



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 16, 2021

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met via videoconference on Wednesday, June 16, 2021.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

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

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

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Items #15 was pulled for discussion.
- Item # 20 and 21 were postponed by applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Item 6: Andrea Garza- supports the staff recommendations.
- Item 7: The Conservation Society of San Antonio- supports landmark designation.
- Item 9: Frederica Kushner supports the applicants request with staff recommendations.
- Item 13: The Conservation Society of San Antonio- supports landmark designation.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| ○ Item 1, Case No. 2021-270 | 206 PALO BLANCO ST |
| ○ Item 2, Case No. 2021-232 | 209 W MARIPOSA |
| ○ Item 3, Case No. 2021-285 | 225 W WILDWOOD |
| ○ Item 4, Case No. 2021-253 | 297 LOVERA BLVD |
| ○ Item 5, Case No. 2021-272 | 345 W COMMERCE ST |
| ○ Item 6, Case No. 2021-261 | 354 CLUB DR |
| ○ Item 7, Case No. 2021-260 | 404 CALHOUN |
| ○ Item 8, Case No. 2021-283 | 414 MISSION ST |
| ○ Item 9, Case No. 2021-263 | 602 E DEWEY PLACE |
| ○ Item 10, Case No. 2021-266 | 613 N FLORES ST |
| ○ Item 11, Case No. 2021-286 | 711 E EVERGREEN |
| ○ Item 12, Case No. 2021-269 | 811 W HOUSTON ST |
| ○ Item 13, Case No. 2021-208 | 828 NEVADA |
| ○ Item 14, Case No. 2021-258 | 875 E ASHBY PLACE |

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1-14 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2021-264
ADDRESS: 922 E CROCKETT ST
APPLICANT: Ligaya Thompson

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove the existing siding to provide structural and framing repairs to the historic structure.
2. Replace seven existing wood windows with aluminum windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 922 E Crockett features Craftsman detailing with wood siding and windows. The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic and Design Review Commission on October 20, 2020, for approval to reconstruct rear additions and perform porch modifications. The applicant has received administrative Certificates of Appropriateness for repair and maintenance.
- b. FRAMING – The applicant has noted structural damage to the structure’s framing which has resulted in the structure leaning, and various façade openings no longer being square. The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, original siding and to perform framing repairs to ensure that the structure is square. Staff finds the proposed scope of work to be appropriate; however, staff finds that all siding that is removed should be reinstalled. Siding that is beyond repair is to be documented, and its replacement approved by OHP staff.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace seven (7) wood windows. OHP staff performed a site visit on June 3, 2021, and found five of the seven wood windows to be in a repairable state. One existing window featured non-original sashes and the other was missing a bottom sash and had significantly deteriorated. Both of these windows are located in room 1 on the plan.
- d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, wood windows with an aluminum window. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations recommends that if original windows are beyond repair, they are to be replaced with new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. The previously proposed replacement windows are not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Staff finds that the existing wood windows should be repaired. Where the original windows and their elements no longer exist, wood windows should be installed that match the profile and material of the original wood windows.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the removal of the existing siding to provide structural and framing repairs to the historic structure with the stipulation that all framing be done in-kind, that window openings are fully documented and remain in their exact location, and that existing, original siding be repaired and re-installed.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, window replacement. Staff recommends repair of the existing windows with in-kind replacement of only two windows, both located in room 1, noted on the floor plan.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

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

- *COMMISSIONER CARPENTER LEFT MEETING AT 3:15 pm.*

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2021-245
ADDRESS: 243 NORTH DR
APPLICANT: Mark Shaw

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing attic vent on the west elevation gable with a window.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 243 North is a 1-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style. The structure features a high-pitch front gable composition shingle roof, stone cladding, one-over-one windows with decorative wood window screens, an arched porch entry, a deep-set asymmetrical front porch, and prominent stone-clad chimney on the west elevation. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. GABLE VENT MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing arched gable vent on the west elevation with a fully wood Jeld-Wen 2500 one-over-one window. Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that applicants should preserve existing window and door openings. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. 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. As the west elevation is not a primary elevation and the gable modification will not be visible from the public right-of-way, staff finds the proposal appropriate, but finds that a window closer in dimensions to the existing gable vent would be more consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the window product features dimensions that more closely match the existing opening and does not exceed the minimum requirements for egress. The applicant is required to submit final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submits an updated elevation drawing showing accurate window proportions to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness..

