



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
April 06, 2022

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, April 06, 2022 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

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

ROLL CALL:

Present: Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Cervantes, and Fetzer.

Absent: Gibbs, Morales, Grube, and Laffoon.

* *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:

- Preservation Month Announcements and new staff- ScoutSA Historic Specialist- Amy Fulkerson.
- 13th Annual Historic Homeowner Fair on May 7th.
- Items # 29 was postponed by the applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve meeting minutes for March 16th, 2022.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| ○ Item 1, Case No. 2022-175 | 7023 SYMPHONY LANE |
| ○ Item 2, Case No. 2022-174 | 634 CEDAR ST |
| ○ Item 3, Case No. 2022-100 | 112 SOLEDAD ST |
| ○ Item 4, Case No. 2022-180 | 1122 MISSION RD |
| ○ Item 5, Case No. 2022-169 | 4002 ROOSEVELT AVE |
| ○ Item 6, Case No. 2022-162 | 129 W AGARITA AVE |
| ○ Item 7, Case No. 2022-164 | 311 FERGUSON |
| ○ Item 8, Case No. 2022-191 | 222 BROOKS ST |
| ○ Item 9, Case No. 2022-185 | 207 HERMINE BLVD |
| ○ Item 10, Case No. 2022-173 | 3618 MCCULLOUGH AVE |
| ○ Item 11, Case No. 2021-608 | 116 CAMARGO |
| ○ Item 12, Case No. 2022-188 | 207 WYANOKE |
| ○ Item 13, Case No. 2022-190 | Hemisfair Blvd ROW |

- *Point of Privilege: Commissioner Savino notes that some minor errors were made in application for 3 cases. They are as follows: item #2: 634 Cedar St.- finding e should include building height is 14' rather than plate height; case #7: 311 Ferguson- is an individual landmark not in St. Paul Square; and, case #10- 3618 McCullough- finding d text of Lavaca would need to be applicable to Montevista is still accurate? Some feedback as point for future reference for staff.*

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1,2, 4, 6-10, and 13 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **The MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.**

- *Commissioner Grube left meeting at 3:16pm.*

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2022-154
 ADDRESS: 1422 S ST MARYS ST
 APPLICANT: DARRYL OHLENBUSCH

REQUEST: A request for review by the HDRC regarding eligibility of the property located at 1422 S St Mary's St for landmark designation.

FINDINGS:

- On December 18, 2021, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation by Dana M. Delao of Hansco, Inc, on behalf of the property owner 1422 S St Mary's St, located in the Lavaca neighborhood of City Council District 1. OHP 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 January 18, 2022.
- On February 28, 2022, Darryl Ohlenbusch submitted a request for review of historic significance for the property at 1422 S St Mary's St.
- DEMOLITON AND DESIGNATION COMMITTEE.** The Demolition and Designation Committee (DDC) held a site visit on Wednesday, March 23, 2022. Notes from the visit are included in the case file.
- HISTORIC CONTEXT.** The property at 1422 S St Mary's St is a one-story commercial structure with a brick Mission Revival-style portion facing Florida St built c. 1929, flanked to the east and west by additions built between 1986 and 1995. It is located in the Lavaca neighborhood of City Council District 1. Daniel Alanis currently owns the property. The property in question has been associated with automobile service and repair since at least 1951, per the 1912-1951 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. Currently, the oldest portion of the building at this location is a brick structure which appears on the Sanborn map and is book-ended by later additions to the east and west. The 1951 Sanborn map shows this brick structure labeled as "Auto Rep(air)," and the footprint of the structure matches the configuration of the brick structure that still exists on the site. The historic pattern of use in this area, in particular on St. Mary's Street, was from the 1920s onward associated with automobile services, as St. Mary's was the primary road to southern Texas from downtown San Antonio until the advent of the interstate highway system. Additional research shows the property first appears in the 1929 city directory as Droemer Garage.
- SITE CONTEXT.** The property is located on the southwest corner of a trapezoidal block bound to the west by S St Mary's St, the south by Florida St, the east by S Presa St, and the north by Claudia St. The structure covers the majority of the parcel, with concrete or asphalt covering the remainder along the south and west sides. There is a fire station immediately to the north of the property, with a fenced parking lot for the station directly east. The S St Mary's and S Presa corridors are largely commercial, with primarily residential properties located between and on either side. A pole sign is located at the northwest former of the property, on the south edge of a grass easement

separating the subject property from the fire station. There is a divorced sidewalk along the west edge of the parcel that becomes a married sidewalk when it turns east onto Florida St; the west easement is paved in brick.

- f. . ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION. The c 1929 front-gabled building has a stepped brick parapet and a course of stucco brick below. The façade is clad in brick and dominated by a central single-car garage with flanking fenestration closed by CMU. A sign and a light are centered above the garage door. To the south is a shed-roofed structure clad in corrugated steel with a single-car garage door and a gated carport to the left. The portion of the building at the corner is flat roofed with a corrugated steel-clad parapet. It has a door at the entrance of the west elevation with two garage doors to the north and two six-over-six windows to the south that are both covered in metal burglar bars. The south elevation of this portion has a two-car garage on the side nearest the c. 1929 portion.
- g. EVALUATION: In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. The applicant submitted that the property meets the following criteria, consistent with UDC Sec. 35-607(b):
 - 1. Its value as a visible or archeological reminder of the cultural heritage of the community, or national event;** as an early and surviving example of automobile repair structures on S. St. Mary’s, this structure is a visible reminder of the culture heritage of the community.
 - 5. Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;** The structure is load-bearing brick masonry, with scissor-truss roof construction, and, with the exception of front openings that apparently have been filled with later concrete block, completely intact.
 - 6. Its historical, architectural or cultural character as a particularly fine or unique example of a utilitarian structure, including, but not limited to, bridges, acequias, gas stations, transportation shelters, or other commercial structures;** the structure is intact, and also contributes to the historic integrity of the overall area associated with early 20th century automobile services—in particular, it
Staff found that the evidence submitted by the applicant supports criteria 1 and 5 but does not sufficiently support criteria 6. The style, form, and materials of the structure are common for the period of construction.
- h. 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.
- i. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606. If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.
- j. 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: A property must meet three of 16 criteria under UDC Sec. 35-607(b) in order to be eligible for local historic landmark designation. Staff finds that 1422 S St Mary’s St meets two criteria. Therefore, staff finds that the property is not eligible based on findings a through g and does not recommend a Finding of Historic Significance to the Historic and Design Review Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to continue to the next available hearing for applicant to be present. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT.

