



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**OFFICIAL MINUTES**  
**04 March 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, March 4, 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 3:12 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

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

Absent: Martinez-Flores.

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

- Public Meeting: OHP UDC Amendments, Thursday, March 12, at 6 pm at Lion's Field Center on Broadway.
- REHABARAMA is April 4. Sign up as a sponsor, contractor, or volunteer online at [www.SApreservation.com](http://www.SApreservation.com) or by contacting staff at 210-207-0035.

**CONSENT A and B AGENDA**

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda- A items:**
  - Item #A-1, Case No. 2020-078 623 HEMISFAIR BLVD
  - Item #A-2, Case No. 2020-081 875 E ASHBY PLACE
  - Item #A-3, Case No. 2020-083 909 W HOUSTON ST

**Motion:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent Agenda A-1- A-3 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **THE MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT**

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

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Virginia Van Cleave for B6-B7, B9- case there were violations been held violating the neighborhood.

- o Item #B-2, Case No. 2020-088 500 COLUMBUS
- o Item #B-3, Case No. 2020-073 1434 W ROSEWOOD AVE

- AGENDA B-1 WAS PULLED DUE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS.

**Motion:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent agenda B2 and B3 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motions.

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

**Action:** THE MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA A ITEMS**

- **Item # A-4. HDRC NO. 2020-075**

ADDRESS: 1915 BROADWAY/CVS Pharmacy  
Applicant: Brent Adcock/Republic Sign

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an internally illuminated channel letter sign on the E Grayson (south) elevation to feature 13.2 square feet. The applicant is requesting this sign in addition to previously approved signage.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install an internally illuminated channel letter sign on the E Grayson (south) elevation to feature 13.2 square feet. The applicant is requesting this sign in addition to previously approved signage.
- b. ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE – The UDC Section 35-678 notes that applicants may apply for up to three signs to not total more than fifty (50) square feet.
- c. PREVIOUS APPROVAL – The applicant has received previous approvals to install two handing canopy signs, a vertically oriented blade sign at the corner, and a wall sign on the Broadway (east) elevation. The previous signage totaled more than fifty (50) square feet.
- d. SIGNAGE – At this time, the applicant is requesting an additional channel letter sign on the E Grayson (south) elevation. In addition to the proposed signage, the applicant is proposing to reduce the size of the previously approved signage to total fifty (50) square feet, including the proposed wall sign.
- e. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed an internally illuminated wall sign to feature 13.2 square feet. The proposed sign will feature channel letters. As a standalone sign, staff finds the proposed signage to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC; however, in combination with the previously approved signs, including the corner blade sign, staff finds the sign to be in excess of that which is recommended by the UDC, as noted in finding b, regarding total number of signs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings b and e, as the proposed signage exceeds that which is recommended by the UDC in regards to total number of signs.

Staff finds that the proposed sign may be appropriate with the removal of the previously approved blade sign at the corner.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT**

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA B ITEMS**

- **Item # B-1. HDRC NO. 2019-553**  
ADDRESS: 728 CHESTNUT ST/204 HAYS  
APPLICANT: Adam Gates/Adam Word Gates - Architect

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct three, 3-story residential structures at 204 Hays and 728 Chestnut. The proposed new construction will feature a total of five residential units. These lots are zoned Downtown only.

**FINDINGS:**

- The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct three, 3-story residential structures at 204 Hays and 728 Chestnut. The proposed new construction will feature a total of five residential units. These lots are zoned Downtown only. This request was originally listed on the February 19, 2020, Historic and Design Review Commission agenda; however, the request was reset by the Commission to the March 4, 2020, HDRC hearing as the applicant was not present.
- 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.
- CONTEXT, DEVELOPMENT PATTERN & EXISTING STRUCTURES – The lots addressed at 204 Hays and 728 Chestnut are located to the immediate south of the Hays Street Bridge, and neighbored by industrial structures. The two structures that previously existed on these lots were found to be non-contributing, and are eligible for demolition.
- DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on January 28, 2020. At that meeting, committee members did not express any concerns regarding the proposed new construction.
- SIDEWALK & SETBACK WIDTH – The Downtown Design Guide requires that a minimum of a seventy-two (72) inch sidewalk be provided, and that a continuous landscaped and hardscaped area