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Andrea Garza- supports staff's stipulations 1 and 2.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with stipulations and modify stipulation not to exceed that maximum requirement of standard specifications.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2021-238
ADDRESS: 1907 W KINGS HWY
APPLICANT: Nicholas Melde/Architexas

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the ribbon driveway with solid concrete driveway, including portions of flagstone.
2. Replace the front concrete walkway and yard with flagstone.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 1907 W Kings Hwy was constructed circa 1938, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features a primary turned gable with a front-facing board-and-batten gabled window bay, flanking covered porch, a stone chimney on the west side elevation, wood sash windows, and 105 profile wood lap siding.
- b. COMPLIANCE – The applicant submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify the front yard, driveway, and walkway on May 4, 2021. Staff worked with the applicant from May 5 through May 7 to obtain missing application materials, including notification that no work has been approved. On May 18, staff received photo reports that work has begun prior to approval and reached notified the applicant again that no work has been approved and a Stop Work Order was issued. Work continued through May 20 and beyond despite multiple notices sent to the applicant throughout the review process.
- c. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to replace the ribbon driveway with a full concrete driveway. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., applicants should retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations such as ribbon drives and incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Staff finds that the ribbon driveway is a common historic pattern within the 190 block of W Kings Hwy and throughout the Monticello Park Historic District. Staff finds the ribbons should be restored; the applicant may resubmit an alternative driveway plan with permeable material that would still maintain the ribbon configuration.
- d. WALKWAY & HARDSCAPE – The applicant has proposed to remove the front walkway featuring simple poured concrete approximately 3-feet wide tapering near the porch stairs – to install a flagstone walkway with a larger flagstone patio connecting to the driveway. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.ii., applicants should replace those portions of sidewalks or walkways that are deteriorated beyond repair and every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material. Staff finds that the existing concrete walkway related to existing pattern of the block and the modest style of the home, while the flagstone walkway is more appropriate for contemporary suburbs or some high-style historic stone homes and districts. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i., applicants should not introduce large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces where they were not historically located. Staff finds the introduction of a large flagstone patio connecting the walkway and driveway is inconsistent with Guidelines and should be reserved; the applicant may resubmit a design that features a smaller decomposed granite or steppingstone path if access between the walkway and driveway is necessary while maintaining the majority of the natural front lawn.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends denial of item 1. Driveway modifications based on finding c. The ribbons should be restored, and the applicant may submit an alternative driveway plan with permeable material that would still maintain the ribbon configuration.

Staff recommends denial of items 2. Walkway and Hardscaping based on finding d. The front walkway should be restored to simple poured concrete that flares near the porch steps. the applicant may resubmit a design that features a smaller decomposed granite or steppingstone path if access between the walkway and driveway is necessary while maintaining the majority of the natural front lawn.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Andrea Garza- has concerns that work was done before approval and disregard city guidelines, and supports staff stipulations 1 and 2.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to deny item 1 and 2 based on staff’s findings.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2021-179
ADDRESS: 506 E PARK AVE
APPLICANT: Erin Camp/CAMP ERIN & COPPOLA KEVIN

REQUEST:

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

1. Modify the existing driveway to remove the front parking pad.
2. Replace the existing brick front walkway with concrete pavers.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 506 E Park is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman style. The structure first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map as a multi-family dwelling. The structure features a side gable and hip standing seam metal roof with widely overhanging eaves, wood cladding, a deepset front porch and second story front porch, wood box columns, divided lite windows, and a front brick walkway. The property is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.
- b. CASE HISTORY – The applicant presented the request to the HDRC on May 5, 2021, and received approval to remove the existing parking pad and replace the existing brick walkway with a brick or fully concrete walkway to match the existing footprint. Following the HDRC decision, staff observed that the applicant had replaced the existing brick walkway with the proposed rectangular concrete pavers without approval. The applicant has returned to the HDRC to request approval for the installed concrete pavers.
- c. DRIVEWAY MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing fully concrete driveway to remove a front parking pad. According to Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements, applicants should incorporate a similar driveway configuration to that historically found on the site. Guideline 7.A.ii for Site Elements states that off-street parking areas should not be added within the front yard setback as to not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape. The existing parking pad is a nonconforming condition. Staff finds the removal of the parking pad consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. FRONT WALKWAY REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing brick front walkway with rectangular concrete pavers. Guideline 5.A.i for Site Elements states that historic sidewalk and walkway paving materials—often brick or concrete—should be retained and repaired in place. According to Guideline 5.A.ii for Site Elements, when replacing those portions of sidewalks or walkways that are deteriorated

beyond repair, every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material. Guideline 5.A.iii states that replacement of walkways should follow the historic alignment, configuration, and width of walkways. Alter historic width or alignment only where absolutely necessary to accommodate the preservation of a significant tree. While properties immediately adjacent to 506 E Park also feature brick front walkways, the property may have originally featured a fully concrete front walkway. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines. In-kind front walkway replacement or replacement with a fully concrete front walkway in the same footprint as existing is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Item 1, staff recommends approval of the parking pad removal based on finding b with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant submits an updated measured site plan showing the proposed driveway configuration to staff for review and approval.

Item 2, staff does not recommend approval of the concrete paver installation based on finding c. Staff recommends that the applicant replaces the concrete pavers installed without approval with a brick or fully concrete walkway to match the previously existing footprint.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Andrea Garza- supports staff items 1-3 and requests all windows be replaced with standard window replacement.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 1 and deny item 2.
Commissioner Laffoon seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2021-207
ADDRESS: 301 E ROSEWOOD AVE
APPLICANT: Oscar Martinez/MARTINEZ OSCAR &

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new wrought iron front yard fence to be 4-feet tall.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 301 E Rosewood is a 2-story residential constructed circa 1930 with Tudor Revival and Craftsman influences. The structure features a limestone façade, ganged wood windows, and an asphalt shingle roof with exposed rafter tails. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot-high wrought iron front yard fence. The property currently features a low limestone retaining wall. Guideline 2.B.i for Site Elements states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. According to Guideline 2.B.iii for Site Elements, the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. The streetscape along E Rosewood features predominantly open yards or yards landscaped with box hedges or short retaining walls. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

- c. FENCE LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the 4-foot-high wrought iron fence around the perimeter of the front yard, atop of or adjacent to an existing limestone wall. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements states that fence or wall installation should be avoided in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic district that have not historically had them. While there is a front yard fence in the vicinity, the majority of this block is unfenced. Staff does not find that a front yard fence is characteristic of E Rosewood.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the front yard fence installation based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant installs box hedges or a similar landscaping buffer as found on the block.

If the HDRC is compelled to approve the front yard fence installation, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the final construction height of the approved gate and fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the gate and fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to deny application based on staff’s findings
Commissioner Lafoon seconded the motion.

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

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

- COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ JOINED MEETING AT 4:20PM

ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2021-224
ADDRESS: 420 BROADWAY
APPLICANT: Zabrina Silva /Comer Signs, LLC

- Applicant withdrew application

ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2021-242
ADDRESS: 134 W MISTLETOE
APPLICANT: Lyndsay Thorn/Thorn Architects

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

1. Demolish a contributing rear accessory structure.
2. Construct a rear carport.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 134 W Mistletoe is a 2 ½ story residential structure constructed circa 1910 in the Craftsman style by prominent San Antonio architect Atlee B. Ayers. The home features woodlap and wood shake siding, a hipped roof, and prominent front porch. The property features a 1-story rear accessory structure of wood construction fronting Howard Street with two garage doors and a full concrete driveway pad. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.