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2022-121
ADDRESS: 535 E HUISACHE AVE
APPLICANT: CEE WINKLER/WINKLER JULIE M

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the front concrete walkway and steps with a set, grouted flagstone walkway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 535 E Huisache is a single-story, single-family, minimal-tradition-style structure featuring a front porch and accessed via an asphalt driveway and poured concrete walkway at the front of the property. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. VIOLATION – OHP staff performed a site visit in January 2022 and found that the original concrete front sidewalk had been replaced with flagstone pavers.
- c. SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT – The applicant is proposing to replace the existing poured concrete walkway and front steps with set and grouted flagstone pavers. The property is located on the 500 block of E Huisache Avenue, which maintains properties which feature poured concrete driveways and front walkways that are in similar profile and color to the existing sidewalks which run along the north and south sides of E Huisache. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.i-iii state that historic sidewalks should be replaced only where beyond repair using in-kind materials, and to match the existing sidewalk in material composition and color, width, and alignment. Staff finds the replacement sidewalk to be inconsistent with these guidelines. Replacement with a poured concrete sidewalk that matches the original sidewalk would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval for sidewalk replacement based on finding b. Staff recommends that the applicant install a poured concrete sidewalk that is consistent in material, dimension, profile, and color to that which was removed, and that is consistent with sidewalks that are found historically on the block.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Caller- support applicant’s sidewalk and walkway.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to deny application based on staff’s finding. Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES. 1 NAYS. 5 ABSENT.

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2022-117
ADDRESS: 527 HAYS ST
APPLICANT: Megan Suermann/SUERMAN PATRICK & SUERMANN MEGAN

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

- 1. Cover the existing, tan brick with a white lime wash.
- 2. Replace the existing, aluminum windows with new vinyl windows.
- 3. Add black louvered shutters to the front windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 527 Hays was constructed circa 1970 and is located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features brick masonry construction, a low slope turned gable with a front facing gable covered porch, aluminum sash windows, and an infilled wall with a window where the garage door was originally.
- b. BRICK PAINTING. The applicant has proposed to apply a white lime wash to cover the existing, tan brick. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A.i., historically unpainted brick surfaces should remain unpainted. The proposed painting/application of limewash is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, aluminum windows with new vinyl windows. The windows that have been proposed by the applicant are white, vinyl windows that feature a nailing fin. Staff finds the proposed replacement windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and staff’s standards for replacement windows. The replacement of the existing, aluminum windows may be appropriate provided the replacement product meets staff’s standards, noted in the applicable citations.
- d. SHUTTER INSTALLATION. The applicant has proposed to install black shutters at the front windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.x. notes that shutters should not be installed where they did not historically exist. Staff finds the proposed installation of shutters to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the painting/limewashing of brick, based on finding b. Staff recommends the brick remain unpainted.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, the replacement of the existing, aluminum windows with white vinyl windows, as noted in finding. Staff recommends that the applicant install windows that are consistent with staff's standards for replacement windows, as noted in the applicable citations.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the installation of window shutters based on finding d.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to continue to the next available hearing.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2022-133
ADDRESS: 1118 NOLAN ST
APPLICANT: Tim Riley

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install nine (9) Andersen 400 Series Woodwright windows. Same size, shape, location and appearance as the existing windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 1118 Nolan is located within the Dignowity Hills Historic District and was constructed circa 1930. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install nine (9) Andersen 400 Series Woodwright windows to replace the existing wood windows. The existing wood windows predominately feature a four over four profile.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – At the time of staff's review, the applicant had not confirmed a time for OHP staff to perform a site visit to inspect windows. Per the submitted photos, OHP staff does not find the proposed windows to be in a state that is beyond repair. Staff finds that the existing wood windows should be repaired, in-kind. Additionally, the proposed material, vinyl, is not a consistent replacement material, per the Guidelines and Staff's Standards for Replacement Windows.
- c. PREVIOUS REVIEW & DRC- The request was reviewed on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, DRC Meeting. The commission recommended replacements be in-kind. The applicant agreed to attempt to make contact for pricing on the wood replacement windows. The applicant would like to replace the original wood windows with replacement wood windows. While replacement wood windows are more appropriate than vinyl, staff finds that the original wood windows are in a state that can be repaired.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b. Staff recommends the applicant repair the existing, wood windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved for restoration of 1 and 3 and use of existing good condition sashes from historic rehabilitation to original size and replacement of windows 4-9 with in-kind wood window.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2022-149
ADDRESS: 326 RIVERSIDE DR
APPLICANT: Nicholas Melde/Architexas

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

1. Replace the existing, shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.
2. Perform fenestration modifications to the front façade by removing the two existing door openings and creating a new, door opening centered between the two groups of windows.
3. Remove the existing front porch roof and construct a new, shed porch roof.
4. Perform fenestration modifications to the northeast façade by relocating two window openings and modifying their sill heights.
5. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately seventy-two conditioned square feet as well as a rear covered porch.

FINDINGS:

- a. The existing Craftsman structure at 326 Riverside (previously addressed as 314 Riverside) was constructed circa 1945 and is contributing to the Mission Historic District.
- b. PREVIOUS APPROVALS – The applicant has received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform in-kind repair to existing wood windows, wood siding, wood trim, wood soffit and fascia elements and to paint the exterior.
- c. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof. Standing seam metal roofs on Craftsman structures are vernacular to San Antonio. Staff finds the proposed replacement to be appropriate provided that the replacement roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth with no striations or corrugation. A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to inspect the materials prior to installation.
- d. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS (Front Façade) – The applicant has proposed to perform fenestration modifications to the front façade by removing the two existing door openings and creating a new, door opening centered between the two groups of windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance 6.A.i. notes that exterior window and door openings should be preserved. Staff finds the proposed request to be inconsistent with the Guidelines and finds that the existing front façade configuration should be preserved.
- e. PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, non-original porch roof and construct a new, shed porch roof. The existing porch roof was constructed circa 2014. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B. iv. notes that porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original. Furthermore, the Guidelines note that If no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. The applicant has proposed to construct a shed porch roof. Photos from circa 2011 note a gabled porch roof, centered on the primary roof gable with remnants of Craftsman detailing, such as exposed rafter tails. Historic Craftsman structures are found commonly throughout the Mission Historic District and predominantly feature gabled porch roofs when the front porch is not recessed within the footprint of the house. Generally, staff finds that a gabled porch roof form would be consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS (Northeast Façade) – The applicant has proposed to perform fenestration modifications to the northeast façade by relocating two window openings and modifying their sill heights. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance 6.A.i. notes that exterior window and door openings should be preserved. Staff finds that the existing window openings should be preserved in their current location and that their original profile should be maintained.
- g. REAR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature approximately seventytwo conditioned square feet as well as a rear covered porch. The proposed rear addition would result in an extension of the primary ridgeline and the elimination of the secondary rear gable.
- h. REAR ADDITION– The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited to minimize view from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should feature similar roof forms, and should feature a transition to differentiate the new addition from the historic structure. Additionally, the Guidelines for Additions 1.B notes that additions should be subordinate o the principal façade of the historic structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot, and should feature an overall height that is generally consistent with that of the historic structure. Generally, staff finds that the proposed addition is consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the applicant should incorporate a vertical element to note differentiate the addition from the original structure.
- i. REAR ADDITION (Materials) – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding to match the original (117 profile), wood trim to match the profile of the original, a standing seam metal roof, and salvaged wood windows from the existing, rear façade. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate. The addition’s roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard

galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth with no striations or corrugation. A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to inspect the materials prior to installation.

- j. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature a gabled roof, to extend the existing ridge line to the rear. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate.
- k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, as noted in finding h, staff finds that a vertical element should be added on both the side and rear facades to differentiate the addition from original massing and walls.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the installation of a standing seam metal roof with the following stipulation:
 - i. That the replacement roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth with no striations or corrugation. A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to inspect the materials prior to installation.
- 2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, fenestration modifications to the front façade based on finding d. Staff recommends the front façade be maintained as it exists.
- 3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the construction of a new porch roof with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the new roof feature a gabled profile that is centered on the primary gable featuring a subordinate height as noted in the photos provided by staff in the exhibits.
 - ii. That the proposed porch roof feature a standing seam metal roof to match the proposed standing seam metal roof.
 - iii. That detail construction document be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval that include column details.
- 4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, fenestration modifications to the northeast façade based on finding f. Staff recommends the northeast façade be maintained as it exists and that windows maintain their current profile.
- 5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, the construction of a rear addition with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the addition’s roof feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth with no striations or corrugation. A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to inspect the materials prior to installation.
 - ii. That a vertical element should be added on both the side and rear facades to differentiate the addition from original massing and walls.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to deny item 2, approve item 3 with staff stipulations, deny item 4, and approve of item 5 with staff stipulations and clarification that applicant withdrew seam metal roof. Applicant withdrew item 1. Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2021-592
ADDRESS: 703 MISSION RD
APPLICANT: FT Builder Services, LLc

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a commercial structure at 703 Mission Road, located within the Mission Historic District and Mission Protection Overlay District 1. The existing structure and canopy located on the property is proposed for demolition.

The Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a review of contributing status from HDRC.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a commercial structure at 703 Mission Road, located within the Mission Historic District and Mission Protection Overlay District 1. The existing structure and canopy located on the property is proposed for demolition. Additionally, the Office of Historic Preservation is requesting a review of contributing status from the Historic and Design Review Commission.

- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on November 10, 2021. At that meeting, committee members asked questions about the proposed design and discussed the existing structure and the mural on its south façade. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on January 12, 2022. At that site visit, committee members did not find the structure to be contributing and recommended that the applicant incorporate the existing mural into the new construction. This request was reviewed again by the Design Review Committee on March 22, 2022, where the applicant presented revised construction documents and a revised site design. Generally, committee members were complementary on the revised building footprint, reduction in fuel pumps and revised site design.
- c. DEMOLITION – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the primary structure. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Requests for determination of whether an object, building, structure, or sign are contributing or non-contributing to a historic landmark or historic district shall be made on an application obtained from the historic preservation officer through the office of historic preservation. The historic preservation officer shall review the application for completeness and shall make a determination whether the subject of the application is contributing or non-contributing within thirty (30) days of deeming the application complete. The historic preservation officer may, at his or her discretion, present the application to the historic and design review commission for their recommendation. Properties that are determined to be noncontributing are eligible to receive administrative approval for demolition requests by OHP staff.
- d. EXISTING STRUCTURE – The property at 703 Mission includes a single-story stone-clad commercial structure built in 1967 for Benedict P Kotara with gas station canopy, tanks, and pumps added by 1982, per BCAD and confirmed by historic aerial photography. It is located in the Roosevelt Park neighborhood of City Council District 3; within the boundaries of the Mission Historic District, Mission Protection Overlay District, and the World Heritage Buffer Zone; and in a River Improvement Overlay (RIO-4). Nizar Ventures LLC currently owns the property. The stone-clad structure was built as Kotara's Ice House, alternately known as Ben Kotara's Place, and operated as such until at least 1976. An April 2000 mural titled “El Barrio on My Mind,” funded by the City on San Antonio 1999 Neighborhood Improvement Challenge Program, covers the south elevation.
- e. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – All historic-aged buildings within a district are generally considered contributing unless formally determined otherwise. A Historic Assessment of the property was completed in December 2021 at the request of the applicant. Staff finds that the north, east, and west elevations of the stone-clad commercial structure and the gas station canopy and pumps do not contribute to the Mission Historic District. Following the assessment, staff is seeking concurrence from the HDRC regarding noncontributing status and recommendation as authorized in the UDC. The mural titled "El Barrio on My Mind" is significant, and staff recommends that the applicant present options that preserve, relocate, or recreate the mural on site. At this time, the applicant has proposed to preserve the existing plaque and install a graphic print of the original mural.
- f. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – Single-family residential streets are located to the immediate west and southwest of this site. Commercial and industrial sites are located to the immediate north, across E Mitchell, and multi-family and Mission Concepcion are located to the east and southeast.
- g. NEW CONSTRUCTION (Transitions & Setbacks) – The Mission Historic District Design Manual notes that new construction located adjacent to residential areas should not exceed the height of adjacent contributing structures by more than forty (40) percent, and that the new buildings should follow the established pattern of the block in terms of front building setback. The applicant has proposed to locate the structure on the western portion of the site to accommodate for fuel pumps and parking on the eastern half of the property. Staff finds the setback from Mission Road to be appropriate. Regarding the setback on E Mitchell, the applicant has proposed for a setback that is greater than the adjacent historic structure, which features a setback consistent with those found historically on the block. Staff finds the proposed setback on E Mitchell to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – Per the Mission Historic District Design Manual 4.C., parking areas should be located behind buildings within urban historic contexts. Parking areas with ten (10) or more spaces located in the side and rear yards shall be interrupted with landscaped areas (pods) at a ratio of sixteen-point two (16.2) square feet landscaped area for every (1) vehicle parking spot. Pods may be used to meet the requirement for tree and understory preservation, parking lot canopy trees and/or pedestrian circulation system. Canopy trees shall be integrated into the design of surface parking lots to provide shade for a minimum of 25 percent of any individual parking lot. Additionally, the Mission Historic District Design Manual recommends screening of parking areas from the sidewalk and street with a landscaping buffer to reduce its overall visual impact. The UDC Section 35-672(b)(2) notes that parking areas should be located towards the interior of the side or the side or rear of a building. All parking within a thirty (30) foot setback from the lot line at Mission Road shall not exceed forty (40) percent of the lot line as measured in a lineal direction parallel to the lot line. Additionally, all parking within a twenty (20) foot setback from a property line adjacent to a street shall be buffered.

