



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
15 January 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, January 15, 2020, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL:

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

Present: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.

Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

WINDOW WORKSHOP AND CERTIFICATION COURSE IS JANUARY 25 AND 26 AT THE KELSO HOUSE. FIND MORE DETAILS AND REGISTRATION AT WWW.SAREHABBERCLUB.COM.

-- REHABARMA IS APRIL 4 IN DISTRICT 5. SAVE THE DATE AND WATCH FOR MORE DETAILS AS THEY'RE CONFIRMED.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT A and B AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda- A items:**
 - Item #A-1, Case No. 2020-006 SAVINGS ST BOUNDED BY N FLORES ST AND SOLEDAD ST
 - Item #A-5, Case No. 2019-751 337 W COMMERCE ST
- AGENDA A-2 WAS PULLED DUE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS
- AGENDA A-3 WAS PULLED DUE TO NOT ENOUGH COMMISSIONERS FOR RECUSAL
- AGENDA A-4 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR DISCUSSION

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve the consent Agenda A-1 and A-5 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: **THE MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

• **Consideration of Consent Agenda- B items:**

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Margaret Leeds discussed the 216 and 218 Wickes case and concurs with OHP staff to deny application. Virginia Van Cleave- representing Conservation Society- supports the restoration of structures and landmark for item B-15- 4101 Swans Landing. Virginia Van Cleave-representing Conservation Society- 204 City St. Concurs with staff recommendations.

- o Item #B-2, Case No. 2019-712 436 DEVINE ST
- o Item #B-3, Case No. 2019-750 128 W FRENCH PLACE
- o Item #B-4, Case No. 2019-760 204 CITY ST
- o Item #B-5, Case No. 2019-732 2616 N MAIN AVE, 2620 N MAIN AVE
- o Item #B-6, Case No. 2019-745 841 E GUENTHER ST
- o Item #B-7, Case No. 2019-746 203 KING WILLIAM
- o Item #B-8, Case No. 2020-012 1023 HAYS ST
- o Item #B-9, Case No. 2019-742 1023 HAYS ST
- o Item #B-10, Case No. 2019-668 328 E HUISACHE AVE
- o Item #B-11, Case No. 2019-747 420 E DEWEY PLACE
- o Item #B-12, Case No. 2019-632 314 LAMAR ST
- o Item #B-13, Case No. 2019-739 130 BOSTON
- o Item #B-14, Case No. 2019-738 429 DEVINE ST
- o Item #B-15, Case No. 2019-755 4101 SWANS LANDING

- AGENDA B-1 WAS PULLED DUE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS.
- AGENDA B-16 WAS POSTPONED BY APPLICANT TO FEBRUARY 5TH HEARING.
- AGENDA B-17 WAS WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT
- AGENDA B-23 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve the consent agenda B with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motions.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nays: Bowman.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: **THE MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES, 1 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA A ITEMS

- **Item # A-2. HDRC NO. 2019-757**
ADDRESS: 646 S FLORES ST
Applicant: Adrianna Swindle/Lake Flato Architects

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a commercial structure featuring between four and five stories and 170,000 square feet at 646 S Flores. The proposed new construction will be located on land that is currently a surface parking lot, within the Arsenal Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 4. The proposed new construction will feature ninety-six (96) feet in height, and exceeds the allowable height for RIO-4, which is eighty-four (84) feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a commercial structure featuring between four and five stories and 170,000 square feet at 646 S Flores. The proposed new construction will be located on land that is currently a surface parking lot. The applicant has noted that the proposed new construction will feature materials that include limestone, glass curtain walls, metal facade panels, terra cotta screening, and wood accent elements. The proposed new construction will feature ninety-six (96) feet in height, and exceeds the allowable height for RIO-4, which is eighty-four (84) feet.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 7, 2020. At that meeting...
- d. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – The immediate area around the site of the proposed new construction features primarily commercial structures ranging in height from two to four stories in height. Historic residential structures are also in the immediate vicinity, which primarily feature two stories in height.
- e. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a), pedestrian access shall be provided among properties to integrate neighborhoods. Additionally, the various functions and spaces on a site must be linked with sidewalks in a coordinated system. The applicant has noted various connections, including those adjacent to the right of way and those that connect various site courtyards to each other and the right of way. This is consistent with the UDC.
- f. **ENTRANCE ORIENTATION** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. Additionally, per the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i, new construction should feature entrances that are oriented consistently with the predominant orientation found on the block. Staff finds the proposed entrance orientation to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC and Historic Design Guidelines.
- g. **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. Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has adequately incorporated a human scale through the use of human scaled materials, human scaled façade openings, and human scaled entrance elements.
- h. **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. Additionally, the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.ii. notes that the primary façade of new construction should be in keeping with established patterns, and that no new façade should exceed forty (40) linear feet without being penetrated by windows, entryways, or other defined bays. The applicant has separated the proposed façade with alternating materials, alternating wall planes, façade panels, fenestration, and other architectural elements. This is consistent with the UDC and the Historic Design Guidelines.
- i. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – 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 divided the proposed new construction into three distinct segments. The mid-section is separated from the base through both a change in materials and a change in scale, and is separated from the cap by architectural control joints,

roof elements, and parapet caps. Staff finds the proposed façade composition to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