- b. DEMOLITION – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only and replace the structure with a rear carport. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historical development pattern within a historic district.
- c. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – The existing rear accessory structure is a 1-story, two-bay auto structure that may have been constructed circa 1950. A series of rear accessory structures, including a stable, appear on the 1911 and 1931 Sanborn Maps. A rear accessory structure matching the footprint of the existing rear accessory structure first appears on the Sanborn Map in 1951. The existing rear accessory structure has either been modified since construction or is a newer structure that matches the circa 1950 rear accessory structure in footprint and location. The structure is contributing to the district.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:
 - A. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;* [The applicant has provided one cost estimate of \$50,000 for the rehabilitation of the existing structure and has expressed that the applicant finds the structure to have likely been built circa 1980 and to be noncontributing to the district. The applicant has provided a cost estimate of \$20,000 for the demolition of the structure.]
 - B. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;* [The applicant has provided one cost estimate for rehabilitation of the existing structure. The applicant does not find that the structure can be reasonably adapted to suit their needs.]
 - C. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.* [This is not applicable to the current owner.]
- 1b. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – The applicant may provide to the Historic and Design Review Commission additional information which may show a loss of significance in regards to the subject of the application in order to receive Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation of approval of the demolition. If, based on the evidence presented, the Historic and Design Review Commission finds that the structure or property is no longer historically, culturally, architecturally or archeologically significant, it may make a recommendation for approval of the demolition. In making this determination, the Historic and Design Review Commission must find that the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding by the Commission that the structure or property has undergone significant or irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural, or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Additionally, the Historic and Design Review Commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect. Staff conducted a site visit on June 11, 2021, and observed that the existing rear accessory structure features a typical level of deterioration, commonly found in similar structures of the same age. The structure shows evidence of bowing along the roof line, wood rot at the base of the structure and on the rafter tails, and the rear of the structure has

been partially clad with wood privacy fencing. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to the modifications and deterioration of original materials.

- 1c. In general, staff encourages the rehabilitation, and when necessary, reconstruction of historic structures. Such work is eligible for local tax incentives. The financial benefit of the incentives should be taken into account when weighing the costs of rehabilitation against the costs of demolition with new construction.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear carport with a storage area and outdoor kitchen area in place of the existing rear accessory structure. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the proposed carport on the lot to front Howard Street, which generally reflects that of the historic structure currently on the site. The applicant has proposed to set the carport along the property line. The existing structure currently features a setback of 15’-6” and a fully concrete driveway that extends from the apron to the structure. Staff finds that the proposed carport should feature a setback in keeping with the existing rear accessory structure and remain in line with the neighboring structure at 1712 Howard Street.
- 2b. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed a 1-story carport structure with a Dutch gable roof. The structure will measure approximately 14’-11” in height. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings and rear accessory structures. The scale of the proposed structure does not impact or visually compete with primary structure on the lot or nearby historic structures. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2c. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed a footprint of approximately 865 square feet for the carport structure and approximately 93 square feet for an attached rear storage area. The structure will feature two attached pergolas over the outdoor kitchen area on the east side of the structure and on the north side of the structure. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. The existing rear accessory structure is approximately 438 square feet, which is consistent with the historic development pattern of the district. The proposed carport will more than double the square footage of the existing rear accessory structure. Staff finds that the proposed footprint should more closely reflect the footprint of the existing rear accessory structure.
- 2d. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a Dutch gable roof form. The roof form on the existing rear accessory structure is a shed roof form that slopes toward the rear. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- 2e. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has not provided material specifications for the proposed rear carport at this time. In the submitted elevation drawings, the proposed carport appears to feature a composition shingle roof and wood construction. The existing structure features board and batten siding and a metal roof. Staff finds that the applicant should submit final material specifications to staff for review.
- 2f. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The applicant should incorporate architectural details that are appropriate for the Monte Vista Historic District.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of request item #1, the demolition of the historic rear accessory structure based on findings 1a through 1c.