- i. **AUTOMOBILE PARKING** – The applicant has submitted a detailed site plan noting the locations of parking. The applicant has proposed to buffer all automobile parking from the pedestrian path at the right of way via landscaping elements. Staff finds this to be appropriate; however, the amount and scale of buffering proposed is not consistent with the UDC or Mission Historic District Design Manual. Buffering should not only serve as a physical break between parking and a sidewalk, but also as a visual barrier. Due to the amount of continuous, adjacent parking, the applicant is also required to include landscaped pod areas to separate parking locations of more than ten (10) parking spaces. Staff finds that additional or increased buffering is needed on the E Mitchell side of the property as well as within the parking area immediately in front of the commercial structure.
- j. **CURB CUTS** – The site currently features a continuous curb cut on E Mitchell and Mission Road, as well as two curb cuts on E Parkview. The applicant has proposed for the reconfigured site to feature one of the two existing curb cuts on E Parkview. The continuous curb cut on E Mitchell and Mission Road will be removed and a single curb cut will be installed on E Mitchell to feature twenty-five (25) feet in width. This is consistent with the UDC.
- k. **NEW CONSTRUCTION (Mass, Scale, and Form)** – The Mission Historic District Design Manual 2.B. notes that wall planes and fenestration should be organized to yield facades that appear monolithic and enduring while still allowing for visual interest through breaks in scale and pattern, facades should not exceed more than fifty (50) feet in length uninterrupted, and heights should not exceed more than 3 stories in height. The has proposed fenestration and a mural on three facades, and for alternating materials on the rear façade. While alternating materials separate the façade, staff finds that additional architectural elements, such as fenestration should be added to the rear façade.
- l. **NEW CONSTRUCTION (Roof form)** – The Mission Historic District Design Manual 2.C. notes that a flat roof with a parapet wall is recommended as a primary roof form for all commercial buildings. The applicant’s proposed roof form is consistent with the Mission Historic District Design Manual.
- m. **NEW CONSTRUCTION (Materials)** – The applicant has proposed materials that include stucco, stone, metal canopies, and aluminum windows and storefront systems. The Mission Historic District Design Manual 2.D. notes that primary facades should consist of materials that are vernacular to San Antonio, such as stone, wood and stucco and that seventy-five percent (75%) of the exterior facades should consist of these materials. Nontraditional materials may make up twenty-five percent (25%) of these facades. When stucco is applied, it should be done by hand and feature traditional finishes and control joints at locations where there is a change of material or wall plane. Generally, the proposed materials are consistent with the Mission Historic District Design Manner. Staff finds that both stucco and stone should be applied in a traditional manner, and not simply be an applied veneer.
- n. **WINDOWS** – The applicant has noted the installation of aluminum windows. Staff finds the installation of a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction and staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction to be most appropriate; however, an aluminum window may be appropriate. All windows should be recessed at least two inches within wall openings.
- o. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, staff finds that the architectural elements that have been proposed do not represent the traditional architectural elements found within the Mission Historic District. Generally, staff finds that traditional fenestration patterns, canopy profiles and architectural details should be incorporated into the proposed new construction. Architectural elements that mimic traditional forms should be eliminated.
- p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan noting the locations of various landscaping materials and planting locations. As noted in finding i, landscaping buffers are required per both the Mission Historic District Design Manual and the UDC’s River Improvement Overlay standards. While the applicant has proposed significant landscaping in certain locations, staff does not find the landscaping plan to be sufficient to be consistent with the UDC as automobile parking has not been sufficiently buffered from pedestrian traffic and the right of way.
- q. **FUEL CANOPY** – The applicant has noted the installation of a fuel canopy to cover two (2) fuel pumps. The applicant has not submitted construction documents for the proposed canopy. Generally, staff finds that the installation of a canopy would add to the massing on site. Canopy lighting should not produce light pollution or spillover lighting.
- r. **SIGNAGE** – The applicant has noted signage locations on the front elevation. Staff finds that a detailed signage package should be submitted for review and approval. Signage should not produce light pollution.
- s. **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 is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- t. **DUMPSTER LOCATION** – The applicant has noted the location for dumpsters at the eastern end of the site; however, the applicant has not noted the design of the enclosure not how it will be screened. Staff finds that the dumpster location should be designed and screened.
- u. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is located within a River Improvement Overlay District, Mission Local Historic District, Mission Parkway National Register of Historic Places District, and is in close proximity to the historical alignment of the San Antonio River. Furthermore, the property is adjacent to 41BX12, a previously recorded archaeological site and designated State Antiquities 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 conceptual approval of both the proposed site plan and the proposed building design with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposes parking and site design that is consistent with the landscaping, parking and site design requirements outlined in the UDC Section 35-672 and the Mission Historic District Design Manual, as noted in finding i. Parking along the right of way on E Mitchell should be adequately buffered. Parking directly in front of the proposed new construction should be separated by landscaping islands.
- ii. That the applicant submits a robust landscaping plan that is consistent with the UDC Section 35-672 and the Mission Historic District Design Manual, as noted in finding p. Revisions that address stipulation i and finding I should be addressed.
- iii. That the applicant provides a designed dumpster location on site for review and approval, as noted in finding t.
- iv. That the applicant introduces elements that separate blank facades, such as changes in materials, wall planes or fenestration, as noted in finding k.
- v. That the proposed stucco and stone be applied in a traditional manner, and that the stone is not simply a stone veneer, as noted in finding o.
- vi. That the applicant submits product specifications for the proposed windows, and that windows be consistent with the staff's standards for windows in new construction, as noted in finding n.
- vii. That the applicant provides construction documents for the proposed fuel canopy, as noted in finding q. The proposed canopy should feature materials that are consistent with the Mission Manual and should not result in the creation of light pollution.
- viii. That the applicant develops a detailed signage package to submit to the Commission for review and approval, as noted in finding r.
- ix. That the applicant incorporates traditional architectural details, as noted in finding n, and that conjectural architectural features such as the tower elements be eliminated in favor of a more modern design that utilizes traditional materials and form.
- ix. That all mechanical and service equipment be located in a manner than screens it from view from the public right of way, as noted in finding s.
- x. Archaeology – An archaeological investigation is required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.
- xi. That the applicant present options that preserve, relocate, or recreate the mural on site. A detailed plan should be submitted when returning to the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