- j. **ALLOWABLE HEIGHT** – The UDC notes that the allowable height of RIO-4 is seven (7) stories, and eightyfour (84) feet. The applicant has proposed an overall height of ninety-six (96) feet, exceeding the allowable height by twelve (12) feet, or approximately fourteen (14) percent. While the proposed new construction is not located immediately adjacent to the San Antonio River, and is not located adjacent to any historic structures, the proposed height is not consistent with the UDC. A variance from the Board of Adjustment may be needed. Staff finds that the additional height is appropriate given the proposed new constructions distance from one and two story residential structures and the San Antonio River.
- k. **HEIGHT COMPATIBILITY** – The UDC Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. Additionally, the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i. notes that new construction should feature a height and overall scale that are consistent with nearby historic buildings. Generally, staff finds that the proposed new construction’s height relates to historic structures in the immediate vicinity, which feature multiple stories. Generally, staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate given its distance from one and two story residential structures and the San Antonio River.
- l. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include limestone, wood elements, terracotta screening, weathered steel and zinc panels. Staff finds the proposed materials to be consistent with the UDC and Historic Design Guidelines.
- m. **WINDOWS** – At this time the applicant has not provided specific information regarding windows. Staff finds that dark colored frames that are recessed at least two (2) inches within façade planes should be used.
- n. **ARCHITECTURAL & SITE LIGHTING** – The applicant has not provided specifics to architectural and site lighting at this time. When returning for final approval, staff finds that the applicant should provide lighting plans for any site and architectural lighting.
- o. **MECHANICAL & SERVICE EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- p. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided both rendered site plans, and renderings noting landscaping elements and materials. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan when returning to the Commission for final approval.
- q. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is located within and/or includes the designated Arsenal Local Historic District, United States San Antonio Arsenal National Register of Historic Places District, Arsenal Local Historic Landmark, River Improvement Overlay District, and previously recorded archaeological site 41BX622. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That that applicant provide a detailed landscaping plan, as well as detailed site and architectural lighting plans when returning to the Commission for final approval, as noted in findings n and p.
- ii. That the applicant screen all mechanical equipment from view as noted in finding o.
- iii. That the applicant inset all windows at least two (2) inches within walls as noted in finding m.

- iv. Archaeology – Archaeological investigations are required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

As noted in finding j, the proposed height exceeds that allowed by the UDC for RIO-4. A variance from the Board of Adjustment may be needed to permit the proposed height.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Rene Ruiz is neutral about the case, but has concerns about bike pedestrian lane affecting the neighborhood.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer,
Nays: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon .

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

- **Item # A-4. HDRC NO. 2019-752**
ADDRESS: 3331 ROOSEVELT AVE
APPLICANT: xavier gonzalez/grg atchitecture

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a commercial structure at 3331 Roosevelt Avenue, located within the Mission Historic District. The proposed new construction will feature both interior and exterior dining space, and surface parking for approximately 200 automobiles.

FINDINGS:

- The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a commercial structure at 3331 Roosevelt Avenue, located within the Mission Historic District. The proposed new construction will feature both interior and exterior dining space, and surface parking for approximately 200 automobiles.
- CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- EXISTING LOT – The existing lot currently features both an existing commercial structure and an existing industrial structure. Based on previous surveys, staff finds that the existing buildings are non-contributing to the district and are eligible for demolition.
- CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – The proposed new construction is located on a commercial corridor, and much of the development in the immediate area is commercial in nature. Mission San Jose is located to the northeast of the proposed site, while single-family residential structures are located to the immediate west.
- MISSION PROTECTION OVERLAY DISTRICT – This project falls within the MPOD-2, and is located approximately, 1,100 feet from the measurement marker immediately in front of the Mission. The proposed height is consistent with the MPOD height restrictions.
- SETBACKS – The Mission Design Manual notes that in general, new buildings should follow the established pattern of the block in terms of front building setback where there is a strong historic context. On corridors where building setbacks vary or are not well-defined by existing contributing buildings, buildings should maintain a minimum front setback of fifteen (15) feet. Per the submitted application documents, the proposed new construction is consistent with the Mission Design Manual.