If the HDRC finds that there is unreasonable economic hardship or, failing that, finds a loss of significance has occurred and approves the requested demolition, then staff makes the following recommendations regarding the requested new construction:

2. Staff recommends approval of request item #2, the construction of a rear carport structure, based on findings 2a through 2f with the following stipulations:

- i. That materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding, and wood doors be salvaged and stored for use on site in future construction.
- ii. That the applicant explores a setback in keeping with the existing rear accessory structure that remains in line with the neighboring structure at 1712 Howard Street. An updated site plan must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iii. That the applicant reduces the overall footprint to more closely reflect the footprint of the existing rear accessory structure. An updated site plan and updated elevation drawings must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iv. That the applicant submits final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Paul Kinnoson, Paul Bonduraut, The Conservation Society of San Antonio, and Tony Garcia- supports staff recommendations to deny application. Gerard Scheer- supports applicant's request for demolition.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to refer to the Design Review Committee for a site-visit review. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2021-100
ADDRESS: 415 MISSION ST
APPLICANT: Jake Jazdzewski/JAZDZEWSKI JAKE & MONICA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval to:

1. Relocate the existing multistory rear accessory structure approximately six feet to the southeast.
2. Remove an exterior staircase.
3. Perform various fenestration modifications, to include the removal of a door and awning on the second story with a window, the enclosure of a window on the rear façade with siding, and the installation of sliding doors.
4. Enclose an existing garage bay with siding.
5. Replace all existing windows and doors with new aluminum clad wood windows and doors, with the exception of the half circle window on the front façade and those to be modified as outlined in Item 3.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 415 Mission St is a 2 ½-story residential structure constructed circa 1915 in the Queen Anne style with Colonial Revival influences. The home features woodlap siding, a full-width single story front porch with Doric columns, and a distinctive steeply pitched front gable flanked by dormers. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District. The property also features a rear accessory structure with both one and two story masses, also contributing to the district.
- b. The applicant received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on March 17, 2021. The approval carried the following stipulations:
 1. That the applicant retains the existing windows and doors to be removed and reuses them in other openings on the structure, to include the replacement of windows deteriorated beyond repair if applicable, or keeps them onsite for future use as noted in findings e and f; **this stipulation will continue to apply.**

2. That the applicant submits a comprehensive window schedule and photographs of each window requested to be replaced for final approval to determine the appropriateness of window replacement as noted in finding h. Staff strongly encourages window repair and restoration wherever feasible, which is eligible for administrative approval; **this stipulation has not been fully met.**
 3. That the applicant submits a detailed plan for structure relocation, to include stabilization measures and foundation details for the structure's new location; **this stipulation will continue to apply.**
 4. That the applicant provides information on the proposed new siding to be used and all final material specifications for final approval; **this stipulation has been met.**
- c. RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate the existing rear accessory structure approximately 6 feet to the southeast to accommodate a new backyard configuration, to include an inground pool that is eligible for administrative approval. Staff generally finds the request to be appropriate due to its limited distance and retention of the historic development pattern of rear structures in the district. The new side setback is not indicated in the plans. The applicant may be required to obtain a setback variance from the Board of Adjustment.
 - d. STAIR REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove an existing outdoor stair leading to the second story. The applicant has proposed to incorporate an interior staircase to address access and egress. Staff finds the stair removal acceptable.
 - e. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing second story door at the stair landing with a new window to match existing in terms of scale, proportion, configuration, and inset. The awning above the door will also be removed. Staff generally finds the request appropriate, but finds that the door should be retained and reused elsewhere on the structure, or stored on the property. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to remove an existing first floor window and enclose with siding on the back elevation. An existing second story window on this elevation will be retained. Staff generally finds the request acceptable based on its limited visibility from the public right-of-way and the retention of an additional opening, but finds that the window should be retained and reused elsewhere on the structure, or stored on the property. Staff also finds the addition of new sliding doors on an ancillary elevation to be appropriate.
 - f. GARAGE BAY ENCLOSURE – The applicant has proposed to enclose the open garage bay with siding to create interior space. The garage is the single story mass of the rear accessory structure and faces the primary structure. The garage does not serve a driveway, rear alley, or other parking access or configuration and is located to the west of the driveway in the rear yard. Staff finds the enclosure of the garage bay acceptable due to its limited visibility from the public right-of-way and the fact that the remaining elements of the structure, including all walls, the front half circle window, and the vertical trim pieces, will be retained, rendering the intervention reversible.
 - g. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – Based on the submitted documentation, staff has observed evidence of paint stripping and flaking, deteriorated glazing and small nails at joints from previous repairs, and some areas where the bottom rail has begun separating at the joint. However, almost all of the original wood is intact in all cases with very limited evidence of irreversible rot or damage. The joints of the top sashes are in excellent condition with no evidence of slipping or separation. Staff finds that all windows are in repairable condition, with most requiring minimal repair and intervention like re-glazing and painting, along with refitting into the trim and frames.
 - h. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND MAINTENANCE – 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. The historic house already features an inherent barrier in the original wood screens. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. The wood windows were designed specifically for this structure and can accommodate the natural settling and movement of the structure as a whole throughout seasons. Modern replacement products are extremely rigid, often resulting in the creation of gaps, cracks, and major points of air infiltration at the window frames and other areas of the exterior wall plane over time due to material incompatibility when considering the structure as whole integrated system.

- i. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WASTE AND LIFESPAN – 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 and the depletion of natural resources and forests, petroleum-heavy manufacturing methods, transportation, and installation. Finally, window repair and restoration utilizes the local labor and expertise of craftspeople versus off-the-shelf, non-custom composite products. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of original windows whenever possible.
- j. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing windows with new aluminum clad wood windows per the submittal documents. 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 g, staff finds that the windows are in repairable condition, with a majority of them being covered and protected over the past few decades by exterior screens. Staff does not find replacement consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the applicant restores all wood windows in the openings that are not proposed to be modified as noted in findings g through j. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings that reflect the window retention to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That all new windows to be installed in new openings or where non-original windows exist meet the following stipulations: the windows should be wood or fully wood and 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.
- iii. That the applicant retains the existing windows and doors to be removed and reuses them in other openings on the structure, to include the replacement of windows deteriorated beyond repair if applicable, or keeps them onsite for future use as noted in findings e and f.
- iv. That the applicant submits a detailed plan for structure relocation, to include stabilization measures and foundation details for the structure’s new location, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Lisa Lynn-concerns about the scaling of the project.

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

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

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

ITEM 24. HDRC NO. 2021-284
ADDRESS: 225 W ELSMERE PLACE

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Remove the existing side patio and awning on the east elevation.
2. Construct an approximately 285-square-foot, 1-story side addition.
3. Construct an approximately 339-square-foot rear covered patio enclosure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 225 W Elsmere is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1923 in the Spanish Revival style. The property features a clay tile front gable roof, stucco cladding, a second story front porch, original divided lite windows, and a recessed arched entry way. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness or final approval.
- c. **SIDE PATIO REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing side patio and patio awning on the east elevation and replace the patio area with an enclosed sunroom. The property first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map and does not appear to originally feature the side patio awning along the east elevation. Guideline 7.B.ii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that applicants should refrain from enclosing side and rear porches, particularly when connected to the main porch or balcony. Original architectural details should not be obscured by any screening or enclosure materials. Alterations to side and rear porches should result in a space that functions, and is visually interpreted as, a porch. Staff finds that as the existing side patio condition is likely not original to the structure and that removal is appropriate.
- d. **SUNROOM ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story side addition that will extend the front façade to the east and feature a roof top balcony, accessible from the second story. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing approximately 202-square-foot side patio with an approximately 285-square-foot side addition. Guideline 1.B.iv for Additions states that the building footprint should respond to the size of the lot. An appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within historic districts. Residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. According to Guidelines 1.B.i for Additions, residential additions, including porches and balconies, should be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass. Staff finds that while the footprint of the proposed side addition is appropriate, the location of the side addition flush with the front façade wall plane is not consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has provided evidence that the original plans for the structure included a terrace on the east elevation of approximately 146 square feet. Staff finds that the side addition should be set back from the front façade and should be subordinate to the principal façade.
- e. **SUNROOM ADDITION: ROOF** – The applicant has proposed to install a flat roof on the proposed side sunroom addition to accommodate a second-floor balcony. The second-floor balcony will feature patio flooring and will be covered with a canvas awning. The side addition will feature a sloped parapet along the front façade to accommodate the flat roof for the second-floor balcony. Guideline 1.A.iii for Additions states that additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure. As the structure currently features a side patio awning and as the second-floor balcony will not detract from the historic structure, staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- f. **SUNROOM ADDITION: DOOR AND WINDOW REMOVAL: FIRST FLOOR** – The applicant has proposed to extend the new enclosed sunroom to the exterior family room wall on the east elevation. The extension of the east elevation to meet the exterior family room wall will require the removal of a south facing window in the family room. The existing window appears to be an original steel window. Staff finds the removal of an existing window, not visible from the public right-of-way, to accommodate an addition to be appropriate. Staff finds that the window should be salvaged and used in the new addition or stored on the property for future use.
- g. **SUNROOM ADDITION: DOOR AND WINDOW REMOVAL: SECOND FLOOR** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing south facing window on the second floor of the east elevation to accommodate an exterior door from the master bedroom to the proposed second-floor balcony. The existing window appears

to be an original four-over-four wood window. Staff finds the removal of an existing window, not visible from the public right-of-way, to accommodate an addition to be appropriate. Staff finds that the window should be salvaged and used in the new addition or stored on the property for future use.

- h. **SUNROOM ADDITION: NEW WINDOWS: SIZE AND PROPORTION** – The applicant has proposed to install arched windows with non-traditional proportions on the front façade and east elevation of the addition. Staff’s standard window specifications state that new windows should feature traditional dimensions and proportions as found within the district. The applicant’s proposed front façade features 1 new arched window opening and the proposed east façade will feature 3 new arched window openings. Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that applicants should avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. According to Guideline 4.A.ii for Additions, applicants should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found on the original structure should not be used to avoid drawing undue attention to the addition. Staff finds the introduction of a new window opening on the front façade inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. If the sunroom addition is set back from the front façade wall plane, the introduction of the front-facing window will be appropriate. Staff finds that the proposed fenestration pattern on the east elevation is not visible from the public right-of-way and is generally appropriate.
- i. **SUNROOM ADDITION: NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install arched steel windows on the addition. The applicant has not provided detailed material specifications for the proposed window product or material specifications for the proposed new door. Staff finds that steel windows are appropriate and match existing and original windows on the historic structure. Windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. 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 be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- j. **SUNROOM ADDITION: MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed to install stucco cladding on the proposed addition to match existing. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that additions should use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original. Staff finds the proposal appropriate and finds that the applicant should incorporate an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure.
- k. **REAR PATIO INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to install an approximately 339-square-foot rear patio enclosure on the west side of the rear yard featuring arched openings to mimic the proposed enclosed sunroom, a flat red tile roof, and an outdoor fireplace on the west elevation. The property currently features an uncovered brick rear patio area. Guideline 3.B.i for Site Elements states that large pavers or other impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they were not historically located. Guideline 3.B.ii for Site Elements states that new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. According to Guideline 3.A.ii for Site Elements, do not fully remove and replace traditional lawn areas with impervious hardscape. The proposal does not include a request for fenestration modifications at the rear patio enclosure. Staff finds that as the existing rear patio area features hardscaping and that the historic lawn area will not be reduced by more than 50 percent, the proposal is appropriate.
- l. **LANDSCAPING** – At this time, the applicant has not provided a comprehensive landscaping plan to staff for review. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a landscaping plan for the east and rear of the property showing any landscaping modifications as a result of the proposed side addition and rear patio enclosure.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Item 1, staff recommends conceptual approval of the request to remove the existing side porch and awning based on finding c.

Item 2, staff recommends conceptual approval of the side addition based on findings d through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposes a side addition that is set back from the front façade and is subordinate to the principal façade based on finding d and that the applicant incorporates an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure. The applicant is required to submit updated elevation drawings to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.
- ii. That the windows proposed for removal are salvaged and used in the new addition or stored on the property for future use.
- iii. That the applicant submits final material specifications for the proposed new windows and doors to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval. Windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. 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 be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- iv. That the applicant submits a landscaping plan to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding l.

Item 3, staff recommends conceptual approval of the request to construct a rear patio enclosure based on finding k.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society of San Antonio and Paul Kinnoson- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 25. HDRC NO. 2021-265
ADDRESS: 310 FLORIDA ST
APPLICANT: CANTU ERIN ANN

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 7 existing wood windows with a vinyl replacement product.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 310 Florida is a 1-story, single-family home constructed circa 1910. The property first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features a rectangular plan, a pyramidal standing seam metal roof, a deep-set front porch with a front gable detail, Corinthian columns, wood siding, and original one-over-one wood windows. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – Staff conducted a site visit on June 10, 2021 and observed the following conditions: damaged and peeling or chipping paint, broken or missing cords, and loose glass. Some of the existing windows are currently painted shut and some of the existing windows may require reglazing or the reworking of the sashes. The windows do not show signs of significant wood rot, wood damage, or severe deterioration. Staff finds that all windows are in repairable condition, with most requiring minimal repair and intervention like re-glazing and painting, along with refitting into the trim and frames.

- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND MAINTENANCE – 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. The historic house already features an inherent barrier in the wood window screens. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. The wood windows were designed specifically for this structure and can accommodate the natural settling and movement of the structure as a whole throughout seasons. Modern replacement products are extremely rigid, often resulting in the creation of gaps, cracks, and major points of air infiltration at the window frames and other areas of the exterior wall plane over time due to material incompatibility when considering the structure as whole integrated system.
- d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WASTE AND LIFESPAN – 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 and the depletion of natural resources and forests, petroleum-heavy manufacturing methods, transportation, and installation. Finally, window repair and restoration utilizes the local labor and expertise of craftspeople versus off-the-shelf, non-custom composite products. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of original windows whenever possible.
- e. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace 7 existing wood windows with vinyl replacement windows. The windows requested for replacement are located on the east and west side elevations. 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. 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. As noted in finding b, staff finds that the windows are in repairable condition, with a majority of them being covered and protected over the past few decades by exterior screens, band that the replacement product is not appropriate or consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through e.

If the HDRC is compelled to approve window replacement, staff recommends the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs fully wood windows that meet staff’s standard window stipulations 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.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

NAY: None.
ABSENT: Arreola. And Carpenter.

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

ITEM 26. HDRC NO. 2021-225
ADDRESS: 714, 716, 718 LABOR ST
APPLICANT: Anthony Guajardo/Clearsite Construction

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify the existing roof slope to feature a shed profile as well as to replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The one-story, multi-tenant commercial structure at 714, 716, 718 Labor was constructed circa 1960, first appears on a 1963 aerial image, and is located in the Lavaca Historic District. The structure features a low sloping (nearly flat) asphalt roof, a flagstone masonry façade and plastered CMU side elevation walls.
- b. COMPLIANCE – Staff received a report that roof modification had begun on April 28, 2021, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or permits. In coordination with Development Services Department, the applicant submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness Application on May 5, 2021.
- c. PREVIOUS REVIEW – This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the June 2, 2021, HDRC hearing, where it was referred to the Design Review Committee.
- d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 8, 2021. At that meeting the DRC commented on appropriate roof profiles and offered suggestions for roof repair that would not impact the structure’s roof form and profile.
- e. ROOFING – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing roof slope to feature a shed profile as well as to replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B. ii., applicants should preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs when replacement is necessary. Staff finds that the low slope, flat roof is characteristic of the commercial buildings of the era and should be repaired in-kind.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on finding e. Staff recommends in-kind repairs of the existing roof structure.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve the June 2nd, 2021 HDRC meeting minutes and meeting minutes for the Emergency Hearing held on June 2, 2021.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

HDRC mtg minutes 6/16/21

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: The HDRC regular scheduled meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

APPROVED



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

Date: _____

7/8/21