



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

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

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, November 03, 2021 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

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

ROLL CALL:

Present: Gibbs, Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Arreola, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, and Laffoon.

Absent: Bowman and Fetzer.

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

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- A newly District 5 Appointee came on board with Historic Design Review Commission, Roland Mazuca.
- Items # 15 and 20 were withdrawn by the applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- General Comment: William Lambert requests for DRC to meet on site on Michigan Ave and Fredericksburg before meeting with HDRC hearing for review.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve the October 20th, 2021, HDRC meeting minutes. Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

- Item 1, Case No. 2021-535 221 NEWELL
- Item 2, Case No. 2021-510 816 S COLORADO ST
- Item 3, Case No. 2021-541 210 LAVACA ST
- Item 4, Case No. 2021-543 147 E MISTLETOE
- Item 5, Case No. 2021-553 419 FLORIDA ST
- Item 6, Case No. 2021-515 614 CEDAR ST
- Item 7, Case No. 2021-551 935 S ALAMO ST
- Item 8, Case No. 2021-528 316 E LULLWOOD AVE
- Item 9, Case No. 2021-546 307 PEARL PKWY

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve items on consent with staff stipulations. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Fetzer virtually joined meeting at 3:30pm.*

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM 10. HDRC NO. 2021-498
ADDRESS: 326 SEGUIN ST
APPLICANT: Office of Historic Preservation

REQUEST: The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a recommendation from the Historic and Design Review Commission regarding designation of the property at 326 Seguin St.

FINDINGS:

- On May 5, 2021, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation by Joseph Hopewell of JR Ramon Demolition, on behalf of the property owner of the stone-clad building at 326 Seguin Street, located in the Government Hill neighborhood of City Council District 2. OHP staff notified the Government Hill Community Association and other neighborhood stakeholders and conducted research during the 30-day review period provided by UDC 35-455. After completing the review, OHP staff's research did not indicate that the property met three criteria under UDC Sec. 35-607(b). Staff approved an administrative Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition on June 4, 2021. On June 10, 2021, Marlene Hawkins submitted a request for review of historic significance for the stone-clad building at 326 Seguin Street on behalf of the Government Hill Community Association. The Demolition & Designation Committee (DDC) attended a virtual site visit on July 20, 2021.
- On July 21, 2021, the Historic and Design Review Commission heard the request for review of historic significance. Staff's analysis found that the structure met criteria 3 and 5, which does not meet the threshold for landmark eligibility. The HDRC found the structure met additional criteria 6, 8, and 12, as outlined in the UDC and approved a Finding of Historic Significance for the property at 326 Seguin St.
- On September 16, 2021, City Council approved Resolution 2021-09-16-0045R initiating a change in zoning for the property to include a historic landmark overlay. As a step in the zoning process, a recommendation regarding the proposed designation is required from the HDRC.
- The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.
- City Council has the ultimate authority to approve the historic designation zoning overlay. A recommendation from HDRC will be forwarded to City Council.
- Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff did not find that the property meets the threshold for designation. The Historic and Design Review Commission may recommend approval of historic landmark designation of 326 Seguin St based on finding b.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Sia Cole, Conservation Society of San Antonio Steve, Marlene Hawkins- support of landmark designation; and Rose Hill and Patrick Christensen- oppose landmark designation.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to recommend to designation property based on criteria, 3,5,6,8, and 12.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION FAILED with 8 AYES. 2 NAYS. 1 ABSENT.**

- *MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF SUPER MAJORITY OF 9 AYE TO PASS.*
- *Commissioner Fish left meeting at 4:15pm.*

ITEM 11. HDRC NO. 2021-518
ADDRESS: 1126 E ELMIRA ST
APPLICANT: Daniel Elder/Broadway SA Investors GP LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a seven story, mixed-use structure on the block bounded by E Elmira to the north, Schiller to the east, E Quincy to the south and E Park to the west. The proposed new construction will feature 263 residential units, structured parking, ground floor live-work units and retail.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a seven story, mixed-use structure on the block bounded by E Elmira to the north, Schiller to the east, E Quincy to the south and E Park to the west. The proposed new construction will feature 263 residential units, structured parking, ground floor live-work units and retail.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – This request received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission on December 2, 2020, with the following stipulations:
 - i. That all windows are recessed at least two inches within wall openings and that windows do not feature faux divided lites.
 - ii. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – An archaeological investigation is required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on October 26, 2021. At that meeting, Committee members commented on façade materials, façade massing, and material details.
- d. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a), pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. Additionally, the various functions and spaces on a site must be linked with sidewalks in a coordinated system. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed sidewalks on each side of the proposed new construction. Staff finds the proposed sidewalks to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- e. **AUTOMOBILE PARKING** – The UDC Section 35-672(b)(2) notes that automobile parking should be located toward the interior of the site. The applicant has proposed structured parking that is to be wrapped by residential units. The proposed structured parking will be accessed by vehicles from E Elmira Street. Staff finds the proposed parking to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- f. **CURB CUTS** – The RIO design objectives outlined in the UDC include the creation of a “positive pedestrian experience” at the street edge. Standards related to curb cuts and interference with pedestrian traffic are also provided. The UDC requires projects to limit curb cuts to two (2) on parking areas or structures facing only one (1) street, and one (1) for each additional street face. The applicant has proposed two curb cuts, both on E Elmira Street. Staff finds the proposed curb cuts to be appropriate given the fact that the applicant has not proposed a curb cut on any other bounding street. Staff finds that neither curb cut should exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width, per the UDC. If a curb cut is to exceed twenty-five (25) feet at width, the sidewalk at the pedestrian right of way should not be impacted by the curb cut. The applicant has proposed a curb cut that features an overall width of 26’ – 5”. While this is wider than the curb cut width recommended by the UDC, staff finds the increased