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

ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2022-177
ADDRESS: 909 HAYS ST
APPLICANT: Frank Telles/FT Builder Services LLC

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

1. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the primary structure including window repair.
2. Perform fenestration modifications on the east and west facades by creating new window openings and modifying existing window openings.
3. Remove the existing roof dormer on the north (rear) roof slope.
4. Construct a rear addition to feature a total of 611 square feet, including both conditioned and non-conditioned space.
5. Perform apron, curb cut and driveway modifications.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 909 Hays was constructed circa 1905 and is first found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The structure features Folk Victorian architectural elements and roof dormers on both the north, south and east roof slopes. The structure has been modified in various ways from its original form, including the removal of both front and rear porches, entrance elements and fenestration.
- b. WINDOW REPAIR – The applicant has proposed to repair the existing wood windows. Staff finds this scope of work to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to perform fenestration modifications on both the east and west façades by creating new window openings and modifying existing window openings. The proposed new window openings feature contemporary sizes and profiles. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance 6.A.i. notes that exterior window and door openings should be preserved. Staff finds that the existing window openings should be preserved in their current location and that their original profile should be maintained. Additionally, the Guidelines note that new window openings should not be created on primary facades or where visible from the right of way. Staff finds the proposed modifications to the existing window openings as well as the creation of new window openings on the side facades to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- d. REAR DORMER REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition which will result in the removal of an existing, rear roof dormer. The dormer currently features a ridge height that is higher than that proposed. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alteration 3.B.iii., original roof features, including dormers should be preserved. Generally, staff finds that the applicant should explore ways to maintain the dormer or incorporate the dormer’s ridgeline into that of the proposed addition.
- e. REAR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition to feature a total of 611 square feet, including both conditioned and non-conditioned space.
- f. REAR ADDITION – The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited to minimize view from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should feature similar roof forms, and should feature a transition to differentiate the new addition from the historic structure. Additionally, the Guidelines for Additions 1.B notes that additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the historic structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot, and should feature an overall height that is generally consistent with that of the historic structure. Generally, staff finds the proposed addition to be appropriate; however, staff finds that either a setback or vertical trim piece should be added to the east façade to differentiate the addition from the historic structure.
- g. REAR ADDITION (Materials) – The applicant has proposed materials for the rear addition that feature composite siding and trim and a composition shingle roof. Staff finds the use of composite siding and trim materials to be appropriate provided that all composite siding feature a smooth finish and a four inch exposure. Staff finds that all trim should match that of the historic structure in profile and dimension.
- h. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows should be installed that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction and additions.
- i. WINDOW PROFILES – The applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature windows on the rear addition that feature contemporary profiles. Staff finds that windows that are consistent with the profile of those found on the historic structure should be installed. Additionally, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to the rear addition.
- j. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the rear addition to feature a hipped roof featuring a 5/12 slope. The Guidelines for Additions 2.A.iii., roof forms should utilize similar roof pitch, form, and orientation as the principal structure for additions, particularly for those that are visible from the public right-of-way. As noted in finding d, staff finds that the applicant should explore ways to maintain the existing, rear dormer or to incorporate the dormer’s ridgeline into that of the proposed addition. Additionally, staff finds that the addition’s roof slope should match that of the historic structure’s roof slope.
- k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in the above findings, staff finds that a vertical trim piece or offset should be added to the east façade, that the applicant should explore ways to incorporate the existing rear dormer into the proposed addition, and that the addition’s roof pitch should match that of the original structure.
- l. PATIO – The applicant has noted the installation of a patio addition to the west façade of the proposed addition. Staff generally finds the proposed patio to be appropriate.
- m. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant has noted the demolition of the existing, rear accessory structure. No formal application has been submitted for this request and is not to be considered at this time. Staff finds that a structural report of the rear accessory structure’s condition as well as a cost estimate for its rehabilitation should be submitted to the Commission for review and approval to determine an unreasonable economic hardship for its repair.
- n. DRIVEWAY/CURB CUT/APRON – The applicant has proposed to install a new driveway to feature full width concrete as well as modify the existing curb cut and apron. Driveways on this block of Hays feature multiple profiles, including full width and ribbon strips. Staff finds the installation of a new driveway to be appropriate; however, the width should not exceed ten (10) feet, per the Guidelines for Site Elements. Additionally, staff finds that the curb cut, and apron should remain as they exist.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, window repair, based on finding b with the stipulation that windows are repaired in-kind.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, fenestration modifications to the east and west facades based on finding c. Staff recommends that original window openings be maintained and that no new window openings be created within the historic structure’s footprint. Evidence for previously enclosed windows may be presented to OHP staff for rehabilitation.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, the removal of the rear roof dormer based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant explore ways to maintain the dormer or incorporate the dormer’s ridgeline into that of the proposed addition.
4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the construction of a rear addition based on findings e through l with the following stipulations:
 - i. That either a setback or vertical trim piece be added to the east façade to differentiate the addition from the historic structure.
 - ii. That all composite siding feature a smooth finish and a four inch exposure. Staff recommends that all trim match that of the historic structure in profile and dimension.
 - iii. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction and additions.
 - iv. That the addition feature window profiles that are consistent with those of the historic structure and that additional fenestration be added to the rear addition.
 - v. That the applicant explore ways to maintain the existing, rear dormer or to incorporate the dormer’s ridgeline into that of the proposed addition. Additionally, staff recommends that the addition’s roof slope match that of the historic structure’s roof slope.
5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, driveway, curb cut and apron modifications with the stipulation that the driveway not feature more than ten (10) feet in width, and that the existing curb cut and apron be maintained.

