



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 1, 2021**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met in session and via videoconference on Wednesday, September 1, 2021.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:13 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer.

Absent: Zumarán, Bowman, and Laffoon.

\* *Spanish 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:**

- Item # 7 was pulled for discussion by Commission.
- Item #19 was pulled for discussion by applicant request.
- Item # 20 and 25 postponed by applicant.
- Items # 28 was withdrawn by applicant.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Item 3: Scott Albert and several Dignowity neighbors- support staff recommendations.
- Item 4: Scott Albert and several Dignowity neighbors- support staff recommendations.
- Item 6: Rene Niera-supports the improvements made in this project.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

- Item 1, Case No. 2021-431 1007 AVENUE B
- Item 2, Case No. 2021-428 1523 W ROSEWOOD AVE
- Item 3, Case No. 2021-416 515 N MONUMENTAL
- Item 4, Case No. 2021-416 411 N MONUMENTAL
- Item 5, Case No. 2021-424 875 E ASHBY PLACE
- Item 6, Case No. 2021-427 8535 MISSION RD
- Item 8, Case No. 2021-392 510 E GUENTHER ST
- Item 9, Case No. 2021-400 317 WICKES
- Item 10, Case No. 2021-388 N Alamo from E Travis to McCullough; McCullough from N Alamo to Avenue B; Avenue B from McCullough to Roy Smith
- Item 11, Case No. 2021-406 901 CAMDEN ST

- Item 12, Case No. 2021-408      509 E EVERGREEN
- Item 13, Case No. 2021-414      225 W ELSMERE PLACE
- Item 14, Case No. 2021-407      2101 MCCULLOUGH AVE
- Item 15, Case No. 2021-348      815 E MAGNOLIA AVE
- Item 16, Case No. 2021-404      1423 S ELLISON DR
- Item 17, Case No. 2021-409      215 NELSON AVE
- Item 18, Case No. 2021-412      831 E MAGNOLIA AVE

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1-6, and 8-16 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Bowman virtually joined meeting at 3:25pm.*

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:**

**ITEM 7. HDRC NO. 2021-298**  
 ADDRESS: 9290 LESLIE RD  
 APPLICANT: OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION-June Griffins representing owner

**REQUEST:**  
 The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a recommendation from the Historic and Design Review Commission regarding designation of the property at 9290 Leslie Rd.

- FINDINGS:**
- a. On December 17, 2020, the Historic and Design Review Commission approved a Finding of Historic Significance for the property at 9290 Leslie Rd. On June 17, 2021, City Council approved Resolution 2021-06-17-0035R initiating a change in zoning for the property to include a historic landmark overlay. As a step in the zoning process, a recommendation regarding the proposed designation is required from the HDRC.
  - b. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitatio
  - c. City Council has the ultimate authority to approve the historic designation zoning overlay. A recommendation from HDRC will be forwarded to City Council.
  - d. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends that the Historic and Design Review Commission recommend approval of historic landmark designation of 9290 Leslie Rd based on finding a.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Allison Chambers, Bonnie Wright, Nancy Drazé, Tim Drazé, Kimberly Erwillie, Patricia Arcel, Gene Aida, Patricia Hardberger, and Frederica Kushner- support landmark designation.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve landmark designation based on staff's, THC, and AIP findings.  
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 2 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

- *Commissioner Bowman left meeting at 4:00pm*

**ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2021-405**

ADDRESS: 130 WICKES

APPLICANT: Oscar Hernandez/Oscar's Custom Iron Works

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 4-foot tall wrought iron fence in the front yard with a driveway gate.

**FINDINGS:**

- The primary structure at 130 Wickes is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1915 in the Queen Anne style. The home features a primary hipped roof with a front-facing gable, an asymmetrical front porch, and one over one wood windows. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot-high wrought iron front yard fence. 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 Wickes features a mixture of open yards, fenced yards, and yards with low retaining walls, including a similar fence directly across the street. Staff finds a fence appropriate for this area of the historic district based on existing context and front yard conditions.
- FENCE LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the 4-foot-high wrought iron fence around the perimeter of the front yard. A front driveway gate is proposed at the sidewalk. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements states that the appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Fence locations should be consistent with established patterns and driveway gates should be set back from the sidewalk to mitigate the fence's impact on the public right-of-way. The property currently features a privacy gate set back behind the primary historic structure's façade. Staff finds that the driveway gate should be installed at this approximate location to be consistent with the Guidelines. A modification to the opening mechanism to be swinging versus sliding may be required.

- d. **ARCHAEOLOGY** - The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

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

- i. That the driveway gate be relocated behind the front plane of the historic structure as noted in finding c. An updated site plan is required prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the final construction height of the approved gate and fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the gate and fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.
- iii. **ARCHAEOLOGY** - The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Isa Lynn- does not support the case for the fence.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved approve with staff stipulations 2 and 3. If, in the future, the neighbor's side fence is replaced and aligns with the legal property lines, the applicant should return to staff for an updated gate location proposal that sets it back behind the primary structure. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Fish left meeting at 4:30pm.*

**ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2021-357**  
ADDRESS: 611 MUNCEY  
APPLICANT: Felix Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio PLLC

**REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1.5-story, single-family residential structure on the vacant lot at 611 Muncey, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1.5-story, single-family residential structure on the vacant lot at 611 Muncey, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – This lot is currently void of any structures. This block of Muncey currently features eight existing structures, including new construction, that all feature 1-story in height. Generally, structures on the west side of the street that are orientated towards Muncey feature a uniform setback.
- c. **PREVIOUS REVIEW / DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on August 4, 2021. At that hearing, the Commission referred this request to

the Design Review Committee. This request was reviewed by the DRC on August 10, 2021. At that meeting, Committee members comments on materials, fenestration profiles and design elements. Committee members provided feedback regarding contemporary interpretations of historic architectural elements.

- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback that is to be generally aligned with the front setbacks of the structures found historically on the block that are oriented toward Muncey; however, the exact setback is not clear per the application documents. OHP staff will field verify that the setback is consistent with the Guidelines and that of the neighboring structure at 615 Muncey.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. primary building entrances should be orientated towards the primary street. The proposed entrance orientation is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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. 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 Muncey features all one-story structures. The applicant has proposed 1.5 stories in height and an overall height of 28' – 8 ½". The applicant has submitted a street elevation noting the proposed new construction in context with existing and historic structures on the block. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing to be appropriate as the one story massing of the house will be aligned with the existing structures. An increased setback may further reduce the structure's perceived massing in relationship to the historic structures on the block.
- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of 1' – 6". Staff finds the proposed foundation height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed a number of roofs, including front and side facing gabled roofs, and a shed porch roof. The proposed roof forms are found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant has noted a total building footprint of 1,453 square feet. The lot features 5,056 square feet. The proposed lot coverage of 29% is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite board and batten siding, sealed cedar plank siding, corten corrugated metal siding, steel columns, a standing seam metal roof, and wood windows. Staff finds the installation of composite board and batten siding and a standing seam metal roof to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines as well as historic examples found within the district. Staff finds that board and batten siding should feature a smooth finish, boards that are twelve (12) inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½" in width. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed standing seam metal roof should feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam. A low profile ridge cap can be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction. Staff does not find the use of corten corrugated siding, cedar plank siding and steel columns to be consistent with the Guidelines, as these materials as not found historically within the district in single-family residential construction.

- k. MATERIALS (Windows) – The applicant has proposed to install Jeld-Wen wood windows. Staff finds the installation of wood windows to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed windows should be consistent with staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction (noted in the applicable citations).
- l. FENESTRATION PROFILE – The applicant has proposed fenestration profiles that feature large, picture windows as well as fixed windows. While the applicant has proposed individually scaled window openings to be sized consistently with those found historically within the district, the proposed windows do not feature operable, one over one sashes, as recommended in staff’s standards for windows in new construction. Additionally, the applicant has proposed large, picture windows that do not feature separating mullions and operable sashes. Staff finds that the applicant should propose fenestration profiles that feature individual windows with operable sashes. On the front and side elevations, larger window openings should be separated by mullions and feature individual window openings with windows that feature operable top and bottom sashes in a one over one profile. Staff’s recommended profile is noted at “*Front elevation study – ALTERNATE*” in the application documents.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate as they relate to massing and roof forms. Staff finds that materials and fenestration profiles should be amended as noted in findings j and l, to be consistent with the Guidelines and staff’s standards.
- n. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a concrete ribbon strip driveway. The applicant has noted an overall width of ten (10) feet with a middle strip of decomposed granite. The driveway is proposed on the south side of the lot. This block of Muncey primarily features informal driveway conditions on both the north and south sides of structures. Staff finds the proposed driveway proposal to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- o. FRONT WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a concrete front walkway leading from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. The applicant has noted a walkway that is to feature four (4) feet in width. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided landscaping information on the proposed site plan noting the installation of grass throughout the front and rear yards. Staff finds this to be appropriate. Grass should also be included in the right of way strip between the public sidewalk and curb.
- q. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, front yard chain link fencing with a new, hog wire fence to feature four (4) feet in height. The applicant has also proposed side and rear privacy fencing to feature six (6) feet in height. Staff finds the installation of fencing to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed front yard fence should turn at the driveway and feature a driveway gate that is set back from the front façade plane of the new construction.
- r. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has proposed to place mechanical equipment on the north side of the proposed new construction. Staff finds that all mechanical equipment should be screened from view from the public right of way, per the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends final approval based on findings a through q with the following stipulations:

- i. That the front setback be equal to or greater than that of the historic structure at 615 Muncey, and that field verification be required prior to the issuance of a COA. **(The applicant has agreed to this stipulation.)**
- ii. That board and batten siding feature a smooth finish, boards that are twelve (12) inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½” in width. Additionally, staff recommends that the proposed 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 standard galvalume finish and a crimped ridge seam. **(The applicant has agreed to this stipulation.)**

- iii. That the proposed corrugated steel siding, steel columns and cedar siding be eliminated and that materials that are consistent with the Guidelines and those found historically within the district be used.
- iv. That the proposed wood windows adhere to staff's standard specifications, as noted in finding k and in the applicable citations. **(The applicant has agreed to this stipulation.)**
- v. That fenestration profiles be modified as noted in findings l and m. Windows should feature individual heights and widths that are comparable to those found historically within the district. Windows should feature operable sashes in a one over one profile.
- vi. That grass or fully landscaped greenspace is installed in the right of way strip between the sidewalk and curb, that the proposed fence turn at the driveway and feature a driveway gate that is set back behind the front façade of the new construction and that all mechanical equipment is screened from view from the public right of way. **(The applicant has agreed to this stipulation.)**

A foundation inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that foundation setbacks and heights are consistent with the approved design. The inspection is to occur after the installation of form work and prior to the installation of foundation materials.

A standing seam metal roof inspection is to be schedule with OHP staff to ensure that roofing materials are consistent with approved design. An industrial ridge cap is not to be used.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Scott Albert and several Dignowity Hills Neighbors- case should be further reviewed and shouldn't have so many stipulations.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations except 3 and 5. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** **The MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES. 2 NAYS. 4 ABSENT.**

**ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2021-413**  
 ADDRESS: 245 E COMMERCE ST  
 APPLICANT: Todd Olson

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Install gates and fencing featuring eight (8) feet in height on the property including both the street and River Walk levels.
2. Install garage doors at the River Walk level.

There are application documents that reference the installation of seating at the river level within an existing planter. This scope of work is not part of this request.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant has proposed to install fencing, garage doors and outdoor seating at 245 E Commerce, located within the River Improvement Overlay. There are application documents that reference the installation of seating at the river level within an existing planter. This scope of work is not part of this request.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 25, 2021. At that meeting, Committee members expressed concern regarding the installation of outdoor seating in existing planters, historic or not. Committee members noted that they found the proposed garage doors to be appropriate and were generally supportive of fencing on site.
- c. FENCING & GATES – The applicant has proposed to install a number of fences and gates at the river and street levels. The proposed gates will be wrought iron. Staff finds the proposed gates to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC; however, staff finds that fencing should not exceed six (6) feet in height. Should the Commission approve a height in excess of six (6) feet, a variance from the Board of Adjustment may be required.
- d. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed to install garage doors at the River Walk level to enclose the existing arcade after hours for security purposes. The garage doors will feature metal frames with contemporary profiles. The doors will be set within the exiting openings. Generally, staff finds the proposed doors to be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #2, the installation of site gates and fencing with the stipulation that the proposed gates and fencing do not exceed six (6) feet in height, as noted in finding d.
- 2. Staff recommends conceptual approval of item #3, the installation of garage doors at the River Walk level as noted in finding e.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velasquez moved for conceptual approval as submitted. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2021-435**  
 ADDRESS: 820 NOLAN ST  
 APPLICANT: Eric Esopinal/WALNUT COMPANY INVESTMENTS LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace all existing windows at 820 Nolan with aluminum clad wood windows. The proposed replacement includes the replacement of eleven, 2 over 2 wood windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace all existing windows at 820 Nolan with aluminum clad wood windows. The proposed replacement includes the replacement of eleven, 2 over 2 wood windows. The applicant has provided cost estimates for repair of the existing wood windows.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – OHP staff performed a site visit on June 25, 2021, and on August 16, 2021, and at both site visits found the historic wood windows to be in a repairable condition. Staff finds that the proposed vinyl windows in both the historic structure and the rear additions are eligible for replacement; however, staff finds that they should be replaced with a product that conforms with staff’s standards for replacement windows. The submitted product is not consistent with the Guidelines, as the profile and material are not consistent with the existing, two over two wood windows.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. Staff recommends that all existing, 2 over 2 wood windows be repaired. The non-original vinyl windows may be replaced; however, they should be replaced with a window that is consistent with staff’s standards for historic window replacement.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Scott Albert- and several Dignowity Hills Neighbors- supports staff recommendations.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velasquez moved to keep 3 windows that are in decent shape and the rest of the windows be 2X2 aluminum clad wood windows and revert back window original sizes, and meet staff’s requirements.  
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 24. HDRC NO. 2021-383**  
ADDRESS: 111 LABOR ST  
APPLICANT: Chip Collins/Alamo Architects

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend a previously approved design regarding the installation of composite windows and the recessing of windows within walls where installed with composite siding.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend a previously approved design regarding the installation of composite windows and the recessing of windows within walls where installed with composite siding.
- b. PREVIOUSLY APPROVAL – The applicant received an amended Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic and Design Review Commission on February 19, 2020, for approval to change the approved windows from fiberglass to aluminum, reduce the overall height of the proposed new construction, reduce the previously approved amount of brick cladding, and to increase the height of the proposed structured parking with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant incorporate screening elements into the design of the proposed parking structure’s exposed precast panels. Visual separation should be created on this façade.
  - ii. That all windows feature a recess within walls.
  - iii. That the proposed surface parking on Garfield feature both buffering and screening elements including fencing and landscaping materials.
  - iv. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.
- c. **WINDOW & INSTALLATION DEPTH** – The applicant has proposed to install an Anderson composite window product. As proposed, the product features a nailing fin which prohibits its installation within walls. Staff finds the installation of the proposed window to be appropriate regarding profile; however, staff finds that the windows should be inset within walls to prevent an installed window profile that protrudes from the wall of the new construction. There should be a minimum of 2” 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. All windows should be supplied in a block frame and exclude nailing fins which limit the ability to sufficiently recess the windows.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed composite window with the stipulation that all windows installed within openings at composite siding be recessed within walls to be consistent with Staff’s Standard Specifications for Windows in New Construction. There should be a minimum of 2” 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. All windows should be supplied in a block frame and exclude nailing fins which limit the ability to sufficiently recess the windows.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

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

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

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

**ITEM 26. HDRC NO. 2021-198**  
**ADDRESS: 324 GARFIELD ST**  
**APPLICANT: Michael Pena/Open Studio Architecture PLLC**

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting final approval to construct a new 2.5-story primary residential structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting final approval to construct a new 2.5-story residential structure.

- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – The applicant received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on July 7, 2021. The approval carried the following stipulations:
1. That the applicant reduces the height to 2.5-stories to be more consistent with the prevailing scale of adjacent historic structures and the historic block face as noted in finding 2d; **this stipulation has been partially met.**
  2. That the applicant explores ways to reduce the plate heights to further minimize the overall height of the structure wherever possible; **this stipulation has been partially met.**
  3. That the applicant submits a street elevation of the block to place the proposed structure in context with historic structures on the block face as noted in finding 2d; this stipulation has been met.
  4. That the applicant further develops the gable roof form and detailing to be more consistent with historic precedents in the district as noted in finding 2f; **this stipulation has not been met.**
  5. That the applicant modifies the proposed porch design and shed roof detailing to reduce the fascia height and visual bulk of the support elements as noted in finding 2f; **this stipulation has been met.**
  6. That the windows feature a true ganged condition. All windows must be fully wood or aluminum clad wood and feature a one over one configuration. 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 concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening; **this stipulation will continue to apply for final approval.**
- sanantoseams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth without striation or corrugation. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. An on-site inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications; **this stipulation will continue to apply for final approval.**
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant met virtually with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on February 10, April 28, May 11, and June 22, 2021. The applicant also met with the DRC on a site visit conducted on March 30, 2021. Over the course of the DRC meetings, the applicant received feedback to reduce the overall height of the structure to be more in keeping with the immediate surrounding neighbors; to modify the roof forms to be more consistent with historic precedents; to explore window patterns that align with historic precedents; and to provide site studies that show the proposed building in context. The DRC also supported the demolition of the existing structure due to its substantial modifications over time, leaving little original material left, if any. The DRC recognized the inherent site restraints of the existing short and narrow lot and was generally favorable of the proposed new structure’s footprint and siting. The applicant met virtually with the DRC on July 27, 2021, after receiving conceptual approval from the HDRC. The applicant presented a revised design that incorporated stipulations from conceptual approval and very closely aligns with the current proposal for final approval. The DRC found the updated design generally favorable, including the minor height reduction, roofline modifications, façade modifications, and updates to the porch design.
- d. **DEMOLITION** – The structure currently located at 324 Garfield is a 1-story primary residential structure. The structure features a gable roof form with a low-sloping front porch, simple wood square columns, composite siding, aluminum windows, and an asphalt shingle roof. The structure is located within the Lavaca Historic District. The demolition of the structure was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on July 7, 2021.
- e. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic

example found on the site or block. The applicant has proposed to construct a new 2.5-story residential structure, to be sited along Garfield. Based on the submitted site plans and renderings, the front setback will largely be on the zero lot line and will immediately engage with the sidewalk, which is consistent with the precedent set by the existing structure to be demolished as well as the structures in the immediate vicinity. The setbacks and orientation largely reflect the existing conditions on site. Staff generally finds the setbacks and orientation consistent with the Guidelines.

- f. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The primary front entrance to the building is located on Garfield and is indicated visually by a covered front porch. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent.
- g. **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 existing structure is 1-story in height. Most historic structures in the immediate vicinity on the block face feature either one or one and a half stories of height, with newer structures reaching two to two-and-a-half stories near major intersections, as well as on Lavaca St to the south of Garfield. The applicant has proposed a 2.5-story structure with a maximum height of 30’-6”. The applicant has reduced the overall height of the building by approximately one foot to two feet since receiving conceptual approval. According to the Guidelines, 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. 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%. The existing southern block face of Garfield features exclusively single-story structures. One structure, immediately adjacent to the lot to the east, features the tallest overall height on the block face, created by a 2-story rear addition. Staff finds that the proposed 3-story structure exceeds the majority of historic buildings by two stories, which is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a 1- or 2-story structure, or structure that increases in scale towards the rear of the lot, would be appropriate for the prevailing existing context of the site and immediate vicinity. Staff also finds that the applicant should submit a street elevation of Garfield to place the proposed structure in context with historic structures on the block face.
- h. **FOOTPRINT** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. Staff generally finds the proposed footprint to be consistent with existing precedents for structures in the vicinity, which largely feature a structure-to-lot ratio that exceeds 50% coverage.
- i. **ROOF FORM & PORCH** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, roof forms that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block should be incorporated in terms of pitch, overhangs, and orientation. The applicant has proposed a primary gable roof form with a subordinate dormer roof detail to accommodate the interior stair and the third story. A portion of the roof will be a trellis that accommodates an outdoor porch. The front porch massing is proposed to be 2-story in height with a low-sloping shed roof and simple square columns. Staff generally finds the primary gable form and shed roof to be consistent with the block and area historic precedents, but finds that the primary roofline of the structure covering the third-story porch element should be further defined to be more in keeping with historic gable forms, designs, and materiality in the district.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed a fenestration pattern with several paired windows and single windows that feature a one over one configuration and trim detailing, proportions, and inset that generally appear consistent with historic precedents. Staff finds that the paired windows should be designed to feature a true ganged condition. The windows should be consistent with staff’s standard window stipulations as listed in the recommendation.
- k. **LOT COVERAGE** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, new buildings should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. As noted in findings 2a and 2d, the footprint

of the structure is generally consistent with the massing of the existing structure and historic structures with similar lot configurations in the vicinity as noted in finding e.

- l. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to incorporate an exterior material palette of woodlap siding, wood windows, wood porch elements, and a standing seam metal roof. Staff generally finds the materials to be appropriate.
- m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district or vicinity. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in natural and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Overall, staff generally finds the proposal consistent with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend final approval of the new construction at this time based on findings a through m. If the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) finds the new construction request appropriate and recommends final approval, staff recommends that the following stipulations apply:

- i. That the applicant reduces the height to be more consistent with the prevailing scale of adjacent historic structures and the historic block face as noted in finding g.
- ii. That the applicant reduces the plate heights to further minimize the overall height of the structure wherever possible.
- iii. That the applicant submits a street elevation of Garfield to place the proposed structure in context with historic structures on the block face as noted in finding g.
- iv. That the applicant further develops the gable roof form and detailing to be more consistent with historic precedents in the district as noted in finding i.
- v. That the windows feature a true ganged condition. All windows must be fully wood or aluminum clad wood and feature a one over one configuration. 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 concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- vi. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof featuring panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth without striation or corrugation. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. An on-site inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications.
- vii. If a composite siding product is to be used for siding or skirting, the product shall feature a smooth finish with a maximum reveal of 6 inches. A faux grain texture is not permitted. All material specifications must be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations 5-7.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 27. HDRC NO. 2021-418**  
**ADDRESS: 126 E MISTLETOE**  
**APPLICANT: Jay Louden/Work5hop**

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing standing seam metal roof, to include a vented ridge cap and end cap. The work was completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or permit.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 126 E Mistletoe is a 1-story residential-form structure constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features a wraparound front porch, wood windows, and woodlap siding. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **ROOF REPLACEMENT** – The applicant is requesting a post-work approval for a new standing seam metal roof with a vented ridge cap and end cap. Historically, Folk Victorian structures predominantly featured wood shingle or standing seam metal roofing. Based on the existing standing seam metal roof, staff finds a replacement metal roof acceptable for the structure, but finds that the applicant should adhere to staff’s standard stipulations for new metal roofs, including a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration for the ridge with no vented ridge or end caps.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the request as proposed. Staff recommends approval of the roof replacement based on findings a and b with the following stipulations:

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve as submitted and added stipulations and remove the in-cap to follow interior gable line.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Fernandez, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Grube, Carpenter, and Fetzer.

NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Fish, Zumarán, Bowman, and Laffoon.

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

**ITEM 29.     HDRC NO. 2021-415**  
ADDRESS: 330 W AGARITA AVE  
APPLICANT: GRITTE CHRISTIAN & ANNDEE

**REQUEST:**  
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing front side yard fence with a 4-foot-tall horizontal wood privacy fence.

- FINDINGS:**
- a.     The primary structure located at 330 W Agarita is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1940. The structure features a cross gable composition shingle roof with a low-sloped front gable, a prominent brick chimney on the front façade, horizontal cladding, divided lite window screens, and faux shutters. The property features a 4-foot-tall side wood privacy fence. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
  - b.     **SIDE YARD FENCE REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing 4-foot-tall side yard wood privacy fence that extends to the front property line with a 4-foot-tall horizontal wood privacy fence. Guideline 2.C.i for Site Elements states that privacy fences should be set back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence. Additionally, Guideline 2.C.ii for Site Elements advises not to use privacy fences in front yards. The Unified Development Code (UDC) allows for solid privacy fencing at a maximum height of 3 feet. Staff finds that the existing front side yard fencing is a non-compliant condition that is not consistent with the Guidelines or the UDC. The adjacent property is a vacant lot and the solid fencing is appropriate for screening purposes. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the height of the proposed replacement fencing to 3 feet or install an open fence design at the request 4 feet in height.

- RECOMMENDATIONS:**  
Staff recommends approval of the front side yard fence replacement based on findings a through b with the following stipulations:
- i.     That the applicant installs solid fencing at a maximum height of 3 feet or an open fence design at a maximum height of 4 feet. The applicant is required to submit updated material specifications and a site plan showing the fence location to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
  - ii.    That the fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:**     Commissioner Grube moved to approve as submitted added stipulation that the fence do not exceed 4ft in front, and 6ft ft in rear of the lot and have vertical fencing..  
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**        AYE: Fernandez, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer

NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Fish, Zumarán, Bowman, and Laffoon.

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

**ITEM 30. HDRC NO. 2021-426**  
ADDRESS: 455 MARY LOUISE  
APPLICANT: Teresa Hill/HILL ROBERT C & TERESA

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing divided lite side entry door with a fiberglass door.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 455 Mary Louise is a 1-story, single-family home constructed circa 1930. It first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The structure features a red tile hip roof with a prominent, steeply pitched front gable with wood gable end detailing, light-colored brick cladding, a castellated front porch parapet, decorative limestone porch entry surround, decorative brick window surrounds, and true divided lite windows. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. SIDE DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing divided lite side entry door with a fiberglass door with half-lite glass featuring internal blinds. According to the applicant the existing side entry door has energy efficiency and security issues; the side entry door no longer fits properly within the frame and the deadbolts do not engage. Guideline 6.B.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that doors should be replaced in-kind when possible and when deteriorated beyond repair. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, ensure features match the size, material, and profile of the historic element. Based on the submitted materials, staff finds that the existing side entry door is not deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through b.

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

- i. That the applicant installs a replacement door that matches the existing side entry door in material, size, and profile. The replacement door must not feature faux divided lites or internal blinds. The applicant is required to submit updated material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The existing screen door should be retained.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with stipulation that the door be replaced in-kind. Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 31. HDRC NO. 2021-395**  
ADDRESS: 2511 N FLORES ST  
APPLICANT: Natalia Quesada

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a front yard fence.
2. Install front porch handrails.
3. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 2511 N Flores is a 2-story, multi-family residence constructed circa 1925 in the Foursquare style. The home features a primary hipped roof configuration, vinyl siding, a full-width front porch on the first story, and an enclosed front porch with ganged windows on the second story. The property is an individually designated local landmark. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification.
- b. COMPLIANCE – Per the application materials for Historic Tax Certification and Verification submitted on July 21, 2021, staff found that several scopes of work were completed prior to or outside of approval. The property received OHP and HDRC approval for a variety of rehabilitation work that was completed between 2020 and 2021. The applicant is requesting approval of these scopes of work that were completed prior to approval so that the property will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive.
- c. FRONT YARD FENCE INSTALLATION: LOCATION – The property currently features a 4-foot-high wood-post split rail front yard fencing that was installed prior to approval. The fencing extends from the front yard and turns at the driveway to terminate behind the front façade wall plane to enclose the small side yard on the north side of the property. 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. The property is an individual landmark and is not within a historic district, staff finds the proposal generally appropriate.
- d. FRONT YARD FENCE INSTALLATION: DESIGN – The applicant is requesting approval for the previously installed 4-foot-high wood-post split rail front yard fencing. Guideline 2.B.i for Site Elements states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. The design of the fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Staff finds that the wood-post split rail front yard fencing is not appropriate for the historic structure. Staff finds that the applicant should install a more appropriate front yard fence design, such as wood picket fencing, wrought iron fencing, or wood-framed cattle panel fencing.
- e. FRONT PORCH HANDRAILING INSTALLATION – The front porch currently features wood handrailing that was installed prior to approval. Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that replacement elements should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Do not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance. Staff finds the material and design of the installed handrailing to be appropriate.
- f. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification. The scope of work includes foundation repair, roof replacement, window repair and window replacement, siding repair, exterior painting, plumbing, electrical, and mechanical systems upgrades, landscaping, and a comprehensive interior remodel.
- g. Staff conducted a site visit on August 11, 2021, to examine the conditions of the property. Staff verifies that all work used to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive has been completed. There are scopes

of work that were completed without HDRC or OHP approval. The applicant is seeking approval for the previously unapproved scopes of work to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive. Once the property is in compliance, the applicant is eligible to return to the HDRC to request Historic Tax Verification.

- h. The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, staff recommends approval of front yard fence installation based on findings c through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant installs front yard fencing that is appropriate for the structure, such as wood picket fencing, wrought iron fencing, or wood-framed cattle panel fencing based on finding d. Updated material specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the final construction height of the approved fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the front porch handrailing installation based on finding e with the following stipulation:

- i. That the railings at the front porch are fully wood and 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 steps. Both top and bottom rails should be constructed from 2"x4" members. The proposed railing should not feature an overall height of more than three (3) feet. The applicant must submit evidence that the installed handrails meet this stipulation to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 3, staff recommends approval of Historic Tax Certification based on findings f through h with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant removes the existing front yard fencing or installs appropriate HDRC-approved front yard fencing prior to receiving the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive. The applicant will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive and may return to the HDRC to request Historic Tax Verification once property has come into compliance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve handling porch as submitted, and porch does not exceed 4ft in front and towards the rear of the lot can be 6ft and return to staff. Fence design be approved by OHP staff. And include item 3.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the August 18th, 2021, HDRC meeting minutes. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

**ADJOURNMENT:** The HDRC regular scheduled meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

APPROVED



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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

9/15/21