



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
June 29th, 2022**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, June 29, 2022 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Gibbs, Fish, Mazuca, Carpenter, Cervantes, and Fetzer.

Absent: Savino, Velasquez, Morales, Grube, and Laffoon.

CHAIRMAN’S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Cancelled scheduled work session until further notice.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Item 3: Conservation Society of San Antonio- continues to disagree with the massing in the block.

Item 4: Valerie Cortez- on behalf of Dignowity Hill neighbors- concurs with staff recommendations.

Item 7: Valerie Cortez- on behalf of Dignowity Hill neighbors- recommends for applicant to get in touch with neighbors to discuss case.

Item 8: Bianca Maldonado- supports the case with staff stipulations and additional recommendations infer to graffiti.

Item 9: Mr. Castle- opposed to get this case. Bianca Maldonado- support’s applicant request.

Item 13: Shawn O’Neill- supports project.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Cervantes moved to approve meeting minutes for June 15, 2022.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| ○ Item 1, Case No. 2022-314 | 1119_1123_1127_1135 AVENUE B |
| ○ Item 2, Case No. 2022-338 | 3304 BROADWAY |
| ○ Item 3, Case No. 2022-342 | 421, 423, 431 S ALAMO ST |
| ○ Item 4, Case No. 2022-352 | 609 HAYS ST |
| ○ Item 5, Case No. 2022-350 | 212 N ALAMO ST |
| ○ Item 6, Case No. 2022-351 | 419 S HACKBERRY ST |
| ○ Item 7, Case No. 2022-336 | 803 N CHERRY |

- Item 8, Case No. 2022-337 I-10 W to W Agarita ROW
- Item 9, Case No. 2022-333 250 MARY LOUISE
- Item 10, Case No. 2022-349 722 LAMAR ST
- Item 11, Case No. 2022-331 2023 W GRAMERCY PLACE
- Item 12, Case No. 2022-329 227 W GRAMERCY PLACE
- Item 13, Case No. 2022-200 323 REFUGIO ST

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1-13 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2022-335
 ADDRESS: 724 N PINE ST
 APPLICANT: SUNNIE DIAZ/SOFLIN DAVID & DIAZ SUNNIE R

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear accessory structure to feature a footprint of approximately 955 square feet at the rear of the property at 724 N Pine, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed rear accessory structure will feature a deck attached to the north façade and a covered carport attached to the west façade.

The Historic and Design Review Commission issued final approval for the demolition of the existing, accessory structure at the July 15, 2020, HDRC hearing.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 724 N Pine was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a rear accessory structure to feature a footprint of approximately 955 square feet at the rear of the property at 724 N Pine, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed rear accessory structure will feature a deck attached to the north façade and a covered carport attached to the west façade.
- b. PREVIOUS REVIEW (Demolition) – The Historic and Design Review Commission issued final approval for the demolition of the existing, accessory structure at the July 15, 2020, HDRC hearing. The Commission included a stipulation that materials that are in a salvageable state should be salvaged for reuse on site.
- c. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The applicant received conceptual approval of the proposed rear accessory structure at the July 15, 2022, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant utilize materials found historically within the district in the development of the proposed new construction.
 - ii. That materials that are not deteriorated beyond use be salvaged from the existing structure and incorporated into the proposed new construction.
- d. MASSING & FORM – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that rear accessory structures are to feature a massing and form that is visually subordinate that that of the primary historic structure in regards to their height, massing and form, should be no larger in plan than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure’s footprint and should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic structure. The applicant is proposing an overall footprint for the proposed new construction of approximately 955 square

feet, not including the proposed covered carport. While the proposed footprint is larger than forty (40) percent of the historic structure's footprint, staff finds the proposed footprint to be appropriate given the overall size of the lot.

- e. **MASSING & FORM** – Regarding overall height, the applicant has proposed for the rear accessory structure to feature one story in height. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **ORIENTATION & SETBACKS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. notes that the predominant garage orientation and historic setback patterns of the block should be followed. Generally, staff finds the proposed location, orientation and setbacks associated with the proposed accessory structure to be appropriate and consistent with both the Guidelines and existing structure's location.
- g. **MATERIALS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that new accessory structures should relate to the primary historic structure in regards to their materials and window and door openings. The applicant has proposed materials that include corten corrugated siding, polycarbonate roofing, corrugated roofing, standing seam metal roofing, fiberglass doors and windows, wood and steel columns, cedar siding, and wood decking. The primary historic structure on site features wood elements installed in a traditional manner. Materials such as corten corrugated siding, polycarbonate roofing and corrugated roofing are not found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District in residential construction (both primary and secondary/accessory structures). Staff finds that materials that are found historically within the district should be used in the new construction, such as wood siding in either a horizontal, lap profile or a board and batten profile.
- h. **MATERIALS (Windows & Doors)** – The applicant has proposed to install fiberglass windows and doors. Staff recommends the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with the staff's standards for windows in new construction. An alternative material, such as fiberglass may be appropriate provided that the proposed windows are consistent with staff's standards.
- i. **CHARACTER/ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that new accessory structures should relate to the primary historic structure in regards to their materials and window and door openings. As noted in the findings above, staff finds that materials and windows and doors should be consistent with those found historically within the district and the Guidelines. Additionally, staff finds that all window openings should relate to those found historically on the primary historic structure, to be consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the applicant eliminate the proposed corten corrugated siding, polycarbonate roofing and corrugated roofing as these materials are not consistent with the Guidelines and are not found historically within the district in a residential context. Staff recommend the applicant install wood or composite siding and standing seam metal roofs in profiles that are consistent with the Guidelines. Siding should feature a horizontal profile that features four inches and a smooth finish, if composite. A board and batten profile would also be appropriate with boards features 12 inches in width and battens feature 1.5 inches in width. Standing seam metal roofs should feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish. If a ridge cap is used, it must be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval and should not feature an end cap.
- ii. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff's standards for windows and in new construction. A fiberglass window may be appropriate provided it is consistent with staff's standards.
- iii. That the applicant modify the proposed fixed, rectangular windows to feature a profile that is consistent with the window profiles found on the historic structure.

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- on behalf of Dignowity Hill neighbors- concurs with staff's findings. Dignowity Hill Association-supports the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to with staff stipulation 1- that applicant eliminate the proposed carbonate roofing and standing seam metal roof should feature 18-24 in wide and 1 in in height paneling low profile ridge cap with standard galvalume finish to be submitted to OHP staff for review and feature an inkcap. staff stipulation 2- that the applicant install aluminum clad wood windows in accordance to window standards with fiber glass windows as proposed that meet s dimensional requirements; and stipulation 3-applicant modify the proposed rectangular windows to horizontal windows more consistent within historic districts.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2022-343
ADDRESS: 606 LABOR ST
APPLICANT: Victoria Rodriguez/HLL JONES

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the windows with vinyl.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the windows with vinyl. The 606 Labor address includes two structures, one fronting Labor (Unit 1) and one located immediately behind the front structure (Unit 2). The scopes of work in this application is for Unit 2 fronting Labor.
- b. The historic structure at 606 Labor (Unit 2) is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1920 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure has been modified since its initial construction to include rear additions, porch modifications, and window replacement.
- c. DISPOSAL OF ORIGINAL WOOD WINDOWS- The applicant has stated the original wood windows were disposed of due to their condition. Staff did not review the state of the windows prior to their removal and disposal. There is no record of the windows being beyond repair based in staff's review.
- d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace with Ply-Gem 500 Series white vinyl single-hung windows. Staff finds the proposed replacement windows are inconsistent with the Guidelines for replacement windows.
- e. VIOLATION- The original wood windows have been removed from the home and disposed of without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through e. Staff recommends that the applicant install the original wood windows that were removed. If the original wood windows are not available, staff recommends the applicant salvage wood windows that are appropriate to the home without significant changes to the existing fenestrations.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations that wood windows be replaced with in-kind windows to match the structure.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2022-332
ADDRESS: 1115 S ST MARYS ST
APPLICANT: Roberto Medrano/MEDRANO BUSINESS INVESTMENTS INC

REQUEST: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install nine (9) shade canopies to the front yard and playground area.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 1115 S St Mary's is a contributing structure to the King William Historic District. At this time, the applicant is requesting to install nine (9) shade canopies to the front yard and playground area. The applicant has noted minimum heights of eight feet with the exception of one canopy that will feature (12) ft in height where the slide is located.
- b. CANOPY INSTALLATION- The applicant has requested to install canopies along the front (east) of the property, along the driveway on the north side, and to the rear of the property (west). Staff finds the request of the installation of canopies along the driveway and rear of the property to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A.ii. The installation of canopies in the front yard is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Currently, there is no precedent for the installation of canopies in the front yard. Staff finds that canopies should be installed in a manner that does not result in mounting elements penetrating the historic façade.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends approval of the installation of canopies along the driveway and to the rear of the property with the following stipulations:

- o That the canopy fabric be in natural tones and submitted to staff for review and approval.
- o That the canopies be installed in a manner that does not result in mounting elements penetrating the historic façade.

Staff does not recommend approval for the installation of canopies in the front yard based on finding b.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve rear canopies with the staff stipulations about coloring. Move to approve a smaller scale non-permanent commercial umbrella or canopy structure in the front of site with staff review for prior to installation and that the rear and front not impact the historic structure permanently.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2022-353
ADDRESS: 1722 S ST MARYS ST
APPLICANT: Peter DeWitt/Adapt

REQUEST: The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Infill two windows on the east elevation and one window on the north elevation.
2. Replace two doors on the south elevation with windows salvaged from the east elevation.
3. Add one door with canopy to the east elevation.
4. Remove and replace the existing west canopy.

5. Convert the existing south balcony to a canopy.
6. Add a 3' wood partition to the east elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 1722 S St Mary's St is a two-story stucco-clad commercial structure built c. 1931. It first appears on the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance map as a corner store with a one-story wraparound porch. The flat roof has a stepped parapet on the south side. The building has one-over-one wood sash windows and modern 15-lite doors. The building is an individual landmark located in a River Improvement Overlay (RIO-4).
- b. **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:** The applicant requests approval to add a 3' wood partition to the east elevation. This scope of work is eligible for administrative approval and does not require review by the HDRC.
- c. **FENESTRATION CHANGES:** The applicant requests approval to infill two windows on the east elevation and one window on the north elevation, replace two doors on the south elevation with windows salvaged from the east elevation, and add one door to the east elevation salvaged from the south elevation. Per Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 2, 6.A.i, existing opening should be preserved. Staff finds these requests do not conform to guidelines.
- d. **WINDOWS:** The applicant requests approval to infill two windows on the east elevation and one on the north elevation and replace two doors on the south elevation with one-over-one windows. Per Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 2, 6.A.i, existing openings should be preserved. Should the HDRC approve fenestration changes in finding c, staff finds the salvage and onsite reuse of windows appropriate.
- e. **DOORS:** The applicant requests approval to replace two doors on the south elevation with windows and salvage one of the doors for a new door introduced on the first floor of the east elevation. Per Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 2, 6.A.i, existing openings should be preserved. Should the HDRC approve replacing existing south doors per finding c, staff finds salvage and reuse of a door on the east elevation appropriate. Should HDRC deny the request for fenestration changes, staff finds the addition of a new door on the east elevation generally appropriate since it appears at the rear of the structure. The new door should conform to Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 2, 6.B.i, which states that new doors should match existing doors in size, material, and profile. The new canopy should be based on architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building, per Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 2, 11.B.ii.
- f. **WEST CANOPY:** The applicant requests approval to remove and replace the existing west canopy and convert the existing south balcony to a canopy. Historic Design Guidelines Chapter 2, 10.A.i, suggests that character defining features of historic buildings be preserved, and 10.A.iii suggests that missing features should be replaced in-kind based on evidence. The 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, the first map on which the structure appears, shows a two-story store with one-story wraparound porch. Staff finds removal and replacement of the existing west canopy appropriate since it is not an historic feature.
- g. **SOUTH BALCONY:** The applicant requests to convert the existing south balcony to a canopy and remove the west end of the existing balcony. The 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance map, the first map on which the structure appears, shows a two-story store with one-story wraparound porch. Staff finds removing part of the existing south porch and altering its function to a canopy does not conform to guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff does not recommend approval of item 1, infilling two windows on the east elevation and one window on the north elevation, based on finding c.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 2, replacing two doors on the south elevation with windows salvaged from the east elevation, based on findings d.

Staff recommends approval of item 3, adding one door with canopy to the east elevation, based on finding e, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the new door match existing doors in size, material, and profile.
- ii. That the new canopy be based on architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building.

Staff recommends approval of item 4, removal and replacement of west canopy, based on finding f, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the new canopy be based on architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 5, conversion of the existing south balcony to a canopy, based on finding g.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with stipulations 3 and 4.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2022-313
ADDRESS: 2033 W GRAMERCY PLACE
APPLICANT: Lucia Martinez/MARTINEZ LUCIA HERNANDEZ & MARTINEZROBERT R

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

1. Replace the existing ribbon driveway with a poured concrete driveway.
2. Pour a 15 square foot concrete pad in the rear yard.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 2033 W Gramercy is a traditional-style brick bungalow with two, symmetrical, frontfacing gables, rounded Romanesque window and door openings, a red shingle roof, and a front porch. The structure contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. **DRIVEWAY MODIFICATION** – the applicant is requesting to replace the existing, degraded, concrete ribbon driveway with a solid, poured concrete driveway. Historic Design Guideline 5..B.i for Site Elements advises to retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives, and to incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Staff does not find the request to be consistent with this guideline. Repair and maintenance of the existing ribbon driveway, to match the original material, width, and design, would be appropriate.
- c. **HARDSCAPING INSTALLATION** – The applicant is requesting to install a 15-foot by 15-foot concrete pad at the rear of the house. The Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.ii states that new hardscaping should be limited to areas that are not highly visible, and should not be used as wholesale replacement for plantings, and that, if used, small plantings should be incorporated into the design. Staff finds that the placement and footprint of the poured patio are appropriate.

RECOMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item 1, replacement of the existing driveway with a poured concrete driveway, based on finding b. Staff recommends that the existing driveway be repaired in-kind to match the original in material, width, profile, and design. Installation of pavers between repaired ribbons may be appropriate; the applicant is required to submit material specifications to staff if this modification is requested.
2. Staff recommends approval of item 2, installation of a concrete patio at the rear of the house, based on finding c, with the stipulation that the applicant incorporate landscaping around the concrete slab.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Bianca Maldonado- concerns about the erosion and support staff recommendations 1 and 2.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with concrete curb with scored two tire strips and with 6 in curb siding to help and include steeper approve for alleviate drainage. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2022-344
ADDRESS: 326 RIVERSIDE DR
APPLICANT: NICHOLAS MELDE/Architexas

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

1. Amend a previous issued Certificate of Appropriateness. The previously issued COA specified the rehabilitation and construction of a rear addition to the historic, Craftsman structure at 326 Riverside. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the structure. The structure collapsed on May 24, 2022.
2. The applicant has proposed to replace the historic structure with a 2-story, single-family residential structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend a previous issued Certificate of Appropriateness. The previously issued COA specified the rehabilitation and construction of a rear addition to the historic, Craftsman structure at 326 Riverside. At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the structure. The structure collapsed on May 24, 2022.
- b. PREVIOUS REVIEW –The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rehabilitation of the Craftsman structure and the construction of a rear addition at the April 6, 2022, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.
- c. ARCHAEOLOGY – The property is located within a River Improvement Overlay District, the Mission Local Historic District, and the Mission Parkway National Register of Historic Places District. In addition, the project area is in close proximity to previously recorded site 41BX1621. The Texas Sites Atlas indicates that archaeological sites have been previously identified along/adjacent to the San Antonio River. The property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, an archaeological investigation is required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The historic, Craftsman structure at 326 Riverside features a front facing gabled roof, wood siding and windows and traditional, Craftsman architectural elements. The structure is contributing to the Mission Historic District.
- 1b. 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. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

- a. *The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*

[The applicant has provided a detailed estimate of the cost of rehabilitation, which was underway at the time of the structure's collapse. The applicant has noted that the total cost for rehabilitation of the historic structure is \$186,186.00. At the time of the structure's collapse, the applicant has spent \$35,542.59 on rehabilitation. Neither additional bids, nor a third-party bid has been no obtained at this time. Per Bexar County Appraisal District records, the improvement value for all structures at 326 Riverside for 2022 was \$475,950. The total assessed value was \$658,150.]

- b. *The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*

[A structural engineer's report has not been submitted; however, the applicant has provided photos and information regarding the structure's collapse. The applicant has noted that the bottom plates of the structure's walls were severely deteriorated due to termite damage.]

- c. *The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.*

[The property is note currently listed for sale, and was acquired by the current owner on March 8, 2019, per Bexar County Deed Records. The proposed is currently under redevelopment by the current owner.]

- 1c. Staff finds that the applicant has not fully demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship, as the UDC requires all three criteria, noted above, to be met. Staff finds that the lack of active marketing of the property has prevented the applicant from meeting the requirements to prove an unreasonable economic hardship. Further evaluation of the cost to repair / reconstruct the historic structure as compared to the cost of the proposed new construction have not been provided.

- 1d. When an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the Historic and Design Review Commission additional information which may show a loss of significance in regards to the subject of the application in order to receive Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation of approval of the demolition. If, based on the evidence presented, the Historic and Design Review Commission finds that the structure or property is no longer historically, culturally, architecturally or archeologically significant, it may make a recommendation for approval of the demolition. In making this determination, the historic and design review commission must find that the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission that the structure or property has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Additionally, the Historic and Design Review Commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner, and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. The applicant has proposed to replace the historic structure with a 2-story, single-family residential structure. The proposed replacement structure was one of four designs approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the April 7, 2021, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing. The following stipulations were applied:

- i. That the applicant incorporate materials that are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- ii. That the applicant use windows that are consistent with staff's standards for windows in new construction, as noted in finding o and found in the applicable citations.

Staff's other stipulations, including those regarding setbacks, façade and roof massing, traditional entrance elements, and site elements, were not included in the Commission's approval.

- 2b. **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 not provided specific setback information for the proposed new construction; however, staff finds that the setback of the existing structure should be matched.
- 2c. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This lot historically featured three, 1-story structures and one, 2-story structure. The applicant has proposed to construct 2-story residential structures. Generally, staff finds that there is precedent for height of two stories on the lot, and finds the proposed massing to be appropriate.
- 2d. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Additionally, new construction should feature entrance massing that is consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant has proposed entrance massing with entrances facing toward the primary street, and doors facing the side yard. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate.
- 2e. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., applicants should align foundation and floor-to-floor heights within one foot of floor-to-floor heights on adjacent historic structures. The applicant has proposed foundation heights of eighteen (18) inches in height. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 2f. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a front facing gabled roof. Generally, staff finds a gabled roof form to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- 2g. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed facades with no fenestration, and facades that feature fixed windows, both instances are not recommended by the Guidelines. Staff finds that fully sized windows should be incorporated into each façade.
- 2h. **PORCH MASSING** – The applicant has proposed, a small, recessed corner porch. Generally, staff finds that an increase in porch massing that is more integral to the design of the structure would be most appropriate.
- 2i. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding on both board and batten and lap siding profiles, aluminum windows, and asphalt roofs. Staff finds that the proposed board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide and battens that are one to two (1 to 2) inches wide. Lap siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches. All siding should feature smooth finishes. If additional siding exposures and profiles are requested to vary individual structures, profiles should be based on those found historically on site.
- 2j. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum windows. All windows are to adhere to staff’s standards for windows in new construction. Fixed windows should be eliminated from the design. At this time the applicant has not submitted a specific window product.
- 2k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – As noted in the above findings, staff finds that the proposed fenestration profile and porch massing should be modified to be consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction.
- 2l. **CARPORTS** – The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature an attached carport. Attached vehicular parking (including carports) is not found historically within historic districts. Additionally, parking should be located at the rear or detached from a historic structure. The applicant has proposed parking that would be located within the footprint of the proposed new construction and at the immediate rear of the front porch. This is neither consistent with the Guidelines nor the UDC, which notes that vehicular parking is to be located internally on a lot.

- 2m. WALKWAY – The existing, historic structure at this location features a concrete walkway that leads from the front porch to the proposed sidewalk at the right of way. Staff finds that a front walkway should be incorporated into the proposed design.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not find that the applicant has met the UDC’s requirements for an unreasonable economic hardship, as noted in finding 1c.

Should the Historic and Design Review Commission find an unreasonable economic hardship or a loss of significance not caused directly or indirectly by the owner, as noted in finding 1d, and recommend the approval of demolition of this structure, staff recommends the following stipulations be applied to the approval of the proposed new construction:

- i. That any materials in a condition to be salvaged be salvaged, whether for use on site or elsewhere.
- ii. That the applicant match the setback of the historic structure for the proposed new construction, as noted in finding 2b.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate porch massing and fenestration profiles consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in findings 2g and 2h.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate materials that are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 2i.
- v. That the applicant use windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction, as noted in finding 2j and found in the applicable citations.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve of amended previous issued COA defector for demolition of structure with staff stipulation concerning material salvage, and conceptual for new construction stipulations 1-5 and come back to Commission for the plans. And additional 2 stipulations, 6- that the proposed plan include porch element in memory of historic structure once there and 7 stipulation that the windows be incorporated to current labelled “zero lot line elevation”.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

APPROVED



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

Date: _____

7/20/22