- g. **PARKING LOCATION** – Per the Mission Design Manual, rear and side parking is encouraged for development north of SE Military Drive. The applicant has proposed parking for approximately 200 automobiles to the rear and side (west and south) of the proposed new construction. While this is consistent with the Mission Design Manual, staff finds that a landscaping buffer should be included for parking that is proposed adjacent to the public right of way, on both Roosevelt and Bonner. The proposed landscaping buffer should be consistent with that which is proposed parallel to the proposed structure. Additionally, staff finds that documentation should be submitted to staff that necessitates the proposed amount of parking.
- h. **VEHICULAR ACCESS** – The applicant has proposed a total of three (3) curb cuts on the site; two on Roosevelt and one on Bonner. In general, driveway widths should not exceed 24’, per the Mission Design Manual. Staff finds that the applicant should consider the elimination of a curb cut on Roosevelt. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Mission Design Manual regarding driveway and curb cut widths.
- i. **BUILDING MASS, SCALE AND FORM** – The applicant has proposed a building mass, scale and form that are consistent with the Mission Design Manual. As proposed, the new construction features elements that are consistent with those found historically in the immediate vicinity, such as stone archways, and other façade openings that refer to those found historically at the adjacent Mission San Jose.
- j. **ROOF FORM** – The Mission Design Manual recommends a flat roof with a parapet wall as the primary roof form for all commercial buildings within the Mission Historic District. The applicant’s proposed roof forms are consistent with the Mission Design Manual regarding roof forms.
- k. **MATERIALS** – Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has proposed materials that include stone cladding, stucco, and metal awnings. These materials are consistent with the Mission Design Manual; however, the proposed stucco should feature traditional finishes and control joints that occur only at locations where there is a change in materials or a change in wall plane to create a continuous, monolithic appearance.
- l. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has not specified window materials at this time. Staff finds that metal windows that feature dark frames should be used. All windows should be installed with an installation depth of at least two inches.
- m. **FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT & ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed human scaled elements, entrances and architectural elements that are found historically within the Mission Historic District, and are consistent with the Mission Design Manual.
- n. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has submitted a rendered site plan noting general locations and types of landscaping materials. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate; however, when returning to the Commission for final approval, the applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan for review and approval. Additionally, as noted in finding g, staff finds that additional buffering elements should be incorporated into the landscape design along Roosevelt and Bonner to screen the proposed surface parking lot from the right of way.
- o. **SIGNAGE** – The applicant has noted both a building mounted channel letter sign and a monument sign. The Mission Design Manual notes that monument signs should feature a size not to exceed fifty (50) square feet total, and a height not to exceed five feet and should be indirectly lit. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a detailed signage plan with locations, sizes and designs to the Commission for review and approval.
- p. **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 p with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant incorporate additional landscaping elements to buffer the proposed surface parking from the right of way at Roosevelt and Bonner as noted in finding g.
- ii. That the applicant ensure that no curb cut exceeds more than twenty-four (24) feet in width as noted in finding h.

- iii. That metal windows featuring dark frames be used that are installed at least two (2) inches within all façade openings as noted in finding l.
- iv. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval as noted in finding n.
- v. That a detailed signage plan be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval as noted in finding o.
- vi. That a survey be submitted to staff to confirm elevation points in regards to the allowable height and conformance with the MPOD height restrictions.
- vii. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Jane Henry supports the case.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations with the added additional stipulation that the applicant explore an additional buffer.
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon .

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

- **Item # A-6. HDRC NO. 2019-740**
ADDRESS: 111 W CROCKETT ST
APPLICANT: Kelly Gonyea/Texas Custom Signs

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 111 W Crockett, the Hard Rock Café. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Install an internally illuminated hanging blade sign at the river level to feature forty-four (44) inches in width, and twenty-six (26) inches in height for a total size of approximately eight (8) square feet. The proposed sign will read “Hard Rock Café” and will be one sided. This sign is noted as sign C in the application documents.
2. Install an internally illuminated hanging blade sign at the river level to feature seventy-six (76) inches in width, and fifteen (15) inches in height for a total size of approximately eight (8) square feet. The proposed sign will read “Rock Shop” and will be one sided. This sign is noted as sign D in the application documents.
3. Install an internally illuminated hanging blade sign at the river level to feature forty-four (44) inches in width, and nine (9) inches in height for a total size of approximately three (3) square feet. The proposed sign will read “Rock Shop” and will be one sided. The proposed sign will be located on the interior of the structure; however, will be located less than ten (10) feet from exterior fenestration and is reviewed as exterior signage. This sign is noted as sign G in the application documents.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install signage at the river level of 111 W Crockett, for the Hard Rock Café. Per the UDC Section 35-681, all exterior and interior signs hung within ten (10) feet of an exterior fenestration, or those signs intended to be read by exterior patrons are governed by this section of the UDC.

- b. ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE – Additionally, the UDC Section 35-681(c) notes that the maximum allowable size for any sign on the riverside of a property abutting the publicly owned River Walk and visible from the River Walk shall be eight (8) square feet, and that only one (1) identification sign shall be allowed for each store, shop, restaurant, nightclub or place of business in the River Walk area and fronting on the River Walk. If a building surface is used for signage, the letters or design shall not exceed a surface area of eight (8) square feet. Additional square footage may be approved by the Commission provided that the additional signage is in conformity with the UDC and does not interfere with the pedestrian experience of the River Walk.
- c. BLADE SIGN (C) – The applicant has proposed to install an internally illuminated hanging blade sign at the river level to feature forty-four (44) inches in width, and twenty-six (26) inches in height for a total size of approximately eight (8) square feet. The proposed sign will read “Hard Rock Café” and will be one sided. Per the UDC Section 35-681(c)(6), internally illuminated signs are prohibited on the river side of properties abutting the River Walk. Staff finds that the size and design of the sign are appropriate; however, the sign should be illuminated indirectly.
- d. BLADE SIGN (D) – The applicant has proposed to install an internally illuminated hanging blade sign at the river level to feature seventy-six (76) inches in width, and fifteen (15) inches in height for a total size of approximately eight (8) square feet. The proposed sign will read “Rock Shop” and will be one sided. Per the UDC Section 35- 681(c)(6), internally illuminated signs are prohibited on the river side of properties abutting the River Walk. Staff finds that the size and design of the sign are appropriate; however, the sign should be illuminated indirectly.
- e. BLADE SIGN (G) – The applicant has proposed to install an internally illuminated hanging blade sign at the river level to feature forty-four (44) inches in width, and nine (9) inches in height for a total size of approximately three (3) square feet. The proposed sign will read “Rock Shop” and will be one sided. The proposed sign will be located on the interior of the structure; however, will be located less than ten (10) feet from exterior fenestration and is reviewed as exterior signage. Per the UDC Section 35-681(c)(6), internally illuminated signs are prohibited on the river side of properties abutting the River Walk. Staff finds that the size and design of the sign are appropriate; however, the sign should be illuminated indirectly.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends that the applicant install one sign featuring eight (8) square feet, and external illumination at the River Walk level.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to continue HDRC due to missing applicant.
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES AND 0 NAY. 5 ABSENT

