



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 16, 2022**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, November 16th, 2022 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzler called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. for work session.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Savino, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Fetzler, and Baker.

Absent: Gibbs, Fish, Velasquez, and Morales.

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:

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

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the minutes for the November 2nd, 2022 Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) meeting.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
Welcome John Baker, the new Historic Design Review Commissioner for District 10.
Proposed 2023 HDRC Schedule
Item #10 was postponed by applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Conservation Society of San Antonio- letter of support for item #3.
Commissioner Fetzler asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the Consent agenda.
Commissioner Savino pulled item #1 from the consent agenda to individual consideration for discussion.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Item 2, Case No. 2022-547	320 BONHAM
Item 3, Case No. 2022-543	1146 S ALAMO ST
Item 4, Case No. 2022-546	418 E MULBERRY AVE
Item 5, Case No. 2022-539	1818_1822_1824 MARTIN LUTHER KING DR

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 2-5 with staff stipulations and approve 2023 HDRC Schedule.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Gibbs arrived to meeting at 3:24pm.*

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 1. HDRC NO. 2022-537
ADDRESS: 151 E TRAVIS ST
APPLICANT: Kris Feldmann/CREO

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an 8-story hotel structure on the vacant lot at 151 E Travis Street. The proposed new construction will feature one level at the river level, 151 rooms and restaurant space.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an 8-story hotel structure on the vacant lot at 151 E Travis Street. The proposed new construction will feature one level at the river level, 151 rooms and restaurant space.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – This request received conceptual approval at the June 5, 2019, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
 - That the applicant explore ways to reduce the impact or eliminate the cantilever over the River Walk area. This stipulation has been met; the cantilever has been eliminated.
 - That fenestration and other façade separating elements be added to the south and east facades. This stipulation has been met.
 - That all mechanical and service equipment be screened from view at the public right of way. This stipulation has been met
 - That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted when returning for final approval. This stipulation has been met
 - That the applicant install dark colored windows that feature metal materials that are recessed at least two (2) inches within facades. This stipulation has been met
 - That the applicant submit a master signage plan for review and approval by the HDRC that includes both building and tenant signage, and that the vertical “Artista” sign be eliminated.
 - That no outdoor furniture impede upon the public right of way at the River Walk or street levels.
 - That a detailed lighting plan be submitted for review and approval when returning for final approval.
 - ARCHAEOLOGY – Archaeological investigations shall be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- c. EXISTING SITE – The current site is vacant, but previously featured a one-story, commercial structure that was determined to be non-contributing in 2017 and was subsequently demolished.
- d. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed to continue access along E Travis and the River Walk. The right of way at the River Walk level will be relocated slightly. The applicant has noted a pedestrian path width of between six (6) and seven (7) feet at the street level and of five (5) feet at the river level, matching the current condition. This is consistent with the UDC.
- e. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a)(5), pedestrian access along the River Walk shall not be blocked. The applicant has proposed to install a pedestrian entrance at the River Walk level in the existing stone wall. At no time shall any elements block or impede the flow of pedestrian traffic at the River Walk level, including seating or hostess elements. Additionally, per UDC Section 35-673(p), a landing that is at

minimum six (6) feet in depth shall be provided between the proposed entrance and the River Walk pathway. The width of the connection shall further comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) and/or TAS (Texas Accessibility Standards).

