



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

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
December 07, 2022**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, December 7th, 2022 at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Acting Chair Carpenter called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. for work session.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, and Baker.

Absent: Gibbs, Morales, Grube, Cervantes, and Fetzer.

- *COMMISSIONER GRUBE ARRIVED TO MEETING AT 3:04PM*

CHAIRMAN’S STATEMENT:

Acting Chair Carpenter provided a statement regarding meeting and appeal processes, time limits and decorum.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve the minutes for the November 16th, 2022 Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) meeting.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
Mission Branch Library- Public Meeting on UDC Amendments and application Process
Historic Run Crew Holiday event
Item #14 was withdrawn by applicant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

item #3: Bianca Maldonado- on behalf of MPNA- supports staff recommendations and requests that the size of sash windows and specification of storm windows be provided to staff.
Commissioner Carpenter 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. 2022-542	315 FLORIDA ST
Item 3, Case No. 2022-549	2118 W KINGS HWY
Item 4, Case No. 2022-560	227 W GRAMERCY PLACE
Item 5, Case No. 2022-563	338 ARMY
Item 6, Case No. 2022-564	268 LOVERA BLVD

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 2-7 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 1. **HDRC NO. 2022-550**
ADDRESS: 2600 BROADWAY
APPLICANT: Joe Keresey/Service First Permits

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing storefront system and change the fenestration pattern of the storefront system by relocating the door on the east (Broadway) façade, changing both existing door profiles and changing knee wall and mullion profiles. The applicant has also proposed to modify the east façade’s fenestration profile by introducing new overhead rolling doors.
2. Reclad the existing canopy with corten steel and paint the underside.
3. Paint the exterior and install tile on the existing parapet wall.
4. Install a mural on the south (Post Avenue) façade.
5. Install a patio space on Post Avenue to feature an outdoor fireplace.
6. Install an internally illuminated, open-faced channel letter wall sign to be installed on the west (Broadway) façade to read “Postino”. The proposed sign will feature an overall height of 2’ – 0” and an overall width of 16’ – 2” for a total size of 32.33 square feet.
7. Install a monument sign at the corner of Broadway and Post Avenue as well as signage on the Post Avenue side of the proposed outdoor fireplace.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 2600 Broadway was constructed circa 1950 and is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The structure is located at the corner of Broadway and Post Avenue and is located within the River Improvement Overlay, District 2. The structure features Art Modern architectural elements.
- b. STOREFRONT REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing storefront system and change the fenestration pattern of the storefront system by relocating the door on the east (Broadway) façade, changing both existing door profiles and changing knee wall and mullion profiles. The applicant has also proposed to modify the east façade’s fenestration profile by introducing new overhead rolling doors. The applicant has noted that the new storefront system will feature a dark bronze finish. Generally, staff finds the proposed modifications to be in keeping with the structure’s architectural style and consistent with the UDC.
- c. CANOPY MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to reclad the existing canopy with corten steel and paint the underside. Staff finds the proposed modifications to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- d. PAINTING & PARAPET WALL TILE – The applicant has proposed to paint the exterior and install tile on the existing parapet wall. Generally, staff finds the proposed painting and tile installation to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC. Staff finds that the installation of tile on the parapet wall is a reversible modification that does not modify the structure’s original form.
- e. MURAL INSTALLATION – Part of the painting of the exterior walls will include the installation of a mural on the south (Post Avenue) façade. Staff finds the proposed mural installation of be appropriate.
- f. PATIO – The applicant has proposed to install a patio to the east of the building in the location of a current covered storage area. The proposed patio area will include a trellis system, outdoor seating and a brick fireplace. Staff finds the proposed outdoor patio to be appropriate.

- g. WALL SIGN – The applicant has proposed to install an internally illuminated, open-faced channel letter wall sign to be installed on the west (Broadway) façade to read “Postino”. The proposed sign will feature an overall height of 2’ – 0” and an overall width of 16’ – 2” for a total size of 32.33 square feet. Staff finds the proposed sign to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC Section 35-678.
- h. MONUMENT SIGN & FIREPLACE SIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a monument sign to be located at the corner of Broadway and Post Avenue. The proposed monument sign will feature an overall height of 4’ – 0”. The applicant has also noted the installation of signage on the Post Avenue side of the proposed outdoor fireplace. Signage specifications have not been submitted for either of these signs. Generally, staff finds both the design and placement of each sign to be appropriate. Final signage specifications are to be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, storefront replacement and fenestration modifications, as submitted, based on finding b.
- 2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, canopy modifications, as submitted, based on finding c.
- 3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, painting and brick tile installation on the parapet wall, as submitted, based on finding d.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, mural installation, as submitted, based on finding e.
- 5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, patio installation, as submitted, based on finding f.
- 6. Staff recommends approval of item #6, the installation of a wall sign, as submitted based, on finding g.
- 7. Staff recommends approval of item #7, the installation of a monument sign and signage on the Post Avenue side of the proposed outdoor fireplace with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the proposed signage adhere to the UDC Section 35-678 regarding size and design.
 - ii. That final signage details be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
 - iii. That the monument sign not exceed six (6) feet in height.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved approve with staff stipulations and added stipulation that the original framing be salvaged.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 8. HDRC NO. 2022-557
ADDRESS: 616/618 WILMINGTON AVE
APPLICANT: Office of Historic Preservation

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for 616/618 Wilmington.

- FINDINGS:**
- a. On September 6, 2022, a demolition application was submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation by Juan Chavarria of CH Construction & Remodeling on behalf of the property owner of 616/618 Wilmington, located in the Tobin Hill neighborhood of City Council District 1. OHP staff researched the property to determine eligibility during the 30-day review period provided by UDC 35-455.
 - b. If the HDRC agrees with the request, OHP will seek concurrence from the owner. If the owner is in favor of designation, the request may proceed in the designation process and will be presented to the Zoning Commission. In the case where an owner is not in favor, OHP must first forward the recommendation of the HDRC to City Council for consideration of a resolution to initiate the landmark designation process as outlined in UDC 35-606.