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA B ITEMS

- **Item # B-1. HDRC NO. 2019-753**
ADDRESS: 217 CEDAR ST
APPLICANT: QUINN DENNIS C & CHEEVER JOAN M

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a railing on the front porch.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 217 Cedar was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian Style. The structure features a modified L-plan, a wraparound porch, a brick chimney, a standing seam metal roof, and two street facing entrances. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. PORCH RAILING: MATERIAL AND DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to install a wood railing on the front porch that will span the wraparound porch and flank the existing porch stairs. The proposed railing is a simplified design. Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that replacement or new elements should be simple in design so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the front porch railing installation based on findings a through b.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Margaret Leeds they are opposed to the case and does not concur with staff recommendations because it would alter the character and factor of the street.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, and Bowman.
Nays: Fetzer.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon .

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES AND 1 NAY. 5 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-18. HDRC NO. 2019-320**
ADDRESS: 311 BARRERA
APPLICANT: Cotton Estes/HighCotton Architects PLLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval to construct a 2-story single family structure totaling approximately 2,100 square feet with an attached carport.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a conceptual approval to construct a single family house on the lot at 311 Barrera. The lot is currently vacant. Historically per Sanborn Maps, the lot featured a 1-story commercial structure housing a dry cleaning business with no rear accessory structure. This structure was modified over the years and was demolished in 2016. This block of Barrera between Indianola St and Catherine St is highly intact and features 1- story single family structures designed in the Folk Victorian style with side gable configurations; deep, lowslipping, full-width front porches; symmetrical facades; standing seam

metal roofs; and rectangular windows. The southern portion of this block of Barrera features new 2-story residential structures.

- b. Conceptual approval was granted by the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on July 17, 2019. The approval carried the following stipulations:
 - 1. That the applicant explores more traditional window depths, configurations, and screen designs that reflect the existing proportions and patterns on the block as noted in finding j; **this stipulation has not been met.**
 - 2. That the applicant proposes a front walkway condition that responds to the existing context of the district, like poured concrete or a similar continuous surface, as noted in finding r; **this stipulation has not been met.**
- c. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on June 11, 2019. The DRC feedback included articulating the front door in a physical or symbolic manner that responds to existing patterns in the neighborhood; introducing vertical elements to add rhythm found in neighborhood historic structures to break up the strong horizontality of the proposal; and further exploring the fenestration pattern and depth, the door/gate condition, massing and design of the side façades; and the front façade's relationship with the surrounding intact historic structures. The applicant revised the proposal and met again with the Design Review Committee on June 26, 2019, to review the current proposed design. The DRC was in support of the separation of masses and was generally supportive of the new entry orientation as well as the garage door configuration. Feedback included providing more views of the front column proportions and reconsidering the height of the proposed fencing.
- d. CONTEXT - The north face of this block of Barrera largely consists of small, one-story vernacular houses with side-gabled roofs and simple shed or hipped porches. The Historic Design Guidelines instructs new construction designs to carefully consider the historic context of the block and surrounding district when designing a new structure. New construction should be distinguishable from historic structures in the district without detracting from them. Staff finds that the massing and form generally responds to the established pattern of the block.
- e. 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 example found on the block. The applicant has proposed an overall setback of 14'-2.5" from the right-of-way. This setback is greater than both of the neighboring historic structures, which have a setback of 12'-11" and 6'-2" respectively. Staff finds the proposed setback consistent with the Guidelines based on the site context.
- f. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed to orient the primary entrance toward Barrera. This is generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. The applicant has proposed to construct a structure which features a single height portion toward Barrera and a portion which features 2 ½ stories at the rear of the lot. Staff finds that there are examples of single family structures that feature multiple levels of height in the vicinity. Additionally, the applicant has provided staff with various perspectives noting that the proposed massing will feature a massing similar to an adjacent property's double height accessory structure and that the proposed rear height will be visually removed from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the massing and scale generally consistent.
- h. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundations. The applicant has not clearly indicated the proposed foundation height in the submitted application, but drawings indicate that the height will be fairly minimal due to the slab-on-grade construction an attached carport. Additionally, per the applicant, the low landscape wall and sill height of the windows will echo the 12-24" foundation height of neighboring houses, providing a visual continuity along the streetscape. The minimal foundation height will also keep the overall roof height lower on this primary 1-story block.

While the proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines, staff finds that the overall design considerations of the proposal create a visual condition that is compatible with existing foundation height conditions and is appropriate based on these site and design specific considerations.