width to be appropriate as this is the only vehicular curb cut proposed on site. Staff finds that the proposed the pedestrian sidewalk at E Elmira should feature a uniform height. The grade change for the approach should occur in a manner that does not impact the

- g. **SITE DESIGN** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Staff finds that the applicant has proposed new construction that is consistent with this section of the UDC.
- h. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Landscaping plays an important role in the development of lots within the River Improvement Overlay. Staff finds that a detailed landscaping plan should be submitted for review and approval that is consistent with the UDC.
- i. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant has noted mechanical equipment that is to be located at the roof level. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- j. **HUMAN SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has provided a human scale in multiple instances, including the installation of balconies and human scaled façade openings. The applicant has also proposed various materials, including brick that features a human scale. Staff finds this to be consistent with the UDC.
- k. **FAÇADE SEPARATION** – The UDC Section 35-674 (b)(4) notes that a façade in RIO-2 that features more than fifty (50) feet in length should be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed façade segments that are separated by both vertical and horizontal banding, variations in materials and textures and varying façade planes. This is consistent with the UDC.
- l. **BUILDING MASSING & HEIGHT** – The UDC regulates building height within the River Improvement Overlay Districts. For RIO-2, the maximum height for new construction is ten (10) stories or 120 feet. The applicant has proposed seven stories for a total height of approximately eighty-seven (87) feet. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- m. **HEIGHT TRANSITIONS** – The UDC Section 35-674(c)(2) notes that applicants should organize the mass of a building to step back from established residential neighborhoods. Where a commercial, mixed-use residential, multi-family or industrial use abuts a single-family residential development, or is across the street from a singlefamily residential development, the following standards shall apply: The massing of the building shall not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in height at the setback line. The building mass can continue upward within a forty-five-degree building envelope for a distance of fifty (50) feet measured horizontally from the building face, at which point the building massing may continue vertically to the height established in subsection 35-674(c). Additionally, on the street-side, the building facade shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. If fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building facade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. However, the remainder of the building may obtain its maximum height by stepping back fifteen (15) feet from the building face. The applicant has proposed for a portion of the building massing on E Elmira to feature approximately eighty-five (85) feet in height parallel to the property line and is comparable to existing structures in the vicinity in massing and height. Generally, staff finds proposed massing to be appropriate.as the new construction is setback from the property line. Additionally, staff finds the proposed podium massing to meet the spirit of the UDC’s requirement, as the structure features a setback from the property line and the tower massing features additional setbacks. The applicant is responsible for complying with all zoning requirements regarding building height or associated variances, if required.
- n. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include D’Hanis brick, modular brick, metal panel siding, fiber cement siding and stucco. This is consistent with the UDC.
- o. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – The UDC Section 35-678(e) notes that traditionally, buildings have been organized into three distinct segments; a base, midsection and cap. This organization helps to give a sense of

scale to a building and its use should be encouraged. The applicant has distinctly designed a base, mid section and cap, differentiated by changes in materials, massing and detailing.

- p. **WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed vinyl windows with a dark bronze. Additionally, the applicant has proposed aluminum storefront systems at the ground level. Generally, staff finds the proposed windows and storefront systems to be appropriate; however, staff finds that all windows should be recessed at least two inches within wall openings. Additionally, staff finds that windows with faux divided lites should not be used.
- q. **E QUINCY STREET/SCHILLER STREET** – The applicant has previously received approval from City departments to close E Quincy Street from E Park Avenue to Schiller Street. Staff finds that detailed landscaping and paving documents should be submitted to OHP staff. Schiller should remain open to vehicular traffic while E Quincy should remain open to pedestrian traffic to provide pedestrian access to the San Antonio River.
- r. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is located within a River Improvement Overlay District and is adjacent to the historic alignment of the San Antonio River. A review of historic archival information identifies a desague to the Upper Labor Acequia within or adjacent to the project area. The Upper Labor Acequia is a previously recorded archaeological site and designated National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark. Therefore, an archaeological investigation is required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

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

- i. That the proposed curb cut on E Elmira does not interrupt pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk. The proposed the pedestrian sidewalk at E Elmira should feature a uniform height at the location of the curb cut. The grade change for the approach should occur in a manner that does not impact the sidewalk and pedestrian traffic.
- ii. That all windows are recessed at least two inches within wall openings and that windows do not feature faux divided lites. Staff recommends that a window that appears as a true divided lite window should be used that a one over one window should be installed that does not feature any lites.
- iii. That detailed landscaping and paving documents should be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
- iv. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – An archaeological investigation is required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The Conservation Society of San Antonio- has concerns about proliferation.