If the HDRC does not agree with the request, a resolution from City Council to initiate the landmark designation will not be sought.

- c. **DEMOLITION AND DESIGNATIONS COMMITTEE:** The Demolition and Designation Committee (DDC) held a site visit on November 9, 2022.
- d. **HISTORIC CONTEXT:** The property at 616/618 Wilmington NCB 1716 Blk A Lot 5 & N 5 ft of 7, is a single-story, rear junction double shotgun. There are roughly 12 known examples remaining in the city and to staff's knowledge this is a form that is unique to San Antonio. The property is owned by the Archon Borrowing Group, LLC. The block where 616/618 Wilmington is located was surveyed and re-subdivided in 1911 for Mrs. Kate C. Gosling. Due to finances, most developers could only afford to purchase small parcels of land. A developer would subdivide the land, sell the lots, and the new owner would hire a builder or contractor to build a house. Public transportation played a large role in the early neighborhood development of Tobin Hill with the inception of a mule-drawn streetcar route from Main Plaza north to San Pedro Park in 1878. In general, mule-drawn streetcars increased the distance one could commute within 30 minutes to two to three miles allowing for residential expansion outside the urban core.² The first electric trolleys appeared in 1890. By 1919 the eastern part of Tobin Hill, anchored by the Pearl Brewery, was served by a streetcar that ran from Dallas St. to King's Court in the vicinity of Brackenridge Park. Affordable housing options like 616/618 Wilmington and access to public transportation made the neighborhood a desirable location and the area saw rapid development in the 1920s-30s. On June 26, 1925 Dewey E. Wright and Mary H. Wright signed a mechanic's lien and a deed of trust for construction of the structure located at 616/618 Wilmington. for Dewey E. The Wrights are listed as the residents of 618 Wilmington, while 616 was occupied by Tom C. Frost, Jr., and his wife Ilsé. Dewey Wright was an investment banker at Alamo National Bank, and his first tenet was the grandson of Tom C. Frost, the founder of Frost Bank. The Frost's moved before the birth of their son, Tom C. Frost in 1927. The Wrights owned the property until Mary Hayman Wright's sister purchased the property from them in 1934. Mary Wright and her sister Anna (also known as Sarah A.) Hayman lived at 618 Wilmington from 1934 until Anna's death in 1948. Various tenets resided at 616 Wilmington during these years, the tenants were typically employed nearby at businesses such as Samuels Glass and Franz Ice Shop.
- e. **SITE CONTEXT:** The southeast-facing house is on an irregular block bound to the north by Kendall St., to the east by E. Evergreen St, and to the southeast by E Euclid Ave. The block includes Craftsman, Folk Victorian architecture, and new construction. Divorced sidewalks run through small front yards; driveways are not always present when they are, they appear as either full-width concrete or ribbon drives. The house is on a large lot and has an inground pool on the southeast side of the parcel. The backyard is enclosed with a chain-link fence. E. Evergreen is the boundary of the Tobin Hill Historic District.
- f. **ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION:** The rear junction double shotgun house at 616/618 Wilmington has a Craftsman influence with wide eaves with exposed rafter tails, triangular brace supports for the shed porch, and a square porch pier on the interior side of each porch. The roof has two front gables with a cross gable in the rear where the two units connect. The residences remain relatively unaltered except for the rear porches, which have been enclosed (see Sanborn Map, 1938). Many of the original interior features remain in 616 Wilmington as well.
- g. **EVALUATION:** In order to be eligible for historic landmark designation, properties shall meet at least three (3) of the 16 criteria listed. The applicant submitted that the property meets the following criteria, consistent with UDC sec. 35-607(b):
 - 3. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the community, county, state, or nation;** The home at 616/618 Wilmington was built for Dewey E. Wright and Mary H. Wright c. 1925 and Mary Wright lived at 618 Wilmington through 1948. Dewey Wright was an investment banker at Alamo National Bank. He and his wife occupied 618 Wilmington and had had tenants at 616 Wilmington. Their first tenant was Tom C. Frost, Jr., and his wife Ilse. The Frosts moved before the birth of their son, Tom C. Frost in 1927.
 - 5. Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials;** This rear junction double shotgun is to staff's knowledge a unique shotgun form found only in San Antonio. There are roughly 12 known examples remaining.
 - 8. Its historical, architectural, or cultural integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship;** The Craftsman-style rear junction double shotgun is largely unchanged. It maintains its original footprint with the only exterior modification being enclosed rear porches. The original siding and windows remain intact.

11. It is distinctive in character, interest or value; strongly exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, ethnic or historical heritage of San Antonio, Texas or the United States; Public transportation played a large role in the early neighborhood development of Tobin Hill with the inception of a mule-drawn streetcar route from Main Plaza north to San Pedro Park in 1878. In general, mule-drawn streetcars increased the distance one could commute within 30 minutes to two to three miles allowing for residential expansion outside the urban core. Affordable housing options like 616/618 Wilmington and access to public transportation made the neighborhood a desirable location and the area saw rapid development in the 1920s-30s.

13. It bears an important and significant relationship to other distinctive structures, sites, or areas, either as an important collection of properties or architectural style or craftsmanship with few intrusions, or by contributing to the overall character of the area according to the plan based on architectural, historic, or cultural motif; The Office of Historic Preservation has undertaken a survey of shotgun houses in San Antonio. Based on this survey, there are roughly 12 known examples of rear junction double shotgun homes, a uniquely San Antonio form. This structure is in the Tobin Hill neighborhood, which is an eligible the National Register Historic District and was surveyed by the Office of Historic Preservation in 2021. This structure would be considered contributing to the neighborhood and holds a unique position in preserving the continuity of the intersection of Wilmington, Kendall, and E Laurel.

- h. The City offers a tax incentive for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties because historic landmarks possess cultural and historical value and contribute to the overall quality and character of the City and its neighborhoods. If historic designation is approved, rehabilitation and restoration work may be eligible for this incentive. State and Federal tax incentives are also available for properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and provide substantial relief for rehabilitation projects.
- i. Per UDC Sec. 35-453, once the Commission makes a recommendation for designation, property owners must receive a written approval (a Certificate of Appropriateness) for any exterior work until the City Council makes their final decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of a Finding of Historic Significance and that the Historic and Design Review Commission should recommend approval for the landmark designation of 616/618 Wilmington based on findings a through g.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Frederica Kushner- Tobin Hill Neighborhood Association- concerns about structure and not having communication with neighbors. Looking to approve historic significance.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve finding of historic significance.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 1 NAY. 4 ABSENT.

ITEM 9. HDRC NO. 2022-559
ADDRESS: 918 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: ERJ DEVELOPMENTS LLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a 2-story residential structure at the rear of the lot addressed at 918 Dawson. The proposed new construction will feature frontage to Florence Street and feature a driveway to the east of the structure.
2. Perform exterior modifications to the existing, rear accessory structure including modifying the fenestration pattern on both the east and west facades, the removal of an existing garage door opening on the south façade, replacing the existing asbestos siding with new lap siding and constructing both first and second level additions to the existing, single-story, rear accessory structure.

3. Install a driveway to the east of the existing accessory structure and install a parking location at the center of the site for approximately four (4) automobiles.

FINDINGS:

General findings:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-story residential structure on the lot addressed as 918 Dawson. The applicant has also proposed to both first and second level additions to the existing, single-story, rear accessory structure on the lot. Florence Street is the public right of way to the south of the property.
- b. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – This lot features frontage to Dawson Street to the north and Florence Street to the south. Florence Street to the south features rear accessory structures and one, primary residential structure that was constructed in 2021. The historic structure addressed as 918 Dawson is a 2-story. There is one, 2-story structure in the rear of a yard with Florence Street access.
- c. **EXISTING LOT** – This lot features the 2-story, historic structure and a 1-story, rear accessory structure. The historic structure was constructed circa 1905 and is found on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The current, rear accessory structure is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. Both the primary and rear accessory structures have been modified from their original form.
- d. **ALLEY CONTEXT** – The south side of this property is bounded by Florence Street. While Florence Street is a named street, it functions as an alley. The historic development pattern on the 900 block of Dawson and the 1800 block of E Houston result in rear yards with right of way access to Florence Street.
- e. **LOT COVERAGE** – The existing lot features 14,499 square feet. The existing structures on site total approximately 2,000 square feet. The applicant has proposed to introduce a footprint of approximately 2,110 additional square feet. The proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SITE DESIGN** – The applicant has noted on the site plan the installation of native grass, trees, and mulch. Generally, staff finds the landscaping elements to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **PREVIOUS REVIEW** – The Historic and Design Review Commission conceptually approved the construction of a 2-story rear residential structure with the following stipulations at the October 19, 2022, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing:
 - That the applicant explore ways to decrease the overall massing (height).
 - That wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in the applicable citations.
 - That additional fenestration be added to both the east and west facades.
 - That the propose driveway with access to Florence Alley not exceed ten (10) feet in width.The Commission also conceptually approved modifications to the rear accessory structure with the following stipulations:
 - That the applicant submit product specifications for the proposed garage door and pedestrian door. Staff recommends that both be wood.
 - That the applicant retain the one, existing window opening on the west façade.The Commission denied the construction of a 2-story structure fronting Dawson Street and the construction of a 2-story addition to the existing, rear accessory structure.

Findings related to request item #1:

- 1a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-story residential structure at the rear of the lot addressed at 918 Dawson. The proposed new construction will feature frontage to Florence Street.
- 1b. **SETBACKS** – The applicant has proposed a setback on Florence Street that is greater than the existing setback of the 1-story accessory structure. The existing accessory structure on site features a setback that is generally consistent with those found historically on the block. Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate.
- 1c. **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. As noted in finding c, the primary, historic structure on this lot features 2-stories in height. The applicant has proposed for 2-stories in height, and an overall height of 26’ – 7” in height. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing and height to be appropriate.

- 1d. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant’s proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 1e. 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 noted a foundation height of 1’ – 6”. Staff finds the proposed foundation height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 1f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a primary roof form that features both hipped and gabled forms. Both hipped and gabled roofs are found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 1g. PORCH DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a double-height, front porch element that is incorporated into the massing of the proposed new construction. The proposed porch features porch columns and porch railings. Generally, staff finds the proposed porch design to be appropriate.
- 1h. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally consistent with those found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District in regards to their size; however, staff finds that the applicant should add additional fenestration to the west elevation on the first floor.
- 1i. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood lap siding, composite trim, and a composition shingle roof. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 1j. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has not specified window materials at this time. Staff finds that the applicant should install wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction.
- 1k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in the above findings, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to the west façade.
- 1l. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a driveway to the east of the proposed new construction to feature ten (10) feet in width. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5. B. notes that driveways should feature materials, widths, and designs that are consistent with those found historically within the district. Generally, staff finds the proposed driveway to be appropriate.
- 1m. PRIVACY FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install privacy fencing at the rear (north) and side (west) of the proposed new construction. The fencing will extend to the east property line and to the right of way at Florence Street. This configuration is consistent with existing privacy fences on this block as well as past Commission approvals, where six (6) foot tall privacy fencing was approved on Florence Street in front of new construction. Staff finds the proposed fencing to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, the proposed fencing should not be taller than six (6) feet in height.

Findings related to request item #2:

- 2a. The applicant has proposed to perform exterior modifications to the existing, rear accessory structure including modifying the fenestration pattern on both the east and west facades, the removal of an existing garage door opening on the south façade, and replace the existing asbestos siding with new lap siding. Generally, staff finds the proposed modifications to be appropriate; however, these modifications are being made in the context of both a first and second level addition to the existing structure. Additionally, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct both first and second level additions to the existing, single-story, rear accessory structure.
- 2b. REAR ADDITION (First Floor) – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition to the rear of the existing accessory structure to feature approximately 260 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited to minimize view from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should feature similar roof forms, and should feature a transition to differentiate the new addition from the historic structure. Additionally, the Guidelines for Additions 1.B notes that additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the historic structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot, and should feature an overall height that is generally consistent with that of the historic structure. Generally, staff finds the first floor addition to be appropriate and in keeping with the Guidelines.
- 2c. SECOND FLOOR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a second floor addition that would feature a footprint that matches the ground level footprint (including the proposed addition referenced in finding

3b). The Guidelines for Additions 1.A. notes that additions should be sited to minimize view from the public right of way, should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block, should feature similar roof forms, and should feature a transition to differentiate the new addition from the historic structure. Additionally, the Guidelines for Additions 1.B notes that additions should be subordinate to the principal façade of the historic structure, should feature a footprint that responds to the size of the lot, and should feature an overall height that is generally consistent with that of the historic structure. Staff finds that the proposed second story addition is not consistent with the Guidelines for new construction. Staff finds that only a 1-story addition would be appropriate.

- 2d. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include wood siding to match the existing found on site, a composition shingle roof, wood windows and doors, and composite trim. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate.
- 2e. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has specified double-hung, wood windows. Staff finds this to be appropriate; however, the proposed windows should conform to staff’s standards for windows in new construction.
- 2f. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for the addition to feature a gabled roof, consistent with the original roof form. Staff finds the proposed roof form to be appropriate.
- 2g. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed second story addition atop the existing accessory structure to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a one-story addition would be most appropriate.

Findings related to request item #3:

- 3a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a driveway to the east of the existing accessory structure and install a parking location at the center of the site for approximately four (4) automobiles. The proposed driveway will feature ten (10) feet in width. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5. B. notes that driveways should feature materials, widths, and designs that are consistent with those found historically within the district. Staff finds the proposed driveway to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, staff finds the proposed parking location, at the interior of the site where it is screened from view, to be appropriate. Staff finds that pervious pavement would be most appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the construction of a 2-story, residential structure based on findings 1a through 1m with the following stipulations:
 - i. That wood or aluminum clad wood windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in finding 1j and in the applicable citations.
 - ii. That additional fenestration be added to both the west facade, as noted in finding 1h.
 - iii. That the proposed privacy fencing not exceed six (6) feet in height.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, exterior modifications to the existing rear accessory structure and the construction of additions based on findings 2a through 2g. Staff recommends the applicant construct a one-story addition to be consistent with the Guidelines.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3 the installation of driveways with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the on-site parking location be made of pervious paving.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

1st MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations, item 2 withdrawn by applicant and 3 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES. 2 NAY. 4 ABSENT.

2nd MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to amend the main approve as submitted.
No seconded to the motion.

3rd MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved to amend main motion to compromise to have architectural windows for kitchen windows.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **MOTION FAILED with 2 AYES. 5 NAYS. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 10. HDRC NO. 2022-540
ADDRESS: 315 REFUGIO ST
APPLICANT: David Hannan Jr/FISHER HECK ARCHITECTS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Remove and enclose one of the original front door openings on the primary structure.
2. Modify the fenestration on the primary structure.
3. Construct an approximately 775-square-foot, 2-story rear addition.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 315 Refugio is a 1-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features an L-shaped plan with a cross gable composition shingle roof, exposed rafter tails, an asymmetrical front porch with turned wood columns and decorative brackets, wood cladding, two front doors, and one-over-one windows. Per the 1912 Sanborn Map, the structure did not originally feature the 1-story rear infill addition. The property is contributing to the Lavaca 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.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant attended a Design Review Committee meeting on July 26, 2022, and a second Design Review Committee meeting on September 13, 2022. The Committee discussed the massing and scale of the proposed addition, materials, the fenestration pattern, the front-facing garage, and landscaping solutions. The applicant has updated the proposal and is requesting conceptual approval from the HDRC.
- d. **FRONT DOOR REMOVAL** – The applicant has proposed to remove and enclose one of the two original front door openings. The applicant has proposed to enclose the front door opening on the east elevation of the front porch with wood siding to match existing. Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that existing window and door openings should be preserved. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **REAR FENESTRATION MODIFICATION** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing rear door to accommodate the installation of a full-lite door with sidelites. Guideline 6.a.ii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that historic doors including hardware, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate but finds that the applicant should submit additional evidence that the rear door is not original to the structure and final material specifications for the replacement door and sidelites for staff to review.
- f. **ADDITION: LOT COVERAGE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story rear addition. The total square footage of the primary structure is 1,118 square feet. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be limited 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. A building footprint should

respond to the size of the lot. The applicant has proposed a total square footage of 1,896 square feet for the primary structure and the proposed addition. The total lot coverage proposed is 50.8% Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

- g. **ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct an approximately 775-square-foot, 2-story rear addition. The original primary structure is 1,118 square feet. Guideline 1.B.i for Additions stipulates that residential additions should be designed to be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of scale and mass. Guideline 2.B.iv for Additions states that the building footprint should respond to the size of the lot. An appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within historic districts. Residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. While the proposed addition will not double the existing building footprint, the proposed addition is not subordinate to the principal façade and extends beyond the footprint of the primary structure and will be highly visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **ADDITION: ROOF** – The applicant has proposed to install a front gable roof form with a shed roof form over the front-facing garage door. The addition extends to the side of the primary structure and is setback toward the rear of the primary structure. The roof form of the addition will be highly visible from the public right-of-way. Guideline 1.A.iii for Additions stipulates that residential additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure. This block of Refugio features a cross gable, front gable, and hip roof forms. Staff finds that the roof form is generally appropriate.
- i. **ADDITION: ROOF MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to install a hand-crimped standing seam metal roof on the rear addition to replace the existing composition shingle roof material on the primary structure with a hand-crimped standing seam metal roof to match. According to the 1912 Sanborn map, the structure originally featured a slate or metal roof. Guideline 3.A.iii for Additions stipulates that original roofs should be matched in terms of form and materials. For example, when adding on to a building with a clay tile roof, the addition should have a roof that is clay tile, synthetic clay tile, or a material that appears similar in color and dimension to the existing clay tile. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate.
- j. **ADDITION: REAR ADDITION REMOVAL** – The proposed addition will require the removal of the nonoriginal rear addition that features two (2) one-over-one windows of traditional proportions, two (2) small windows at the rear, and one (1) door. According to Guideline 6.A.i for Additions, filling in historic openings should be avoided, especially when visible from the public right-of-way. This element is not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given that the existing addition is not original to the structure and encourages the applicant to salvage and reuse any reusable material.
- 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. **ADDITION: RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, 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. Avoid blank walls, particularly on elevations visible from the street. No new façade should exceed 40 linear feet without being penetrated by windows, entryways, or other defined bays. The applicant has proposed to install stacked fixed windows on the front façade that read as a separation between the primary structure and the addition, one-over-one windows, fixed windows, and three-pane windows in singular and ganged configurations on the rear and north elevations. Staff finds that the secondstory window

configuration on the front façade and the use of fixed windows is not consistent with traditional fenestration patterns in the district. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate a more traditional fenestration pattern on the front façade and south elevation.

- m. **ADDITION: MATERIALS: NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS** – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum-clad wood windows. Guideline 3.B.i for Additions states that imitation or synthetic materials, such as vinyl siding, brick or simulated stone veneer, plastic, or other materials not compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure, may not be used. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and 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. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. **ADDITION: MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed to install vertical cement board siding on the rear addition. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that additions should use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- o. **ADDITION: ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story rear addition. Guideline 4.A.ii for Additions states that additions should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found on the original structure should not be used to avoid drawing undue attention to the addition. Guideline 4.A.iii for Additions states that applicants should consider integrating contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for additions. Use of contemporary window moldings and door surroundings, for example, can provide visual interest while helping to convey the fact that the addition is new. Guideline 2.A.v recommends that for side or rear additions utilize setbacks, a small change in detailing, or a recessed area at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds that the proposed addition features a clear visual distinction between the old and new building forms.
- p. **ADDITION: GARAGE** – The applicant has proposed to construct an attached front-facing, one-bay carport on the front façade of the proposed addition. 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 20’-4 ½” from the sidewalk. 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. Historic structures along this block of Refugio Street did not historically feature attached garages and currently do not feature garages. The new construction along this block of Refugio Street either feature carports or no parking structure. Properties in the Lavaca 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 front-facing attached garage is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- q. **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 currently features a gravel side yard and a curb cut that appears to not exceed 12 feet in width. The applicant has proposed to install a permeable paver and gravel driveway and parking pad at the existing gravel side yard and a concrete apron. At this time, the applicant has not provided dimensions for the proposed driveway, parking pad, and apron. Staff finds that the applicant should submit dimensions for these elements to staff for review.
- r. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per Guideline 6.B.ii for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right-of-way.

- s. LANDSCAPING PLAN – The applicant has not submitted a comprehensive landscaping plan at this time. The applicant has submitted a site plan featuring plantings along the primary structure and the planting strip. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a final landscaping plan with planting details prior to returning to the HDRC.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of the front door enclosure based on finding d.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the fenestration modification to the rear elevation based on finding e with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant provides evidence to staff that the existing rear door is not original to the structure.
- ii. That the applicant submits final material specifications for the proposed replacement door and sidelites to staff for review. A fully wood door and fully wood sidelites would be most appropriate.

Item 3, staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the construction of a 2-story rear addition based on findings e through s. Staff recommends that the applicant meet the following stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant reduces the total lot coverage to less than 50 percent based on finding f and submits updated plans to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC for conceptual approval.
- ii. That the applicant reduces the overall massing of the rear addition and proposes a rear addition that does not extend beyond the front façade based on finding g. The applicant must submit updated drawings to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
- iii. That the applicant submits a salvage plan for any reusable material removed to accommodate the rear addition based on finding j.
- iv. That the applicant updates the proposal to feature windows of traditional proportions based on finding k. The applicant must submit updated drawings to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
- v. That the applicant incorporates a more traditional fenestration pattern on the front façade and south elevation based on finding l. The applicant must submit updated drawings to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
- vi. That a detached garage or parking area is utilized in lieu of the proposed front-facing attached garage based on finding p.
- vii. That the applicant submits dimensions for the proposed driveway, parking pad, and driveway apron to staff for review based on finding q prior to returning to the HDRC.
- viii. That the applicant submits a landscaping plan to staff for review based on finding s prior to returning to the HDRC.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Louis Fisher, Diane Jones, and Michael Lopez- support the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved for conceptual approval for item 1 recommend approval. Item 2 and 3 with staff stipulations and clarify stipulation 6 to continue the exploration of detached garage. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 11. HDRC NO. 2022-561
ADDRESS: 224 E CAROLINA ST
APPLICANT: Melissa Stendahl/STENDAHL MELISSA & BENJAMIN

REQUEST:

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

1. Complete fenestration modifications.
2. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 224 E Carolina is a 2-story, single-family home constructed circa 1900 and it first appears on the 1911 Sanborn map. The structure features a standing seam metal hip roof with a central front-facing dormer, a symmetrical front façade configuration with a double-height front porch and full-height classical columns, and a brick chimney on the east elevation. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification.
- b. **CASE HISTORY** – The previous property owner attended the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) hearing on March 20, 2019, to request approval for existing violations in order to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive. The previous property owner had originally submitted a request for Historic Tax Certification and Historic Tax Verification in January 2019, and during the review of the request, staff found that a number of modifications were performed prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness or were otherwise outside of the scope of approval issued in 2016. At that time, the owner had completed the following work without approval:
 1. The installation of square columns with stone bases and exposed bolts.
 2. The removal of an existing inset rear addition.
 3. The construction of a new full-width rear addition and the removal of existing rear and side window openings.The March 20, 2019, hearing resulted in a denial of the previous property owner’s request for approval of the violations and the owner was required to bring the property into compliance by replacing the front porch columns and reversing the rear addition to match the previous footprint and fenestration pattern. The current property owner has corrected violation #1 with the installation of full-height round classical columns. The current property owner has returned to the HDRC to request approval of the existing fenestration pattern of the rear addition due to the constraints of the interior floor plan and has provided evidence that the rear elevation is not visible from the public right-of-way along Lotus Avenue. The property is not eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive until the property comes into compliance with the correction of the existing violation or with HDRC approval for the existing conditions.
- c. **REAR ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to replace the original 2-story rear addition that featured an inset on the east elevation with a full-width, 2-story addition. The original rear addition featured five (5) one-over-one windows of traditional proportions and one full-lite pedestrian door on the rear elevation. The proposed rear addition features one (1) rear door, one (1) set of French doors, two (2) one-over-one windows of traditional proportions on the rear and east elevations, and one (1) fixed square window on the rear elevation. The original rear addition was shown on the 1911 Sanborn map. Guideline 1.A.iv for Additions states that additions should utilize a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear and visual distinction between old and new building forms. The rear addition features vertical trim pieces distinguishing the rear addition from the primary structure.
- d. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to remove three (3) window openings on the rear elevation and two (2) window openings on the west elevation of the rear addition and enclose the openings with siding. The applicant has proposed to install a fixed square window on the east corner of the second story of the rear elevation, one (1) one-over-one window on the east end of the first story of the rear elevation, one (1) one-over-one window on the first story of the east elevation, one (1) set of French doors on the rear elevation, and one (1) half-lite door on the rear elevation. Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that existing window and door openings should be preserved. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Staff finds that the proposed fenestration pattern results in a loss of four (4) one-over-one windows of traditional proportions on the rear addition. Staff finds that the previously existing window and door openings should be preserved and that the applicant should return the fenestration pattern to its previous configuration or should submit plans for the installation of appropriate fenestration on the rear addition. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth

between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

- e. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Certification for the property at 224 E Carolina. The scope of work used to qualify for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive includes a comprehensive interior remodel, porch column restoration, rear porch cover installation, and foundation repair. The scope of work meets the cost threshold to qualify for the tax incentive; however, existing violations on the property make the property ineligible to receive the tax incentive until the property comes into compliance or the property receives HDRC approval for the existing conditions.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the fenestration modifications or Historic Tax Certification based on findings a through e. Staff finds that the applicant should restore the fenestration pattern on the rear addition to its previous condition or should submit plans for the installation of appropriate fenestration on the rear addition.

If the HDRC is compelled to approve the fenestration modifications in the existing configuration, the property is eligible for Historic Tax Certification and the application may return to the HDRC for Historic Tax Verification.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Conservation Society of San Antonio and NDC- support the case.

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

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

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES. 2 NAY. 4 ABSENT.**

ITEM 12. HDRC NO. 2022-544
ADDRESS: 354 NORTH DR
APPLICANT: Luis Valderas

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing composition shingle roof on the garage with a corrugated metal roof to match the patio cover and the rear accessory structure.
2. Modify the front gable roof form to a flat roof form and raise the height of the top plate of the garage.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 354 North is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed in the Minimal Traditional style, which first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map with a 1-story rear accessory structure in the same location and configuration as existing. The primary structure features a Dutch gable composition shingle roof with a front-facing gable, a prominent chimney on the west elevation, asbestos siding, a concrete slab porch with wrought iron columns. The rear accessory structure features an L-shaped plan with a front gable composition shingle roof with a side elevation shed roof form, wood and hardie siding, a solid aluminum garage door, a slid pedestrian door, and traditionally sized window openings and a rear corrugated metal, flat-roof patio cover. The property also features a double-height shed structure along the rear property line. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant previously submitted a post-work application with a request to replace the termite-damaged wood siding on the rear accessory structure and to replace the existing roof with a corrugated metal roof to match the carport roof. Staff misunderstood the existing conditions of the rear accessory structure

and believe the existing roof to feature corrugated metal roofing material. The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness on October 10, 2022, for approval to complete the following modifications to the rear accessory structure:

1. Repair the foundation of the rear accessory structure and install new cement flooring within the existing footprint.
2. Replace the wood siding on the rear accessory structure with in-kind material that matches the existing profile, dimensions, and finish.
3. Replace the hardiboard siding on the rear accessory structure with in-kind material. Replacement siding must feature a reveal of no more than 6 inches and a smooth texture.
4. Replace the existing metal roof on the rear accessory structure with in-kind material.
5. Install a full-wood window in the existing opening that meets staff's standard window stipulations.
6. Replace the garage door in-kind.
7. Paint the rear accessory structure to match the existing color scheme.

Staff conducted a site visit of the property on October 28, 2022, following a report indicating that work was taking place outside the approved scope. Staff was informed that the rear accessory structure previously featured a composition shingle roof, matching the primary structure. Staff observed that the composition shingle roof had been replaced with corrugated metal roofing material, that the roof form had been modified to a flat-roof form and the top plate had been raised. The applicant has replaced all wood siding and hardieboard siding with fully wood siding and has enclosed several previously existing window openings. The applicant has expressed financial hardship in reversing the work that has been completed and is requesting approval of the work as completed.

- c. **ROOF: MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to replace the composition shingle roof with a corrugated metal roof to match the existing patio cover. 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 clay 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. Per the 1951 Sanborn Map, the roofing material at that time was a composition shingle roof. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- d. **ROOF: FORM** – The applicant has proposed to modify the front gable and shed roof forms to a flat roof form to match the existing rear carport structure and to raise the top plate height. According to Guideline 3.B.ii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs should be preserved when replacement is necessary. Additionally, Guideline 3.B.iii states that distinctive roof features such as cornices, parapets, dormers, open eaves with exposed rafters and decorative or plain rafter tails, flared eaves or decorative purlins, and brackets with shaped ends should be preserved and repaired. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines and finds that the original roof form should be preserved.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of the roof material change on the rear accessory structure based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant installs a replacement composition shingle roof to match the previously existing roof.

Item 2, staff does not recommend approval of the roof form modification based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant retains the front gable and shed roof forms.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Robin Foster on behalf of MPNA- supports staff recommendations 1 and 2.

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

VOTE: AYE: Savino, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube.
NAY: Velasquez, and Baker.

ABSENT: Gibbs, Morales, Cervantes, and Fetzer.
ABSTAIN: Fish

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 4 AYES. 2 NAY. 4 ABSENT. 1 ABSTAIN.

ITEM 13. HDRC NO. 2022-555

ADDRESS: 400 CLUB DR

APPLICANT: Adrik Garcia Linares/IDEA INTERNATIONAL LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Modify proposed windows on a previously-approved addition.
2. Modify the first-story roof form.
3. Install barrel tile roof to the addition and proposed roof connection.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house at 400 Club Dr is a two-story Minimal Traditional residence with Spanish Eclectic influence built c 1936. The house first appears on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps in 1950 as a single-story home and without the southwest addition. Historic aerials show the southwest addition in 1955, and staff concluded this is likely the year the second story was added as well. The house is on the southwest corner of Club Dr and Shearer Blvd and features a first story primarily clad in stone and a second story and clad in textured stucco. Windows are primarily metal casement windows. The property contributes to the Monticello Park historic district
- b. CASE HISTORY: On March 16, 2022, the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) reviewed and approved plans to reconstruct the rear one-story addition at 400 Club. The proposed addition was to feature the same general location, scale, form, and materiality as a prior non-contributing addition that was removed; the approved plans included 15-lite casement windows similar in size to those found on the two-story part of the house. On November 2, 2022, at a Design Review Committee site visit related to a separate request to replace windows on the two-story part of the house, staff noted that the design for the one-story addition had been modified without review or approval by OHP and/or the HDRC. Specifically, metal casement windows originally proposed and approved were replaced by smaller metal sash windows and the roof form connecting the new addition to the rest of the house had been altered from the approved design. The applicant was instructed to submit a new application for modifications to the previously-approved design.
- c. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL: On November 8, 2022, the applicant received administrative approval for the following scopes of work: repair eight casement windows and replace 15 casement windows in kind on the historic portion of the house and replace the sliding garage doors with a split-bay garage with wood-look doors. On November 17, 2022, the applicant received administrative approval of the following scopes of work: repair the stucco and repoint masonry, repaint stucco and trim in kind (cream and red), replace the wood vents on the primary elevation in kind, sod the backyard, and add gravel to the backyard between the home and walkway. These scopes of work do not require review by the HDRC.
- d. ADDITION (WINDOWS): The applicant proposes to install two 20-lite casement windows to the west side of the addition, two 10-lite casement windows and one eight-lite casement window to the south side of the addition, and one 12-lite casement window to the east side of the addition. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i states that additions should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context, and that character-defining features and details of the original structure such as shapes of window and door openings should be considered in the design of additions. Staff finds the use of casement windows on the addition conforms to guidelines.
- e. ADDITION (ROOF FORM): The applicant proposes a roof form that connects the one-story addition to the rest of the house. As proposed, the new roof form intersects with the existing roof form in a non-traditional manner. Staff finds the proposed roof form generally appropriate. Given multiple roof additions over the years, there are several instances of non-historic roofs tying into one another. Based on photos submitted, there is concern for adequate drainage to support the longevity of the historic home. It would be more appropriate to consolidate and simplify the overall roof forms at the rear to ensure adequate water shed from the historic structure.
- f. ADDITION (ROOF MATERIAL): The applicant proposes installing a barrel-tile roof on the addition and the connection between the addition and the rest of the house. The previously-approved design for the addition

included a largely composition shingle roof with a band of barrel tile at the edges to mimic the addition that was removed. Sloped roof forms on the house feature barrel tile. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i states that new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure, Staff finds the proposed barrel tile roof conforms to guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item 1, modification of proposed windows on a previously-approved addition, based on finding d.

Staff recommends approval of item 2, modification of the roof form, based on finding e, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant proposes a roof form that is as simplified as possible and allows for drainage away from the house.

Staff recommends approval of item 3, installation of a barrel tile roof to the addition and proposed roof connection, based on finding f.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bianca Maldonado- on behalf of MPNA- support staff recommendations 1-3 with staff stipulations.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulations and added stipulation that applicant discuss item 2 in a DRC.

Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, and Baker.

NAY: None.

ABSENT: Gibbs, Morales, Cervantes, and Fetzer.

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

- *Commissioner Grube left meeting at 5:45pm.*

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2022-562

ADDRESS: 603 CEDAR ST

APPLICANT: Dan Gonzalez/Texas Outdoor Design Build

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to expand the existing driveway approach to be twenty (20) feet wide at the curb cut.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 603 Cedar is a 1-story, single-family home constructed circa 1910 in the Craftsman style. It first appears on the Sanborn Map in 1912. The home features a front-gabled, metal roof with wide overhanging eaves and a side gable projection, decorative brackets, one-over-one wood windows with wood window screens, wood cladding, and ornamental craftsman elements. The home is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. The applicant has proposed to widen the existing concrete driveway apron to twenty (20) feet to accommodate a double-width curb cut, apron and driveway approach. According to Guideline 5.B.ii for Site Elements, the replacement of historic driveways should maintain the width and configuration of original curb cuts and applicants should avoid introducing new curb cuts where not historically found. This request to double the width of the existing curb cut, which features a profile prominently found within the King William Historic District is not consistent with the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval to expand the existing driveway approach to twenty (20) feet based on finding b.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve as submitted by the applicant clarify that the curb cut not exceed 16 feet in width.
Commissioner Baker seconded the motion.

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

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

- *COMMISSIONER FETZER JOINED MEETING VIRTUALLY AND COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ LEFT MEETING AT 6:13PM.*

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2022-554

ADDRESS: 614 E MULBERRY AVE/612 & 614 E Mulberry

APPLICANT: Lyn Wolff/MILLER LYN MARIE WOLFF

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace all existing original wood windows with aluminum windows.
2. Replace original wood front doors.
3. Construct an addition to the front façade.
4. Construct an addition to the rear facade.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 612 & 614 E. Mulberry is a multifamily structure that features wood-lapped siding, oneover-one wood windows, metal awnings, and front-facing gables. The structure is first found in the 1927 City Directory, is found on the 1931 Sanborn Map, and is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. WINDOWS (REPAIR AND MATERIALS) - The applicant is requesting to remove thirty-eight (38) original wood windows and replace them with aluminum. Staff performed a site visit on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, and noticed approximately four windows that were deteriorated beyond repair. Based on the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii, Staff finds the repair of the remaining windows would be most appropriate. Staff also finds the replacement of the windows that are deteriorated beyond repair to be replaced with in-kind or salvaged wood windows. The applicant is responsible for submitting salvaged wood windows to OHP staff for review and approval prior to their installation as replacement windows.
- c. DOORS- The applicant has requested to replace the existing, wood door. Based on the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, staff finds the front door should be preserved if possible. If the door is deteriorated beyond repair, staff finds the applicant should replace the front doors with a door with similar features such as true divided lights and wooden material. The casing of the door is not requested to be modified at this time.
- d. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL – the following repairs and maintenance requests are eligible for Administrative Approval exterior lighting, side yard privacy fence, exterior paint of the trim and body, and the replacement of the gutters with in-kind materials.
- e. SITE VISIT- Staff conducted a site visit on November 29, 2022. Staff observed work being conducted on the roof framing, foundation, and flooring prior to the issuance of a COA and no permits were pulled.
- f. FRONT ADDITION (FORM)- The applicant has requested to construct an addition at the front of the structure by enclosing the existing space between the two units. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., An addition to the front of a building would be inappropriate. The proposed request is not consistent with the guidelines.
- g. REAR ADDITION (FORM) – The applicant has requested to enclose the rear openings of the structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i. Site residential additions at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. Staff finds this request is consistent with the guidelines.

- h. REAR ADDITION (MATERIALS) – For the proposed enclosure, the applicant has proposed to use wooden materials for framing and siding. The roof will match the current material, and the windows are proposed to be aluminum. Generally, staff finds the material requests are consistent with the guidelines; however, the proposed window material is not consistent with the guidelines. Staff finds the applicant should provide a window that is consistent with the Guidelines and staff’s standards for windows in additions and new construction. Additionally, per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv, the applicant should have a small change in detail to provide clear distinction between the old and new building forms.
- i. MATERIALS (SALVAGE) - Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.C.i. Staff finds the applicant should salvage the wood windows in the rear of the structure and use those for replacement windows to the north and east elevations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of all existing wood windows with aluminum windows, based on finding b. Staff recommends the applicant repair the windows with in-kind materials. The four windows that are beyond repair should be replaced with salvaged wood windows. The applicant is responsible for submitting salvaged wood windows to OHP staff for review and approval prior to their installation as replacement windows.
- 2. Staff recommends the applicant repair the front doors and sidelights or replace them with a door with true divided lites and wooden material based on finding c.
- 3. Staff does not recommend the construction of the front addition based of finding f.
- 4. Staff recommends approval of the rear addition of the structure based on finding g and h with the stipulation that the infilled areas be articulated by a piece of vertical trim.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to refer to DRC.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2022-541
ADDRESS: 1110 BURNET ST
APPLICANT: Ricardo Ortiz/ORTIZ RICARDO JR & LOZANO DIANA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a detached garage on an existing concrete slab with rolling garage doors.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a detached garage on the existing concrete slab at the rear of the property located at 1110 Burnet St. within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. GARAGE STRUCTURE – To the rear of the existing primary structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a garage structure. The proposed garage structure will be constructed as an addition to an existing, detached accessory structure and will be constructed on top of an existing, concrete slab
- c. GARAGE STRUCTURE (Massing, Form and Setbacks) – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A and B note that garages should be visually subordinate to the primary structure on site, should be no larger in plan that forty (40) percent of the primary structure on site, should relate to the primary structure on site regarding character and materials, should feature similar window and door openings and should feature garage doors similar in size and proportion to those found historically within the district. Additionally, the Guidelines note that the predominant garage orientation should match that found historically on the block and that the historic setbacks

on the block should be followed. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing, form, and design character of the proposed garage to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should detach the shed roof from the shed and explore a gabled roof form to be consistent with the primary structure.

- d. **GARAGE STRUCTURE (Materials)** – The applicant has proposed for the garage structure to feature materials that include a metal roofing, French doors, and a rolling door system. Staff finds that the applicant should install either horizontal lap siding with a four (4) inch exposure, wood or aluminum clad windows, and a garage door with true divided lites and a wooden appearance to be most appropriate. Staff finds that a standing seam metal roof should be installed as a roofing material to match the primary structure. The proposed roof should feature 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. All panels should be smooth with no striations or corrugation.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the detached garage based on findings b through d with the following stipulations:

1. That the roof be similar in pitch and form to the primary structure as noted in finding c.
2. That the detached garage and shed be detached from one another.
3. That the applicant submits windows for review that are consistent with Staff Standards for New Construction prior to the issuance of a COA based on finding d.
4. That the applicant submits a French door example for review to staff prior to approval based on finding d.
5. That the applicant submits final material specifications for staff review of the garage door based on finding d.
6. That the applicant submits examples to staff for review for the proposed siding material based on finding d.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to refer to DRC.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: The HDRC meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

APPROVED



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

Date: 12/21/22