- should be provided adjacent to the curb on predominantly non-commercial streets. The applicant has provided the landscaped and hardscaped area. Staff finds that the applicant should match the existing sidewalks found on Hays and Chestnut
- f. LANDSCAPE & HARDSCAPE – The applicant has noted the installation of a parkway along the curb, as noted in finding e and has noted in the installation of street trees, consistent with the Downtown Design Guide. Additionally, the applicant has provided detailed landscaping plan noting landscaping materials and their planned locations.
  - g. PARKING & ACCESS – The Downtown Design Guide notes that parking should be integrated into the project that they serve. The Downtown Design Guide also notes that with the exception of the minimum ground-level frontage required to access parking and loading areas, no parking or loading should be visible on the ground floor of any building façade that faces as street. The applicant has proposed parking to be located on the ground floor of one unit, and between the proposed duplex structures. Generally, staff finds the location of the proposed parking to be appropriate as it is between structures, and will be screened from the right of way at Hays and Chestnut.
  - h. MASSING & STREET WALL – The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature three (3) stories in height. Per the Downtown Design Guide, building walls should be placed along the sidewalk to define the street and to provide a comfortable scale for pedestrians. Generally, the applicant has proposed to align each building along the sidewalks to provide for a street wall. Where the applicant has not done this (the small duplex structure), street trees have been proposed, which is consistent with the Downtown Design Guide.
  - i. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The Downtown Design Guide requires or each structure to feature a base, midsection and cap. The applicant has separated the proposed new construction into three separate sections. The applicant has separated the base, mid-section, and cap with control joints and façade panel banding of varying heights, with the tallest being at the base, and the shortest at the cap. Additionally, the applicant has distinguished the building cap through the use of a parapet cap. Staff finds this to be appropriate; however, staff encourages the applicant continue studying ways to separate the façade.
  - j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed an overall form that is contemporary in nature, that features porches and exposed balconies within a translucent building envelope. Staff finds the proposed design to be consistent with the Downtown Design Guide; however, staff finds that the applicant should continue to explore details and
  - k. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include stucco façade panels and perforated metal screening. The Downtown Design Guide notes that the use of EIFS is prohibited. Staff finds that if the applicant elects to use EIFS, that the applicant should ensure that the EIFS panels are sized and textured to resemble stucco with expansion and control joints.
  - l. MATERIALS – The Downtown Design Guide notes that materials should be layered on each façade to provide visual variety, depth and a variety of textures. Staff finds that the proposed perforated metal envelope will provide layering to the façade to provide visual depth.
  - m. WINDOWS – At this time the applicant has not noted window materials. Staff finds that metal windows should be used, and that all windows should be recessed at least two (2) inches within walls. Additionally, staff finds that window frames should feature dark colors.
  - n. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has not noted the location of mechanical equipment at this time. Staff finds that all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant continue to explore ways to separate the façade as noted in finding i.
- ii. That is EIFS is used, that the panels are sized and textured to resemble stucco with expansion and control joints.
- iii. That all windows be metal, feature an installation depth of two (2) inches within walls, and feature dark frames.

- iv. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Virginia Van Cleave is opposed to case because it will block the views on the westend of the bridge.