- i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include front facing shed roofs. Additionally, the applicant has provided a street elevation noting the proposed new construction’s roof form in context with the roof forms of the neighboring historic structures. Staff finds the overall proposed roof form consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The front façade window configuration has been modified since conceptual approval to feature two windows on each floor, versus three, equally-sized and spaced windows on each floor. Staff finds that the configuration proposed and approved by the HDRC at conceptual approval is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff also finds that the applicant should explore more traditional window depths, configurations, and screen designs that reflect the existing proportions and patterns on the block.
- k. **LOT COVERAGE** – The building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of total lot area unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The applicant has proposed a building to lot ratio that is greater than fifty (50) percent; however, many historic structures on Barrera feature a similar building to lot ratio. The applicant’s proposed building to lot ratio is consistent, but staff finds that the final landscaping plan should be clearer in addressing how much impervious cover is being introduced in total. Staff finds that a landscaping plan should strive to minimize additional impervious cover to the greatest extent possible due to the large building footprint.
- l. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include finished stucco, a standing seam metal roof, horizontal wood slats, and fiberglass-clad wood windows. Staff finds this material palette to be generally appropriate based on the existing context within the district. The proposed standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish.
- m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Staff finds that the proposed new construction features architectural forms that are contemporary, but complementary, to the architecture found historically in the district.
- n. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has noted the location of mechanical equipment at the rear of the proposed new construction. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- o. **CARPORT** – The applicant has proposed to construct an attached single-bay carport on the northwest side of the structure. The carport will be partially clad with wood slats and partially enclosed by a stucco façade. Along the streetscape, the carport will be enclosed by a sliding wooden driveway gate measuring 7’-0” in height. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, rear garages should be detached from the primary structure or follow historic precedents in the district. Traditionally, residential structures in the Lavaca Historic District featured 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. The historic residential properties along Barrera generally follow this pattern. However, staff finds that the limitations of the lot size and site restrictions, as well as the careful detailing of the carport element, are acceptable and respond to existing district contexts.
- p. **DRIVEWAY** – Per the site plan, the applicant has proposed to utilize the existing curb cut for a new decomposed granite driveway to measure 9 feet in width. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- q. **WALKWAY** – The applicant has proposed a front yard walkway to connect the proposed front porch to the public right of way. Per the submitted documents, the proposed walkway is formed concrete blocks. The applicant should ensure that the width of the proposed front walk is consistent with those found on the block and staff finds that a front walkway condition that responds to the existing context of the district, like poured concrete or a similar continuous surface, is most appropriate. The walkway as currently proposed is not consistent with the Guidelines.

- r. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided a comprehensive landscaping plan. The plan includes significant concrete and rock cover. Staff finds that a pervious versus impervious cover calculation for the lot should be submitted for consideration for final approval. The Guidelines recommend that a maximum of 50% of impervious cover be introduced to the lot. As noted in finding k, staff finds that a landscaping plan should strive to minimize additional impervious cover to the greatest extent possible, and maximize drought tolerant landscaping in lieu of rock cover, due to the large building footprint.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant explores more traditional window depths, configurations, and screen designs that reflect the existing proportions and patterns on the block as noted in finding j and submits detailed specification information and drawings to illustrate depth, proportion, configuration, and detailing. 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.
- ii. That the applicant reconfigures the front fenestration pattern to closely match the proposal reviewed and approved at the conceptual approval stage as noted in finding j.
- iii. That the applicant proposes a front walkway condition that responds to the existing context of the district, like poured concrete or a similar continuous surface, as noted in finding q.
- iv. That the applicant proposes a landscaping plan that eliminates non-native cover, such as shadow stone, and incorporates additional drought-tolerant and native plantings. The applicant must submit a pervious versus impervious cover calculation for the lot for consideration for final approval. Staff recommends the substantial integration of more landscaping in lieu of the proposed expanses of concrete and rock cover as noted in findings k and r.
- v. That the standing seam metal roof features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. 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 COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations 3 and 4. Applicant will return with staff for final approval on stipulation 5.
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: Grube.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES AND 1 NAY. 5 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-19. HDRC NO. 2019-759**
ADDRESS: 515 NOLAN
APPLICANT: 515 NOLAN ST SERIES

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a 646 square foot rear addition with a tower element
2. Relocate 5 windows and opening from the side and rear elevations
3. Modify the rear accessory structure

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 515 Nolan was constructed circa 1950, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features front-facing and turned gable, asbestos siding, composition shingle roofing material, and metal casement windows.
- b. **ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 646 square foot addition with a two-story tower element, a rooftop terrace, and rear covered porch. The addition features wood siding, composition shingle roofing material, 5 relocated existing metal casement windows, 4 fixed windows, a sash window, and a sliding window
- c. **VISUAL IMPACT** – Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., applicants should 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 that the addition set to the rear is generally appropriate.
- d. **HISTORIC CONTEXT** – Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.ii., applicants should design new residential additions to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block; eg. a large, two-story addition on a block comprised of single-story homes would not be appropriate. Staff finds that the 500 block of Nolan exclusively features one-story structures and that the proposed two-story tower element is not consistent with the historic pattern.
- e. **ROOF FORM** – The proposed addition features hipped roofs continuing from the existing gable forms and the tower element features its own hipped roof. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., applicants should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure for additions. Staff finds that proposed new roofs are consistent with the Guidelines and relates to the primary historic structure.
- f. **TRANSITION BETWEEN NEW AND OLD FORMS**– Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., applicants 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 visual distinction between old and new building forms. The applicant has notes the use of “new wood siding to match existing”; the primary structure features asbestos siding. Staff finds that the design lacks a transition from new and old forms and is inconsistent with the Guidelines; the applicant should incorporate a setback between new and old wall planes and/or utilize different but related siding materials.
- g. **MASSING AND FORM** - The applicant has proposed to construct a 646 square foot addition with a two story tower element, a rooftop terrace, and covered rear porch. Per the Guidelines for Addition 1.B. i., applicants should design residential additions, including porches and balconies, to be subordinate to the principal façade of the original structure in terms of their scale and mass. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.ii., applicants should limit rooftop additions to rear facades to preserve the historic scale and form of the building from the street level and minimize visibility from the public right-of-way. Staff finds that the first floor rear addition massing is generally appropriate. However, staff finds that the tower element and roof top terrace is atypical to the traditional architectural style of the primary historic structure and is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **FOOTPRINT** – The primary historic structure features 984 square feet and the proposed addition features approximately 646 square feet. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv., 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; and residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. Staff finds the proposed footprint is consistent with the Guidelines.

- i. HEIGHT – The primary historic structure features a height of 13’-3” and the tallest point of the rear addition features a height of 18’-11”. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v., generally, the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure; the maximum height of new additions should be determined by examining the line-of-sight or visibility from the street; addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The submitted line-of-sight study notes that the addition would be visible from the front right-of-way. Staff finds that the height of the addition should be reduced until it is not visible from the right-of-way, or that the applicant modifies the nonconforming tower feature noted in finding g and f.
- j. MATERIALS – The proposed addition features “new wood siding to match existing” and composition shingle roofing material. Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., applicants 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 structure. Staff finds that Hardie plank siding with a profile comparable to that found in the historic district (4 inch exposure with smooth finish and no faux wood grain texture) would be an appropriate material.
- k. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The proposed addition features architectural elements including a rear covered porch with square columns, a hipped roof tower element, and a rooftop terrace with simple wood railing. Per the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i., applicants should design additions to reflect their time while respecting the historic context and consider character-defining features and details of the original structure in the design of additions, including roof form, porches, porticos, cornices, lintels, arches, quoins, chimneys, projecting bays, and the shapes of window and door openings. Per the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.ii., applicants 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. Staff finds that the tower element and roof top terrace does not relate to the traditional architecture style of the primary historic structure and should be reconsidered.
- l. ADDITION WINDOWS – The proposed addition features 5 relocated existing metal casement windows, 4 fixed windows, 1 sash window, and a sliding window. Staff finds that existing window openings should remain in place and the proposed windows should better relate to primary historic structure by adhering to the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction. An aluminum or aluminum-clad window with divided lights and sizes matching any existing window may be more appropriate if true casement windows cannot be replicated.
- m. WINDOW RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate 5 metal casement windows throughout the property to accommodate the proposed addition and new interior floorplan. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., applicant should preserve existing window and door openings. Staff finds requesting new window openings that would not be visible from the right-of-way would be more appropriate than relocating multiple window openings.
- n. ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - The applicant has proposed to convert the existing garage structure into an accessory dwelling unit including the removal of a garage door, the installation of a divided light window and a sliding window, and door replacement. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.B.i., applicants should ensure that replacement garage doors are compatible with those found on historic garages in the district (e.g., wood paneled) as well as with the principal structure. Staff finds that the garage door opening should not be removed. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A.ii., when new materials are needed, they should match existing materials in color, durability, and texture; refer to maintenance and alteration of applicable materials above, for additional guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed windows and doors should relate to existing windows and doors on the accessory and primary structures, which may include the use of a traditional wood panel door and divided light aluminum windows of existing sizes.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does recommend approval of the rear addition with window relocation as proposed based on findings b through m. If the commission is compelled to approval the request, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. The two-story tower element and terrace should be removed from the design - or reduced in height and integrated into the existing roof to not be visible from the front right-of-way.
- ii. Existing window openings on the primary historic structure should remain in place. New window openings on the side and rear elevations may be a more appropriate response to a proposed addition and new interior floorplan.
- iii. New windows and openings should relate to primary historic structure by adhering to the *Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction*. An aluminum or aluminum-clad window with divided lights and sizes matching any existing window may be more appropriate if true casement windows cannot be replicated.
- iv. Final material specifications should be submitted and consistent with the Guidelines. Hardie plank siding with a profile comparable to that found in the historic district (4 inch exposure with smooth finish and no faux wood grain texture) would be an appropriate material.

Staff recommends approval to modify the rear accessory structure based on finding n with the following stipulation:

- i. That the garage door opening is not to be removed; appropriate garage door replacement or treatment may be approved administratively.
- ii. That the proposed windows and doors should relate to existing windows and doors on the accessory and primary structures, which may include the use of a traditional wood panel door and divided light aluminum windows of existing sizes if true casement windows cannot be replicated.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Virginia Van Cleave-representing Conservation Society- concurs with staff recommendations.

Motion: Commissioner Bowman moved to refer to Design Review Committee- DRC.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

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

- **Item # B-20. HDRC NO. 2019-744**
ADDRESS: 2015 W MISTLETOE
APPLICANT: RODRIGUEZ RALPH & SONIA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing side chimney.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 2015 W Mistletoe is a 1-story, single-family home constructed circa 1940. It first appears on the Sanborn Map in 1951. The home features a double pyramidal roof, an asymmetrical front porch, wood cladding, and a painted brick chimney. The house is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. CHIMNEY REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing brick chimney. The chimney is located to the front of the structure on the west elevation. According to the Historic Design

Guidelines, existing roof vents should be preserved. Although the chimney does show signs of deterioration, it is characteristic of this style of home and period of construction and chimneys can be found on several historic structures on the block. The chimney is also original to the structure and visible from the public right-of-way. Staff does not find chimney removal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the chimney removal based on finding b.

Staff recommends that the existing chimney be repaired or reconstructed using salvaged brick to the fullest extent possible. The applicant is required to submit drawings for its reconstruction to staff prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to deny application.
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

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

• **Item #B-21. HDRC NO. 2019-754**

ADDRESS: 427 ADAMS ST

APPLICANT: Sue Ann Pemberton/Mainstreet Architects Inc.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an addition on the detached rear garage.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 427 Adams is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1912. It first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The house features a side gable metal roof, a second story extension over a covered carport, stucco cladding, and decorative craftsman-style side lite entry door surrounds. The rear garage is original to the primary structure according to the Sanborn Map. It features a metal hip roof, stucco cladding, and two bays of doors. The west elevation features two one-over-one windows and a pedestrian door. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a 373 square foot addition to the rear detached garage, located at the northwest side of the property. The addition will be located on the west elevation of the existing 455 square foot garage. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, additions should be located at the rear of the property whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines stipulate that additions should not double the size of the primary structure. The addition is approximately a fourth of the size of the overall footprint of the primary structure and will not double the size of the existing rear detached garage. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. **ROOF MATERIAL** – The proposed addition is 1-story in height and is subordinate to the existing roofline of the primary structure. The existing roofing material on the rear garage is metal. The applicant has proposed to install a metal hip roof to closely match the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

- d. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION** – The applicant has proposed to install one new wood window on the north elevation to match the existing windows on the west elevation, 3 wood doors on the north elevation to match the existing doors on the north elevation of the existing garage, and 3 horizontal wood windows on the south elevation. According to Guideline 5.A.iv. for New Construction, applicants should design window and door openings to be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings. Additionally, Guideline 5.A.v. stipulates that garage doors should be incorporated with similar proportions and materials as those traditionally found in the district. The OHP Window Policy Document states that windows used in new construction should maintain traditional dimensions and profile. As the south elevation is street facing and the proposed horizontal windows would be visible from the public right-of-way, staff finds the proposal to install horizontal windows on the south elevation inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to use wood windows and doors for all of the new window and door installation. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed to stucco the façade to match the existing garage wall. Staff finds this proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure should be incorporated. The proposed addition keeps with the style of the rear detached garage and the primary home without detracting from its significance. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the 1-story addition to the rear detached garage based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install windows with proportions more traditional to the style of the rear detached garage and primary structure.
- ii. That the applicant submits updated elevations to staff for review and approval prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Margaret Leeds-points out to reinforce match the windows to the structure.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve as submitted and described windows to the east to match the west; and added stipulation that the proportion of the small horizontal window be explored to reflect the 1 to 1 proportion.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT

• **Item # B-22. HDRC NO. 2019-758**
ADDRESS: 714 N PINE ST
APPLICANT: NAEGER JENNIFER & LEO

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 5-foot tall wrought iron fence across the front yard with a dual opening mechanical gate at the driveway.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 714 N Pine was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The two-story single-family structure features a wrap-around porch and balcony with dentil molding on the cornice, a front-facing gable with shake shingles, square columns with capital and base trim, and a brick chimney.
- b. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard fence across the front yard meeting at the existing chain-link side fences, including a pedestrian and driveway gate.
- c. DESIGN – The applicant proposed the fence to feature a wrought iron design with finials, rings, and raised pedestrian and driveway gates. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character, and respond to the design and materials of the main structure. Staff finds that a wrought iron fence is typical to Folk Victorian style and is generally appropriate. If a motorized driveway gate is approved, equipment should be minimally visible behind the gate.
- d. LOCATION – Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii., new front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. Staff finds that front yard fences are found on N Pine and within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Additionally, per the Guidelines 3.ii., privacy fences should not be used in the front yard. While fences with front gates are typically stipulated to turn at the driveway, staff finds that the wraparound porch and balcony provides a site condition where setting the driveway gate behind the front façade plane is infeasible.
- e. . HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence with a height of 5-feet at its tallest point at the pedestrian and driveway gate. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds that no portion of the fence should exceed 4-feet in height including the finials and raised gate portions.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings with the stipulation that no portion of the fence exceeds 4-feet in height. If a motorized driveway gate is approved, equipment should be minimally visible behind the gate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulations and allowing gates to be taller than 4ft.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fish, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nay: Gibbs.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES, and 1 NAYS. 5 ABSENT

- **Item # B-24. HDRC NO. 2019-756**

ADDRESS: 417 WILLOW ST
APPLICANT: Juan Delallata/Blustar Construction

REQUEST:

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

1. Perform partial demolition of the side and rear additions
2. Construct a new side and rear additions
3. Modify side accessory structure
4. Replace the shingle roof with standing seam metal on both structures
5. Install front yard fencing

