CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
04 December 2019

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, December 04, 2019, 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 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- City Office closures
- Historic Run Crew: Tuesday, December 17, Downtown Holiday Lights Tour. Multiple tour start times 6:15 pm to 7 pm. Walkers and runners welcome. $15 Pre-registration at www.SApreservation.com.
- Announcement regarding induction of Rudy's Feed Store (1801 Nogalitos) into Legacy Business Program
- Public Comments Review and approval of the 2020 HDRC Application and Hearing Schedule

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Virginia Van Cleave to speak on 314 E. Mistletoe in oppsed to case because they need to uproot the designation.

CONSENT A and B AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda- A items:**
  - Item #A-2, Case No. 2019-684 1422 E GRAYSON ST

- AGENDA A-1 WAS PULLED BY COMMISION FOR DISCUSSION
- AGENDA A-3 WAS PULLED DUE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent Agenda A with staff stipulations. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

Action: **THE MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES, 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT**

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda- B items Heard after 4:30pm:**

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

- Item #B-1, Case No. 2019-676 1023 N PINE ST
- Item #B-2, Case No. 2019-700 1024 DAWSON ST
- Item #B-3, Case No. 2019-689 1127 N PALMETTO
- Item #B-4, Case No. 2019-660 132 CAMARGO
- Item #B-5, Case No. 2019-679 1430 W ROSEWOOD AVE
- Item #B-6, Case No. 2019-656 147 CROFTON
- Item #B-7, Case No. 2019-677 151 NORTH DR
- Item #B-8, Case No. 2019-658 209 VANCE ST
- Item #B-9, Case No. 2019-659 209 VANCE ST
- Item #B-10, Case No. 2019-680 309 WICKES
- Item #B-11, Case No. 2019-685 413 E MISTLETOE/Fred C. and Mary Rodriguez Luna House
- Item #B-12, Case No. 2019-706 5626 SAN FERNANDO ST
- Item #B-13, Case No. 2019-070 801 N OLIVE ST, 701 NOLAN
- Item #B-14, Case No. 2019-693 138 E LULLWOOD AVE

- AGENDA B-15 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL THE DECEMBER 18TH HEARING.
- AGENDA B-16 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL THE DECEMBER 18TH HEARING.

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

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

Action: **THE MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES, 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA A ITEMS

- **Item # A-1. HDRC NO. 2019-682**

ADDRESS: 1500 N ST MARYS
Applicant: Jennifer Gonzalez/ACG ST MARYS PLACE LOFTS GP LLC

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify the previously approved design. Within this request, the applicant has proposed to:

1. Modify the previously approved materials from brick, metal panels, translucent façade panels and stucco to stucco and horizontal Hardie siding.
2. Modify the previously approved window profiles.
3. Eliminate the corner tower element from the design.
4. Eliminate the canopies at various locations on the facades.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify the previously approved design, which was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the February 20, 2019, Commission hearing. Stipulations of that approval are noted below:
   i. That the proposed aluminum windows feature dark colored frames.
   ii. That the all proposed signage be submitted to the Historic and Design Review Commission for review as a separate application.
   iii. ARCHAEOLOGY – An archaeological investigation is required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

b. At this time, the applicant is requesting to modify the materials of the previously approved design. The overall massing, height and footprint of the proposed new construction will remain unmodified.

c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on November 13, 2019. The commissioners present expressed concern over the loss of the full-height tower element as well as canopy which provided articulation at the street level.

d. MATERIALS – The previously approved design featured materials that included brick, stucco, and metal panels. The previously approved brick was featured at the street level on both the Jones and N St Mary's façade, as well as on the majority of the N St Mary's elevation and at the intersection of Jones and N St Mary's. At this time, the applicant has proposed to eliminate sections of brick from the design and substitute brick with Hardie siding. Per the submitted design documents, brick will remain in locations at the corner of Jones and N St Mary's and at the street level.

e. MATERIALS – The UDC Section 35-674(d) notes that indigenous materials and traditional materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. Additionally, the UDC notes that a minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls shall be comprised of the following materials: modular masonry, stucco and painted concrete, painted or stained wood, and other materials that convey the texture, scale and finish similar to traditional building materials. Staff finds the use of stucco to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the previously approved color palette should remain, or similar colors should be used on various façade planes to provide visual depth to each façade. In regards to the proposed Hardie siding, staff finds the use of Hardie to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should provide additional information to staff regarding the exposure, finish, and trim detailing for the proposed siding. Staff finds that an exposure of no larger than eight (8) inches should be used, that the proposed Hardie should feature a smooth finish, that the Hardie be painted a dark color and that the applicant explore contemporary installation profiles.

f. WINDOW PROFILES– The applicant has proposed to modify the previously approved window profiles from windows that featured a separating rail to create a transom element to windows that are shorter in profile with no transom element. Staff finds the modification to be consistent with the UDC; however, the applicant should provide additional information, such as head and sill details as was previously submitted. Additionally, per the UDC, windows are to be recessed at least two (2) inches within walls. This applicant is responsible for complying with this requirement. Staff also finds that dark colored window frames should be installed. White should not be used.