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

VOTE:
AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Arreola, Mazuca, Grube, and Laffoon.
NAY: Carpenter.
ABSENT: Fish and Bowman.
RECUSE: Fetzer

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 1 NAY. 2 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.**

ITEM 12. HDRC NO. 2021-523
ADDRESS: 221 NEWELL
APPLICANT: Thomas Brown/Clayton Korte

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

- 1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work including roof repair, window and door repair, façade repair and repointing and resealing of exterior masonry.
- 2. Replace any steel windows that are beyond repair with thermally broken aluminum windows.
- 3. Perform façade modifications to the south (Newell) façade by expanding the existing loading dock, replacing the existing overhead rolling doors, low wall and steel windows with new overhead doors and a new aluminum storefront system, and create a larger entry vestibule.

4. Perform façade modifications to the east (Karnes) façade by creating several new entrances, replace an existing window with a new entry into a raised dining terrace, the installation of various raised terraces and a new canopied terrace.
5. Perform façade modifications to the northeast corner façade by removing the façade to create an open air entrance with a recessed glass storefront system.
6. Perform modifications to the west (alley) façade by adding a patio terrace with breeze block guardrails, screen walls, and service ramp.
7. Perform various streetscape enhancements to Karnes Street including the installation of brick paving to replace the existing asphalt paving.

FINDINGS:

- a. The one-story structure located at 221 Newell was constructed in 1948 as a warehouse and office building and is commonly known as the Samuel's Glass Building. The structure was design by Bartlett Cocke. The structure features existing modifications including a roof extension and modifications to the alley loading dock. At this time the structure is not a locally designated landmark; however, the applicant has submitted an application for historic designation. Designation of this structure as a locally designated landmark would make it eligible for local historic tax incentives.
- b. **REHABILITATIVE WORK** – The applicant has proposed rehabilitative scopes of work including roof repair, window and door repair, façade repair and repointing and resealing of exterior masonry. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to replace any existing steel windows that are damaged beyond repair with thermally broken aluminum windows. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitative scopes of work to be appropriate. If existing steel windows are found to be beyond repair, product specifications of the replacement aluminum windows are to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval. Window profiles, installation depths and colors are to match the original
- c. **REHABILITATIVE WORK** – The applicant has proposed rehabilitative scopes of work including roof repair, window and door repair, façade repair and repointing and resealing of exterior masonry. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to replace any existing steel windows that are damaged beyond repair with thermally broken aluminum windows. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitative scopes of work to be appropriate. If existing steel windows are found to be beyond repair, product specifications of the replacement aluminum windows are to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval. Window profiles, installation depths and colors are to match the original.
- d. **FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS (East, Karnes Façade)** – The applicant has proposed to perform façade modifications to the east (Karnes) façade by creating several new entrances, replace an existing window with a new entry into a raised dining terrace, the installation of various raised terraces and a new canopied terrace. The existing east façade features three overhead rolling doors and industrially sized steel windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i. notes that new façade elements that alter or destroy the historic building character of a structure should not be introduced. Staff finds the proposed modifications to the east façade generally maintain the existing profile and form of the original façade, while incorporating new elements. Staff finds the proposed modifications to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, staff finds that all removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
- e. **FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS (Northeast Corner)** – The applicant has proposed to perform façade modifications to the northeast corner of the structure by removing the façade to create an open air entrance with a recessed glass storefront system. This modifications would result in the removal of an existing overhead rolling door opening, one window and existing masonry façade materials. While the proposed modifications would result in original elements being removed, the location of the proposed modifications is in a nonprominent location on the structure and do not impact a primary façade. Staff finds that all removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
- f. **FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS (West, Alley Façade)** – The applicant has proposed to perform façade modifications to the west, alley façade by adding a patio terrace with breeze block guardrails, screen walls, and service ramp. Staff finds the proposed modifications to be appropriate as existing architectural features will be minimally impacted. Staff finds that any removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
- g. **STREET SCAPE (Karnes)** – The applicant has proposed to perform various street scape modifications to Karnes Street including the installation of brick paving to replace the existing asphalt paving. Staff finds the proposed improvements to be appropriate; however, detailed landscaping plans should be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, rehabilitative scopes of work with the following stipulations:
 - i. That if existing steel windows are found to be beyond repair, product specifications of the replacement aluminum windows are to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval. Window profiles, installation depths and colors are to match the original.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, façade modifications to the south façade based on finding c with the following stipulations:
 - i. That all removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
 - ii. That detailed product specifications for the proposed storefront system are submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, façade modifications to the east façade based on finding d with the following stipulations:
 - i. That all removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
 - ii. That detailed product specifications for the proposed storefront system are submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, façade modifications to the northeast corner based on finding e with the following stipulations:
 - i. That all removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
 - ii. That detailed product specifications for the proposed storefront system are submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, façade modifications to the west façade based on finding f with the following stipulation:
 - i. That all removed façade materials shall be salvaged for reuse.
6. Staff recommends approval of item #6, street scape modifications to Karnes Street with the following stipulation:
 - i. That detailed landscaping and site paving plans be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

VOTE:
AYE: Gibbs, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, and Laffoon.
NAY: Savino.
ABSENT: Fish and Bowman.
RECUSE: Fetzer
ABSTAIN: Arreola

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 1 NAY. 2 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL. 1 ABSTAIN.**

ITEM 13. 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 a signage fascia on each side of the existing fuel canopy. The signage fascia will rear “Sunoco” on the front (east) elevations in flat, non-illuminated letters. Other elevations will only feature new panels with no signage. 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.

Monument signage and fuel pump graphics were approved by the HDRC with stipulations on October 20, 2021.

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. **PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SIGNAGE** – Monument signage and fuel pump graphics were approved by the HDRC with stipulations on October 20, 2021.
- e. **FASCIA SIGNAGE** – The applicant has proposed to install a signage fascia on each side of the existing fuel canopy. The signage fascia will rear “Sunoco” on the front (east) elevations in flat, non-illuminated letters. Other elevations will only feature new panels with no signage. 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the proposed signage based on finding e with the stipulation that the signage be located on either the north or south façade as to not face directly toward Mission San Jose.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Arreola moved to table case to next available hearing.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2021-501
ADDRESS: 209 ALAMO PLAZA
APPLICANT: David Hannan/Fisher Heck Architects

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

- 1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work including window repair, fascia and soffit repair, storefront system repair on the east facade and masonry cleaning.
- 2. Install a new, wood storefront system on the west façade to feature wood doors.
- 3. Install a new steel framed canopy on the west façade.
- 4. Relocate the existing roof hatch.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform rehabilitative scopes of work, install a new storefront system, canopy and other exterior elements at 209 Alamo Plaza.
- b. The historic structure located at 209 S Alamo, in its two story form was constructed circa 1895. Structures on this site are found on the 1885 Sanborn Map; however, they do not exist in the height and footprint found on later Sanborn Maps.
- c. **REHABILITATION** – The applicant has proposed to perform rehabilitative scopes of work including window repair, fascia and soffit repair, storefront system repair, and stucco repair on the east facade and masonry

cleaning. Staff finds the proposed scopes of work to be appropriate as the applicant has noted in-kind repair. Staff finds that all masonry cleaning should be done in a manner that does not damage brick. Additionally, the composite siding panel that will be used on the under side of the soffit should feature a smooth finish. The existing storefront system and storefront system beam are not original.

- d. **STOREFRONT SYSTEM** – The applicant has proposed to install a new, wood storefront system on the west façade to feature wood doors and a key box. The existing storefront system has been obscured by non-original building materials. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.ii. note that non-historic facades should be returned to their original design based on photographic evidence. When evidence is not available, the scale, design, materials, color and texture of new materials should be compatible with those of the historic façade. Generally, staff finds the profile of the storefront to be appropriate.
- e. **CANOPY** – The applicant has proposed to install a new steel framed canopy on the west façade. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii. notes that canopies should be added based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. If no such evidence exists, the design of new canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached. Generally, staff finds the installation of a canopy on the west façade to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed height of the canopy is atypical with the historic placement of canopies, which are typically located above the storefront system and beneath transom windows. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed standing seam metal roof that is proposed for the canopy should feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, crimped ridges and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should not feature striations or corrugation. Lastly, staff finds the profile of the canopy, with an exposed steel beam to be atypical with historic canopy design. Staff finds that the proposed canopy should feature a profile that is consistent with historic canopy details. Canopy rod anchors should not be installed through the face of historic masonry.
- f. **ROOF HATCH RELOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to relocate that existing roof hatch. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate provided that the profile of the roof and parapet walls remains unchanged.
- g. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, rehabilitative scope of work based on finding c with the following stipulations:
 - i. That all repair work be done in-kind.
 - ii. That the proposed composite panel on the underside of the soffit feature a smooth finish.
 - iii. That all masonry cleaning be done in a manner that does not damage the historic brick façade.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the installation of a new storefront system on the rear (west) façade, with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant submits a detailed section of the new storefront system to staff for review and approval.
 - ii. That the applicant submits the proposed wood doors to staff for review and approval.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the installation of a new canopy with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the canopy's height be reduced to be placed consistently with historic examples; commonly immediately between the storefront system and transom windows.
 - ii. That the proposed standing seam metal roof that is proposed for the canopy should feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, crimped ridges and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should not feature striations or corrugation.
 - iii. That the proposed canopy should feature a profile that is consistent with historic canopy details, The exposed steel beam should be modified or covered.
4. Staff recommends approval of item #5, roof hatch relocation with the stipulation that the existing roof and parapet wall profiles remain unchanged.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2021-514
ADDRESS: 9536 Espada Road
APPLICANT: Lauro Garza