- f. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION – The applicant shall coordinate with the City of San Antonio Center City Development Office, Transportation and Capital Improvements and the Disability Access Office in regards to the river and street level details, width of public walkways and public access across the site.
- g. LANDSCAPING – The UDC Section 35-673(3) provides information regarding landscape design. The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan that notes the types and locations of various native planting materials. Staff finds the proposed landscaping plan to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- h. RIVER LEVEL WALL – The applicant has proposed to modify an existing, river level wall by removing a section of approximately thirty-one (31) feet in width. While staff finds the proposed modification to be appropriate, staff finds that all removed stone elements should be salvaged for reuse on site. The existing wallmounted lanterns must also be preserved. The applicant is to submit a detailed plan of how these materials will be reused on site to OHP staff for review and approval.
- i. MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant has noted the installation of mechanical equipment at the roof level where it will be screened by a parapet wall. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. HUMAN SCALE – According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has provided a human scale in multiple instances on the E Travis facade, including through the installation human scaled façade openings, a human scaled street level with individual storefront systems and a human scaled entrance canopy. At the river level, the applicant has incorporated pedestrian sized windows and doors, entrance elements, and outdoor seating elements that introduce a human scale at the base of the existing, retaining wall.
- k. BUILDING HEIGHT & SCALE (Solar Study)– According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there is no maximum height of new construction in RIO-3 provided that solar access standards are met. 5.5 hours of direct sunlight are required during the winter solstice and 7.5 hours of direct sunlight are required during the summer solstice. The applicant has submitted a solar study which notes that the UDC requirements have been met.
- l. FAÇADE SEPARATION – The UDC Section 35-674 (b)(4) notes that a façade in RIO-3 that features more than thirty (30) feet in length should be divided into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed façade sections that vary in depth, dimension, and materials. Staff finds the proposed façade separation to be appropriate.
- m. FAÇADE SEPARATION – The UDC Section 35-678(e) notes that traditionally, buildings have been organized into three distinct segments; a base, midsection, and cap. This organization helps to give a sense of scale to a building and its use should be encouraged. The applicant has met this requirement of the UDC by defining each section individually with different materials, balconies, recessed façade elements and a decorative parapet wall at the roof.
- n. FAÇADE SEPARATION – Since conceptual approval, the applicant has increased the amount of façade separation on the north, south and west facades. The applicant has proposed for the east façade to feature storefront openings at the top-level, open-air balconies, fixed window openings and a number of façade panels, a change in material. Generally, staff finds the east façade to be consistent with the UDC; however, staff finds that any additional detailing or separation that is possible should be incorporated into the design.
- o. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include brick, EIFS in varying colors, and wall tile at entrances at both the street and river levels. Staff finds the brick and wall tile to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC. The UDC Section 35-674.01(d)(1) notes that a minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestration) shall be composed of modular masonry materials including brick, stone and masonry block, other materials that convey the texture, scale, and finish similar to traditional building materials, stucco and painted concrete when detailed to express visual interest and convey a sense of scale and painted or stained wood in a lap

or shingle profile. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate additional modular masonry materials, such as brick into the design to meet the UDC's standards. Staff finds that the limited use of EIFS is appropriate provided it be detailed and applied to present an appearance similar to applied stucco, with expansion joints comparable to stucco. A construction detail is to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval; however, per the submitted construction documents, this appears to be the intent of the applicant.