g. TOWER ELEMENT / ARCHITECTURAL FOCAL POINT – The applicant has proposed to eliminate the tower element that was proposed at the corner of N St Mary's and Jones Avenue. The UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), notes that an architectural focal point is to be incorporated into the design when a property is situated in such a manner as to appear as the terminus at the end of the street. An architectural feature will be considered to be a focal point through any of the following methods, but not limited to: additional height, creation of a tower, variation in roof shape, change of color or materials or the addition of a design enhancement feature. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate an architectural focal point that is consistent with the UDC.

h. STREET & FAÇADE CANOPIES – The applicant has proposed to eliminate the previously proposed street and façade canopies. Previously, the canopies were incorporated into the design to provide a human

scale and the street level, and the provide separation between the base, mid-section, and building cap; however, staff finds that the modified design still provided a human scale and a separation between the base, mid-section and building cap. Staff finds the proposed removal of street and façade canopies to be appropriate, provided that architectural detail can be introduced which maintains interest at the pedestrian level.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval of items 1, 2, and 4 based on the findings with the following stipulations:

i. CHANGE IN MATERIALS - That the previously-approved color palette remain, or similar colors be used on various façade planes to provide visual depth and separation to each façade section as noted in finding e. The applicant must also provide additional information to staff regarding the exposure, finish, and trim detailing for the proposed siding. Staff finds that an exposure of no larger than eight (8) inches should be used, that the proposed Hardie should feature a smooth finish, that the Hardie be painted a dark color, and that the applicant explore contemporary installation profiles.

ii. WINDOW PROFILES - That all windows be recessed at least two inches within wall planes, that the applicant submit window detailing to staff for review and approval, and that all windows feature a dark, or non-white color, as noted in finding e.

iii. CANOPY REMOVAL – That an architectural detail is introduced at the first floor which maintains visual interest at the pedestrian level.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 3, elimination of the corner tower detail, as submitted based on finding g. Staff recommends that the applicant develop a new architectural focal point at the intersection of Jones and N St Mary's. This could potentially be achieved by utilizing a change in materials, color, or parapet detail at the corner, or by maintaining a continuous material for all levels at this location.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

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

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES AND 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT

- **Item # A-3. HDRC NO. 2019-690**
  ADDRESS: 423 S ALAMO ST/La Villita
  APPLICANT: James McKnight/Brown & Ortiz, P.C.

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct a 9-story hotel tower on the existing, vacant lot located at 423 S Alamo. The proposed hotel will feature approximately 275 rooms.
2. Construct street level structures, including a hotel entry and drop off structure, a restaurant, and a structure to connect the historic German School buildings to the proposed hotel tower.
3. Perform modifications to the existing courtyard between the two historic German School buildings.

FINDINGS:

General Findings:

a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 9-story hotel tower on the existing, vacant lot at 423 S Alamo that is to feature approximately 275 hotel room. In addition to the proposed hotel tower, the applicant has proposed to construct street level structures to house hotel amenities, and to connect to the existing, historic German School buildings on site. The applicant has also proposed modifications to the existing courtyard between the two historic German School buildings.

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 November 12, 2019. At that meeting, committee members noted that the existing, historic structures should be incorporated into the design and encouraged the applicant to provide additional master planning documents when submitting for conceptual approval.

d. EXISTING SITE CONDITION – The existing site features an asphalt surface parking lot, and the German English School historic site, which features a number of historic structures.

e. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has both rendered site plans and renderings of the site including various landscaping details. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan when returning to the Commission for final approval.

f. SITE LIGHTING – At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding site lighting. Staff finds that an site lighting plan should be submitted when returning to the Commission for final approval.

g. SIGNAGE – Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has proposed monuments signs along S Alamo. Both the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for Signage and the UDC Section 35-678 recommend that signage not exceed more than fifty (50) square feet per application. Both documents also note that additional square footage may be approved by the Commission. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a detailed master signage plan, including hotel, tenant, and wayfinding signage to be reviewed and approved by the Commission.

h. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is within the La Villita Local Historic District, La Villita National Register of Historic Places District, and includes the German-English School Local Historic Landmark. In addition, the German-English School is a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (marker #2178). Furthermore, previously recorded archaeological site 41BX304 is located within the subject property. A review of historic archival information identifies the project area as the possible location of the Spanish Colonial Cuartel. Moreover, the reported second location of Mission San Antonio de Valero is in close proximity to the subject property. Therefore, an archaeological investigation is required. State law requires a 60 day notice to the Texas Historical Commission prior to modifying the historical or architectural integrity of a Recorded Texas Historic Landmark. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Findings related to request item #1:

1a. The applicant has proposed to construct a 9-story hotel tower on the existing, vacant lot located at 423 S Alamo. The proposed hotel will feature approximately 275 rooms.

1b. 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. The applicant has proposed a primary entrance at the base of the tower that is oriented toward S Alamo. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

1c. 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, a human scale has been provided in multiple instances, including through the installation of recessed balconies on the S Alamo façade and human scaled floor to ceiling heights that translate to the façade through materials. Staff finds these instances of representing a human scale to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC; however, staff finds that the applicant should continue to incorporate human scaled fenestration patterns, detailing and materials throughout the design, including at the street level.

1d. 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. Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has separated the façade as required by the UDC in all locations with the exception of the easternmost portions of the tower, where the façade consists of poured concrete. Staff finds that additional façade separation should occur at this location through the incorporation of additional façade materials and additional fenestration.

1e. 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. Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has divided the proposed tower into three distinct segments. The mid-section is framed in a manner that separates it from the base and cap, which feature recessed massing, glass curtain wall systems, and rooftop parapet walls. Staff finds the proposed façade composition to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

1f. ALLOWABLE HEIGHT – There is no height restriction for new construction in RIO-3, consistent with the Downtown District. The applicant has proposed a height of approximately one hundred and twenty (120) feet. Cesar E Chavez Boulevard is a dividing boundary between the Downtown District and the neighborhoods to the south. The proposed height is appropriate within the context of the Downtown District.

1g. HEIGHT COMPATIBILITY – 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. The proposed new construction is located adjacent to structures that are below the allowable building height. The proposed new construction features a podium with 1 story in height; generally, this is consistent with the massing of the historic structures found in the immediate vicinity; however, the proposed tower is located within the La Villita Historic District where there is an immediate contrast between the overall height of the proposed new construction and the height of the historic structures in the immediate vicinity.

1h. MATERIALS – Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed materials that include concrete, aluminum storefront systems, wood accent walls and metal façade panels. These materials are all consistent with the UDC. When returning for final approval, staff finds that the applicant should submit all materials specifications to staff for review and approval.

1i. WINDOWS – At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding windows. Staff finds that dark colored frames that are recessed at least two (2) inches within façade planes should be used.

1j. ARCHITECTURAL LIGHTING – At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding architectural lighting. Staff finds that an architectural lighting plan should be submitted when returning to the Commission for final approval.

1k. 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.

1l. 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.

1m. CURB CUTS – The applicant has proposed three curb cuts to facilitate vehicular access into the site. Two of the proposed curb cuts will be located on S Alamo, and are associated with the proposed hotel drop off. The third curb cut will be located on Arciniega Street. The UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(B) notes that curb cuts should not exceed twenty-five (25) feet in width. Staff finds that the proposed curb cut on S Alamo, should feature an uninterrupted sidewalk at the curb with a steeper vehicular approach to ensure that pedestrian access on the sidewalk is not disturbed.

1n. AUTOMOBILE PARKING – At this time the applicant has not noted on site vehicular parking. If on site automobile parking is proposed, it should be located toward the interior of the site, or to the side or rear buildings. Additionally, all on-site parking is to be buffered and screened from view of the right of way, as noted in the UDC Section 35-672(b)(3). The applicant is responsible for complying with all parking requirements and standards of the UDC.

<u>Findings related to request item #2:</u>

2a. The applicant has proposed to construct street level structures, including a hotel entry and drop off structure, a restaurant, and a structure to connect the historic German School buildings to the proposed hotel tower. These one story structure will interact directly with the existing, historic structures on site.

2b. ATTACHMENT: The proposed hotel connections will take place at the southern buildings of the German-English School complex which consist of a single-story stone structure constructed ca. 1858 and a two-story brick wing constructed ca. 1910. In the documents provided, a connection will occur at the southern wall of the 1858 building near the location of an existing mechanical addition. It does not appear that any historic building materials will be removed at this connection, and that the new construction will maintain existing sight lines of the stone structure. Additional construction details should be developed to demonstrate the reversibility of the connection with little to no negative impacts to the stone structure. Sufficient detail to review impacts of the addition to the two-story brick structure have not been provided for review. While a single-story addition at this location may be designed to be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, additional information will be needed to evaluate the impacts of the proposal.

2c. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. Per the submitted site plan, the applicant has proposed for the new construction to feature setbacks that are greater than and subordinate to those of the historic structures on the site, with the exception of the proposed hotel entry and drop off structure's canopy. Staff finds that all elements of the proposed new construction should feature setbacks from S Alamo that are greater than those of historic structures on the lot.

2d. 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 entrances that are oriented toward S Alamo, consistent with the Guidelines.

2e. SCALE & MASSING – The Guidelines for New Construction 2.A. notes that the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of S Alamo features historic structures with one story in height, as well as those with multiple stories in height. The proposed new construction features one story in height, and an overall massing that is consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to for the new construction to feature various walls plans with various depths. Staff finds this appropriate as the proposed massing is separated and does not add visual mass by adding one continuous wall plane.

2f. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed flat roof forms for both proposed structures. Flat roofs are found historically within the immediate vicinity of this structure. Generally, staff finds the proposed flat

roofs to be appropriate as flat roofs are found historically within the immediate vicinity and on this lot. Additionally, the flat roofs allow the proposed new construction to feature a massing that is subordinate to the adjacent historic structures.

