Based on finding c Siding replacement. Staff does not recommend approval of item 2. Roofing material change based on finding d and e.

In-kind roof replacement is eligible for administrative approval with adherence to the Standard Specifications for Metal Roof Replacement, including no striation or ridge caps.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Lisa Lynn- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 1 and 2 as submitted.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 8 AYE. 2 NAY. 1 ABSENT.

* Commissioner Bowman left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2021-026

ADDRESS: 119 FLOSS RD

APPLICANT: Rene Cortez/CORTEZ RENE G & LAURA B

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

1. Construct an addition to the existing, historic structure to feature approximately 2,400 square feet. The proposed addition will be constructed to the east side of the existing historic structure.
2. Construct a detached carport and workshop structure to feature an overall footprint of approximately 1,230 square feet. The proposed detached structure will be located to the west of the existing historic structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 119 Floss Road was constructed circa 1940 and features Craftsman architectural elements. The structure is contributing to the Mission Historic District.
- b. PREVIOUS REVIEW– This request was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 3, 2021, where the Commission referred this request to the Design Review Committee.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 9, 2021, where the Committee recommended design updates regarding details, massing and setbacks. Generally, the Committee found the proposed footprint and location of the addition to be appropriate. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on March 9, 2021, where the Committee noted that the increased setback was appropriate and did not compete with the historic structure’s massing. At that meeting, the Committee also recommended additional modifications to architectural details.
- d. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the existing, historic structure to feature approximately 2,400 square feet. The proposed addition will be constructed to the east side of the existing

historic structure. Per the Mission Historic District Design Manual, additions should be located to the rear of a property whenever possible. The applicant has proposed a side addition to feature a setback from the front façade of the primary structure. Regarding side additions, the Mission Historic District Design Manual notes that side additions must be set back from the front façade by at least fifty (50) percent of the total side façade length. A greater setback is encouraged where feasible. The applicant has proposed for the massing of the addition to feature a greater setback than that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds that an increase to 50% would be consistent with the Mission Historic District Design Manual.

- e. ADDITION (Width) – The Mission Historic District Design Manual note that side additions must not be greater than thirty (30) percent of the width of the front façade of the primary structure. The applicant has proposed an addition that features a width that doubles that of the primary structure. The proposed addition’s width is not consistent with the Design Manual; however, with an increased setback as noted in finding d, staff finds that the width may be appropriate.
- f. ROOF FORM – Per the Mission Historic Design Manual, side additions must feature a subordinate roofline in height, while maintaining the original roof form. Ridge lines that match the existing historic structure in height may be considered on a case-by-case basis. The applicant has proposed for the addition’s roof feature a greater massing, height and general profile than that of the primary structure. The proposed roof form is not consistent with the Design Manual. Staff finds that a lower, transitional roof form between the original structure and the addition be used to be consistent with the Design Manual.
- g. MATERIALS – Per the submitted elevations, the applicant has proposed to match the siding of the primary structure. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate. The applicant has also noted a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the standing seam metal roof to be appropriate; however, the roof should feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap is not be to used.
- h. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds that windows should comply with staff’s standards for windows in new construction and additions, as noted in the applicable citations.
- i. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – To the side of the site, the applicant has proposed to construct a detached carport and workshop structure to feature an overall footprint of approximately 1,230 square feet. The proposed detached structure will be located to the west of the existing historic structure. The Guidelines for New Construction note that rear accessory structures should not feature a footprint that is more than forty (40) percent of that of the primary historic structures. Generally, staff finds the proposed size of the accessory structure to be inconsistent with the Guidelines; however, given the size of the lot, staff finds that an increased, detached footprint may be appropriate.
- j. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE (Materials) – The applicant has proposed for the accessory structure to feature siding that matches that of the primary historic structure. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate. The applicant has also noted a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the standing seam metal roof to be appropriate; however, the roof should feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap is not be to used. The applicant has noted the installation of a metal garage door.
- k. EXISTING STRUCTURE – The existing, historic structure features modifications, including the existing porch roof, columns and porch railings. At this time, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing, street facing front door. Staff finds that this door should remain as it exists, as it contributes to the historic structure’s form as a previous, stand-alone structure.

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

- i. That the proposed addition’s setback be increased to 50% of the primary structure’s setback as noted in finding d and that a lower, transitional roof form between the original structure and the addition be used as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the existing, front door of the historic structure be maintained.

- iii. That the standing seam metal roof feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap is not to be used. Staff finds that a wood or metal garage door should be used. Vinyl is not an appropriate material.
- iv. That wood windows be installed that match the profile of those found in the historic structure. If the historic structure's wood windows no longer exist and have been replaced, staff recommends that wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed that are consistent with staff's standards for windows in additions, as noted in the applicable citations.
- v. That wood siding be used to match that found on the primary structure, or that composite siding be used that features an exposure of four inches, a thickness of $\frac{3}{4}$ ", mitered corners or corner trim and a smooth finish, as noted in finding j.
- vi. That the proposed garage door be wood or metal in construction.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items with stipulations 2-3, 4 and 5. And to include the stipulation to retain the historic elements to the addition.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 9 AYE. 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 24. HDRC NO. 2021-178
ADDRESS: 402 PEREIDA ST
APPLICANT: FCR Investments LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an 8-foot-tall wood privacy fence along the west property line.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 402 Pereida was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and contributes to the King William Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features a traditional L-plan with an inset porch with turned columns and Folk Victorian brackets, wood sash windows, and wood lap siding.
- b. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install an 8-foot tall wood privacy fence along the west property line, adjacent to the commercial property at 412 Pereida. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.C.i, applicants should set privacy fences back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence. While 6-foot-tall rear privacy fences are eligible for administrative approval, taller fences may be escalated to commission review. Staff finds that 8-foot-tall fences are permitted when adjacent to commercial properties and that the proposed fence design and location is generally appropriate if the 8-foot height terminates behind the front bay of the house at which it should begin to taper until it meets the 4-foot tall front yard fence.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval based on the findings with the stipulation that the 8-foot height terminates behind the front bay of the house at which it should begin to taper until it meets the 4-foot-tall front yard fence. A revised elevation drawing of the fence height line should be submitted to staff prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve as presented with 8 feet across as request by the applicant. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: The **MOTION PASSED with 5 AYE. 4 NAY. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 25. HDRC NO. 2021-172

ADDRESS: 129 W AGARITA AVE

APPLICANT: CHRISTOPHER VERETTE/CrabApple Designs LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace two windows on the rear elevation with an aluminum clad wood casement window with a fixed transom.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 129 W Agarita is a 2-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1905 in the Neoclassical style. The house is commonly known as the Hoarder House. The structure features a composition shingle hip roof with a prominent front gable and widely overhanging eaves, a 2-story wraparound front porch, wood cladding, one-over-one and divided lite windows, exposed rafter tails, and decorative woodwork. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – The applicant has proposed to replace two (2) one-over-one wood windows located on the north (rear) elevation. The windows are fully wood and are located beneath a second story box bay window. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing windows with one Marvin aluminum-clad wood casement window with a fixed transom featuring simulated divided lights. Guideline 6.A.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that historic windows should be preserved. At this time, the applicant has not provided evidence that the existing windows are not original to the structure. Additionally, 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 documentation provided does not show that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines and finds that the existing windows should be repaired in place.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: REPLACEMENT PRODUCT – The applicant has proposed to replace two (2) existing one-over-one wood windows with one Marvin aluminum-clad wood casement window with a fixed transom featuring simulated divided lights. According to the Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement, meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25”. Stiles must be no wider than 2.25”. Top and bottom sashes must be equal in size unless otherwise approved. The proposed replacement product does not match the existing windows in material, configuration, and form. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing windows in place.

If the HDRC finds the window replacement appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant replaces the existing windows with a fully wood window product that meets staff’s standard window specifications and submits updated specifications to staff for review and approval. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash.

This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Faux divided lights are not permitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to continue the item to next available hearing.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYE. 2 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 26. HDRC NO. 2021-181

ADDRESS: 1933 FREDERICKSBURG RD

APPLICANT: HECTOR GUEL/MIKES ELECTRIC FOR (CLINICAS UNIDAS)

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install two (2) approximately 150-square-foot channel letter sets with LED illumination.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 1933 Fredericksburg, a 1-story corner commercial structure featuring a decorative corner parapet, stucco cladding, storefront window awnings, and a corner entrance. The applicant is requesting to install two (2) exterior signs totaling approximately 300 square feet. This property is located within the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE – The Historic Design Guidelines for Signage state that each building will be allowed one major and two minor signs. Total requested signage should not exceed 50 square feet. According to Guideline 1.A.iii for Signage, signs should be designed to be in proportion to the façade, respecting the building’s size, scale and mass, height, and rhythms and the sizes of window and door openings. Scale signage (in terms of its height and width) to be subordinate to the overall building composition. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- c. WALL SIGNS: SIZE – The applicant has proposed to install two (2) internally illuminated channel letter signs to read “Clinicas Unidas” and featuring the business logo on both the north and east elevations. The proposed signage features an overall height of 6’ – 3” and an overall width of 24 feet. The signs will feature an overall square footage of approximately 150 square feet each. Guideline 1.A.iii for Signage states that signage should be designed to be in proportion to the facade, respecting the building’s size, scale and mass, height, and rhythms and sizes of window and door openings. Scale signage (in terms of its height and width) to be subordinate to the overall building composition. While the proposed square footage is excessive, staff finds the installation of two (2) signs, each with a total square footage larger than 50 square feet appropriate as each sign will be installed on a surface area of approximately 240 square feet and will be installed on opposite elevations. Both signs will only be visible together from the corner entry. Staff finds that 50 square feet for each sign, for a total of 100 square feet, is acceptable due to the location of the structure on an intersection, the context of the site, and the scale of the building.
- d. WALL SIGNS: MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install signs that feature acrylic faces, aluminum backs, and internal illumination. Guideline 1.D.i for Signage notes that signage for historic properties should not feature materials such as plastic or fiberglass. According to Guideline 1.D.ii for Signage, signs should be constructed of durable materials used for signs during the building’s period of construction, such as wood, wrought iron, steel, aluminum, and metal grill work. Additionally, Guideline 1.E.i for Signage

states that only indirect or bare-bulb light sources that do not produce a glare should be used to illuminate signs. Internal illumination should not be used. Guideline 3.C.iv for Signage states that internally-illuminated, wall-mounted channel letters should be avoided for new signs unless historic precedent exists. Reverse channel letters may be permitted. As proposed, the wall signage is not consistent with the Guidelines, as the Guidelines recommend against internal illumination and plastic channel letter faces. Staff finds that the applicant should explore an appropriate material and install indirect illumination.

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

- i. That the proposed signs be reduced to 50 square feet each, for a total of 100 square feet of signage. Updated graphics with dimensions must be submitted to staff for review and approval.
- ii. That the proposed signage features all metal faces and external illumination. Updated material specifications and lighting plans must be submitted to staff for review and approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society of San Antonio and Andrea Martinez- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to refer to Design Review Committee.
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 9 AYE. 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 27. HDRC NO. 2021-187

ADDRESS: 2318 W GRAMERCY PLACE

APPLICANT: Steven & Lauren Salazar/SALAZAR STEVEN L & LAUREN R

REQUEST: The applicant has proposed to replace 10 divided-lite steel casement windows with matching size and divided lite configuration with sliding Fibrex windows by Renewal by Andersen

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 2318 W Gramercy features a wide front façade configuration with low sloping hipped roofs and steel casement windows found on midcentury structures and flagstone-clad façade. The one-story single-family structure contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. EXISTING WINDOWS - The applicant has proposed to replace 10 divided-lite steel casement windows that are each likely to be original to the structure, if not replaced in-kind. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. applicants should install new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Per the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement*: when individual elements such as sills, muntins, rails, sashes, or glazing has deteriorated, every effort should be made to repair or reconstruct that individual element prior to consideration of wholesale replacement. Throughout the submitted application photos, staff finds no instances of window system deterioration beyond repair. Staff finds that all 10 windows are wholly intact and should be repaired in-place where specific areas begin to deteriorate.
- c. PROPOSED WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to replace the steel casement windows with windows with matching size and divided lite configuration with sliding Fibrex windows by Renewal by Andersen. If the commission approves of window replacement, staff finds that the proposed window product Renewal by Andersen does not match the existing windows in steel material or casement style configuration.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement based on the finding b regarding existing conditions. The windows should be repaired in-place.

If the commission approves of window replacement, staff finds that the proposed product Renewal by Andersen does not match the existing windows in steel material or casement style configuration and should not be used unless specifically approved by the commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Andrea Garza- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve item 1 as submitted and item 2 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

* Commissioner Arreola left the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

ITEM 28. HDRC NO. 2021-139
ADDRESS: 244 HERMINE BLVD
APPLICANT: Jay Brandon

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 14 existing wood windows on the house with matching size and divided lite configuration with sash Fibrex windows by Renewal by Andersen

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 244 Hermine was constructed in the English stone cottage style and contributes to the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features a two front-facing overlapping central gables with an arched inset doorway, flagstone façade, a side flaking stone chimney, and oneover- one wood windows with the exclusion of the front picture window which likely replaced the original set of ganged sash windows.
- b. EXISTING WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to replace 14 one-over-one wood sash windows that are each likely to be original to the structure, if not replaced in-kind. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. applicants should install new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Per the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement*: when individual elements such as sills, muntins, rails, sashes, or glazing has deteriorated, every effort should be made to repair or reconstruct that individual element prior to consideration of wholesale replacement. Throughout the submitted application photos, staff finds no instances of window system deterioration beyond repair – nor individual elements failing with the potential exception of the dislocating meeting rail on window 8. Staff finds that all 14 windows are wholly intact and should be repaired in-place where specific areas begin to deteriorate.
- c. PROPOSED WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to replace with windows with matching size and configuration one-over-one sash Fibrex windows by Renewal by Andersen. If the commission approves of window replacement, staff finds that the proposed window product Renewal by Andersen generally adhere to the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement* with the exception that original wood windows should be replaced with matching wood windows, instead of the proposed composite Fibrex material, unless specifically approved by the commission.

Mtg Minutes 4/21/21

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of window replacement based on the finding b regarding existing conditions. The windows should be repaired in-place.

If the commission approves of window replacement, staff finds that the proposed window product Renewal by Andersen generally adhere to the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement* with the exception that original wood windows should be replaced with matching wood windows, instead of the proposed composite material, Fibrex, unless specifically approved by the commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to deny application.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

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

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

The Commission approved the HDRC April 7th, 2021 meeting minutes.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

APPROVED



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

Date: 5/6/21