- p. WINDOWS – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. For window openings that are not included within a curtain wall system, an inset of at least two to three inches within each wall is required. The applicant has proposed dark framed fiberglass windows and dark framed aluminum storefront systems. Additionally, the applicant has noted that all will be recessed within openings at least two (2) inches.
- q. STREET CANOPY – The applicant has proposed a street canopy at the primary entrance at the street level. Staff finds the proposed street canopy to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- r. SIGNAGE – The applicant has not specified signage at this time. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a master signage plan including both hotel and retail tenant signage when returning for final approval. The applicant is responsible for complying with UDC Sections 35-678 and 35-681 in regards to signage.
- s. SITE FURNISHINGS – As part of the landscaping plan (noted in finding g), the applicant has provided site furnishing examples, which include metal planters and wood and metal seating. Staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate; however, final seating elements should be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
- t. LIGHTING DESIGN – Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the Riverwalk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. The applicant has submitted a lighting plan noting various site and landscaping lighting elements. Staff finds the proposed lighting plan to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- u. STREET LEVEL UTILITY EQUIPMENT – The Downtown Design Guide, Chapter 7, I, notes that ventilation intakes and exhaust vents should be located to minimize adverse pedestrian impacts along with the sidewalk. Typically locating vents more than 20 feet vertically and horizontally from a sidewalk and directing the air flow away from the public realm will accomplish this objective. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Downtown Design Guide regarding street level utility equipment.
- v. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That all removed river wall stone be salvaged and reused on site. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan for salvage and reuse to OHP staff for review and approval.
- ii. That the applicant explore additional detailing or façade separation to be explored to be incorporated into the east façade's design.
- iii. That the proposed EIFS be detailed and applied to present an appearance similar to applied stucco, with expansion joints comparable to stucco. A construction detail is to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
- iv. That the existing wall-mounted lanterns be preserved. The applicant is to submit a detailed plan of how these materials will be reused on site to OHP staff for review and approval.
- v. That the applicant should incorporate additional modular masonry materials, such as brick into the design to meet the UDC's standards, as noted in finding o.
- vi. That no outdoor furniture impedes upon the public right of way at the River Walk or street levels as noted in finding e.
- vii. That ventilation intakes, exhaust vents, and other utility items should be located to minimize adverse pedestrian impacts along with the sidewalk.
- viii. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved approve with staff stipulations 1-5 and 7-8 with anything outside property line to include outdoor furniture and use of sidewalks submitted in a new application for COA. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 6. **HDRC NO. 2022-536**
ADDRESS: 938 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: Ruben Carrillo/FOCAL DESIGN BUILDERS LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a single-family residential structure on the vacant lot at 938 Dawson Street, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a single-family residential structure on the vacant lot at 938 Dawson Street, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. EXISTING LOT – This lot is currently void of any structures. The previous structure located on this lot was destroyed by fire in late September 2018. The structure was subsequently demolished under an emergency demolition order.
- c. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – This lot is bounded by Dawson Street to the north, Goodloe Alley to the east and Florence Street to the south. This block primarily consists of single-family historic structures, although one, two-story historic structures exists on the lot.
- d. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. At this time, the applicant has not specified the proposed front setback from Dawson Street. Staff finds that the new construction’s setback should be equal to or greater than the setbacks of the historic houses found on this block; specifically those addressed as 924, 930 and 934 Dawson. The applicant is responsible for providing a setback diagram noting the setbacks of existing structures on this block as well as the proposed setback for the new construction at 938 Dawson.
- e. ENTRANCES – According the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. primary building entrances should be orientated towards the primary street. The proposed entrance orientation is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature 1-story in height with an overall height of approximately twenty (20) feet. Staff finds the proposed massing and height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of approximately one (1) to three (3) feet in height. The applicant has proposed a minimal foundation height. Staff finds that the foundation height should be increased to be consistent with the historic examples on the block and the Guidelines for New Construction. A foundation height of at least one (1) foot in height should be used.
- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a front and rear facing gabled roof. Generally, proposed roof form is consistent with those found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

- i. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant has proposed new construction with a footprint of approximately 1,800, not including the rear patio deck. The lot features approximately, 7,160 square feet. The proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include both horizontal and board and batten siding, stucco, and a standing seam metal roof. If composite siding materials are used, staff finds that horizontal siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches with a smooth finish. Board and batten siding should feature boards that are 12 inches wide with battens that are approximately 1.5 inch in width. The proposed standing seam metal roof 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. An industrial ridge cap should not be used. Staff finds that the proposed stucco should be eliminated, as stucco is not found historically within the historic district as a residential siding material.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed white, vinyl windows. Per the submitted window installation detail, the window will feature a profile that is not consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction. Staff finds that wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction should be installed.
- l. FENESTRATION PROFILE – The applicant has proposed for the west façade to only feature one (1) window opening, while the east façade is to only feature three (3) window openings. Staff finds that multiple window openings should be added to both side facades. Additionally, staff finds that a side facing window should be added within the bedroom and front porch location, consistent with historic configurations found within the district. Window openings should feature profiles and locations consistent with those found historically within the district. Grouped windows should be separated by a mullion of approximately six (6) inches in height.
- m. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a front porch that features massing that is integrated into the overall massing of the new construction, consistent with the historic examples found on this block. The applicant has proposed both porch columns and porch railings; however, the applicant has not provided detailed drawings of both. Staff finds that the proposed porch columns should feature six (6) inches square with both capital and base trim. Additionally, the proposed porch railings should feature both top and bottom rails.
- n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in the previous findings, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to both side facades, that the proposed stucco be eliminated and that additional information be provided regarding front porch detailing.
- o. REAR DECK – The applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature a small wood pergola and an uncovered wood deck. Staff finds the proposed pergola and deck to be appropriate.
- p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has not specified landscaping materials at this time. Staff finds that a detailed landscaping plan should be submitted for review and approval.
- q. FENCING – The applicant has noted fencing on the site plan, but has not provided specifications of the proposed fencing. Staff finds that detailed fencing details, including the propose driveway gate should be submitted for review and approval.
- r. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing concrete walkway stairs and their unique configuration and to add a concrete landing at the front of the proposed new construction. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate.
- s. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to provide vehicular access into the site from Goodloe Alley via a driveway. Staff finds the location of the proposed driveway to be appropriate; however, per the Guidelines for Site Element, the proposed driveway should not exceed ten (10) feet in width.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff final approval based on findings a through s with the following stipulations:

- i. That the new construction’s setback be equal to or greater than the setbacks of the historic houses found on this block; specifically, those addressed as 924, 930 and 934 Dawson, as noted in finding d. The applicant is responsible for providing a setback diagram noting the setbacks of existing structures on this block as well as the proposed setback for the new construction at 938 Dawson.
- ii. That the foundation height be increased to be consistent with the historic examples on the block and the Guidelines for New Construction. A foundation height of at least one (1) foot in height should be used, as noted in finding g.

- iii. That horizontal siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches with a smooth finish if composite. Board and batten siding should feature smooth boards that are 12 inches wide with battens that are approximately 1.5 inch in width. The proposed standing seam metal roof 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. An industrial ridge cap should not be used.
- iv. That the proposed stucco be eliminated, as noted in finding j.
- v. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows are used as noted in finding k and in the applicable citations.
- vi. That additional fenestration be added to both the east and west facades and within the front porch's bedroom wall, as noted in finding l.
- vii. That the applicant install porch columns that are six (6) inches square with capital and base trim and that the proposed porch railing feature capital and base trim, as noted in finding m.
- viii. That the applicant submit a detailed landscaping plan for review and approval that include fencing information and driveway information as noted in findings p, q and s.

A foundation inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that foundation setbacks and heights are consistent with the approved design. The inspection is to occur after the installation of form work and prior to the installation of foundation materials.

A standing seam metal roof inspection is to be schedule with OHP staff to ensure that roofing materials are consistent with approved design. An industrial ridge cap is not to be used.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

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

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

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

ITEM 7. HDRC NO. 2022-399
ADDRESS: 363 NORTH DR
APPLICANT: Thomas Gandy/GANDY THOMAS R

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Remove the existing asbestos tile siding and brick wainscoting and install new lap siding.
- 2. Perform modifications to the front façade to include the installation two one over one windows.
- 3. Perform modifications to the side (west) façade to include the removal of an existing door opening, and the removal of an existing concrete stoop and steps.
- 4. Install new, rounded porch steps to the front façade.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 363 North was constructed circa 1940 and is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District. The historic structure features 1-story in height, traditional architectural elements, and an enclosed front porch.
- b. VIOLATION – Work to both the front and side (west) facades began prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. OHP staff most recently left a notice of violation and stop work order on site on July 30, 2021. A post work application fee of \$500.00 is applicable.
- c. PREVIOUS REVIEW – This request was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission on August 17, 2022. At that hearing, the request was referred to a Design Review Committee site visit.

- d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on September 28, 2022. At that site visit, Committee members discussed the structures original materials and porch form, discussed which current features are non-original, and discussed options for an appropriate approach to exterior modifications and repair
- e. SIDING INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing façade tiles and brick wainscoting and install horizontal lap siding on each façade. Per the 1941 Sanborn Map, the structure originally features asbestos tiles. Staff finds the removal of asbestos tiles to be appropriate; however, a replacement tile should be installed that preserved the existing profile and appearance of the tiles siding. Many structures of similar form and style found on this block feature masonry (brick or stone) wainscoting. Staff finds the brick wainscoting to be original and finds that it should be preserved.
- f. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS (Front Façade) – The applicant has proposed to perform modifications to the front façade to include the installation of two, one over one windows on the front façade. This wall plane is not original and is the front of a previously enclosed front porch. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A and B. note that front porches should not be enclosed. When porches are enclosed, the Guidelines note that they should function and visible read as a porch. Per photos, the front porch has been enclosed with screening elements since 2007, at least. Staff finds that either windows should be added across the entirety of the enclosed porch to read as an open element with visible porch columns, or that the structure should be returned to its previous condition.
- g. EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS (Side Façade) – The applicant has proposed to perform modifications to the side (west) façade to include the removal of an existing door opening, and the removal of an existing concrete stoop and steps. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., existing window and door openings are to be preserved. The proposal to remove the existing, side door is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds this door opening should be preserved in its original location. Additionally, staff finds that the side stoop and porch steps are an original element and should be preserved.
- h. FRONT PORCH STEPS – The applicant has proposed to install new, rounded concrete porch steps as well as a concrete apron to the proposed porch steps. The existing steps are clad in brick, but feature a minimal design and a width that is slightly wider than that of a pedestrian door opening. There is no historic precedent of an alternative porch design on site or within the district. Staff finds that the existing porch steps form should be maintained. In-kind replacement, with concrete would be appropriate, with no change to profile.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the removal of the existing façade tiles and brick wainscoting for the installation of lap siding as noted in finding e. Staff recommends that the existing siding tile profile be maintained. Replacement with a fiber cement tile with matching profile would be appropriate and eligible for administrative approval.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, modifications to the front façade, as noted in finding f. Staff recommends that either windows be added across the entirety of the enclosed porch to read as an open element with visible porch columns or that the structure be returned to its previous condition.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, modifications to the side (west) façade to include the removal of an existing door opening, and the removal of an existing concrete stoop and steps, as noted in finding g. Staff recommends that the door opening, concrete stoop and stairs be preserved.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the installation of new, rounded concrete porch steps and a concrete apron as noted in finding h. In-kind replacement, with concrete would be appropriate, with no change to profile.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bianca Maldonado with MPNA- opposed to this case.

1st MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations; approve item 2 with staff stipulations and additional stipulations to follow standard window specifications; deny item 3 of removing of existing door opening but approval of modification to concrete stoop and that the steps and narrow width to align with the width of gate post; denial of 4 but approve the aligning steps to be code-compliant steps with a safely sized landing in same material and design as existing. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

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

2nd MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved to amend main motion and approve item 3 with staff stipulations that the door be replaced with window that matches other window on the side of house and others on the house in roughly the same location as the door.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **MOTION FAILED with 4 AYES. 4 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 8. HDRC NO. 2022-428
ADDRESS: 515 CLUB DR
APPLICANT: Gilbert Garza/Garza Design-Build LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an approximately 2,400-square-foot 1- story, single-family residential structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 515 Club is currently a vacant lot and Historic Aerial Maps and the Sanborn Maps show that the property has been a vacant lot since at least 1951. The block consists of 1-story and 2-story singlefamily residences. The lot at 515 Club is located beside a midcentury 1-story residential structure and a 2- story historic structure. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness or final approval. The proposal received conceptual approval from the HDRC on October 19, 2022, with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant should provide a setback diagram showing the proposed setback in relation to the neighboring structures and the setback for the front-facing garage to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding d. This stipulation has been met.
 - ii. That the applicant submits window specifications to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding i. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended. Windows should feature traditional operations, an inset of two (2) inches within facades, and 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. This stipulation has been met, although the stipulation remains through final approval.
 - iii. That the applicant updates the proposed fenestration to feature traditional proportions and window configurations commonly found in the district and submits updated elevation drawings to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding j. This stipulation has been met.

- iv. That the applicant submits a final landscaping plan with planting and fencing details and an updated site plan showing all proposed site work to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval as noted in finding p. This stipulation has NOT been met. A landscaping plan for the front yard as been submitted for review.
- v. That the front door arch is evaluated to be more pronounced and that the entire arch is visible and celebrated. This stipulation has NOT been met.
- vi. The option for the composition shingle roof is not incorporated into the design. The roof must feature barrel clay tile roofing material. This stipulation has been met.
- vii. That the front facing garage door product selection is made with attention to detail so that the garage doors do not over-dominate. This stipulation has been met.
- viii. That the driveway & walkway feature a smooth, natural colored concrete. This stipulation has been met.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant’s proposal was reviewed at the Design Review Committee meeting on September 27, 2022. The DRC discussed the front-facing garage, the front walkway configuration, alternate cladding materials that would better complement the historic homes in the district, the fenestration pattern, and the existing front retaining wall. The applicant was referred to a second DRC meeting during the October 5th HDRC hearing. The applicant attended the second DRC meeting on October 12, 2022, and the meeting discussion focused on the applicant’s updates, fenestration pattern, site conditions, and landscaping plans. The applicant received conceptual approval from the HDRC on October 19, 2022 and returned to the DRC to discuss final changes to the proposal on November 8, 2022. The November 8th DRC discussed foundation and floor heights, the garage door selection, the updated fenestration pattern, floodplain concerns, front entry arch modifications, and the intention to remove the chimney featured in the latest drawings.
- d. SETBACK & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings should align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed to construct a 1- story, single family residence oriented south toward Club Drive. The existing properties along Club are oriented toward Club. The applicant has proposed a front facade setback of 30’. The front-facing garage features a 9-foot setback from the front facade. The applicant has expressed that the adjacent properties feature 30’ setbacks. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- e. SCALE AND MASSING – The applicant has proposed to construct an approximately 2,400-square-foot, 1-story residential structure with an entry volume and a front-facing garage. According to Guideline 2.A.i for New Construction, new structures should feature a height and massing that is similar to historic structures in the vicinity. 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 block within the Monticello Park Historic District features 1-story and 2-story historic structures and a 1-story midcentury structure. Staff finds that the proposed scale and massing of the structure appears generally appropriate.
- f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a hip form with two front facing gables. According to Guideline 2.B.i for New Construction, new construction should feature roof forms that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. The adjacent structures on Club Drive feature front gable, cross gable, low-sloped front gable, and hip roof forms. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. LOT COVERAGE – Guideline 2.D.i for New Construction stipulates that building to lot ratio for new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings. Limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The applicant has provided a total square footage of 2,700 square feet, including the front porch and rear patio. The living space and attached garage total 2,400 square feet. The applicant has submitted documentation showing that the total percentage of lot coverage is 37 percent. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. MATERIALS AND TEXTURES – The applicant has proposed to construct the residence with 3-coat, stucco cladding and a red barrel tile roof. The applicant has expressed that they would like to install a fully wood garage door and wood or metal-clad windows but has not provided final material specifications at this time. Guideline 3.A.i for New Construction stipulates that new construction should use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. For example, corrugated metal siding would not be appropriate for a new structure in a district comprised of homes with wood siding. Consider using traditional materials, such as

wood siding, in a new way to provide visual interest in new construction while still ensuring compatibility. This immediate block of Club Drive predominately features homes with stone cladding and red clay barrel tile roofs or composition shingle roofs. The neighboring midcentury structure features brick cladding. The district does feature stucco-clad homes as well. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

- i. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum-clad divided lite windows that will be recessed two inches from the façade. Staff finds that the proposed windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Faux divided lites are not permitted. Staff finds that all windows installed should feature traditional operations and that the applicant should submit final product specifications for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
- j. **RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS** – Guideline 2.C.i for New Construction stipulates that new construction should incorporate window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Windows, doors, porches, entryways, dormers, bays, and pediments shall be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed a fenestration pattern on the front façade that features an arched entry, one arched window, and a solid garage door. The fenestration pattern on the remaining elevation consists of divided lite French doors with arched transoms on the rear elevation, divided lite windows, and a half-lite divided lite door on the side elevation. According to Guideline 2.C.ii, no new façade should exceed 40 linear feet without being penetrated by windows, entryways, or other defined bays. Staff find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Guideline 4.A.i for New Construction states that new buildings should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. Additionally, Guideline 4.A.ii for New Construction states that applicants should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district when one exists. Details should be simple in design and should complement, but not visually compete with, the character of the adjacent historic structures or other historic structures within the district. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found within the district are inappropriate. The applicant has proposed to install decorative gas lanterns flanking the front arched window, the front entry, and the garage, and a recessed arched entry. The applicant has submitted drawings showing a prominent central chimney but has expressed that they will not be moving forward with a chimney as proposed. Staff finds the architectural details to be in keeping with the Guidelines and finds that the applicant should update the drawings to feature the final proposed design and all proposed architectural details.
- l. **GARAGE** – The applicant has proposed to construct an attached front-facing, two-bay garage on the west side of the front facade. Guideline 5.A.i for New Construction states that new garages and outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form. The proposed garage is setback approximately 9 feet from the frontmost portion of the front façade. According to Guideline 5.B.i for New Construction, the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Do not introduce front-loaded garages or garages attached to the primary structure on blocks where rear or alley-loaded garages were historically used. Although three out of the five single-family residential structures on this immediate block of Club Drive feature front-facing garages, residential structures in the Monticello Park Historic District traditionally feature a primary structure along the street and a rear detached accessory structure accessed either from a service alley or by a driveway from the street. Staff finds that a detached garage should be utilized in lieu of the proposed attached front-facing garage.
- m. **DRIVEWAY** – Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements notes that new driveways should be similar to those found historically within the district in regard to their materials, width, and design. Additionally, the Guidelines note that driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. The property does not currently feature a driveway,

driveway apron, or curb cut. The applicant has proposed to install a fully concrete 10-foot-wide driveway on the west side of the property to meet the proposed garage. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

- n. **SITE WORK** – The Guidelines for Site Elements note that front yard walkways and site work should appear similar to those found historically within the district in regard to their materials, width, alignment and configuration. The applicant has proposed to install a curved 4-foot-wide, fully concrete front walkway from front entry to the sidewalk. Properties on this block feature serpentine, fully concrete front walkways from the driveway to the front entry and from the sidewalk to the front entry. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate.
- o. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per Guideline 6.B.ii for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right-of-way.
- p. **LANDSCAPING PLAN** – The applicant has not submitted a comprehensive landscaping plan at this time. The property currently features a masonry retaining wall that appears to date to the 1950s per the Historic Aerial Maps, when this property was likely the side yard for the neighboring structure at 511 Club. The applicant has proposed to deconstruct the existing retaining wall and re-use the material to construct stone columns for proposed fencing. The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan for the front yard area surrounding the proposed front walkway only. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a final comprehensive landscaping plan with planting and fencing details to staff for review.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through p. Staff recommends addressing the following stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval:

- i. That the applicant submits final window specifications to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding i. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended. Windows should feature traditional operations, an inset of two (2) inches within facades, and 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.
- ii. That the applicant submits updated drawings showing the finalized front entry design, the new construction without the previously proposed chimney, and any other material and design modifications prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding k.
- iii. That a detached garage is utilized in lieu of the proposed front-facing attached garage based on finding l.
- iv. That the applicant submits a final comprehensive landscaping plan with planting details prior to returning to the HDRC as noted in finding p.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bianca Maldonado- on behalf of MPNA and Conservation Society of San Antonio- support the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Cervantes moved to approve with staff stipulations except item 3 to approve as presented.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 9. HDRC NO. 2022-548
ADDRESS: 218 WASHINGTON ST
APPLICANT: Anne Toxey

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the original barrel tile metal roof with a galvalume standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 218 Washington is a 2-story, single-family house constructed circa 1915 in the Craftsman style. The house is commonly known as the Gustav Giesecke House. The structure features a standing seam metal hip roof with a prominent central gable and chimney, overhanging eaves and exposed rafter tails, brick cladding, one-over-one and casement windows, an asymmetrical recessed front entry, a covered porch on the north elevation, and a porte-cochere on the south elevation. The property features a rear garage that was constructed around the same time as the primary structure and features a barrel tile metal hip roof, brick cladding, and one-over-one wood windows. The rear garage has suffered fire damage. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing barrel tile metal roof with a standing seam metal roof to match the roof on the primary structure. Guideline 3.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that roofing materials should be replaced with in-kind materials whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Historic materials such as slate or clay tiles should be retained and re-used when large-scale replacement of roof materials other than asphalt shingles is required. The existing metal roof tiles are severely damaged and require replacement. Furthermore, Guideline 3.B.iv states that new roofing materials should match the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile and style or materials should be selected that are consistent with the building style when in-kind replacement is not possible. The primary structure originally featured barrel tile roofing. Staff finds the request is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the installation of a material that is similar in appearance to the existing tile would be appropriate.
- c. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL – The applicant has proposed other rehabilitative scopes of work on the rear accessory structure, such as brick repointing, window repair, the replacement of five (5) windows fire-damaged beyond repair to match existing, garage door restoration, and the in-kind replacement of other fire damaged features. These scopes of work are eligible for administrative approval and do not require review by the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through b. Staff recommends that the roof is replaced with in-kind materials or a material similar in appearance to the existing tile.

If the HDRC finds roof replacement with a standing seam metal roof appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulation:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Conservation Society of San Antonio and King William Association- support the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulations for standing seam metal roofs. Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: The HDRC meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

APPROVED

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Scott W. Carpenter", written over a horizontal line.

Scott Carpenter, Acting Chair
Historic Design Review Commission
City of San Antonio

Date: 12 December 2022