CASE COMMENT:

The applicant has noted the demolition of the existing, rear accessory structure. No formal application has been submitted for this request and is not to be considered at this time. Staff finds that a structural report of the rear accessory structure’s condition as well as a cost estimate for its rehabilitation should be submitted to the Commission for review and approval to determine an unreasonable economic hardship for its repair.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations, deny item 2, approve item 3 that the applicant work with staff for dormer ridgeline for proposed addition, and approve items 4-5 with staff stipulations
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2022-179
ADDRESS: Dawson at N Olive
APPLICANT: Raul Ruiz/OliveDawson LLC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for the construction of three (3), 1-story residential structures on the vacant lot at the southwest corner of Dawson and N Olive, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. These lots are currently unaddressed.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for the construction of three (3), 1-story residential structures on the vacant lot at the southwest corner of Dawson and N Olive, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. These lots are currently unaddressed.

- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee in November 2021. At that time, the Committee discussed setbacks, building orientation and site design.
- d. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – This lot is currently void of any structures. This lot is bounded by Dawson Street to the north and N Olive Street to the east. Historic structures on the 500 block of N Olive and the 700 block of Dawson all feature one story in height. Corner structures found historically on Dawson Street feature an orientation toward Dawson.
- e. **SETBACKS (N Olive)**– 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. The applicant has proposed a setback for each structure on N Olive of approximately twenty (20) feet from the property line. Per the submitted site plan, the proposed setbacks are generally consistent with that of the historic structure at 519 N Olive. Staff finds that setbacks that are equal to or greater than that of the historic structure at 519 N Olive are appropriate. The applicant should clearly demonstrate an equal or greater setback.
- f. **SETBACKS (Dawson)** – 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. The applicant has proposed a setback on Dawson Street that is greater than that of the adjacent historic structure at 726 Dawson. 726 Dawson shares a front setback that is consistent with the other four historic structures on this block. Staff finds the proposed setback on Dawson to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **ORIENTATION (N Olive & Dawson)** – The Guidelines for New Construction note that the orientation of new construction should be oriented consistently with the historic examples found within the district. As noted in finding c, corner structures found historically on Dawson Street feature an orientation toward Dawson. Per the submitted site plan, the applicant has proposed a primary orientation toward N Olive, with architectural elements such as a wraparound porch to address Dawson Street. Staff finds that the proposed building orientation at the corner may be appropriate provided there is an entrance element (door) on the Dawson façade.
- h. **BUILDING SPACING** – This block of N Olive features building spacing that is less than what is found commonly throughout the district. Staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information noting proposed building spacing that is comparable to that which is found historically on this block of N Olive. What has been proposed, per the site plan may be appropriate with additional, accurate information.
- i. **DRIVEWAYS** – The applicant has proposed driveways of ten (10) feet of width for each lot. The proposed driveways on N Olive follow the historic driveway location, to the south of the structure. The proposed driveway on Dawson is located to the west of the structure, atypical for the existing driveway locations on this block; however, staff finds this to be an appropriate location to allow for adequate setbacks and setback from the intersection.
- j. **FRONT WALKWAYS** – Historic structures feature walkways that lead from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. The applicant has proposed for each house to feature a walkway leading to the sidewalk at N Olive. Staff finds the proposed walkways to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. **GENERAL DESIGN** – The applicant has submitted street elevations providing information regarding façade arrangement, massing and overall heights. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and architectural form of each structure to be appropriate; however, staff finds that fenestration patterns and window openings should be consistent with those found historically within the district. Small, contemporarily sized windows should be eliminated for windows that feature traditional sizes and profiles.
- L. **SITE ELEMENTS** – While developing additional design documents, staff finds that the applicant should also develop a detailed landscaping plan that is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed site plan, building setbacks and building orientation based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide additional information to confirm a setback on N Olive street that is equal to or greater than that found at 519 N Olive for all three structures.
- ii. That the applicant provide specific measurements relating to building spacing that are consistent with building spacing found historically on N Olive.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate entrance elements, such as a door on the Dawson façade, as noted in finding g.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate traditionally sized and placed window opening when developing the design of each structure at noted in finding k.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2022-198
ADDRESS: 801 MATAGORDA
APPLICANT: James Caraway/Third Day Storm Restoration

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 801 Matagorda.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 801 Matagorda is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1895 in the Folk Victorian style. The property first appears on the Sanborn Map in 1896. The structure features a cross gabled roof, an asymmetrical front porch with wood supports and decorative brackets, non-original aluminum windows, and wood cladding. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. VIOLATION – Office of Historic Preservation staff performed a site visit on March 17, 2022 and observed a standing seam metal roof with a ridge cap being installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. OHP staff issued a stop work order at that time. At a follow up site visit on March 18, 2022, it was found that the stop work order was ignored and the roofing work completed. No permit was issued by Development Services Department for roof replacement.
- c. ROOF REPLACEMENT – 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 801 Matagorda. 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 feature a crimped ridge seam, and panels should feature a standard galvalume finish. Staff finds that the proposed ridge cap should be eliminated for a crimped ridge seam.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the following stipulation:

- i. That the proposed standing seam metal roof feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Panels should not feature corrugation or striations.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations and additional stipulations to include flat panel and seam. That gable in cap modifies to transition gable to flat edge metal roof.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2022-161
ADDRESS: 2160 W SUMMIT AVE
APPLICANT: Sarah Manzke/MANZKE SARAH SILVER & MARC D

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

1. Remove the rear, alley-facing roof parapet on the addition to improve drainage.

2. Replace the metal-clad patio doors on the rear elevation.
3. Replace the steel casement windows on the rear elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2160 W Summit is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1920. The structure first appears on the 1938 Sanborn Map. The home features a composition shingle cross hip roof with wide overhanging eaves, a prominent front façade chimney with decorative features, painting brick cladding, six-over-six and divided lite windows. The structure features a rear balcony addition that does not appear on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. SITE VISIT – Staff performed a site visit on March 30, 2022 and observed the following conditions: paint peeling or chipping, cracked or missing glazing, and rusted hardware. The windows are currently inoperable and have been modified to accommodate air conditioning units. The existing windows and doors on the rear elevation are not original to the structure and the window opening framing shows evidence of previous modifications.
- c. PARAPET REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove the parapets and railing on the rear balcony to improve drainage. The rear addition and balcony do not appear on the 1951 Sanborn Map and are not original to the structure. The applicant has expressed that water pools on the flat-roof balcony and causes water damage and leaks on the interior of the structure. Guideline 7.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres should be preserved. Do not add new porches, balconies, or porte-cocheres where not historically present. As the balcony is not original to the primary structure, staff finds the modification consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the metal-clad patio doors on the rear elevation. The existing doors are not original to the structure and exhibit deterioration and delamination. The bottom portion of the door has had to be reinforced and do not meet properly. Guideline 6.A.ii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that historic doors including hardware, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures should be preserved. Staff finds that the existing doors are not historic or original to the structure and that in-kind replacement is appropriate.
- e. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – The applicant has proposed to replace two (2) sets of steel casement windows with Pella Lifestyle Series aluminum-clad wood windows. Guideline 6.A.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that historic windows should be preserved. Per finding b, staff observed during the site visit that the windows were inoperable and were not original to the structure. Staff finds that replacement of the existing rear steel casement windows is appropriate but finds that the replacement windows should match the existing window configuration.
- f. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: REPLACEMENT PRODUCT – The applicant has proposed to replace two (2) sets of steel casement windows on the rear elevation addition. The applicant has proposed to install Pella Lifestyle Series aluminum-clad wood windows in a fixed-over-awning window configuration. 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. Staff finds that the existing windows are not original to the structure and fully wood or aluminum-clad wood would better match the historic windows on the primary structure. The replacement windows should match the existing casement window configuration.
- g. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL – The applicant has proposed to perform in-kind repairs to stabilize and repoint the exterior brick, to replace the roof on the rear balcony, and to reconstruct the existing landing and stairs to match existing and to meet the leveled foundation. This scope of work is eligible for administrative approval and does not require review by the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Item 1, staff recommends approval of the rear balcony modification based on finding c. Item 2, staff recommends approval of the door replacement based on finding d. Item 3, staff recommends approval of the rear addition window replacement based on findings e through f with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs fully wood or aluminum-clad wood windows that match the existing window configuration. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and 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. Final window specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Bianca Maldonado- supports staff recommendations 1-3and thankful for additional information.

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

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

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

ITEM 24. HDRC NO. 2022-150
ADDRESS: 504 KING WILLIAM
APPLICANT: Daniel Cruz/Design Coop

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

1. Install a wood pergola on the rear balcony.
2. Install a wood pergola at the rear elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 504 King William is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed in 1883 and was designed in an eclectic style with Queen Anne influences. The home was designed by prolific architect Alfred Giles. The home underwent a major renovation in 1915, during which the turret, the carved stone decorative band, and the existing square porch columns were installed. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. REAR BALCONY: PERGOLA INSTALLATION. The applicant has proposed to install a fully wood pergola on the rear balcony. The proposed balcony pergola is 11 feet in height and will total 235 square feet. The proposed pergola will connect to the primary structure with a ledger block and threaded rod. According to Guideline 1.A.i for Additions, residential additions should be located at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. An addition to the front of a building would be inappropriate. The balcony pergola will be visible from the public right-of-way but will not detract from the architectural character of the building. Staff finds that the request is appropriate if the condition is reversible and is an independent structure not attached to the primary historic structure.
- c. REAR YARD: PERGOLA INSTALLATION. The applicant has proposed to install a pergola in the rear yard along the east (rear) elevation. The proposed pergola is 10 feet, 6 inches in height at the Johnson Street rear pedestrian gate and extends to 13 feet, 6 inches in height. The proposed pergola will total 560 square feet and will connect to the primary structure with a ledger block and threaded rod. The applicant has proposed to install a stone paver walkway beneath the pergola structure. Guideline 3.B.i for Site Elements states that large pavers or other impervious surfaces should not be introduced where they were not historically located. Guideline 3.B.ii for Site Elements states that new pervious hardscapes should be limited to areas that are not highly visible and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings. According to Guideline 3.A.ii for Site Elements, do not fully remove and replace traditional lawn areas with impervious hardscape. Limit the removal of lawn areas to mulched planting beds or pervious hardscapes in locations where they would historically be found, such as along fences, walkways, or drives. Low-growing plantings should be used in historic lawn areas; invasive or large-scale species should be avoided. Historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50%. The applicant has not provided the total percentage of lot coverage for review. Additionally, the applicant has not provided a landscaping plan showing the proposed site work. Staff finds that the applicant should submit lot coverage information and a landscaping plan showing the material and dimensions for all proposed site work to staff for review. Staff finds that the requested pergola is appropriate if the condition is reversible and is an independent structure not attached to the primary historic structure.
- d. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL. The application materials include elevation drawings showing a steel guardrail on the rear balcony. A simplified steel guardrail was approved by HDRC in January 2018, per HDRC Case No. 2018-011. The modification to the guardrail design is eligible for administrative approval and does not require review by HDRC.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Items 1 & 2, staff recommends approval of the pergola installations based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the pergolas are installed so that they are a reversible condition and are independent structures that do not require attachment to the primary structure. The applicant must submit updated installation plans to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submit a final landscaping plan showing the material and dimensions for all proposed site work and total percentage of lot coverage to staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to refer to DRC
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 25. HDRC NO. 2022-130
ADDRESS: 334 W ELSMERE PLACE
APPLICANT: Tom Krulevitch

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Modify the front porch to include a larger footprint and low walls.
2. Construct a 1-story rear addition with attached uncovered deck.
3. Modify the rear accessory structure to include the removal of two walls and the construction of a second story addition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 334 W Elsmere is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1925 in the Craftsman style with Colonial Revival influences. The home features woodlap siding, an arched shed porch overhang, and a standing seam metal roof. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The structure also features a rear 1-story accessory structure, also contributing to the district.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing front porch configuration. The current porch features an arched shed overhang and a concrete pad that is slightly larger than the overhang. The proposal will not affect the overhang. The proposal includes removing the existing steps and pad and extending the uncovered porch to the full width of the front façade. Short walls with faux column bases will be included. Per the Guidelines, front porches should be retained. 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. The porch configuration appears to be original to the structure and is characteristic of other structures of a similar design in the Monte Vista Historic District and nearby neighborhoods of a similar development period. Staff does not find the modifications consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **ADDITION: MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1- story rear addition to the existing 1-story historic house, which will require exterior modifications to the existing structure. Based on submitted photographs and the conceptual documents, the proposed modifications appear to include the removal of an existing window and door configuration on the rear elevation. Staff finds that the removal of elements of the rear addition are acceptable for the new addition and recommends that any salvageable elements be reutilized in the new addition.
- e. **ADDITION: FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story rear addition. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new additions should never result in the doubling of the historic building footprint. Staff generally finds the footprint to be consistent based on the limited conceptual documentation, but requires final, dimensioned documentation to make a complete recommendation.
- f. **ADDITION: SCALE AND MASSING** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story rear addition. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the height of additions should be subordinate to the primary structure or, at minimum, align with the primary ridgeline. Staff generally finds the height consistent with the Guidelines based on the submitted documentation.
- g. **ADDITION: ROOF** – The applicant has proposed to install a standing seam metal roof on the addition to match the primary structure. The roof will feature a gable configuration. Staff finds the proposal conceptually consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **ADDITION: WINDOWS AND DOORS** – Per the submitted documentation, the addition will feature accordion-style doors and a set of three windows on the rear elevation. The right and left elevations of the addition do not currently feature fenestration. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new windows on additions should relate to the windows of the primary historic structure in terms of materiality and overall appearance. Windows used in new construction should relate be similar in appearance to those commonly found within the district in terms of size, profile,

and configuration. As noted in finding d, the applicant should reclaim windows to be removed for the addition where feasible. While no material is expressly prohibited by the Historic Design Guidelines, a high-quality wood or aluminum-clad wood window product often meets the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in staff's specifications and the recommendation if new windows or doors are needed. Staff recommends that the applicant explore adding fenestration to the left and right elevations for final approval.