2g. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has proposed for the majority of the exterior facades to feature floor to ceiling storefront and glass curtain wall systems. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings that are similar in proportion of wall to window space as those found on nearby historic facades should be used. While the applicant has not proposed window and door openings that related to those found historically within the immediate vicinity, staff finds that the proposed, full height storefront and glass curtain wall systems reduce the overall perceived massing of the additions, do not compete with the historic structures, and are consistent with the Commercial nature of this block.

2h. WINDOW MATERIALS – As noted in finding 2f, the applicant has proposed aluminum storefront systems and glass curtain walls. Generally, staff finds that the proposed aluminum curtain wall systems and aluminum storefront systems to be appropriate.

2i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The Guidelines for New Construction note that new building should be designed to reflect their own time while respecting the historic context. Additionally, the Guidelines note that architectural details that are in keeping with the predominant architectural style along the block face or within the district. When contemporary interpretations are incorporated, they should be done so in a manner that does not district from the district. Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate. Staff finds that the applicant should continue to explore ways to utilize traditional materials, forms and details.

<u>Findings related to request item #3:</u>

3a. The applicant has proposed to perform modifications to the existing courtyard between the two historic German School buildings. Currently, this courtyard features raised planting beds, Live Oaks, a fountain and an existing historical marker.

3b. COUTYARD MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing courtyard by constructing new planting beds, an outdoor bar area, and new outdoor seating areas. The applicant has not specifically noted which elements of the existing courtyard are to be replaced, and which are to be retained. Staff finds that any contributing or historic elements of the existing courtyard, including paving, should remain as it currently exists. Non-original elements may be removed or modified; however, these modifications should be done in a manner that does not negatively impact existing, historic elements, or result in new conditions that are incongruous with the historic spatial relationships of the site.

3c. OUTDOOR FURNITURE – The applicant has proposed outdoor seating areas in the existing courtyard. High quality street furnishings are required per UDC Section 35-673(i). The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.

3d. LANDSCAPING / SITE LIGHTING – As noted in findings h and i, the applicant has not provided specifics for site lighting and landscaping at this time. Staff finds that a detailed site lighting and landscaping plan should be submitted when returning to the HDRC for final approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Generally, staff finds the proposed new construction and site modifications to be appropriate and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, and the Unified Development Code, Section 35.

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the construction of a 9-story hotel tower based on finding 1a through 1n with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant continue to incorporate human scaled fenestration patterns, detailing and materials throughout the design, including at the street level, as noted in finding 1c.

ii. That the applicant incorporate addition fenestration, materials or detailing to separate the north and south facades on the eastern portion of the structure as noted in finding 1d, or at other locations not shown where large expanses of concrete may occur.

iii. That that the proposed curb cut on S Alamo, feature an uninterrupted sidewalk at the curb with a steeper vehicular approach to ensure that pedestrian access on the sidewalk is not disturbed, and that all on site automobile parking be screened from view from the public right of way as noted in findings 1m and 1n.

2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the construction of street level structures and connections to the German English School based on findings 2a through 2i, with the following stipulations:

i. That additional details be developed that allow for the reversibility of the connection with little to no negative impacts to the stone structure. Details regarding this connection as well as any connections to the two-story brick building will require additional approvals as the design is further developed.

ii. That the applicant continue to explore ways to utilize traditional materials, forms and details as noted in finding 2i.

3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, modifications to the existing courtyard based on findings 3a through 3d with the following stipulations:

i. That all modifications be done in a manner that does not damage historic or contributing elements, and that all historic and contributing elements remain as they currently exist.

ii. That the applicant submit both a landscaping and site lighting plan when returning to the Commission for final approval as noted in finding 3d.

ARCHAEOLOGY – Archaeological investigations shall be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Virginia Van Cleave opposed to case because of the massing of the project, and Maria Torres- President of Pacuache Indian First Nation- opposed to case because of its disrespect to burial grounds and opposed to move the cenotaph.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES AND 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT**

- **Item # A-4. HDRC NO. 2019-702**
  ADDRESS: 300 ALAMO PLAZA 300 BLOCK OF BONHAM 200 BLOCK OF E CROCKETT ALAMO PLAZA PARK
  APPLICANT: City of San Antonio

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to implement Phase 1 of the Alamo Plan which includes:

1. STREET IMPROVEMENTS - Perform modifications and improvements to Bonham Street including the shifting of traffic lanes and the reconfiguring of the intersection of Bonham and E Crockett. Perform

modifications and improvements to E Crockett Street from Bonham Street to Alamo Plaza including the installation of bollards and new paving materials. The 1974 Lady Bird Fountain will be removed.
2. LANDSCAPING AND HARDSCAPING - Expand the pedestrian plaza to the south by performing site and landscaping modifications south of the historic mission footprint. Create a new focused plaza for the Cenotaph including new trees, planters, and seating. The 1976 bandstand will removed.
3. CENOTAPH – Positioning of the Cenotaph within the proposed plaza. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the Cenotaph at its new location including the development of interpretive elements and lighting.

FINDINGS:

General Findings:

a. Aspects of the Phase 1 improvements received conceptual approval from the HDRC on October 10, 2018. This approval included the removal of the Lady Bird Fountain and existing bandstand. Final approval to "dismantle, repair, and reassemble the Cenotaph (Spirit of Sacrifice) in Alamo Plaza at the approximate location of the existing bandstand" was also approved in 2018. Renderings showing other aspects of the conceptual Alamo Plan, including potential demolitions, are for reference only and are not included in this request.

b. STREET IMPROVEMENTS – The proposed street improvements will generally improve pedestrian access and walkability within Alamo Plaza. The designs indicate the placement of street trees and special paving treatments which are consistent with the provisions of UDC Section 35-646 for construction in the public right-of-way. Within this phase of work, the ca. 1934 stone perimeter walls of the Alamo garden will be removed. The walls are not located on City property and are not subject to approval within this request. Vehicular access through the plaza will be controlled; an updated parade route is provided as reference in this application.

c. LANDSCAPING AND HARDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to expand the pedestrian plaza to the south by performing site and landscaping modifications south of the historic mission footprint. Paving materials will consist of small brick, stone, or concrete pavers in addition to sections of larger pavers. Selected materials are of high quality, complement the historic surroundings, and provide variety and interest to the pedestrian landscape consistent with UDC 35-646. The three largest, existing Live Oaks at this location will be retained and protected during construction. Additional plant selections shall further conform with recommend species for plantings in the regional climate.

d. CENOTAPH - The Cenotaph to the Alamo Defenders (also known as the Spirit of Sacrifice) was commissioned in 1936 by the Texas Centennial Commission. It was designed by architect Carleton Adams with sculptural elements by Pompeo Coppini. The Cenotaph was completed in 1939 and dedicated in 1940. The Cenotaph inscriptions list 182 men who died at the battle of the Alamo, compiled by Dr. Amelia W. Williams. Today, there are 189 known Defenders; some errors in the names listed have been identified.

e. CENOTAPH – Consistent with the October 2018 approval, the Cenotaph will be dismantled, repaired, and reconstructed at a new location within the proposed plaza located approximately 450 feet to the south of its current location. The Cenotaph will be reoriented 180 degrees so that the primary Spirit of Sacrifice sculpture may continue to address the Alamo grounds to the north. All materials conservation efforts will be consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Masonry. The existing marble base will be updated with additional names of verified Alamo Defenders using the most accurate information available. No revisions or alterations to the existing sculptures or the overall design of the Cenotaph are proposed.

f. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project area is located within the Alamo Plaza Local Historic District, Alamo Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, is partially within the RIO District, and includes the Alamo Plaza Local Historic Landmark. In addition, the designated boundary for the Alamo State Antiquities Landmark, previously recorded archaeological site 41BX6, extends into the project area. The submitted Phase 1 Limit of Work overlaps the boundary of the Cemetery on the Grounds of the Alamo, as identified on the publicly accessible Texas Historic Sites Atlas. Furthermore, the project area is traversed by the Acequia del Alamo, a Local Historic Landmark, National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark,

and previously recorded archaeological site 41BX8. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable. In addition, the project shall comply with the Texas Antiquities Code and Health and Safety Code of Texas. The archaeology consultant shall submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts. Archaeological investigations on City of San Antonio property and right-of-way shall be coordinated with the OHP throughout the construction of the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval of all request items as submitted. Final details regarding the interpretation plan for the Cenotaph may require additional approval by the HDRC. Final paving and material specifications that are consistent with the approved scope may be submitted to staff.

Archaeological investigations are required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable. Moreover, the project shall comply with the Texas Antiquities Code and Health and Safety Code of Texas. The archaeology consultant shall submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts. Archaeological investigations on City of San Antonio property and rightof-way shall be coordinated with the OHP throughout the construction of the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Maria Torres (6 mins)- President of Pacuache Indian First Nation- opposed to case because of its disrespect to burial grounds and cenotaph; Perry Donop, Patricia Ana Speeth, Lee White, Charisma Villareal, Susan Green, Lamar Henry (6 mins Johann yield her time), Brandon Barkhart, Paul Geschuick (9mins), Denise Homer, Jeff Osadigh, Randy Barnes, Susan Paintzler, Kyle Peterman, Cindy Gaskill, Virginia Van Cleave(representing Conservation Society of San Antonio), Westin Martinez, Ramon Garza, John Mathis, Don Dixon (6 mins Gary Anthony yield his time), Jack Finger, Matthew Pena, Walter West, Luke Meier, Sandra Whitten, George Rodriguez, Dr. Tim Westley - opposed to case because they are to move Cenotaph; and Emily Doherty opposed to case because of the economic impact on the Alamo and the parking situation.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to table case until executive session briefing on lawsuit of the case.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES AND 3 NAY. 2 ABSENT**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA B ITEMS

- **Item # B-17. HDRC NO. 2019-647**
  ADDRESS: 803 BURLESON ST
  APPLICANT: Zachary Blasdel- Owner of the property

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriate for approval to:
1. Install front porch decking and steps over the concrete porch.

2. Receive Historic Tax Verification for the property at 803 Burleson.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting Historic Tax Verification for the structure located at 803 Burleson, located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The property received Historic Tax Certification at the November 6, 2019, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the stipulation that all work is approve prior to Verification.

b. SCOPE OF APPROVED WORK – A number of rehabilitative scopes of exterior work have been approved including foundation and skirting repair, the removal of vinyl siding to restore wood siding, window repair, column replacement, reroofing with standing seam metal, the installation of fencing and a rear deck, fenestration modifications, the construction of a carport, and painting. In addition to the previously noted exterior items, a number of interior scopes of work have been planned or completed including electrical, plumbing, and mechanical improvements, and interior finishes.

c. TIMELINE OF COMPLETION - The project began in June 2017, and is planned for completion by November 2019.

d. ITEMIZED LIST OF COSTS - The applicant submitted an itemized list of costs that meets the threshold to be eligible for Historic Tax Certification.

e. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT - The requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 have been met and the applicant has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer including photographs, an itemized list of costs, and a timeline for completion.

f. TAX INCENTIVE PERIOD - Approval of Tax Verification by the HDRC in 2019 means that the property owners will be eligible for the Substantial Rehabilitation Tax Incentive beginning in 2020.

g. COMPLIANCE – Upon review for Historic Tax Certification, staff found that two items of work were completed prior approval; front door replacement and the installation of front porch decking. The applicant has agreed to remove the nonconforming door and install a Craftsman style door with administrative approval. At this time, the applicant is requesting to maintain the front porch decking as installed, rather than reverse the work or modify to feature a traditional profile, which would be eligible for administrative approval.

h. FRONT PORCH DECKING – The applicant is requesting to install wood decking including steps and railing over the existing concrete porch. The proposed deck features 2” x 6” wood members laid parallel to the front façade plane. The proposed steps feature four-and-half steps over the existing two steps. Staff finds that porch decking featuring 1” x 3” tongue-and-groove wood members laid perpendicular to the front façade plane with a step configuration matching the original would be appropriate and eligible for administrative approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1. Staff does not recommend approval of front porch decking as installed based on finding i. Staff recommends that the applicant install porch decking featuring 1” x 3” tongue-and-groove wood members laid perpendicular to the front façade plane with a step configuration matching the original. If the commission is compelled to approve as installed, staff stipulates that the porch decking, railing, and columns be painted white to match the trim color and reduce visibility of a non-conforming feature.

Item 2. Staff does not recommend approval of Historic Tax Verification. Staff recommends that the compliance items noted in item 1 be approved or corrected prior to the approval of Historic Tax Verification.

CASE COMMENT:

COMPLIANCE – Upon review for Historic Tax Certification, staff found that two items of work were completed prior approval; front door replacement and the installation of front porch decking. The applicant has agreed to remove the nonconforming door and install a Craftsman style door with administrative approval. At this time, the applicant is requesting to maintain the front porch deck as installed, rather than reverse the work or modify to feature a traditional profile, which would be eligible for administrative approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve with staff stipulations in regards to correct porch decking to match the original.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES AND 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-18. HDRC NO. 2019-379**
  ADDRESS: 910 N HACKBERRY ST
  APPLICANT: Cy Goudge/JCG HOMES LLC

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construction two, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 910 N Hackberry, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construction two, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 910 N Hackberry, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – This request received conceptual approval at the July 17, 2019, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
   i. That the applicant utilize roof forms that are found historically within the district and those that minimize perceived height. **The applicant has met this stipulation.**
   ii. That the applicant include a foundation height that is within one (1) foot of those found historically on this block. **The applicant has met this stipulation.**
   iii. That the applicant confirm that the proposed lot coverage is less than fifty (50) percent, per the Guidelines. **The applicant has met this stipulation.**
   iv. That the propose driveways not exceed ten (10) feet in height. **The applicant has met this stipulation.**
   v. That the proposed attached carport either be separated from the proposed new construction and shifted toward the rear of the lot, or eliminated.
   vi. That the applicant follow staff's specifications for materials, window materials and architectural details. **The applicant has met this stipulation.**
   vii. That both structures feature a unique design

c. CURRENT SITE – The current site is void of any existing structures, and is bounded to the west by N Hackberry, and to the north by Fayn Way.

d. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – This block of N Hackberry primarily features historic structures that feature one story in height.

e. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed footprints of both structures are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

f. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION (N Hackberry) – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. This block of N Hackberry features three (3) residential structures that address N Hackberry. The applicant has noted that these structures

feature setbacks of 17’ – 0”, 16’ – 6” and 15’ – 6”. Per the submitted site plan, the applicant has proposed setbacks of approximately 17’ – 0” from the right of way. At the time of conceptual approval, staff recommended that the applicant increase the proposed setbacks to be greater than those found historically on this block. Staff finds that this should be incorporated into the final design. Setbacks that are equal to or greater than those found historically on the block should be used.

g. ENTRANCES (N Hackberry) – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Per the submitted construction documents, the primary entrance orientation for both structures will front N Hackberry. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

h. SCALE & MASSING – The Guidelines for New Construction 2.A. notes that the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The applicant has proposed two, 2- story structures that are both to feature a height of 28’ – 0”. The three historic structures on this block each feature one story in height, and overall heights of 18’ – 8”, 19’ – 4” and 22’ – 3”. Generally, staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

i. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed for both structures to feature front facing gabled roofs with shed porch roofs. Both of the proposed roof forms are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines, as they are found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District; however, staff finds that both structures should not have identical roof forms.

j. FOUNDATION & FLOORT HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor height should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has proposed foundation heights for both structures of 1’ – 6”. Staff finds the proposed foundation heights to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

k. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – The applicant has proposed window and door openings that generally are consistent with those found within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

l. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include asphalt shingle roofs, composite siding with an exposure of four (4) inches and a smooth finish, wood columns, and wood windows. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate. Staff finds that the proposed composite siding should feature a thickness of at least ¾” and feature mitered corners.

m. WINDOW MATERIALS – As noted in finding l, the applicant has proposed wood windows. The applicant has also provided a wall detail noting the proposed installation of the proposed windows; however, the detail does not include dimensions. Staff finds the proposed windows to be appropriate; however, 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.

n. ARCHTIECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, as two structures that are to be constructed adjacent to each other, staff finds that differentiating and unique architectural elements should be incorporated into the design. This was a stipulation of conceptual approval. Elements that could differentiate the proposed designs include roof forms, porch roof forms siding profiles (the inclusion of board and batten siding), and the inclusion of additional architectural and massing elements, such as dormers on hipped roofs.

o. ATTACHED CARPORT – The applicant has proposed an attached carport for the structure that is to be located on the northern portion of the lot (structure #2). Historically, attached carports are not found within the district. Staff finds the construction of a carport to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the carport should be detached.

p. DRIVEWAYS – The applicant has proposed one driveway on N Hackberry and another on Fayn Way. The applicant has noted an overall width of 10' – 0" for both driveways, and decomposed granite paving. Staff finds the proposed locations, profile and materials of the driveways to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, per the construction documents, the applicant has noted a typical curb cut and apron.

q. WALKWAYS – The applicant has proposed two walkways leading from the proposed new construction to the sidewalk at the public right of way. The applicant has aligned both walkways with the proposed front doors, which staff finds to be appropriate; however, the applicant has proposed for both walkways to feature brick paving. Historically, front walkways throughout the district featured concrete. Additionally, the existing, historic walkways in the immediate vicinity are concrete. Staff finds that the proposed front yard walkways should be concrete.

r. LANDSCAPING – At the time, the applicant has not submitted a detailed landscaping plan. Staff finds that the applicant should submit a detailed landscaping plan noting landscaping materials and their locations to staff for review and approval. This is to be done prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

i. That setbacks that are equal to or greater than those found historically on this block be used as noted in finding f. This would require the shifting of both structures to the rear (east).

ii. That the applicant modify the proposed roof design of one of the proposed structures to provide a unique design for each structure as noted in findings i and n. The redesign of one of the new structures is to be submitted to staff for review and approval, and should feature materials, windows materials and architectural details that are consistent with those presented within this application.

iii. That the applicant ensures that the proposed wood windows meet the following specifications: 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.

iv. That the proposed carport be detached from the proposed new construction as noted in finding o.

v. That the proposed brick walkways be modified to feature concrete paving as noted in finding q.

vi. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval as noted in finding r.

A foundation inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that appropriate setbacks are being installed. The foundation inspection shall be scheduled prior to the pouring of the foundation.

A roofing inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that an industrial or large ridge cap in not installed. The roofing inspection shall be scheduling prior to the installation of roofing materials.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES AND 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-19. HDRC NO. 2019-692**
  ADDRESS: 409 QUENTIN DR
  APPLICANT: Amalia Cavazos

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a full concrete driveway to replace an existing two-ribbon driveway.

FINDINGS:
a. The primary structure located at 409 Quentin is a 1-story Ranch style single family home constructed circa 1945. It features a low-profile side gable composition roof with a front gable on the east side of the house, asbestos cladding, and both wood one-over-one windows and steel casement windows. It is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
b. DRIVEWAY CONFIGURATION – The applicant has proposed to install a fully concrete slab driveway where a ribbon driveway has historically existed. The Historic Design Guideline 5.B.i. for Site Elements states that historic driveway configurations should be retained and repaired in place. Staff finds the proposal is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
c. PERVIOUS MATERIAL – Guideline 5.B.i. for Site Elements also states that pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration. As full concrete driveways exist throughout the neighborhood, staff finds that the use of pervious pavers within the repaired concrete ribbon driveway would be consistent with the Guidelines

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant install pervious pavers within the repaired concrete ribbon driveway.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with score lines marking the original extent of ribbon driveway.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.
n
Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Fetzer.
Nays: Laffoon.
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 1 NAY. 2 ABSENT**

- **Item #B-20. HDRC NO. 2019-701**

ADDRESS: 418 MISSION ST
APPLICANT: Denise Scheff-Crittenden

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Amend the previously approved fenestration pattern and window specifications for the rear addition..
2. Restore the front porch deck and balcony slope.

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 418 Mission Street was constructed circa 1905, features two stories and originally featured a double height front porch. The primary historic structure as well as both rear accessory structures appear on the 1912 Sanborn map in their present locations. At that time, this parcel was addressed as 318 Mission Street

b. CASE HISTORY – On December 7, 2016, the construction of a rear addition featuring 20 new windows matching the wood sash windows of the primary historic structure in size and configuration was approved. The previous owner began to construct the rear addition and sold the property prior to any window installation. On November 8, 2019, staff conducted a site visit and found that the previously installed windows are inconsistent with the expired approval and the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions. An application was submitted by the current owner on November 15, 2019, to amend the window specifications of the previous approval, as well as restore other architectural details that the previous owner had inappropriately modified.

c. ADDITION WINDOWS – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum sash windows with the exception of 2 bay windows on the rear façade and 3 full light, frosted windows on the second floor of the north side elevation. Each window will feature wood trim and a detachable wood screen. The proposed windows differentiate from the previously approved plan by featuring raised sill heights, unequal sash sizes or full light configurations, frosted glass, and nailing fins. Per the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions, new windows on additions should relate to the windows of the primary historic structure in terms of materiality and overall appearance; windows used in new construction should relate be similar in appearance to those commonly found within the district in terms of size, profile, and configuration; while no material is expressly prohibited by the Historic Design Guidelines, a high-quality wood or aluminum-clad wood window product often meets the Guidelines with the stipulations listed below. Although the proposed trim and wood screens generally relate to the recessed profile of an appropriate window installation, staff finds that the raised sill heights, unequal sash sizes, full light configuration, frosted glass, and nailing fins are a departure from the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions.

d. PORCH AND BALCONY – The previous owner began work on the porch and balcony between 2017 and 2018, including the installation of beadboard as decking and the leveling of the balcony, effectively removing the drainage mechanism. The applicant has proposed to restore the porch decking and balcony to its original historic configuration. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., reconstruct porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs; if no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff finds that the reconstruction porch should feature 1” x 3” tongue-and-groove wood decking laid perpendicular to the front façade plane and a balcony with a subtle slope, traditional wood railing, and matching columns and decking to the first floor porch.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of item 1, the amendment to the previously approved fenestration profile and window specifications. Unless otherwise approved by the Commission, the windows on the rear addition should meet the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions. Per finding c, staff finds the that the raised sill heights, unequal sash sizes, full light configuration, frosted glass, and nailing fins are a departure from the Standard Specifications and the originally approved construction documents.

Staff recommends approval of item 2, porch and balcony reconstruction based on finding d, with the following stipulations

i. That the front porch and balcony feature 1” x 3” tongue-and-groove wood decking laid perpendicular to the front façade plane

ii. That the balcony features a subtle slope, traditional wood railing, and matching columns and decking to that of the first floor porch.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to refer to DRC site-visit.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT

- **Item # B-21. HDRC NO. 2019-666**

ADDRESS: 507 N MONUMENTAL
APPLICANT: Steve Santos

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 5 foot tall side yard fence, featuring wood posts topped with 2 foot tall corrugated metal panels.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary historic structure at 507 N Monumental was constructed in the Folk Victorian style and is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The property features a non-original chain-link fence in the front yard and abuts commercial properties to the south and east and an infill structure to the north.

b. COMPLIANCE – Upon submitting the application on November 1, 2019, the applicant disclosed that the fence had already been installed to expedite a privacy need.

c. FENCE – The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 5 foot tall side yard fence, featuring wood posts topped with 2 foot tall corrugated metal panels. The proposed fence spans 50 feet long between 507 and 509 N Monumental.

d. FENCE DESIGN - The applicant has proposed to construct a 5 foot tall, side yard fence, featuring wood posts topped with 2 foot tall corrugated metal panels. 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; the design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Staff finds that the fence design is a departure from any typical fence style in the district. A simple wood privacy fence would be eligible for administrative approval with standard stipulations for height.

e. FENCE HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to construct a 5 foot tall side yard fence, featuring wood posts topped with 2 foot tall corrugated metal panels. 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; the appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Staff finds that an open fence should be reduced to 4 foot tall and a solid fence reduced to 3 foot tall past front yard plane.

f. FENCE MATERIAL - The applicant has proposed to construct a 5 foot tall side yard fence, featuring wood posts topped with 2 foot tall corrugated metal panels. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.v., applicants should construct new fences or walls of materials similar to fence materials historically used in the district; applicants should select materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district, and that are compatible with the main structure. For screening incompatible uses, alternative fence heights and materials may be appropriate where residential properties are adjacent to commercial or other potentially incompatible uses. While the property is surrounded by commercial properties to the south and east and a nonhistoric infill property to the north, staff finds a

simple wood privacy fence would address the privacy concern of the applicant while relating to existing historic patterns.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval of the fence as proposed based on finding b through f. A simple wood privacy fence would be eligible for administrative approval with standard stipulations for height.

CASE COMMENT:
COMPLIANCE – Upon submitting the application on November 1, 2019, the applicant disclosed that the fence had already been installed to expedite a privacy need.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Velasquez moved to deny application
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:32 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair