



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**October 06, 2021**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, October 06, 2021 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

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

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Zumarán, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

Absent: Fernandez, Arreola, Carpenter, and Bowman.

\* *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:**

- A new Historic Preservation Specialist came on board with Office of Historic Preservation, Hannah Leighner.
- Items # 14, 26, 27 and 30 were withdrawn by applicant.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Item 5: Bianca Maldonado supports staff recommendations based on staff's findings a-f.
- Item 3: Lulu Francois and several Dignowity neighbors, supports the case.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve the September 1st, 2021, HDRC meeting minutes. Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Zumarán, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

NAY: None

ABSENT: Fernandez, Arreola, Carpenter, and Bowman.

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

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

- |                              |                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| ○ Item 1, Case No. 2021-489  | 234 YUCCA ST        |
| ○ Item 2, Case No. 2021-492  | 1502 BUENA VISTA ST |
| ○ Item 3, Case No. 2021-467  | 903 LABOR ST        |
| ○ Item 4, Case No. 2021-476  | 223 S ALAMO ST      |
| ○ Item 5, Case No. 2021-422  | 2043 W SUMMIT AVE   |
| ○ Item 6, Case No. 2021-437  | 725 E GUENTHER ST   |
| ○ Item 7, Case No. 2021-463  | N Palmetto ROW      |
| ○ Item 8, Case No. 2021-487  | 430 E MYRTLE        |
| ○ Item 9, Case No. 2021-488  | 216 LAVACA ST       |
| ○ Item 10, Case No. 2021-486 | 327 W COMMERCE ST   |
| ○ Item 11, Case No. 2021-481 | 301 ALAMO PLAZA     |
| ○ Item 12, Case No. 2021-454 | 178 THORAIN BLVD    |

- Item 13, Case No. 2021-461                    214 W ROSEWOOD AVE
- Item 15, Case No. 2021-490                    323 DEVINE ST
- Item 16, Case No. 2021-485                    304 E TRAVIS ST
- Item 17, Case No. 2021-482                    420 BROADWAY

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 1-13 and 15-17 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:**

**ITEM 18.        HDRC NO. 2021-472**  
                   ADDRESS: 114 PARKVIEW DR  
                   APPLICANT: HMI Homes, LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Cover the existing wood siding with 4” Dutch lap siding.
2. Replace the existing aluminum window at the front of the house with a wood window.
3. Enclose three (3) existing windows on an existing rear addition
4. Enlarge the existing front door opening and replace the existing front door.
5. Remove the existing metal awning above the front porch and construct a new wooden front porch.

**FINDINGS:**

- a.        The primary structure located at 114 Parkview Drive is a 1-story residential structure with Craftsman architectural influences including exposed rafter tails and a covered front porch. The structure also features wood siding, a combination of vinyl, aluminum and wood windows. The structure is contributing to the Mission Historic District.
- b.        COVERING EXISTING SIDING – The primary structure currently features three (3) different styles of wood siding including 4” Dutch lap siding on the original part of the house, 6” Dutch lap siding on the middle section of the house, and 1”x6” wood boards at the rear addition. The applicant is requesting to cover all of the existing wood siding with 4” Dutch lap siding to create a uniform appearance. Staff performed a site visit on September 27, 2021 and observed the existing siding to be in various states of deterioration and missing in several parts of the home. Per the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations B.i, existing siding that is in good condition should be retained and repaired in place. Staff finds that removing the existing historic siding on sections A and B as noted in the exhibits and installing new wood 4” Dutch lap siding as proposed in these areas is an appropriate treatment in this instance. The existing wood siding on section C as noted in the exhibits may be covered by 4” Dutch lap siding as proposed.
- c.        WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant is requesting to replace one (1) existing aluminum window located on the front of the primary structure with a wood window to match the existing wood window located to the right side of the front door. Per the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii, replace non-historic incompatible windows with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that replacing the existing aluminum window with a wood window to be consistent with the guidelines.
- d.        FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The applicant is requesting to remove three (3) existing aluminum windows on the rear addition and cover the openings with 4” Dutch lap siding. Guidelines 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that filling in historic door or window openings should be avoided. However, the existing windows are non-historic aluminum frame windows, and are located on a later

addition. Staff does not find that the removal of these windows will negatively impact the integrity of the primary structure. Staff finds the request appropriate.

- e. **FRONT DOOR REPLACEMENT** – The applicant is requesting to replace the existing front door with a 36” x 80” fiberglass Craftsman door. The existing door is likely not original to the structure as it is a contemporary material and appearance. Per the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, Replace doors, hardware, fanlight, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures 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. Staff finds that the proposed style of the door to be consistent with the Craftsman features of the primary structure and finds that the door should be solid wood or a salvaged wood door where possible.
- f. **FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant is requesting to remove the existing metal awning and construct an offset front gable porch cover with wood posts. Per the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., reconstruct porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Many of the adjacent homes with similar architectural features exhibit an offset front gable porch cover. Staff finds that the introduction of this element is an appropriate treatment.
- g. **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS** – The applicant has included wood window repair and painting in their application. These items are eligible for administrative approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff recommends approval of items 1-5 with the following stipulations:

- i. That the existing historic wood siding be removed and replaced with 4” Dutch lap wood siding versus being covered by new siding.
- ii. That the applicant provide staff with product specifications of the proposed wood window prior to the issuance of the COA.
- iii. That the proposed front door be wood to be consistent with the design guidelines.
- iv. That the front porch columns be no thicker than 6” square, feature chamfered corners and top and bottom trim.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations 2,3,4 and added stipulation that applicant work with staff on design and dimensions of the door and drawings before issuing a COA.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2021-493**  
ADDRESS: 419.423. and 427 N MESQUITE ST  
APPLICANT: Peggy Brimhall/Figurd

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct three, 2-story, single-family residential structures and one, 2-story accessory structure on the vacant lots at 419, 423, and 427 N Mesquite. These lots are located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting A Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct three, 2-story, single family residential structures and one, 2-story accessory structure on the vacant lots at 419, 423, and 427 N Mesquite. These lots are located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – This request received conceptual approval at the September 21, 2021, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
- i. That the applicant orient the corner structure toward Dawson, as noted in finding e.
  - ii. That the front setback for the corner structure be equal to or greater than those found historically at 526 Dawson, as noted in finding f. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - iii. That the applicant take measures to reduce the overall height of the proposed new construction as much as possible, as noted in finding h. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - iv. That composite siding feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. Composite siding used in a board and batten profile should feature boards that are 12 inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½” wide. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction. This stipulation is to apply for all structures, including the accessory structure.
  - v. That windows be installed that adhere to staff’s standards for windows in new construction, as noted in findings m and t. This stipulation is to apply for all structures, including the accessory structure. vi. That all square, fixed windows are eliminated and replaced with larger windows that feature a one over one profile with operable sashes, and that a side window be added within the front porch massing of houses A and C.
  - vii. That all columns feature six (6) inches square with capital and base trim and that gable returns be eliminated from the proposed design. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - viii. That the roof form, fenestration profile and setback of the proposed accessory structure be modified as noted in finding r.
  - ix. That the applicant submit a detailed landscaping plan when returning to the Commission for final approval and that all mechanical equipment is screened from view from the public right of way.
  - x. That the applicant attend a Design Review Committee meeting prior to attending a hearing for final approval. **Added by the HDRC.**
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 28, 2021.
- d. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – The lots addressed as 419, 423 and 427 N Mesquite are located at the corner of N Mesquite and Dawson Street. The 500 block of Dawson as well as the 400 block of N Mesquite both feature only one story residential structures.
- e. EXISTING LOTS – There are currently three lots where as previously, only two lots existed.
- f. ORIENTATION – Per the Guidelines for New Construction, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed the primary orientation of the corner structure (427 N Mesquite) to face N Mesquite. Staff finds that the corner structure’s entrance and porch should be oriented toward Dawson to be consistent with the historic development pattern of the block; corner structures on Dawson are oriented toward Dawson.
- g. SETBACKS (Dawson) – The applicant has noted a setback on Dawson Street of approximately twenty-five (25) feet from the property line and sidewalk, to align with the front façade of the historic structure to the immediate west (526 Dawson). Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. OHP staff will field verify that the setback is consistent with the Guidelines and that of the neighboring structure at 526 Dawson.
- h. SETBACKS (N Mesquite) – The applicant has noted a setback on N Mesquite of approximately 7’ – 9” from the property line and sidewalk. The applicant has noted that the front setback of each structure on N Mesquite will be equal to that of the the setback of the historic structure on the block. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- i. SCALE & MASS – As noted in finding d, The 500 block of Dawson as well as the 400 block of N Mesquite both feature only one story residential structures. 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. As previously noted, the applicant has proposed three, 2-story residential structures and one, 2-story accessory structure. The applicant has proposed overall heights for the residential structures of 28’ – 6”, 31’ – 6” and 31’ – 3”. The applicant has proposed an overall height for the accessory structure of 22’ – 1”. While staff finds two stories in height to be appropriate; staff finds that the applicant should take measures to reduce the overall height of the proposed new construction as much as possible such as modifying open end gabled roofs to clipped gabled roofs and reducing.

- j. 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 noted foundation heights of twelve (12) inches minimum for each structure. Foundation heights found historically on this block feature between two (2) and three (3) feet in height. Staff finds that a foundation height of at least one (1) foot is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. 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 noted foundation heights of twelve (12) inches minimum for each structure. Foundation heights found historically on this block feature between two (2) and three (3) feet in height. Staff finds that a foundation height of at least one (1) foot is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- l. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed for each residential structure to feature a combination of front, side and rear gabled roofs. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate. m. 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 the proposed lot coverage for all three lots. The proposed lot coverage for all three lots, including house A and the associated accessory structure are consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding in both a lap and board and batten profile and standing seam metal roofs. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that composite siding should feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. Composite siding used in a board and batten profile should feature boards that are 12 inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½” wide. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
- o. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed aluminum windows. At this time, the applicant has not provided window product information for staff to review. Staff finds that a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction should be installed. If a non-wood or non-aluminum clad wood window is to be proposed, the applicant should submit detailed application documents to support the proposed window.
- p. FENESTRATION PROFILE – Generally, staff finds that the applicant has proposed fenestration patterns that are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that all square, fixed windows should be modified to feature larger profiles and operable sashes. Grouped windows should be separated by a mullion of approximately six (6) inches in width.
- q. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, staff finds that as noted in findings o and p, fenestration profiles should be modified to be consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found within the district. Additionally, staff finds that all columns should feature six (6) inches square with capital and base trim.
- r. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed an accessory structure between buildings A and B to feature a footprint of approximately 235 square feet and two stories in height. The applicant has proposed for the accessory structure to feature a shed roof and a front facing garage door.
- s. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The Guidelines for New Construction note that accessory structure should be visually subordinate to the primary structure on the lot, should be no larger in plan that 40 percent of the primary structure, should relate to the period of construction of the primary structure on the lot, should feature similar window and door openings as those found historically and should feature garage doors similar in proportion to those found historically within the district. Additionally, the Guidelines note that the location of accessory structures on site should be consistent with those found historically within the district; towards the rear of the lot. Generally, staff finds the proposed accessory structure to be appropriate; however, staff finds that fenestration should be added and that fenestration should be consistent with that found historically within the district.
- t. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE (Materials) – The applicant has proposed composite lap siding and a standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that composite siding should feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
- u. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE (Window Materials) –The applicant has not noted window materials at this time. Staff finds that a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction should be installed.
- v. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed a concrete paver walkway to lead from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. Staff finds the proposed walkway to be appropriate; however, staff finds that it should be poured concrete and feature three to four feet in width, per the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- w. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted a detailed landscaping plan noting planting and landscaping materials. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping to be appropriate.

- x. FENCING – The applicant has noted the installation of fencing on site to include both hog wire fencing and cedar privacy fencing. Staff finds both fencing proposals to be appropriate; however, fencing should not exceed four (4) feet in height within the front yard (in front of the front façade, including the recessed porch). Privacy fencing should not exceed six (6) feet in height.
- y. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the location of mechanical equipment and has noted that it will be screened by a fence.

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

- i. That the front porch and door be reoriented toward Dawson, as noted in finding f.
- ii. That the applicant continue to explore measures to reduce the overall height of the proposed new construction as much as possible, as noted in finding I, such as modifying open end gabled roofs to clipped gabled roofs and reducing.
- iii. That composite siding feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. Composite siding used in a board and batten profile should feature boards that are 12 inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½” wide. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction. This stipulation is to apply for all structures, including the accessory structure.
- iv. That windows be installed that adhere to staff’s standards for windows in new construction, as noted in findings n and u. This stipulation is to apply for all structures, including the accessory structure.
- v. That all square, fixed windows are eliminated and replaced with larger windows that feature a one over one profile with operable sashes, including those found on the accessory structure, and that fenestration be added to the accessory structure’s blank facades, as noted in finding s.
- vi. That the proposed front walkway be poured concrete to be consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found within the district and that a walkway be added on Dawson for the norther, corner structure.
- vii. That fencing not exceed four (4) feet in height within the front yard (in front of the front façade, including the recessed porch). Privacy fencing is not to exceed six (6) feet in height.

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:** Lulu Francois on behalf of Dignowity Hill Neighbors- do not support staff recommendations with stipulations.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to refer to DRC.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2021-479**  
ADDRESS: 411 N MONUMENTAL  
APPLICANT: Pegy Brimhall/Figrd, LLC

**REQUEST:** The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval construct a 1-story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 411 N Monumental, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant has also proposed to construct a rear accessory structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval construct a 1-story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 411 N Monumental, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant has also proposed to construct a rear accessory structure.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – This request received conceptual approval at the September 1, 2021, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
  - i. That the proposed foundation height be increased in height to at least 1 foot in height to be consistent with the Guidelines. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - ii. That composite siding should feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
  - iii. That a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in the applicable citations.
  - iv. That the applicant proposes fenestration profiles that feature individual windows with operable sashes. Additionally, staff recommends that all window openings, and windows should feature traditional heights and widths, and 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.
  - v. That a side window be added within the front porch massing and that fenestration be added on the north elevation toward the front porch.
  - vi. That all columns feature six (6) inches square in profile with capital and base trim. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - vii. That the proposed rear accessory structure comply with the Guidelines for New Construction and that full construction documents be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - viii. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval, that the proposed walkway feature 3 to 4 feet in width and that all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.
- c. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – This lot is currently void of any structures. This block of N Monumental currently features five historic structures on the west side of the block, each with an orientation toward N Monumental. Each of these structures features one story in height.
- 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 of 13’ – 6” from the property line, aligning with the setback of the historic structure to the immediate north (415 N Monumental) and featuring approximately 2’ – 6” of less setback from the street as the closest historic structure to the south 405 N Monumental, which features the deepest setback on the block. Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. OHP staff will field verify that the setback is consistent with the Guidelines and that of the neighboring structure at 415 N Monumental.
- 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. As noted in finding b, this block of N Monumental features both 1 and 2 story residential structures. The applicant has proposed for the new construction of feature 1-story with an overall height of 19’ – 1/2 “. The applicant has submitted a street elevation noting the proposed height in relationship to the height of

- historic structures on this block. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately two (2) to three (3) feet. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of one (1) foot. Staff finds the proposed foundation height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
  - h. E ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed front and rear facing gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
  - i. ROOF FORM (Porch roof) – The applicant has proposed a porch roof that is flat in profile. Generally, staff finds the location of the proposed porch roof to be appropriate; however, staff finds that a flat roof is inconsistent with the Guidelines and examples of historic roofs found within the district. Staff finds that a shed or low hipped porch roof should be incorporated into the proposed porch massing.
  - j. 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 compliance with the Guidelines regarding lot coverage.
  - k. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding and a standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that composite siding should feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
  - l. PORCH – The applicant has proposed a double height front porch to feature massing that is integrated within the overall massing of the proposed new construction. The proposed front porch will also feature a wraparound element. Columns should be at least six (6) inches square. Staff finds that a column detail should be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval prior
  - m. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include both wood board and batten and lap siding and a standing seam metal roof. Staff finds that horizontally profiled siding should feature an exposure of four inches and a thickness of ¾”. Board and batten siding should feature boards that are 12 inches wide and batten that are 1 – ½” wide. Siding corners should either be mitered or feature corner trim. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
  - n. FENESTRATION PROFILE – The applicant has proposed for façade locations to be void of fenestration, specifically on the north elevation. Staff finds that additional window openings should be added on the north elevation.
  - o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, as noted in findings m and n, staff finds that the proposed fenestration profiles should be revised to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. Additionally, staff finds that the porch roof should be modified to feature a shed or low hipped profile.
  - p. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to construct a carport at the rear of the lot to feature access to Goodloe Alley. Generally, staff finds the location, massing and footprint of the proposed accessory structure to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
  - q. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed a concrete paver walkway to lead from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. Staff finds the proposed walkway to be appropriate; however, staff finds that it should be poured concrete and feature three to four feet in width, per the Guidelines for Site Elements.
  - r. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted a detailed landscaping plan noting planting and landscaping materials. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping to be appropriate.
  - s. FENCING – The applicant has noted the installation of fencing on site to include both hog wire fencing and cedar privacy fencing. Staff finds both fencing proposals to be appropriate; however, fencing should not exceed four (4) feet in height within the front yard (in front of the front façade, including the recessed porch). Privacy fencing should not exceed six (6) feet in height.

- t. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has noted the location of mechanical equipment and has noted that it will be screened by a fence.

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

- i. That composite siding should feature smooth boards that feature a thickness of ¾” and an exposure of four (4) inches. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
- ii. That a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in the applicable citations and in finding l.
- iii. That the non-traditionally sized windows on the north and south elevations be modified to feature sizes and profiles that are consistent with those found historically within the district. These include the large picture window in the dining room, the two square windows in the bathroom , and the horizontal mater bathroom window. Additionally, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to the north elevation.
- iv. That the proposed front walkway be poured concrete to be consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found within the district.
- v. That fencing not exceed four (4) feet in height within the front yard (in front of the front façade, including the recessed porch). Privacy fencing is not to exceed six (6) feet in height.
- vi. That a shed or low hipped porch roof should be incorporated into the proposed porch massing, as noted in finding i.

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:** Lulu Francois on behalf of Dignowity Hill Neighbors- support staff recommendations with stipulations.

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

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

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

**ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2021-480**  
ADDRESS: 515 N MONUMENTAL  
APPLICANT: Peggy Brimhall/Figurd, LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a steel awning structure in two locations within the public right of way at the River Walk level.
2. Modify the existing pavement surface at the River Walk level in two locations from exposed aggregate pavement to broom finish concrete.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval construct a 1-story, single family

- residential structure on the vacant lot at 515 N Monumental, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant has also proposed to construct a rear accessory structure.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval at the September 1, 2021, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
- i. That the proposed foundation height be increased in height to at least 1 foot in height to be consistent with the Guidelines. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - ii. That the applicant confirm lot coverage and that lot coverage does not exceed fifty (50) percent of the lot area. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - iii. That board and batten siding feature smooth boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” in width. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
  - iv. That a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in the applicable citations.
  - v. That the applicant proposes fenestration profiles that feature individual windows with operable sashes. Additionally, staff recommends that all window openings, and windows should feature traditional heights and widths, and 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.vi. That a side window be added within the front porch massing and that fenestration be added on the north elevation toward the front porch. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - vi. That all columns feature six (6) inches square in profile with capital and base trim. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - vii. That the proposed rear accessory structure comply with the Guidelines for New Construction and that full construction documents be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval. **This stipulation has been met.**
  - viii. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval, that the proposed walkway feature 3 to 4 feet in width and that all mechanical equipment be screened  
ix. from view from the public right of way.
- c. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – This lot is currently void of any structures. This block on N Monumental currently features four existing, historic structures that front N Monumental on the west side of the block, two of which feature two stories in height.
- 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 of 15’ – 9” from the property line, aligning with the setback of the historic structure to the immediate north (519 N Monumental) and featuring approximately one (1) foot of less setback from the street as the adjacent historic structure to the immediate south (511 N Monumental). Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. OHP staff will field verify that the setback is consistent with the Guidelines and that of the neighboring structure at 519 N Monumental.
- 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. As noted in finding b, this block of N Monumental features both 1 and 2 story residential structures. The applicant has proposed for the new construction of feature 1-story with an overall height of 21’ – 4 “. The applicant has submitted a street elevation noting the proposed height in relationship to the height of historic structures on this block. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately two (2) to three (3) feet. The

applicant has proposed a foundation height of one (1) foot. Staff finds the proposed foundation height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof with a front facing gabled dormer. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate and 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 existing lot features 6,350 square feet in size. Staff finds that the proposed total footprint of new construction should not exceed fifty (50) percent of the total lot size, per the Guidelines.
- j. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite board and batten siding and a standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that board and batten siding should feature smooth boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” in width. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed aluminum windows. At this time, the applicant has not provided window product information for staff to review. Staff finds that a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction should be installed. If a non-wood or non-aluminum clad wood window is to be proposed, the applicant should submit detailed application documents to support the proposed window.
- l. FENESTRATION PROFILE – The applicant has proposed fenestration profiles that features a large, picture window (south elevation) as well as fixed windows that feature profiles and head and sill heights that are inconsistent with the historic examples found within the district (north elevation). Staff finds that the applicant should propose fenestration profiles that feature individual windows with operable sashes. Additionally, staff finds that all window openings, and windows should feature traditional heights and widths, and 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.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, as noted in finding l, staff finds that the proposed fenestration profiles should be revised to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- n. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to construct a carport at the rear of the lot to feature access to Goodloe Alley. Generally, staff finds the location, massing and footprint of the proposed accessory structure to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- o. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed a concrete paver walkway to lead from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. Staff finds the proposed walkway to be appropriate; however, staff finds that it should be poured concrete and feature three to four feet in width, per the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted a detailed landscaping plan noting planting and landscaping materials. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping to be appropriate.
- q. FENCING – The applicant has noted the installation of fencing on site to include both hog wire fencing and cedar privacy fencing. Staff finds both fencing proposals to be appropriate; however, fencing should not exceed four (4) feet in height within the front yard (in front of the front façade, including the recessed porch). Privacy fencing should not exceed six (6) feet in height.
- R. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the location of mechanical equipment and has noted that it will be screened by a fence.

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

- i. That board and batten siding feature smooth boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” in width. 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 crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A low profile ridge cap may be submitted for review and approval by the Commission for new construction.
- ii. That a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff’s standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in the applicable citations and in finding k.

- iii. That the non-traditionally sized windows on the north and south elevations be modified to feature sizes and profiles that are consistent with those found historically within the district. These include the large picture window in the dining room, the two square windows in the bathroom , and the horizontal mater bathroom window.
- iv. That the proposed front walkway be poured concrete to be consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found within the district.
- iv. That fencing not exceed four (4) feet in height within the front yard (in front of the front façade, including the recessed porch). Privacy fencing is not to exceed six (6) feet in height.

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:** Lulu Francois on behalf of Dignowity Hill Neighbors- support staff recommendations with stipulations.

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

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

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

**ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2021-444**  
ADDRESS: 114 BOSTON  
APPLICANT: jaime jimenez/Jaime Jimenez Idea Studio

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct an addition featuring approximately 622 square feet to the historic structure at 114 Boston, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
2. Replace the existing concrete walkway with a new concrete walkway.
3. Replace the existing ribbon strip driveway with a solid concrete driveway.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an addition featuring approximately 622 square feet to the historic structure at 114 Boston, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. The historic structure at 114 Boston was constructed in the Craftsman style circa 1925 and is first found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The historic structure features a hipped roof. The structure currently features non-original vinyl windows and a small rear addition.
- c. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to both the side and rear of the historic structure. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited to minimize view from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should feature similar roof forms, and should feature a transition to differentiate the new addition from the historic structure. Additionally, the Guidelines for Additions 1.B notes that additions should be subordinate o the principal façade of the historic structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot, and should feature an overall height that is generally consistent with that of the historic structure. The addition, as proposed would feature massing that is approximately 1/3 of the width of the historic structure and would modify the historic structure’s roof form. The proposed addition is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. ADDITION (Materials) – The applicant has proposed materials that include a stucco façade, a standing seam metal roof, and new siding with a four inch exposure. Generally, staff finds the proposed siding and metal roof

to be appropriate; however, per the Guidelines, a stucco façade on a house that features wood siding is not appropriate. Staff finds that the proposed addition should feature wood siding that matches the exposure of that found on the historic structure.

- e. ADDITION (Windows) – At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials for the proposed addition. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed to be consistent with staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction.
- f. ADDITION (Architectural Details) – The Guidelines for Additions 4.A. notes that additions should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context of the historic structure and should incorporate architectural details that are consistent with those of the original structure. Generally, staff finds the proposed addition to be inconsistent with the Guidelines given the proposed location, fenestration profile (fixed, square windows), and materials. Staff finds that all proposed window openings should feature sizes that are consistent with those found on the historic structure.
- g. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing concrete walkway with a new concrete walkway. The existing concrete walkway is damaged and staff finds its replacement to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the existing profile should be maintained, including the flare at the front porch steps.
- h. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a solid concrete driveway where an existing ribbon strip driveway exists. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that new driveways should feature a similar configuration as those found historically within the district in regards to their materials, width and design. Staff finds that the existing ribbon strip profile should be maintained.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the construction of an addition, based on findings c through f. Staff recommends that the addition should primarily be located at the rear of the historic structure, should not increase the massing in width of the historic structure, and should feature materials and architectural details that are consistent with those found on the historic structure.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the replacement of the existing concrete walkway provided that it is replaced in-kind, with a matching profile, based on finding g.
- 3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the replacement of the existing concrete ribbon strip driveway with a solid concrete driveway, based on finding h.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Lulu Francois on behalf of Dignowity Hill Neighbors- support staff recommendations.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved for continuance.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2021-373**  
ADDRESS: 3215 ROOSEVELT AVE  
APPLICANT: DOUGLAS CAFFEY/EMPIRE CANOPY SIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at the fuel service station at 3215 Roosevelt. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

- 1. Replace the existing pole sign with a monument sign to feature an overall height of five (5) feet in height and approximately six (6) feet in width for a total size of 60 square feet, including the base and both sides. The total square footage of signage panels equals fifty (50) square feet. The proposed signage will feature external illumination.
- 2. Install a signage fascia on each side of the existing fuel canopy. The signage fascia will rear “Sunoco” on the front (east) and left (west) elevations. The proposed signage fascia would feature a length of

approximately thirty-six (36) feet on the east and west elevations and approximately 24' – 6" on the north and south elevations. The application notes that the existing canopy flood lights may be used to illuminate the fascia signage.

3. Install signage and graphics on each existing fuel pump, totaling two (2) fuel pumps.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The existing service station at 3215 Roosevelt Avenue is located within the Mission Historic District and is located across Roosevelt Avenue from Mission San Jose, a UNESCO World Heritage Site.
- b. ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed signage to include a monument sign, fascia signage, and fuel pump signage. The Historic Design Guidelines recommend one major and two minor signs per application, not to exceed fifty (50) square feet total.
- c. EXISTING SIGNAGE – The property at 3215 Roosevelt currently features a number of signs, including a canopy sign on the building and a number of unapproved window graphics. Staff finds that all existing, nonapproved signage should be removed.
- d. MONUMENT SIGN – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing pole sign with a monument sign to feature an overall height of five (5) feet in height and approximately six (6) feet in width for a total size of 60 square feet, including the base and both sides. The total square footage of signage panels equals fifty (50) square feet. The proposed signage will feature external illumination. Generally, staff finds the proposed signage to be appropriate and consistent with the Mission Historic District Design Manual; however, staff finds that each sign face should be metal. Plastic sign faces should not be installed.
- e. FASCIA SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install a fascia signage on each side of the existing fuel canopy. The fascia signage will rear “Sunoco” on the front (east) and left (south) elevations. The proposed signage fascia would feature a length of approximately thirty-six (36) feet on the east and west elevations and approximately 24' – 6" on the north and south elevations. The application notes that the existing canopy flood lights may be used to illuminate the fascia signage. Staff finds that the proposed signage on the east and south elevations is in excess of that recommended by the Historic Design Guidelines. The fascia signage would feature approximately seventy (70) square feet of signage that reads “Sunoco”. Generally staff finds the proposed signage to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and Mission Manual as it exceeds the square footage recommended by the Guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed signage should be eliminated from the request. Painting the fascia in branded colors would be appropriate.
- f. FUEL PUMP SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install signage and graphics on each existing fuel pump, totaling two (2) fuel pumps. Given the small size of these signs and their limited visibility from distances off of the site, staff finds the proposed fuel pump signage to be appropriate provided that it is not internally illuminated.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the installation of a new monument sign based on finding c with the stipulation that the signage feature metal faces. Plastic faces should not be installed.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the installation of fascia signage based on finding d. Staff recommends the proposed signage be eliminated. Painting the fascia in branded colors would be appropriate.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, fuel pump signage based on finding e with the stipulation that the signage is not internally illuminated.

Staff recommends the removal of all existing signage, including window graphics, as noted in finding c.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1 and 3 with staff stipulations, and remand item 2 to DRC.

Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**

AYE: Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Zumarán, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

NAY: None.

ABSENT: Fernandez, Arreola, Carpenter, and Bowman.



2. Construct a new 2-story rear addition.
3. Replace the existing non-original front porch columns with round columns.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 232 Lavaca is a 1.5-story residential structure constructed circa 1910 in the Queen Anne style with Folk Victorian influences. The structure features a primary hip roof with a front facing gable, a wraparound front porch, one over one ganged wood windows, and a 2-story rear addition with an open double-height porch. The structure is located on a corner lot at the intersection of Lavaca and Indianola streets with rear frontage along Refugio, a third primary street. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on August 10, 2021, to present a prior version of the proposal. The DRC was generally supportive of removing the existing rear addition due to its non-original nature, but found that the proposed new addition deviated from the historic development pattern and existing context in terms of massing, scale, materiality, and height. While more contemporary additions are found in the immediate vicinity, the DRC noted the importance of the corner lot condition of the property, which essentially creates a condition of three public right-of-ways along Lavaca, Indianola, and Refugio. The DRC suggested incorporating scale, massing, and roof forms similar to the existing addition, which nestles behind the primary historic structure and is visually subordinate. The DRC encouraged the applicant to study the materials and details of the historic structure to influence the rear addition, as well as explore a potential connector element to offer a more clear transition between the historic structure and new addition. The DRC also recommended that the applicant ensure the renderings are accurate in terms of what will be retained on the historic structure, such as chimneys or windows. The applicant met again with the Design Review Committee on September 8, 2021, to review a revised design. The DRC suggested further exploring window proportions and patterns for the addition that responded to the fenestration pattern on the historic house. The DRC also suggested adding fenestration to the west elevation, continuing to explore material palettes that are compatible with the historic structure, and continuing to explore the roof form, massing, and siting of the addition as a holistic design approach. The applicant met with the DRC on September 21 and 28, 2021, to review a revised design that is similar to the current proposal. The DRC was supportive of the window and material changes, as well as the addition of a porch overhang element at the corner of the proposed addition that echoes the location and general form of the existing front porch on the historic structure. The DRC encouraged the applicant to ensure their renderings and drawings were accurate and related to each other in terms of design. The DRC also encouraged the applicant to restore all existing wood windows.
- d. **EXISTING ADDITION** – As noted in finding a, the structure contains an existing 2-story rear addition. Based on Sanborn Maps, the addition was constructed after 1951. Staff finds its removal eligible for administrative approval.
- e. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant as proposed to construct a new 2-story addition to the primary structure totaling approximately 1,066 square feet. The existing primary structure’s square footage is approximately 1,639 square feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new additions should not double the footprint of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds that the proposal generally meets this guideline..
- f. **ORIENTATION AND SETBACK** – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the rear of the structure. Per the Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the structure whenever possible and should be inset behind the front façade to minimize the impact on the public streetscape. Staff finds the orientation and setback generally consistent.
- g. **SCALE** – The proposed addition is 2-story and will be roughly comparable to the primary historic structure’s tallest ridge in height. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. Staff finds that a 2-story addition that is slightly subordinate to the primary structure may be appropriate due to the surrounding context of the block and vicinity. The applicant should make every effort possible to reduce the scale and mass of the addition, either through design modifications, reduction in height, material selections, or a combination of these methods.
- h. **FENESTRATION** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, openings in new construction should use traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. Based on the

submitted elevations, the applicant is requesting window sizes and proportions that are a modern interpretation of those found on the primary structure that also incorporate traditional ganged trim conditions, recess, inset, and configurations. Staff finds the proposed fenestration appropriate with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

- i. **MATERIALITY** – The applicant has proposed to use composite lap siding, metal and/or hardi panel siding, and a standing seam metal roof. The window and door materials are not indicated. Staff finds that the material palette should respond to the design modifications outlined in staff’s findings and should minimize the visual weight of the proposed addition. The Guidelines encourage a material palette that responds to the existing historic structure and historic structures in the vicinity.
- j. **ROOF FORM** – The proposed 2-story rear addition will utilize a flat roof form. According to the Guidelines, roof forms on additions should respond to the roof form of the primary structure and predominant roof forms used historically in the district. Staff finds that the applicant should modify the roof form to feature a gable, hip, or another form that is more consistent with the primary structure and roof forms found historically. Staff encourages the applicant to incorporate a similar roof form as the existing addition, which nests within the existing primary structure’s roofline and is complementary while clearly reading as a new addition.
- k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** - According to the Guidelines for Additions, new additions should feature 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. While staff finds that the modern interpretations of the specific details, forms, and design elements found on the primary structure may be appropriate, staff does not find the addition consistent at this time due to the flat roof form and material palette.
- l. **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.
- m. **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.
- n. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – 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 k, the applicant is responsible for submitting comprehensive and complete documentation to assess window replacement, including a window schedule, photos of all windows requested to be replaced, and a proposed replacement product. Staff finds that all existing windows should be repaired and restored unless demonstrably deteriorated beyond repair. Not enough information has been provided by the applicant at this time to assess a window request. The applicant has verbally stated that all existing windows are to be repaired, which should be confirmed for final approval.

- o. PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing non-original front porch posts with new round columns with a simple capital and base. The proposed columns are predominantly Neoclassical in style but have precedent on Folk Victorian and Queen Anne styles in the district. Per the Guidelines, porches and their related elements, such as ceilings, floors, and columns, should be replaced in-kind when such features are deteriorated beyond repair. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, the design should be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. Porch elements should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff finds that replacement of the existing columns is appropriate.
- p. FENCING – The submitted renderings include new cattle panel style fencing. The applicant is required to submit a fencing site plan and detailed material specifications and/or drawings that indicated the proposed height as part of an application for review and approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Staff does not recommend conceptual approval at this time based on findings a through p.

If the HDRC finds the request consistent and recommends conceptual approval, staff recommends that the following stipulations apply:

- i. That the applicant modify the proposed roof form to be more consistent with the existing roof forms on the lot and the surrounding historic roof forms as noted in finding j. Staff recommends that the applicant incorporate a similar roof form as the existing addition.
- ii. That the applicant explore material palettes that minimize the visual weight of the rear addition as noted in finding i.
- iii. That the applicant retain all existing window locations and restore the original wood windows. The applicant is required to submit a window schedule that illustrates any windows to be replaced on the primary historic structure, if applicable, along with supporting evidence that the window sashes are deteriorated beyond repair. All existing openings must be retained as noted in findings l through o.
- iv. That the applicant submits final window specifications for the addition to staff for review and approval. Windows should be fully wood or aluminum clad wood and feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. White color is not allowed, and color selection should be presented to staff. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- v. 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.
- vi. That the applicant retain all existing chimneys, dormer vents, dormer shingles, and other significant architectural details.
- vii. That the applicant submits drawings and material specifications for any proposed front yard fencing for final approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved for conceptual approval with stipulations 3-7 and remove stipulations 1 and 2.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 28.      HDRC NO. 2021-462**  
ADDRESS: 111 CEDAR ST  
APPLICANT: Anthony Athens/CENTRO PROPERTIES MNGMNT LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1.      Install a concrete curb cut immediately adjacent to the existing driveway.
2.      Remove approximately eight feet of existing front yard fencing at the sidewalk, as well as the fence from the sidewalk to the corner of the house. A portion of the existing fence will be installed between the new end of the fence and the bottom of the side stairway on the front porch. 5. Install a rear covered patio.

**FINDINGS:**

- a.      The primary structure located at 111 Cedar is a 1-story residential form structure constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features a cross gable configuration, woodlap siding, a standing seam metal roof, and an asymmetrical porch with square columns. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b.      CURB CUT – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing curb cut and driveway. The proposal includes extending the concrete curb cut to the north of the structure in front of the primary structure. Per the Guidelines, the width and configuration of existing curb cuts should be retained. Introducing new curb cuts where not historically found should be avoided. Driveways and parking should be located at the side and rear of the property. The proposal effectively creates a front yard parking condition, which is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- c.      FENCING MODIFICATIONS – The proposal includes the relocation of a portion of the front yard fence. Staff finds the fencing location modifications may be acceptable and potentially eligible for administrative approval, but does not find the infill of the area with concrete and a curb cut appropriate as noted in finding b.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Items 1 and 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the request items based on findings a through c.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

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

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

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

- *COMMISSIONER ZUMARÁN LEFT MEETING AT 5:40PM*

**ITEM 29.      HDRC NO. 2021-090**  
ADDRESS: 310 E CAROLINA ST  
APPLICANT: Nicholas Melde/Architexas

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish the primary structure.
2. Reconstruct the primary structure (excluding current additions) and construct a new 2-story rear addition.

## **FINDINGS:**

### General findings:

- a. The primary structure at 310 E Carolina was constructed circa 1920 in the Craftsman style and first appears on the Sanborn maps in 1930 in roughly the same footprint as existing. The primary structure is a 1-story, single family residence and features a rectangular plan, tile construction, a metal cross hipped roof, wood siding, wood windows, and a wraparound front porch. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant attended a Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting on March 24, 2021. The discussion focused on clarifying the scope of the demolition request, the materiality of the primary structure and current conditions, the overall square footage and design of the addition, the visibility of the rear addition from the public right-of-way, the setback of the rear addition from the neighboring property, and the fenestration pattern. The applicant attended a DRC site visit on March 30, 2021. The DRC site visit focused on determining the terminus of the tile construction and establishing the portions of the structure that are original and those that are later additions. The request previously came before the HDRC for conceptual approval on June 2, 2021, and the request was referred to a DRC site visit with the stipulation that the applicant addresses staff’s stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC:
  - i. That the applicant submits accurate, as-built elevation drawings for each side of the existing structure and proposed addition to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC for conceptual approval. ***This stipulation has been met.***
  - ii. If the existing building is to be retained, a demolition plan must be submitted to staff to fully understand the impacts of the proposed addition and how it will attach to the existing structure. ***This stipulation has not been met.***
  - iii. That the applicant provides percentage of lot coverage and total square footage for the existing structure and the proposed addition prior to returning to the HDRC for conceptual approval. ***This stipulation has not been met.***
  - iv. That the applicant submits material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to returning to the HDRC for conceptual approval. ***This stipulation has not been met.***
  - v. That the applicant submits window specifications to staff for review. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and 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. ***This stipulation has not been met.***
  - vi. That the applicant submits a landscaping plan to staff for review. ***This stipulation has not been met.***

The applicant attended a second DRC site visit on June 29, 2021. The DRC site visit discussed the need for asbuilt drawings, photos of the unique characteristics and construction method of the original structure, and the massing of the proposed new rear addition. The applicant is returning to the HDRC to request conceptual approval.

### Findings related to request item #1, demolition of 310 E Carolina:

- 1a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to demolish the primary structure located at 310 E Carolina and reconstruct the primary structure to match the original structure with the construction of a 2-story rear addition.
- 1b. PUBLIC NOTICE – Demolition notice postcards were mailed to properties within a 200-foot radius of the property, as well as to the registered neighborhood association on May 6, 2021, as required by the Unified Development Code.
- 1c. The loss of a landmark is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any landmark or contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason,

to successfully reuse the structure. For full demolition of primary structures, the UDC requires clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The applicant must prove by a preponderance of evidence that:

- c. *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 a cost estimate from a qualified masonry contractor for the stabilization and repair of the existing, clay tile house. The estimate provided is \$145,820 and emphasizes repair of existing structural components. A second estimate for reconstruction with similar materials was provided at \$179,617. Total projected costs for the proposal to fully rehabilitate the historic structure and replace the foundation, install a new concrete stem wall, etc. are \$447,580.40. The applicant has not submitted cost estimates for the current proposal to demolish and fully reconstruct the house with the proposed rear addition. Without this information, a determination regarding rate of return cannot be made.]
- d. *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;*  
[As proposed, the property will continue to be used as a single-family residence. Based on contractor estimates, the existing house can feasibly be repaired for residential use.]
- e. *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.*  
[The property has been owned by the current owner's family and the current owner recently acquired the property. Since that time, the property has not been actively listed and the applicant has not provided substantial evidence of marketing the property to potential tenants. No evidence of repairs or improvements have been made on the property.]
- 1d. Staff finds that the applicant has not demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship in accordance with the UDC due to the lack of marketing of the property.
- 1e. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – Per the UDC, when an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information which may show a loss of significance. As noted in findings b and 1a, there is clear and convincing evidence that the structure is original and features a rare form of tile construction. There is evidence that the structure is severely deteriorated and is need of intervention. Staff does not find that the applicant has provided clear and convincing evidence that the structure has lost significance.

Findings related to request item #2, reconstruction of the primary structure and the construction of a new 2-story rear addition:

- 2a. 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.
- 2b. RECONSTRUCTION OF PRIMARY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the primary structure to match existing. The reconstructed primary structure will feature wood frame construction, a single front entrance, as opposed to the existing double entry, a standing seam metal roof, stucco cladding, and oneover- one aluminum clad wood windows. Staff finds the proposal to reconstruct the primary structure to match existing in footprint, materials, and form appropriate.
- 2c. LOT COVERAGE – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story rear addition to the reconstructed primary structure. The applicant has not provided the total percentage of lot coverage for the primary structure and the addition. The applicant should submit the percentage of lot coverage for review. Total lot coverage should not exceed 50 percent.
- 2d. MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story rear addition. Guideline 1.B.i for Additions stipulates that residential additions should be designed to be subordinate to the principle façade of the original structure in terms of scale and mass. Guideline 2.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. The proposed addition is 2-stories, which is a full story larger than the primary historic structure. The floor heights of the rear addition allow for the view from the public right-of-way is minimized. The existing structure is approximately 1,938 square feet. The proposed reconstructed structure with the new 2-story rear addition will be approximately 2,289 square feet. The footprint of the original clay tile structure is approximately 1,000 square feet. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

- 2e. ROOF – The applicant has proposed to install a front gable roof form on the 2-story rear addition that will be visible from the public right-of-way. The side of the rear addition facing west will feature a shed roof and second floor balcony at the rear. Only a portion of the front gable roof on the rear addition will be visible from the public right-of-way, over the east side of the front facade. Guideline 1.A.iii for Additions stipulates that residential additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure. The historic structure features a side gable roof form with a front gable. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a line-of-sight study for review.
- 2f. ROOF MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install a standing seam metal roof on the rear addition. The existing structure features a composition shingle roof. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that additions 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. Guidelines 3.A.ii for Additions states that new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines, unless evidence exists that the property historically featured a metal roof.
- 2g. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to install windows and doors with traditional proportions. Staff’s standard window specifications state that new windows should feature traditional dimensions and proportions as found within the district. Staff finds the proposed fenestration pattern to be appropriate.
- 2h. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum-clad wood windows and doors. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- 2i. MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to install stucco cladding to match the existing structure. 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 consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story rear addition. Guideline 4.A.ii for Additions states that additions should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found on the original structure should not be used to avoid drawing undue attention to the addition. Guideline 4.A.iii for Additions states that applicants should consider integrating contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for additions. Use of contemporary window moldings and door surroundings, for example, can provide visual interest while helping to convey the fact that the addition is new. Staff finds that the addition should incorporate architectural details that are respectful of the historic context and are consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of request item #1, the demolition of the primary structure based on findings 1a through 1e.

Item 2, if the HDRC finds that either an unreasonable economic hardship or, failing that, an irreversible loss of significance has occurred to warrant approval of item #1, staff recommends that the applicant address the following stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC for conceptual approval of item #2, the reconstruction of the primary structure and the construction of a new 2-story rear addition based on findings 2a through 2j:

- i. If the existing building is to be retained, a demolition plan must be submitted to staff to fully understand the impacts of the proposed addition and how it will attach to the existing structure.
- ii. That the applicant submits material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to returning to the HDRC for conceptual approval.
- iii. That the applicant submits window specifications to staff for review. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and 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.
- iv. That the applicant submits a line-of-site study for the proposed rear addition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 1 based on economic hardship and approve item 2 with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 31. HDRC NO. 2021-469**  
ADDRESS: 314 NORTH DR  
APPLICANT: Rudy Davila/DAVILA CONCRETE CONTRACTORS

**REQUEST:**  
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new curb cut, driveway apron, driveway and walkway on site at 314 North, located within the Monticello Park Historic District.

- FINDINGS:**
- a. The primary structure located at 111 Cedar is a 1-story residential form structure constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features a cross gable configuration, woodlap siding, a standing seam metal roof, and an asymmetrical porch with square columns. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
  - b. VIOLATION – Office of Historic Preservation staff performed a site visit on September 9, 2021, and issued a Stop Work Order for the installation of a curb cut and the laying of base and rebar in preparation for the installation of a concrete apron, driveway and walkways on site without a Certificate of Appropriateness.
  - c. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a driveway with a curved profile resulting a parking being located in front of a portion of the historic structure that is setback from the primary façade. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., new driveways should feature a similar configuration as those found historically within the district in regards to their materials, width and design. Driveways found

historically within the Monticello Park Historic District feature straight profiles with either ribbon strip or full concrete configurations. Historic driveways are approximately ten (10) feet in width. Staff finds the proposed driveway to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a straight driveway that does not exceed ten (10) feet in width would be appropriate. While the driveway would terminate in front of the house, the section of the house where it would terminate is setback from the primary façade. Staff finds this terminating point to be appropriate.

- d. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed a walkway within the front yard to feature concrete paving to lead from the proposed driveway to the existing front walkway. Staff finds the proposed walkway to be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings c and d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed driveway feature a straight profile and a width that does not exceed ten (10) feet.
- ii. That the proposed curb cut and driveway apron be consistent with those found historically on the block in regards to profile and width.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to DRC site-visit.  
Commissioner Laffoon seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 32. HDRC NO. 2021-477**  
ADDRESS: 314 DELAWARE  
APPLICANT: Joe Morfin/Morfin Renovators LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install porch railings and decking on the front porch.
2. Reconstruct the porch columns to match the original.
3. Install foundation skirting to match the siding (117 profile).
4. Install a wood transom window above the front door.
5. Replace the existing vinyl windows with new vinyl windows.
6. Install a wood, front yard fence.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 314 Delaware was constructed circa 1925 in the Craftsman style and is first found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The structure features a hipped roof with a gabled porch roof and exposed rafter tails and non-original porch skirting and non-original windows.
- b. VIOLATION – Office of Historic Preservation staff issued a Stop Work Order on August 25, 2021, for window replacement, the removal of existing foundation skirting, the removal of original columns, fencing, porch railing replacement and porch decking replacement.
- c. COMPLIANCE (Railing, skirting, columns and decking; items #1 through #3) – The applicant has noted that the previously installed porch railing profile will be reinstalled, that 1x3 tongue and groove porch decking will be installed perpendicular to the front façade, that foundation skirting that matches the siding of the house (117 profile) will be installed, and that columns will be installed to match the original. The proposed re-installation and repair of these items is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. TRANSOM WINDOW – The applicant has installed a transom window above the front door. The installed transom window features a wood profile. The applicant has provided information noting the

existence of a former transom. Staff finds the installation of a transom window at this location to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. **WINDOWS** – The historic structure at 314 Delaware previously featured vinyl windows that were replaced by the applicant. The replacement windows feature unequal sashes. The applicant has proposed to install each window to feature two (2) inches in depth, traditionally dimensioned trim, architecturally appropriate casing and sloped sills, and will feature frames that will be painted a dark color. Staff finds the window that has been installed to be inconsistent with staff’s standards for replacement windows. Staff finds that a window that is consistent with staff’s standards for replacement windows should be installed.
- f. **FENCING** – The applicant has noted fencing within the front yard.. The proposed fencing will feature four (4) feet in height and horizontal wood pickets. Generally, staff finds the proposed fencing to be inconsistent with the Guidelines, which notes that fencing should be consistent with historic fencing found within the district. Staff finds that fencing that is consistent with that found historically within the district should be installed (vertical wood pickets, hog wire, or cattle panel would be appropriate).

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3, the installation of foundation skirting, porch railings and decking and porch columns with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install porch decking that features a 1x3, tongue and groove profile and that all decking is installed perpendicular to the front façade.
- ii. That the repaired columns match the original in profile and trim detail and that the wall columns be installed to match the original.
- iii. That the proposed porch railings feature a 2” x 4” top rail, 1” x 2” rail trim, 1” – ½” x 1” – ½” square pickets and a notched 2”x 4” bottom rail. The bottom rail should be approximately 3 to 4 inches above the decking.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, window replacement, based on finding e. Staff recommends a window that is consistent with staff’s standards for replacement windows be installed. Staff’s standards are noted in the applicable citations.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #5, front yard fencing, based on finding f. Staff recommends that front yard fencing that is consistent with the Guidelines be installed. Vertical pickets, hog wire or cattle panel would be appropriate.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velasquez moved as submitted except for the 3 fenestrations in the front and accept vinyl as long as it fits standard dimensions, and approve items 1-4 and 5 as recommended by staff. Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** **The MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES. 1 NAY. 5 ABSENT.**

**ITEM 33** **HDRC NO. 2021-475**  
ADDRESS: 901 MASON ST  
APPLICANT: robert miranda/finesse construction llc

**REQUEST:**  
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a standing seam metal roof with a ridge cap on the historic structure at 901 Mason, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a standing seam metal roof with a ridge cap on the historic structure at 901 Mason, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. VIOLATION – Office of Historic Preservation staff performed a site visit on August 12, 2021, to inspect the roof work that had been done to date. At that time, OHP staff found a ridge cap installed. No roofing inspection was performed to inspect materials prior to installation.
- c. ROOF REPLACEMENT – Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should be installed where historically found or architecturally appropriate. Additionally, the Guidelines note that new metal roofs should adhere the specifications outlined in the Guidelines; panels should be smooth and feature 18 to 21 inches in width, seams should be 1 to 2 inches tall, ridge seams should featured a crimped ridge seam, and panels should feature a standard galvalume finish. Staff finds the ridge caps to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends that a standing seam metal roof that is consistent with the Guidelines regarding ridge detail (crimped/munched ridge seam or a crimped ridge sleeve) be installed in place of the installed ridge cap.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to DRC site-visit.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

**ADJOURNMENT:** The HDRC regular scheduled meeting adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

**APPROVED**

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

Date: 11/7/21