- i. **ADDITION: MATERIALS** – Materials for the addition have not yet been indicated. Staff finds that the applicant should propose a complete exterior material palette for final approval, including woodlap siding or composite siding with no faux grain and a maximum reveal of 4-6 inches; compatible roofing material; and salvaged wood windows and/or wood or aluminum-clad wood windows and doors.
- j. **REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MODIFICATIONS** – Per the submitted documents, two walls of the existing rear garage will be removed, resulting in new footprint to support a second story addition and additional exterior modifications. The two remaining walls will be retained and incorporated into the new design, which features a taller primary roofline, a new fenestration pattern, and new exterior garage doors facing the street. At this time, staff does not find the proposal conceptually appropriate due to limited visual clarity, unclear drawing convention, and an incomplete understanding of exactly what materials will be retained from the existing garage. Staff finds that applicant should aim to maximize material salvage from the walls to be removed for reuse in the new design and submit a clear salvage and reuse plan, in addition to measured, dimensioned drawings. Staff also finds that the applicant should propose modifications that are consistent with the Guidelines for Additions pertaining to roof forms, fenestration patterns, massing, scale, and materials.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend conceptual approval at this time. Staff finds the applicant should address the following items prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant retains the existing front porch configuration as noted in finding c.
- ii. That the applicant provides clear, measured, dimensioned drawings that clearly convey what will be retained and what elements are new for both addition and rear accessory structure modifications as noted in findings d, h, and j.
- iii. That the applicant salvage and reuse the windows to be removed for the rear addition as noted in findings d and h.
- iv. That the applicant explores adding fenestration to the right and left elevations of the addition for final approval as noted in finding h.
- v. That the applicant submits a rear accessory structure proposal that includes clear elevations and additional information on which materials will be retained in the new design as noted in finding j. The drawings should also indicate the height of the rear structure relative to the primary structure.
- vi. That the applicant incorporates roof forms, materials, and fenestration patterns into the rear accessory structure modifications that are consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding j.
- vii. That the applicant submits a final window specification for the proposed wood or aluminum clad wood windows to staff for review and approval. 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 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 Savino moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations 2-6, and stipulation 7 intact for DRC.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 26. HDRC NO. 2022-183
ADDRESS: 138 KING WILLIAM
APPLICANT: NICHOLAS WHITELONIS/WHITELONIS NICHOLAS & AMANDA

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the rear chimney.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 138 King William is a two-story, residential structure with a wraparound porch and double height porch columns. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. CHIMNEY REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing chimney from the rear corner of the primary structure as part of foundation repairs. The Historic Design Guidelines 3.B.iii state that existing historic roof forms should be maintained. Staff finds the removal of the chimney to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the exterior appearance of the chimney should not be impacted by foundation repair.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval based on finding b. The exterior appearance of the chimney should not be impacted by foundation repair.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Cervantes moved to deny application.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 27. HDRC NO. 2022-168
ADDRESS: 728 N PINE ST
APPLICANT: Carly Osborn/OSBORN CARL & CARLY

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing concrete front walkway with concrete pavers.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing concrete front walkway with concrete pavers.
- b. CASE HISTORY: On March 2, 2022, the applicant requested a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing asphalt driveway with gravel in the same footprint to match existing and to landscape the rear yard using gravel, pavers, turf, planning beds, and fruit trees. While reviewing application materials submitted for this request, staff observed that the applicant had replaced the existing concrete walkway with concrete pavers. After administratively approving the scopes of work submitted on March 2, 2022, staff reached out to the owner by email on March 24, 2022, to request application materials to rectify the walkway violation.
- c. WALKWAY REPLACEMENT: The applicant has proposed to replace the existing concrete walkway with a concrete paver and gravel walkway. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A. ii. notes that historic sidewalk and walkway materials should be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the existing concrete walkway to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. In-kind replacement of the existing sidewalk is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the concrete walkway with a paver and gravel walkway based on finding c. Staff recommends that a concrete walkway be installed that matches the profile of the original.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter move to deny walk as installed, but with the stipulation that the non-complying pavers be permitted to remain in place up to a year and be replaced with concrete poured and void of added color/pattern walkway.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

APPLICANT: Brandon Ewing/Signarama (Downtown San Antonio)

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a temporary real estate sign 5'x20' and attached to the brick exterior with bolts at 102 Heiman, located within the St Paul Square historic district.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a temporary real estate sign 5'x20' and attached to the brick exterior with bolts at 102 Heiman, located within the St Paul Square historic district. The proposed signage would face west, toward I-37.
- b. **ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE:** The UDC Section 35-612(f)(5) and Section 35-678(f)(5) both limit the size of real estate signs to eight (8) square feet. The UDC permits thirty-two (32) square feet for construction signs. Guideline 6.1.D.i suggests choosing a dark background with light lettering to make signs more legible.
- c. **WALL BANNERS:** The applicant has proposed to install one (1) real estate banner on the west façade of the building to read "FOR LEASE – Executive Real Estate Group – J.E. Aranda 512-750-5690." The proposed sign will feature an overall width of 5'x20'. As noted in finding b, the UDC recommends real estate signs of only eight (8) square feet in size; however, given the size of the building and its adjacency to the highway, staff finds that additional square footage up to 32 square feet is appropriate.

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

- i. That the wall-mounted real estate signage not exceed 32 square feet overall.
- ii. That the signage feature a dark background with white letters.
- iii. That the real estate signage be removed once the vacancy is filled.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with stipulations, signage verbiage be reduced, final design review be by staff and signage be no more than 50 square ft. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

APPROVED



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

Date: 4/20/22