6. Install a gravel driveway
7. Install concrete paver walkways and patio areas

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure 417 Willow was constructed circa 1925 and first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The one-story single-family structure features a symmetrical turned gable Craftsman style configuration with a centered covered concrete porch, wrought iron columns, wood lap siding, sash windows, composition shingle roofing material, and side and rear additions. The atypical lot features a 4-foot setback to the rear fence and property line and a side yard with a garage and attached carport.
- b. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION** – The applicant has proposed to perform partial demolition of the side addition and rear addition to prepare for construct of new additions. Staff finds that non-historic additions are eligible for demolition. All conforming material such as wood windows or wood lap siding should be salvaged when possible.
- c. **SIDE AND REAR ADDITIONS** – The applicant has proposed to construct a side addition flush the primary roof and façade planes, and to modify the rear addition to feature a continuous roof plane. The additions will have matching composition shingle roofing and roof forms, wood lap siding material, and wood windows and doors. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., applicants 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 visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds that the proposed design with a continuous roof and wall planes provides a false sense of historicism and that an addition that features a subordinate roof height would be more appropriate. Staff finds that the remaining design details are generally consistent with the Guidelines. However, final specifications for windows and doors and an updated measured drawing should be submitted to staff. New windows should adhere to the Standard Specification for Windows for Additions and New Construction; the horizontal picture window on the rear façade should instead feature a matching wood sash window.
- d. **ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to modify the garage to feature front-facing door windows, a reconstructed attached carport, and wood lap siding to match the primary historic structure. The garage features portions of original board-and-batten siding and a number of non-conforming modifications and dilapidation. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.A.ii., repair outbuildings and their distinctive features in-kind; when new materials are needed, they should match existing materials in color, durability, and texture. Staff finds that the fenestration modifications with windows and doors that match the primary structure are appropriate. However, the board-and-batten siding should be repaired in-place or replace in-kind rather than feature wood lap siding.
- e. **ROOFING MATERIAL** – The applicant has proposed to change the roofing material of both structures from composition shingle to standing seam metal. The 1951 Sanborn Maps depicts the primary structure to feature shingle roofing material and the garage to feature a non-combustible material. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.A.iv. applicants should match new roofing materials to the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile, and style, or select materials consistent with the building style, when in-kind replacement is not possible. While the structure may originally feature shingle roofing material, staff finds that standing seam metal roofs on Craftsman style houses are typical to the Dignowity Hill Historic District and may be appropriate for this structure. The new roof should adhere to the Standard Specifications for Standing Seam Metal Roofs
- f. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing chain-link fence with 4-foot tall wood picket fencing in front of the primary historic structure and 6-foot tall horizontal privacy fencing in front of the side accessory structure. While staff acknowledges the atypical configuration of this property, per the Guidelines for Site Elements, 2.B.iii., applicants should limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds that all portions in front of the front façade plane of the primary historic structure, regardless of orientation, should feature traditional vertical wood pickets and is no taller than 4-feet; 6 foot tall wood privacy fences are only appropriate behind the front façade plane.

- g. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed to install a gravel driveway where the side yard is currently unpaved. While pervious driveway surface is supported by the Historic Design Guidelines, staff remains concerned that about total lot coverage where driveways are typically limited to 10-feet in width, and that the submitted renderings depicts a driveway that is substantially offset from the driveway approach.
- h. CONCRETE PAVERS – The applicant has proposed to perform landscape modifications including installation of square concrete paver paths and patio areas. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.B.i., applicants should not introduce large pavers, asphalt, or other impervious surfaces where they were not historically located. Staff finds that the square concrete pavers are a contemporary feature that should be avoided where they are visible in the front yard; simple walkways are typically restored with poured concrete or crushed granite.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends of the following items based on the findings b through g with the following stipulations:

1. Perform partial demolish of the side and rear additions
 - a. That all salvageable materials be retained and reused on site
2. Construct a new side and rear additions
 - a. That roof on the addition is subordinate the historic roof height
 - b. That all windows on the addition adheres to the Standard Specification for Windows for Additions and New Construction, which may require modifying the rear fixed horizontal window.
 - c. That updated drawings and specifications must be submitted staff prior to final approval
3. Modify side accessory structure
 - a. That the board-and-batten siding is used to match the existing siding rather than modifying to wood lap
 - b. That all windows on the addition adheres to the Standard Specification for Windows for Additions and New Construction, which may require modifying the rear fixed horizontal window.
 - c. That updated drawings and specifications must be submitted staff prior to final approval
4. Replace the shingle roof with standing seam metal on both structures
 - a. That the new roof should adhere to the Standard Specifications for Standing Seam Metal Roofs
5. Install front yard fencing
 - a. That all portions in front of the front façade plane of the primary historic structure, regardless of orientation, should feature traditional vertical wood pickets and is no taller than 4-feet; 6 foot tall wood privacy fences are only appropriate behind the front façade plane.

Staff does not recommend approval to install concrete pavers based on finding h.

6. Install concrete paver walkways and patio areas
7. Install a gravel driveway

The applicant may submit a landscape and driveway design that is consistent with the Guidelines for review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1-4 with staff stipulations remove for stipulation 3a; refer item 5,6,and 7 to Design Review Committee- DRC.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

Vote:
Ayes: Fish, Gibbs, Arreola, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nay: None.
Absent: Fernandez, Velasquez, Martinez-Flores, Carpenter, and Laffoon.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.

APPROVED



Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair