CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

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

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, December 1, 2021 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:
Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL:
Present: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Arreola, Mazuca, Grube, Cervantes, and Fetzer.
Absent: Fish, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

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

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:
Chairman Fetzer provided a statement regarding meeting and appeal processes, time limits and decorum.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:
- New Commissioner came on board for HDRC representing District 8, Jimmy H. Cervantes.
- Items # 1 was pulled for discussion by Commission.
- Items # 14,15, 18 and 21 were postponed or withdrawn by the applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- Item 1: Valerie Cortez – does support OHP staff recommendation for noncontribution and propose that the applicant submit drawings.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

1st MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve the November 17th, 2021, HDRC meeting minutes to include amended comments by Commissioner Velasquez.
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION FAILED with 3 AYES. 5 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

2nd MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve the November 17th, 2021, HDRC meeting minutes as submitted.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

- Item 2, Case No. 2021-508 — 275 NORTH DR
- Item 3, Case No. 2021-572 — 630 E NUEVA, 210 S ALAMO
- Item 4, Case No. 2021-567 — 722 LAMAR ST
- Item 5, Case No. 2021-539 — 630 E CARSON
- Item 6, Case No. 2021-585 — 1502 BUENA VISTA ST
- Item 7, Case No. 2021-584 — 327 FLORIDA ST
- Item 8, Case No. 2021-583 — 410 AUSTIN ST
- Item 9, Case No. 2021-545 — 138 E HOLLYWOOD AVE
- Item 10, Case No. 2021-560 — 410 MISSION ST
- Item 11, Case No. 2021-569 — 830 W COMMERCE ST

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve items on consent 2-11 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 0 NAY. 3 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS:

ITEM 1. HDRC NO. 2021-580
ADDRESS: 434 SHERMAN ST
APPLICANT: ROBERT AMEZQUITA/AMEZQUITA DESIGN STUDIO

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1-story residential structure with a detached, rear accessory structure and a detached, rear carport at 434 Sherman.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1-story, residential structure with a detached accessory structure at 434 Sherman, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
b. EXISTING LOT – This lot currently features a 1- story structure. This structure was determined to be noncontributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District on January 2, 2019. And Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on November 18, 2021.
c. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – The lot is located at the corner of Sherman and N Olive Street. Historic structures within the immediate vicinity predominantly feature 1-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 approximately ten (10) feet from the property line. The applicant has not noted how the proposed setbacks relates to the historic setbacks on both Sherman and N Olive. The 1912 Sanborn Map notes a historic structure at this location that features an orientation towards Sherman with setbacks on both Sherman and N Olive that are less than those existing on the lot. Historically, this lot has not featured the depth that other lots on Sherman feature, nor the depth/width that lots on N Olive feature. Generally, staff finds the setbacks that have been proposed to be generally appropriate given the immediate surroundings and documented historic conditions.
e. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed an orientation towards Sherman Street. The corner lot structure immediately across N Olive Street features an orientation towards Sherman Street.

Additionally, the historic structure that was located on this lot featured an orientation towards Sherman. Staff finds the proposed orientation to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

f. 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.

g. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. 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. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature 1-story in height with an overall height of approximately seventeen (17) feet. Staff finds the proposed massing and height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

h. 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 to feature 12 (twelve) inches; however, this is not shown to scale in the submitted elevation drawings. Staff finds that the proposed foundation height should be consistent with the Guidelines.

i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for two front and rear facing gables to be connecting by a joining ridge. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

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 featuring a seven (7) inch exposure, composite trim, an asphalt shingle roof, standing seam metal awning roofs, cedar trim and cedar beams. Staff finds that all composite siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches, a smooth finish and a thickness of ¾". The proposed board and batten siding is to feature boards that are 12 inches in width with battens that are approximately 1 – ½" in width, with a smooth finish. The proposed standing seam metal roof elements should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height and a standard galvalume finish. A large profile ridge cap is not to be used.

l. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has not specified 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.

m. FENESTRATION PROFILE – Generally, staff finds the proposed fenestration profile to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should add fenestration to the west façade, which is currently void of fenestration.

n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, staff finds that fenestration should be added to the west façade, as noted in finding m, and that materials should adhere to staff's standards, as noted in findings k and l.

o. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear accessory structure to be located to the immediate rear (south of the proposed new construction. The applicant has proposed for the accessory structure to feature a footprint of approximately 200 square feet. The proposed accessory structure will feature composite siding featuring a seven (7) inch exposure, composite trim, and an asphalt shingle roof. The applicant has proposed for the rear accessory structure to feature sliding doors on both the north and east elevations, as well as a one over one window on the south elevation. Generally, staff finds the proposed accessory structure to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that all composite siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches, a smooth finish and a thickness of ¾". The proposed window should adhere to staff's standards for windows in new construction. A detail of the proposed door is to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.

p. REAR CARPORT – The applicant has proposed to construct an open air carport at the rear of the proposed new construction. The proposed carport is to feature composite siding featuring a seven (7) inch exposure, composite trim, and an asphalt shingle roof. The proposed carport will feature a footprint of approximately 240 square feet. Generally, staff finds the proposed carport to be appropriate; however, staff finds that all composite siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches, a smooth finish and a thickness of ¾".

q. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a driveway on N Olive of decomposed granite to feature a width of ten (10) feet. Generally, staff finds the proposed driveway to be appropriate.

r. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed a concrete walkway leading from the front porch of the proposed new construction to the right of way at Sherman. The proposed walkway will feature a width of four (4) feet and a concrete profile. Staff finds the proposed walkway to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted the installation of grass lawn, decomposed granite, landscaping beds and hardscaping on site. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
t. FENCING – The lot currently features a chain-link fence, which the applicant has noted will remain, per the site plan. The existing chain-link fence is grandfathered into the code. New chain-link fencing is prohibited. If the existing fence is removed, it shall not be reinstalled.
u. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has not noted the location of mechanical equipment on site. All mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from the public right of way.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant propose a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in finding h.
ii. That all horizontal composite siding feature an exposure of four (4) inches, a smooth finish and a thickness of ¾". The proposed board and batten siding is to feature boards that are 12 inches in width with battens that are approximately 1 – ½" in width, with a smooth finish. The proposed standing seam metal roof elements should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height and a standard galvalume finish. A large profile ridge cap is not to be used. These specifications apply to all three proposed structures.
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 and in finding l.
iv. That fenestration be added to the west façade as noted in finding m.
v. That no new chain-link fencing be installed on site.
vi. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way as noted in finding t.

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: Valerie Cortez-– does support OHP staff recommendation for noncontribution and propose that the applicant submit drawings.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve with staff stipulations. Added stipulations proposed that finding h with block foundation and to heights along the block. Fenestration be added to the side and adhere to staff guidance to windows on west facade. Add window to south elevation at studio. Item 6 South elevation set standards.
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSEDED with 8 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 12. **HDRC NO. 2021-380**
ADDRESS: 232 LAVACA ST
APPLICANT: Clint Belew/BelewHouse

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting final approval to:
1. Remove the non-original 2-story rear addition.
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 – The applicant received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on October 6, 2021. The recommendation for conceptual approval included the following stipulations:
   1. That the applicant modify the proposed roof form to be more consistent with the existing roof forms on the lot and the and surrounding historic roof forms as noted in finding j. Staff recommends that the applicant incorporate a similar roof form as the existing addition; **this stipulation has not been met**.
   2. That the applicant explore material palettes that minimize the visual weight of the rear addition as noted in finding i; **this stipulation has not been met.**
   3. That the applicant incorporate appropriate window sizes and proportions and modify the overall fenestration pattern; this stipulation has been met.
   4. That the applicant explore material palettes that minimize the visual weight of the rear addition; **this stipulation has been met.**
   5. 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; **no window replacement is requested as part of the application for final approval.**
   6. 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; **this stipulation will continue to apply.**
   7. 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; **this stipulation will continue to apply.**
   8. That the applicant retain all existing chimneys, dormer vents, dormer shingles, and other significant architectural details; **this stipulation will continue to apply.**

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 requested fencing in the front yard is proposed to be 4’-0” in height and fully metal, including the hogwire and vertical and horizontal fence components. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, materiality, and character. Staff finds that cattle panel fencing is generally appropriate for the district, but finds that the posts and rails should be woo in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence, which is more consistent with fence materials historically used in the Lavaca Historic District
q. REAR YARD MODIFICATIONS – The submitted site plan includes information not requested as part of this application, including the widening of an existing rear curb cut, privacy fencing, and a rear detached structure. An approval for the scope included in the request item for this case does not imply approval or endorsement of additional items, including any new site work, renovations, exterior modifications, additions, hardscaping, landscaping, or new construction. A separate application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is required to initiate review of additional work.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend final approval at this time based on findings a through q.

If the HDRC finds the request consistent and recommends final 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 and 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 retains 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 all final material specifications for siding, skirting, and other exterior elements be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

viii. That the posts and rails on the proposed fencing be wood in lieu of the requested fully metal fence style as noted in finding p.

ix. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

If the HDRC finds the request consistent and recommends final approval, any additional information represented the submitted documents that are not included in the request language for this case requires a separate request for a Certificate of Appropriateness as noted in finding q.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve with stipulations 3-9 .
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Laffoon joined meeting virtually at 4:45pm.*

ITEM 13. HDRC NO. 2021-024

ADDRESS: 205 OSTROM
APPLICANT: STAPLETON BUILD & DESIGN LLC, Toby Stapleton

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove existing, rear addition to restore the original footprint of the historic, 1935 structure.
2. Rehabilitate the historic structure.
3. Construct a 2-story residential structure to front Ostrom, to the south.

FINDINGS:

a. The historic structure at 205 Ostrom was constructed circa 1935 and is contributing to the River Road Historic District. The historic structure features two, front facing gabled roofs, rear additions and a modified front porch.
b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on February 23, 2021. At that meeting, Committee members commented on the revisions to the proposed design and recommended items for the applicant to incorporate into the design. This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on November 9, 2021. At that meeting, Committee members noted that the revised design was appropriate, that incorporating the garage into the massing of the new construction relived pressure on the site, and commented on the garage roof's profile.
c. REHABILITATION (Removal of existing additions) – The applicant has proposed to remove existing additions at the rear of the primary, historic structure. The proposed additions are found on the 1951 Sanborn Map, and are contributing to the property. While the existing additions are contributing, staff finds their removal to be appropriate in the context of the restoration of the historic footprint and facades of the historic structure; specifically as it relates to the preservation of the historic structure.
d. REHABILITATION – The applicant has proposed a number of rehabilitative scopes of work that include foundation repair, siding repair, roof repair, and wood window repair. Staff finds the proposed rehabilitative scopes of work to be appropriate and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. If original materials are beyond repair, they should be replaced with in-kind materials featuring matching profiles. Windows that are found to be beyond repair should be submitted to OHP staff for review prior to their removal and replacement.
e. NEW CONSTRUCTION – At the western half of the site, the applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story, residential structure to feature an attached garage structure.
f. 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. This specific lot is unique as it features frontage to Ostrom to the South, Dewberry to the west and E Magnolia to the north. The applicant has proposed a setback from Ostrom that is generally consistent with the historic structure's side setback from Ostrom. Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate.
g. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed an orientation towards Ostrom. Staff finds the proposed orientation to be appropriate.
a. 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.
h. 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. Historic structures in the immediate vicinity feature one story in height; however, the applicant has provided an example of historic elements featuring similar heights. Generally, staff finds the proposed height of 2-stories (approximately 31.5 feet) to be appropriate.
i. 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. Per the submitting construction documents, the proposed foundation heights are consistent with the Guidelines.
j. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front and rear facing, gabled roofs. Staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
k. 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 consistency with the

Guidelines; however, staff finds that the proposed amount of construction within the rear yard is atypical for the development pattern of the River Road Historic District.

l. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials to include horizontal lap siding, a standing seam metal porch roof, asphalt shingles, brick foundation skirting, wood trim and wood handrailing. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate. 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. All window and door trim should be consistent with that found historically on the primary historic structure in regards to profile and width.

m. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install double hung windows. 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.

n. FENESTRATION PROFILE – Generally, the applicant has proposed fenestration that is consistent with fenestration found historically within the district in regards to window profiles. Staff finds that fenestration should be added to facades sections that are currently void of fenestration and that all small, square windows be eliminated. Windows should feature traditional sizes and profiles.

o. ATTACHED GARAGE – The applicant has proposed an attached garage to be located on the east façade of the proposed new construction. The proposed garage will face Ostrom. Attached garages are not found historically within the River Road Historic District. Staff finds that the proposed garage should be detached, to be located at the rear, or at minimum, that an attached, open air carport structure set towards the rear of the structure's east façade should be proposed.

p. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, as noted in finding p, staff finds that the attached garage should be eliminated. Additionally, as noted in finding o, staff finds that fenestration should be added to facades sections that are currently void of fenestration and that all small, square windows be eliminated. Windows should feature traditional sizes and profiles.

q. LANDSCAPING/HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed site paving to facilitate vehicular access from Ostrom Drive onto the property and into the proposed garage. While staff finds a vehicular entrance from Ostrom to be appropriate, the profile should be consistent with the Guidelines, a driveway of ten (10) feet in width. As proposed, the landscaping plan allows for front yard parking, which is not consistent with the Guidelines.

r. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has not noted the location of mechanical equipment on site. All mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from the public right of way.

s. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and the River Road Local Historic District. A review of historic archival maps shows the Upper Labor Acequia, a previously recorded archaeological site and designated National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark, likely crossing the property. 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:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the removal of existing additions, based on finding d with the following stipulation:

i. That wood siding, wood windows, and wood framing that is salvageable be salvaged for reuse on site.

2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the rehabilitation of the primary historic structure, based on finding e with the following stipulation:

i. That any original materials beyond repair be replaced with in-kind materials featuring matching profiles. Wholesale material replacement, such as siding replacement, is not allowed.

ii. Windows that are found to be beyond repair should be submitted to OHP staff for review prior to their removal and replacement.

3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the construction of a 2-story residential structure, based on findings a through s with the following stipulations:

i. That the proposed brick foundation skirting is modified to feature lap siding to match the profile of the house's siding.

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 and in finding m.

iv. That the proposed garaged be detached from the proposed new construction, as noted in finding p.

v. That additional fenestration should be added to facades sections that are currently void of fenestration and that all small, square windows be eliminated. Windows should feature traditional sizes and profiles.

vi. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way as noted in finding s.

vii. ARCHAEOLOGY – An archaeological investigation is required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

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: David Brogan, Myfe Moore, Barbara Witte-Howell, Lucy Wilson Bill Aylor, David Schmitt, George Nash, John Hurtz, Leslie Vasquez, Mimi Quintanilla, Patricia Prachett, Ralieigh Wood, Royce Schwarz, Sylvia Guzman- oppose case as it is inconsistent with neighbhorhood, inconsistent documentations, and several violation case; and, Joel Austin- does support the case .

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve with staff stipulations except for item 4. Modify item 4- that the connected roof slope be connected for elevation, approve alternate alternation to garage and archaeological study be included in documentation.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 16. **HDRC NO. 2021-577**
ADDRESS: 826 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: Terri Lasater-Coppernoll/MY HOMESTEAD HEROES LLC &

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to maintain the existing front porch supports and design as installed.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 826 Dawson is a 1-story home constructed in the Folk Victorian architectural style. It features a T-shaped footprint with a covered front porch, wood siding, and a standing seam metal roof. The property is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
b. VIOLATION/CASE HISTORY – Office of Historic Preservation Staff performed a site visit in September 2021 and found several scopes of work that had been completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness, including the replacement of front porch columns and replacement of porch railings.

c. . EXISTING CONDITIONS – The front porch currently features natural wood posts with a round appearance and the previously existing railings have been replaced. The Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, 7.iii and iv., state that related elements such as ceilings, floors, and columns be replaced in-kind when 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, dimension, and finish. Staff finds that the existing posts and the replacement of the railings are not in keeping with the Design Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends that the front porch columns be returned to previously existing conditions to feature a square column with top and bottom trim, or a Doric column be installed to match the previously existing Doric half columns on the façade of the front porch.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Valerie Cortez- requests that columns be restored as it was orginally.

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

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

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

ITEM 17. **HDRC NO. 2021-578**
ADDRESS: 817 N PALMETTO
APPLICANT: Taylor Hagler

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Replace an existing chain link fence in the front yard with a horizontal wood fence.
2. Replace an existing chain link fence in the side/rear yard with a wood privacy fence.

FINDINGS:
a. The primary structure located at 817 N Palmetto is an example of Folk Victorian architecture with a full front porch, wood siding, and a T-shaped footprint. It is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
b. FRONT FENCE REPLACEMENT – The applicant is requesting to replace the existing chain link fence in the front yard with a horizontally oriented wood fence, 4-feet in height. The Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, B.i., note that new fences should appear like those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Design of the new fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. The proposed fence design is atypical and not commonly seen throughout the district. Staff finds that the fence design be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines; such designs and materials include decorative wrought iron and traditional wood pickets.
c. FRONT VEHICLE GATE – The applicant is requesting to install a vehicle gate across the front of the property. There is currently not a driveway on the property and the applicant has not indicated whether one will be installed at this time. Per the site plan the distance from the south property line and the south elevation of the primary structure is approximately 12-feet and there is also a tree and HVAC unit on this side of the house. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, vehicle gates across the front of the property may be considered when atypical conditions exist such as a driveway no wider than 10-feet. Although a driveway is not currently proposed, staff finds that the existing site conditions could limit the installation of a functional driveway gate located behind the front façade of the house.
d. SIDE FENCE REPLACMEENT – The application is requesting to replace the existing chain link fence in the side yard with a 6-foot-tall wood privacy fence to match the existing privacy fence that is currently in place near the alley. Staff finds this to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

i. That the proposed front yard fence design feature traditional vertical wood pickets or black wrought iron to be consistent with the guidelines.
ii. That the applicant provides an updated fence design to staff for review prior to receiving a COA.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Valerie Cortez – support staff recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved for continuance of case until next available hearing. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 19. **HDRC NO. 2021-605**
ADDRESS: 828 NEVADA
APPLICANT: Anthony Chen

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to
1. replace all of the existing wood windows (eight windows in total) with new wood windows at the south, east, and west elevations. The window openings and fenestrations will not be altered.
2. Amend a previously-approved addition at the rear of the house by installing three new wood windows at the north elevation.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 828 Nevada is a single-story Craftsman-style residence built in 1918 and is located in the Denver Heights neighborhood. The property was issued approval for Landmark designation in March 2021.
b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WOOD WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to replace eight (8) existing wood windows with new wood windows at the south, 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.
c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – Staff performed a site visit on November 22, 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 are in a general state of disrepair. The windows show evidence of dry rot, however are not severely damaged or deteriorated; some window sashes are crooked indicating a previous poor repair, many window panes are cracked or missing, and some window weights and cords are broken or missing. Staff finds that the wood windows are in repairable condition based on the documentation provided, with most requiring repair and intervention such as the reworking of the sashes and re-glazing, along with refitting into the trim and frames and replacement of the deteriorated window sills and trim.
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-theshelf, non-custom composite products. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of original windows whenever possible.

e. 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 weather-stripping 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.
f. NEW WINDOW INSTALLATION: The applicant is proposing to install three new windows on elevation of the rear addition. The addition encloses two existing wood windows. The Historic D Guidelines for Additions 3.C.i recommend to salvage and reuse historic materials, where possibl covered or removed as a result of an addition. Staff finds relocation of the two original windows addition exterior to be consistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1, replacement of the wood windows. Staff recommends that the wood windows be repaired to be consistent with the design guidelines.
2. Staff recommends approval of item 2 based on finding c with the stipulation that the applicant re-use the two previously-existing wood windows on the north elevation that are to be enclosed by the addition as recommended by the guidelines. Staff recommends approval of the additional third window under the stipulation that the proposed new window is consistent with the guidelines and is submitted for review by staff prior to installation.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

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

ITEM 20. **HDRC NO. 2021-602**
ADDRESS: 614 CEDAR ST
APPLICANT: James Finley/FINLEY JAMES & KATHERINE GILLEN

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform foundation repairs to include leveling of the house and removal of the chimney on the northwest façade. The removed chimney will be repaired with in-kind siding to match the existing siding of the house.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 614 Cedar Street is a single-story, single-family, craftsmanstyle structure. The property first appears on the 1931 Sanborn map. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District..
b. CHIMNEY REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing chimney from the northwest façade of the primary structure as part of foundation repairs. The Historic Design Guidelines 3.B.vii state that existing historic roof vents should be maintained. When deteriorated beyond repair, replace roof vents in-kind

or with one similar in design and material to those historically used when in-kind replacement is not possible. Staff finds the proposal to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the chimney based on finding b, and recommends that the applicant repair the foundation maintaining the chimney in place.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

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

ITEM 22. **HDRC NO. 2021-595**
ADDRESS: 320 CEDAR ST
APPLICANT: Chris Coker

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove two (2) front doors and install wood windows.

FINDINGS:
a. The primary structure at 320 Cedar is a 2 ½ - story, multi-family structure constructed circa 1910 in the Queen Anne style. The property first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Maps addressed as 326 Cedar. The structure features a metal hip roof with a projecting side gable, front gable detail, and dormer windows. Additionally, the structure features wood cladding, one-over-one windows, a 2-story front porch supported by Corinthian columns, and three (3) entry doors on the first floor of the front façade. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
b. FENESTRATION MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to replace 2 of the three (3) entry doors on the first floor of the front façade with one-over-one windows. The structure first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Maps addressed as 326 Cedar in the same footprint. The Sanborn Maps shows evidence of the front bay projection and the two doors proposed for replacement may be original to the structure. According to Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, existing window and door openings should be preserved. 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. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
c. NEW WINDOWS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to replace two of the existing entry doors with one-over-one windows featuring 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 window size and proportion consistent with the Guidelines.
d. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. If the HDRC approves the replacement of the existing doors with windows, staff finds wood windows to be most appropriate. Windows 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d.
If the HDRC is compelled to approve the proposed fenestration modification, staff recommends the following stipulations:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve to remove 1 existing door with staff stipulations. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2021-609
ADDRESS: 531 E CARSON
APPLICANT: Michael Heller/J Crawford LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Replace and modify the front porch columns.
2. Replace the front porch railing.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure at 531 E Carson is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1935 in the Craftsman style. The property first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Maps. The structure has been subjected to nonconforming modifications in prior decades including the installation of stone veneer on the front façade, and the covering and replacement of wood siding with aluminum siding. Most recently, the structure was subject to porch modifications prior to approval. The property is contributing to the Government Hill Historic District.
b. COMPLIANCE – The property owner submitted an application for Historic Tax Certification in January 2021. During review of the application materials, staff determined that several scopes of work were completed by the owner's contractor without approval. The applicant is requesting approval of the scopes of work that were completed prior to approval so that the property will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive.
c. PORCH COLUMN REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing Craftsman style wood columns with wood columns to match and to install a porch column on the brick base that currently does not feature a column and did not feature a column historically. Guidelines 7.B.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that porches, balconies, porte-cocheres, and 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. Additionally, Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations recommends that replacement elements, such as stairs, be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Do not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance. Staff finds the porch column replacement with columns that match the scale, massing, detail, and material of the existing columns to be appropriate. The installation of an additional column is not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. PORCH RAILING REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing wood front porch railing with a railing with spindles. Guidelines 7.B.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that porches, balconies, porte-cocheres, and 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. Staff finds that the installation of a simplified porch railing would be most appropriate. The proposed railings should feature both a top and bottom rail. The bottom rail should feature a vertical orientation and should be installed approximately three to four inches above the porch decking. Both top and bottom rails should be constructed from 2"x4" members. The proposed railing should not feature an overall height of more than three (3) feet. Staff finds the proposed railing inappropriate.

e. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL – The applicant has proposed to complete additional scopes of work that are eligible for administrative approval and do not require review by the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the porch column replacement based on finding c with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant removes the front porch column that is not original to the front porch.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the front porch railing replacement based on finding d with the following stipulation:

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

CASE COMMENT - The applicant will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive and may return to the HDRC to request Historic Tax Certification and Historic Tax Verification once property has come into compliance.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez ed to approve with staff recommendations and allow retention long span column.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: The HDRC regular scheduled meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Date: 12/15/21