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace existing perimeter fence with new fencing. Proposed height is 6-feet around the entire perimeter.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 9536 Espada Road is an irregularly shaped parcel that backs up to the Espada Ditch. There is an existing primary structure on the property and is set back approximately.
- b. FRONT YARD FENCE/GATE – The applicant is proposing to install a 6-foot-tall wrought iron fence and driveway gate at the front of the property. Per the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, 2.B.ii. and iii., avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist and limit the height of new fences within the front yard to a maximum of four (4) feet. Many of the properties along this stretch of Espada Road currently feature front yard fences with driveway gates. Staff finds that the proposed fence and gate design and location is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, and that the height should be reduced to four (4) feet to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. SIDE YARD FENCING – The applicant is proposing to install a 6-foot-tall, treated wood privacy fence along the side yard property lines. Per the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, 2.C.i. and ii., set privacy fences back from the front façade of existing primary structures and do not use privacy fences in front yards. Staff finds that the style and height of this fence are consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. The proposed location of the fence should not extend beyond the front wall plane of the existing primary structure on the property to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
- d. REAR YARD FENCING – The applicant is proposing to install a 6-foot-tall wood framed cattle panel/mesh fence along the rear yard of the property. Staff finds that the fence style, general location, and height is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
- e. ARCHAEOLOGY – The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.
- f. ARCHAEOLOGY – Staff has general concern about the sensitivity of the site and the impacts of construction to the Espada Acequia. Detailed construction management plans should be developed and provided prior to permitting that includes the limits of construction in proximity to the historic acequia and measures taken to mitigate potential impacts during construction. The UDC Section 35-672 does not allow drainage into the acequia.

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

- i. The proposed privacy fence does not extend beyond the front wall plane of the existing structure on the site.
- ii. The proposed front yard fence be no taller than four (4) feet and predominantly open to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
- iii. ARCHAEOLOGY - The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable. The Espada Acequia shall be preserved and shall not be impacted by new construction. Staff has general concern about the sensitivity of the site and the impacts of construction to the acequia. Detailed construction management plans should be developed and provided prior to final approval that includes the limits of construction in proximity to

the historic acequia and measures taken to mitigate potential impacts during construction. The UDC Section 35- 672 does not allow drainage into the acequia. Moreover, the formal construction plans should identify no subsurface work (utilities, grading, etc.) within 5 feet of the extant acequia. No construction activities will occur within the buffer area. In-field protection of the acequia should include orange construction fencing and silt fencing at a buffer distance of 5 feet from the feature. This fencing should be present on-site until construction is completed. As stated previously, the acequia shall not be used for storm water drainage. Furthermore, the acequia shall not be used for storage, equipment cleaning, or any other use during development that could impact the feature.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Arreola moved to table case to next available hearing.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2021-532
ADDRESS: 210 E RISCHE
APPLICANT: Mario Salinas/MDB Architecture

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

1. Replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a new metal roof.
2. Replace seven (7) existing wood windows with aluminum windows.
3. Replace three (3) existing aluminum windows with aluminum windows.
4. Remove one (1) existing wood window from the east elevation and enclose with siding.
5. Replace the existing metal porch handrails and wood railings.
6. Modify the front porch columns.
7. Install limestone skirting at the front of the main house.
8. Install exterior lighting.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 210 E Rische is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed in the Craftsman architectural style. The structure features a pyramid roof, an inset front porch, and double hung wood windows. The property is contributing to the Nathan Historic District.
- b. **METAL ROOF REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing standing seam metal roof on the main structure with a new metal roof with a ridge cap and bronze in color. Staff finds that the proposed in-kind replacement of the metal roof is consistent with the Guidelines if it adheres to the standard stipulations noted in the below recommendation. Ridge caps and end caps are not permitted, and standard galvalume finish is recommended.
- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION** – Staff performed a site visit on October 21, 2021, to assess the condition of the windows requested for replacement. From the photos submitted to date and the site visit, the wood windows proposed for replacement appear to be of historic-age, fully wood one-over-one windows. The windows do not show signs of significant wood rot, wood damage, or severe deterioration. Staff finds that the wood windows are in repairable condition based on the documentation provided, with most requiring minimal repair and intervention such as the reworking of the sashes and reglazing, along with refitting into the trim and frames. Staff also observed three (3) aluminum windows proposed for replacement. The aluminum windows are likely not original to the structure and their replacement with a window product that is consistent with staff's standard stipulations would be appropriate.
- d. **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. 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.

- e. **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 utilize 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.
- f. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WOOD WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to replace seven (7) existing wood windows with replacement aluminum windows that do not meet staff’s standard window stipulations. The windows requested for replacement are located on the north, east, and west elevations. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, wood windows should be repaired in place and restored whenever possible, unless there is substantial evidence that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new windows should be installed to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair.
- g. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ALUMINUM WINDOWS** - The applicant has proposed to replace three (3) existing aluminum windows in the primary structure with new aluminum windows. Staff determined that the windows are most likely not original to the structure. Based on these observations, staff finds that the replacement with a window product consistent with the standard window stipulations is acceptable and will not result in the loss of character defining features or high-quality historic material.
- h. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove one (1) existing wood window from the east elevation of the main house and enclose it with siding. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 6. A. i., preserve existing window and door openings. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. This request is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **PORCH RAILINGS**– The applicant has proposed to replace the existing metal porch handrails and the wood porch balustrade on the front porch with wrought iron railings. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 7.A.ii., preserve existing porch balusters. When replacement is necessary, replace in-kind when possible or with balusters that match the originals in terms of materials, spacing, profile, dimension, finish, and height of the railing. Staff finds that replacing the existing metal handrails with matching handrails is appropriate as this is an existing condition. Replacing the existing wood balusters with wrought iron should be avoided and new balustrades should match the existing in overall design to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **PORCH COLUMNS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the two (2) front porch columns to feature a limestone base with a narrower wood post with a trim cap. The existing porch columns are encased in vinyl/metal siding and the design is unknown at this time. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 7.B.iv and v., design replacement elements, such as stairs, to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Do not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance. Reconstruct porches, balconies, and portecocheres 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. In general, the proposed proportions of the columns are consistent with columns traditionally found on Craftsman style homes of similar design. In many instances column bases on Craftsman

style homes may be wood or brick. Without evidence that the home originally featured brick column bases, staff finds that the bases should be wood with a narrower wood column featuring top trim to be consistent with the Guidelines.

- k. **LIMESTONE SKIRTING** – The applicant has proposed to install limestone skirting on the front of the house and wrap around to the east and west elevation. The skirting will terminate on the west elevation where there is an existing privacy fence, and on the east elevation where the front wall plane begins. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.Bi., replacement skirting should consist of durable, proven materials, and should either match the existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. Staff finds that limestone masonry skirting is atypical to Craftsman style homes and not found on similar structures in the Nathan Historic District. Staff finds that the skirting should be restored to wood lap siding. The applicant may use a single member of smooth Hardie plank and/or concealed metal flashing at grade to mitigate water infiltration and that any other interventions should be made beneath the wood lap siding or from the interior.
- l. **EXTERIOR LIGHTING** – The applicant is proposing to install exterior light fixtures on the front of the house beneath the porch and at the back of the house. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 5.B.iii., avoid damage to the historic building when installing necessary new light fixtures, ensuring they may be removed in the future with little or no damage to the building. Place new light fixtures and those not historically present in locations that do not distract from the façade of the building while still directing light where needed. New light fixtures should be unobtrusive in design and should not rust or stain the building. Staff finds that the proposed light fixtures are consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of:

Item 1: Metal roof replacement, with the following stipulations:

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

Item 3: Replacement of three (3) aluminum windows with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant installs a fully wood window that meet staff's standard window stipulations and submits updated specifications to staff for review and approval. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Openings should also be consistent with those found historically around the historic structure.

Item 5: In-kind replacement of the front porch metal handrails as proposed and balusters with the stipulation that the balusters be wood, and a final design be submitted to OHP staff for review prior to a COA being issued.

Item 6: Front porch column modifications with the stipulation that the columns and bases be wood, and an updated drawing be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval prior to a COA being issued.

Item 8: The installation of exterior lighting at the front and rear of the house as proposed.

Staff does not recommend approval of:

Item 2: The replacement of the wood windows. Staff recommends that the wood windows be repaired to be consistent with the design guidelines.

Item 4: The removal of the wood window on the east elevation and enclosing with siding. Staff recommends maintaining this window opening to be consistent with the design guidelines.

Item 7: The installation of limestone skirting. Staff recommends maintaining the flared design of the skirting and matching the existing wood siding at the skirting area, installing wood lap skirting, a smooth finish hardi-plank skirting with a reveal that does not exceed 6-inches.

CASE COMMENT:

OHP staff issued a COA for the removal of the vinyl siding to allow the applicant to further assess the wood siding underneath. At this time the applicant has not provided an update on whether they wish to restore or replace the siding.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to refer to DRC site-visit with drawings for the case. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2021-538
ADDRESS: 240 W LULLWOOD AVE
APPLICANT: Arnold Flather

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace mulch with concrete or decomposed granite in an area adjacent to the existing driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 240 W Lullwood is a single-story residential building with Colonial Revival influences including a central chimney, a full front porch supported by square columns, and a symmetrical façade. The property contributes to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **PARKING PAD** – The applicant is proposing to replace existing mulch and a small tree in an area in front of the existing garage with crushed gravel or concrete to create an additional parking area. The garage is located at the rear of the primary structure and faces the side street of Belknap Place. The area in question is approximately 240 square feet (15’ x 16’) and is adjacent to a rear alley. There is currently no raised curb in this area. The Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements B.i., note that historic driveways are typically no wider than 10-feet. While nearby properties do have numerous, wider driveways at the rear of the property, the proposed 15-foot width combined with an existing driveway is not consistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b.

If the HDRC is compelled to approve the parking pad, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the area is no larger than 144 square feet to be consistent with the UDC and feature crushed granite to aid in water runoff.
- ii. The applicant provide a detailed parking plan to staff for review prior to the COA being issued.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT. 1 ABSTAIN.**

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2021-540
 ADDRESS: 401 SHOOK AVE
 APPLICANT: Lewis McNeel

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

1. Replace three (3) existing wood windows at the rear of the house with new aluminum clad wood windows.
2. Replace four (4) existing wood exterior doors with wood and glass doors.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 401 Shook is a 2-story residential home designed in the Neoclassical architectural style. The structure features a prominent full facade front porch, a side gable roof with three (3) dormer windows, wood and brick siding, and wood one-over-one windows. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION** – Staff requested a site visit to assess the condition of the windows requested for replacement. From the photos submitted to date and the site visit, the windows proposed for replacement appear to be of historic-age, fully wood one-over-one windows. Two (2) windows do not show signs of significant wood rot, wood damage, or severe deterioration. One (1) window that is located on the west elevation has a rotted lower rail on the bottom sash. Staff finds that the windows are in repairable condition based on the documentation provided, with most requiring minimal repair and intervention such as the reworking of the sashes and reglazing, along with refitting into the trim and frames. The sash with the rotted meeting rail could be replaced with an in-kind traditional wood sash to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND MAINTENANCE** – In terms of efficiency, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a building. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. The original windows feature single-pane glass which is subject to radiant heat transfer. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows, and thermal shades. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. The wood windows were designed specifically for this structure and can accommodate the natural settling and movement of the structure as a whole throughout seasons. Modern replacement products are extremely rigid, often resulting in the creation of gaps, cracks, and major points of air infiltration at the window frames and other areas of the exterior wall plane over time due to material incompatibility when considering the structure as whole integrated system.
- d. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WASTE AND LIFESPAN** – Over 112 million windows end up in landfills each year, and about half are under 20 years old. Historic wood windows were constructed to last 100+ years with old growth wood, which is substantially more durable than modern wood and clad products, and original windows that are restored and maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan, around 10-20 years, and cannot be repaired once they fail. On average, over the lifetime of an original wood window, replacement windows will need to be again replaced at least 4 times. The total lifecycle cost of replacement windows is also much more energy intensive than the restoration of existing windows, including material sourcing and the depletion of natural resources and forests, petroleum-heavy manufacturing methods, transportation, and installation. Finally, window repair and restoration utilize the local labor and expertise of craftspeople versus off-the-shelf, non-custom composite products. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of original windows whenever possible.
- e. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace three (3) existing wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows that generally meet staff’s standard window stipulations. The applicant has committed to installing replacement windows in a style, size, material, and proportion to match the existing windows being replaced and to recess the windows within the frame with traditional wood trim and sill details.

The windows requested for replacement are located on the south and west elevations of the second story. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, wood windows should be repaired in place and restored whenever possible, unless there is substantial evidence that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new windows should be installed to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. As noted in finding b, while the replacement product is appropriate, staff finds that the windows are in repairable condition.

- f. **DOOR REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace two (2) exterior wood doors located above the porte-cochere; one (1) exterior door beneath the porte-cochere; and the front door with aluminum clad wood doors that are similar in appearance to the existing screen doors with a single glass lite in place of the screened area. The two (2) existing doors above the porte-cochere are wood paneled doors without any lites and appear to be damaged at the bottom rails and exhibit some warping. The front door is a wood paneled door with three (3) lites in the top section. The Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i., advise to 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 a replacement product that is in line with the Guidelines is appropriate in this instance for the doors at the porte-cochere and that the front door be maintained where possible.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of:

Item 2: Door Replacement Staff recommends approval of item 2 based on finding f with the stipulation that the front door be retained and the proposed replacement doors above and beneath the porte-cochere be wood and feature a paneled appearance to be in line with the existing appearance; a final door specification and design will need to be provided to staff prior to the issuance of a COA.

Staff does not recommend approval of:

Item 1: Window Replacement

Staff does not recommend approval of item 1 based on findings b through e. The Historic Design Guidelines always recommend that the repair of historic-age windows be prioritized over replacement. Individual sashes that are severely deteriorated or damaged may be replaced with in kind wood sashes of traditional construction methods.

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

- i. That the applicant installs fully wood windows that meet staff's standard window stipulations and submits updated specifications to staff for review and approval. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- ii. That the existing wood windows are salvaged and stored on site for future use or donated to a local architectural salvage store.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION:

Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 2 with staff stipulations and approve with replacement, with standard wood window replacement, and 2 by the roof initially non compliant window, and 3 window comeback with to staff before approving any changes. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 21. 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 Government 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. PREVIOUS REVIEW & DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on October 6, 2021. At that hearing, the request was referred to a Design Review Committee site visit. The DRC met on site on October 27, 2021, where it was recommended that the profile of the end caps be reduced, that all flashing be painted to match adjacent wood trim or columns, and that the profile of the ridge cap be reduced from five (5) inches in profile as much as possible.
- d. 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: Bianca Maldonado- MPA- supports staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve as discussed in DRC and presented by staff during hearing.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Arreola, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzter, and Laffoon..
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish and Bowman.

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

- *COMMISSIONER LAFFOON LEFT MEETING AT 6:30PM*

ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2021-520
ADDRESS: 209 SADIE ST
APPLICANT: Chris and Ava Coker

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification and Verification for the property at 209 Sadie. The applicant is also requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace the existing shingle roof, in-kind.
2. Remove three (3) existing roof dormers.
3. Remove the existing, brick chimney.
4. Modify the fenestration pattern on the east façade by both removing and relocating existing window openings.
5. Modify the fenestration pattern on the rear façade by both removing and relocating existing window openings.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 209 Sadie is a 1-story, single-family home that was constructed circa 1930 and first appears on the Sanborn maps in 1951. The home features a composition shingle hip roof, wood cladding, one-over-one wood windows, a metal porch awning, and wood columns. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. VIOLATION – Office of Historic Preservation Staff performed a site visit on October 21, 2021, and found a number of scopes of work that had been completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness, including fenestration modifications, chimney removal and dormer removal.
- c. HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION & VERIFICATION – As noted in finding b, a number of violations were identified by OHP staff during a site visit on October 21, 2021. This property is not eligible for Historic Tax Incentives until all violations have been resolved, whether through compliance or approval via the HDRC.
- d. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof, in-kind. Staff finds this to be appropriate, provided that historic roof elements remain unchanged.
- e. DORMER REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove three (3), existing roof dormers. The existing roof dormers are located on the sides (east and west) and front (south) roof slopes. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iii. notes that distinctive roof features such as cornices, parapets, dormers, etc. should be repaired and preserved. Staff finds the proposal to remove the existing dormers to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- f. CHIMNEY REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, brick chimney. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations recommend the repair and preservation of historic elements, such as brick chimneys and flues. The removal of this historic element is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- g. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS (East Façade) – The applicant has proposed to modify the fenestration pattern on the east façade by both removing and relocating existing window openings. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window and door openings should be preserved. Additionally, the Guidelines note that new openings where visible from the public right of way should not be installed. Staff finds the requested fenestration modifications to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- h. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS (North Façade) – The applicant has proposed to modify the fenestration pattern on the north (rear) façade by both removing and relocating existing window openings. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. notes that existing window and door openings should be preserved. Additionally, the Guidelines note that historic door and window openings should not be enclosed. Staff finds the requested fenestration modifications to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of Historic Tax Certification and Verification at this time. Staff recommends the current violations be resolved, as noted in the following recommendations, prior to the approval of Historic Tax Certification and Verification.

This property will not be eligible for Historic Tax Certification or Verification until the current violations are resolved.

The denial of Historic Tax Certification and Verification does not resolve any active violations.

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, in-kind roof replacement with the stipulation that all original roof elements, specifically the dormers and brick chimney/flue be reconstructed.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the removal of three roof dormers. Staff recommends that each of the three dormers be reconstructed.

3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the removal of the brick chimney/flue. Staff recommends that this element be reconstructed.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, fenestration modifications. Staff recommends that all original window openings be restored to be consistent with the Guidelines.
5. Staff does not recommend approval of items #5, fenestration modifications. Staff recommends that all original window openings be restored to be consistent with the Guidelines.

All reconstruction work should be based on photographs of the original elements. Construction documents for each of the above noted items are to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Fetzer moved to approve tax certification and verification be denied until the violations be resolved. Item 2- 3 dormers be reconstructed. Item 3. Chimney be reconstructed. Item 4 Small window in south side be reinstated, and Item 5- to restore original window in accordance to the guidelines.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: The MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 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: 11/17/21