**Motion:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations 1,2, and 4; and stipulation 3 all windows be medal.  
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-5. HDRC NO. 2020-074**  
ADDRESS: 211 BARRERA  
APPLICANT: Adrian Gonzalez/ASG

**REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Replace the existing wood Corinthian front porch columns with new square columns.
2. Replace the front wooden door and transom with new solid wood door in mahogany with transom and door trimming. The existing front door appears to be original.
3. Replace the wood siding on the rear accessory structure with wood siding or cement board siding.
4. Construct an addition to the rear accessory structure totaling approximately 204 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure at 211 Barrera is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1915 in the Folk Victorian style. The structure features decorative wood window screens, woodlap siding, a cross gable configuration, and a low-sloping front porch. The structure is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. **PORCH COLUMNS** – The applicant has proposed to replace three existing wood Corinthian style porch columns and install new fiberglass columns with a square, Craftsman-style design. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing columns should be repaired in-kind. Replacement should only be considered when the columns are deteriorated beyond repair, and if that threshold is met, columns should be replaced in-kind to match the existing in size, placement, and detail. Staff does not find the style of the columns as proposed to be appropriate for the structure, and does not find that the columns are deteriorated beyond repair based on the evidence provided.
- c. **FRONT DOOR REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing front door, transom, and trim and install a new Craftsman-style door with new transom and frame detail. The existing door is Folk Victorian in design, fully wood, and appears to be original to the house or the era of construction. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing doors and windows should be preserved. If an existing door is deteriorated beyond repair, new doors should match the existing in style, material, and configuration. Based on the information provided, the existing door is in repairable condition. Staff finds that the applicant should repair the existing door in place.
- d. **REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SIDING REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the siding on the rear accessory structure. The existing siding is uncovered and untreated wood, featuring a dutchlap profile that closely resembles the siding used on the primary structure. The applicant has proposed either replacement in-kind with woodlap siding or a composite siding product. Staff finds both

options generally appropriate, but finds that smooth siding with no faux grain should be used if a composite product is specified.

- e. REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition other rear accessory structure. Staff finds the request eligible for administrative approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff does not recommend the front porch column replacement based on finding b. Staff recommends that the columns be repaired in place.

If the HDRC determines that the columns are eligible for replacement, staff finds that they should be replaced in-kind with new wood columns featuring a Corinthian-style capital and dimensions to match the existing.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend the front door replacement based on finding c. Staff recommends that the door be repaired. The in-kind replacement of trim or framing elements is eligible for administrative approval.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the rear accessory structure siding replacement based on finding d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant utilizes woodlap siding with a maximum reveal of 4 inches or composite siding with a smooth finish and no faux grain. The applicant must submit a final material specification to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the rear accessory structure addition based on finding e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provides accurate, measured, dimensioned drawings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to table item 1 and approve items 2-4 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-6. HDRC NO. 2019-731**  
ADDRESS: 135 ADAMS ST  
APPLICANT: John McDowell/J ADAMS PROPERTIES LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a parking pad on the south side of the property abutting Forcke Street,
2. Have TCI install a curb cut, while road work is taking place on Forcke Street.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 135 Adams was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the Sanborn Maps in 1912. The structure features a pyramidal roof, a 2-story front porch with Corinthian columns, and

wood cladding. The property features a 2-story accessory structure in the rear with a two-car garage and side driveway. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.

- b. COMPLIANCE – During a site visit on November 22, 2019, Staff found that the property at 135 Adams had been subject to the following work prior to approval: initiated installation of a rear side parking pad with permeable rock cover and a limestone perimeter, approximately 3-4 vehicles wide. Staff issued a Stop Work Order. The applicant was compliant with the Stop Work Order and ceased the cited work on the property and subsequently submitted an HDRC application for the proposed scope of work.
- c. PARKING PAD INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing mulch landscaping on the south side of the property facing Forcke Street with shadow stone on the south side of the property facing Forcke Street. Guideline 3.B.iii for Site Elements stipulates that rock mulch or gravel should not be used as a wholesale replacement for lawn area. Staff finds that the proposal is not consistent with the Guidelines. However, as the existing lawn is currently all mulch, staff finds the replacement of mulch with a pervious surface to create a parking pad to be generally appropriate.
- d. CURBING – The applicant has requested that Transportation and Capital Improvements (TCI) install a curb cut along the south side of the property at 135 Adams during the completion of a TCI roadwork project along Forcke Street. Guideline 5.B.ii for Site Elements stipulates that new curb cuts should not be introduced where not historically found. Additionally, Guideline 5.C.i. stipulates that historic curbing should be retained wherever possible. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that if the parking pad is installed, it will be accessible from the existing driveway.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, Staff recommends approval of the parking pad based on findings a through b with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant construct the parking pad with pervious pavers of natural color. The proposed shadow stone is a material that is not consistent with the Guidelines. The applicant is required to submit an updated specification to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submit a landscape plan to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the curb cut based on finding c.

#### **CASE COMMENT:**

A Stop Work Order for work without a permit was issued to the applicant at 135 Adams on November 22, 2019. The applicant disregarded staff recommendations and subsequently completed the work without approval.

Staff was notified on February 4, 2020 that the applicant had completed the installation of shadow stone.

Staff was notified on February 24, 2020 that TCI had installed a curb cut along the proposed parking pad at 135 Adams, contrary to OHP directives.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Lisa Lynde opposed to case completion of renovations without guidelines to parking pad.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations and deny item 2. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

**Action: MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES AND 1 NAY. 1 ABSENT**

- **Item # B-7. HDRC NO. 2020-058**  
ADDRESS: 215 E ROSEWOOD AVE  
APPLICANT: Jim Weynand

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing windows with new windows.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure at 215 E Rosewood was constructed circa 1925 in the Tudor Revival style. It first appears on the Sanborn Maps in 1951. The structure features a composition roof with a prominent sloping front gable, fachwerk, stone cladding, and a variety of window shapes and configurations. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace 28 wood windows with Pella Architect Series Reserve wood windows. Staff performed a site visit to the property on February 10, 2020. During the site visit, staff observed the following damage to the windows: paint peeling or chipping, damaged or missing cords, missing weights, minor wood rot, missing seal tracks, cracked glass, sashes loose in window frames. Many windows are currently inoperable. Staff did not observe any significant wood rot or water damage on the windows; however, there is significant wood rot and water damage beneath ganged windows #13 and #14 on the front façade. Overall, the windows were found to be fully repairable.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in-kind replacement of windows is only appropriate when the original windows are beyond repair. Staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant repair the existing wood windows in place.

If an assembly is deemed deteriorated beyond repair by the HDRC, staff recommends that new windows meet the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs one-over-one fully wood windows to match the existing configuration as closely as possible. The proposed aluminum clad replacement product is not appropriate. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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. The final specification should be submitted to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**CASE COMMENT:**

The applicant’s request was referred to a DRC site visit at the HDRC hearing on Wednesday, February 19, 2020. The DRC site visit was completed on Wednesday, February 26, 2020.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

**Motion:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve repair windows and replace in-kind windows 15-23. Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 ABSENT

• **Item #B-8. HDRC NO. 2020-086**

ADDRESS: 311 PEREIDA ST  
APPLICANT: Amy Perez/KAI HOMES LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a 3-foot tall wood picket fence in the front yard
2. Install a 12-foot wide electric gate crossing the driveway and a 5-foot wide manual gate crossing the walkway
3. Install a 6-foot tall wood privacy fence

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 311 Pereida is a 2-story single, family structure built in 1892 and designed by notable architect Alfred Giles. The house was previously located on the Bonham Academy Campus at 114 Cedar Street and received Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) approval to be relocated to its present location in 2016.
- b. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a 3 foot-tall, painted wood picket front yard fence, including a pedestrian gate at the walkway and a vehicle gate spanning across the front driveway. The applicant has also proposed to install a 6 foot tall, wood privacy fence, which is typically eligible for administrative approval.
- c. DESIGN – The proposed fence features a traditional wood picket design as depicted in the example photo. 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 wood picket fence is typical to similarly styled houses on the immediate block 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 should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. Staff finds that front yard fences are found on Pereida and within the King William Historic District. Additionally, per the Guidelines 3.ii., privacy fences should not be used in the front yard. Staff finds that the front yard fence should turn at the driveway, instead of spanning across the front, and meet at the front corner of the front façade. The driveway gate should be set behind the front façade plan of the house and be incorporated into the privacy fence design – or removed from the fence plan.
- e. HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence with a height of 3-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 the proposed height of 3-feet is appropriate and relates to existing neighboring front yard fences. If the driveway gate is relocated behind the front façade plane of the house, it may feature a maximum height of 6-feet.
- f. PRIVACY FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a 6 foot tall wood privacy fence. Staff finds that the request is generally appropriate and typically eligible for administrative approval. If the applicant relocates the driveway gate behind the front façade plane of the house, the gate should be limited to 6 feet in height and be incorporated into the design of the wood privacy fence.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items 1 through 3 based on stipulations b through f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the front yard fence turn and follow the driveway rather than spanning across the driveway in the proposed fence plane. Additionally, the proposed gate should not feature a location that is forward of that of the historic structure’s front façade plane.
- ii. That the driveway gate is set behind the front façade plane of the house and is incorporated into the privacy fence design – or removed from the fence plan. If a motorized driveway gate is approved, equipment should be minimally visible behind the gate.
- iii. That the front yard fence is limited to 3 feet in height and the rear yard fence is limited to 6 feet in height as proposed.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Mary Nethery- supports the case as it is the tooth of the neighborhood.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve as submitted.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT.**

• **Item # B-9. HDRC NO. 2020-076**

ADDRESS: 427 E FRENCH PLACE  
APPLICANT: Joe Martinez III/Generations construction and remodeling

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. Replace damaged stucco skirting with new stucco skirting.
- 2. Reconstruct the wood porch columns.
- 3. Reconstruct the concrete steps to be in compliance with code.
- 4. Modify the location of a window on the east façade by shifting it eight (8) inches to the rear.
- 5. Replace the side-facing, original front door with a new metal door.
- 6. Enclose the street facing front door opening.
- 7. Install a rear water heater closet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary historic structure at 427 E French Pl was constructed circa 1922 in the Craftsman style and contributes to the East French Place Historic District. The one-story, single-family residential structure features front and side facing gabled roofs, an offset covered porch with Craftsman columns featuring brick bases, wood Craftsman elements, 117 profile wood siding, wood sash windows, and a brick chimney and flue.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted in August 2019, staff found that the front porch columns had been removed prior to approval. The property was then sold to the current owner who reconstructed new porch columns, and replaced front door prior to approval. Other inappropriate modifications include stucco and corrugated metal skirting, and the removal of eave brackets.
- c. SKIRTING – The applicant has proposed to replace the deteriorated stucco foundation skirting and install new stucco foundation skirting. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.i, applicants should install skirting that consists of durable, proven materials, and should either match the

- existing siding or be applied to have minimal visual impact. Staff finds that the existing stucco skirting is inconsistent with the Guidelines and should not be replicated. Staff finds that the new skirting should feature wood lap siding to grade as it would be historic found in the district. Composite siding may be used where contact with the ground is made to reduce rot and deterioration.
- d. PORCH COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the porch columns to feature the same profile but in smaller square dimension. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v, applicants should reconstruct porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. Staff finds that the proposed columns do not match the proportions of the previous columns in the photograph and should be more accurately reconstructed.
  - e. PORCH STEPS – The applicant as proposed to reconstruct the concrete front porch steps to feature appropriately sized risers to comply with residential building codes. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv., applicants should design replacement elements, such as stairs, to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Staff finds that proposed reconstruction is generally appropriate; however, a measured drawing featuring should be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff finds that concrete should be applied in an equal manner to each step.
  - f. WINDOW RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate a side window 8 inches toward the rear to accommodate an interior bathroom. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i, applicants should preserve existing window and door openings. Staff finds that a minor relocation utilizing the same window, trim, head and sill height on a side elevation to generally be appropriate. The fenestration modification should be performed in a manner that minimizes the alterations of the wall framing of the original window opening.
  - g. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace an original, side-facing wood Craftsman front door featuring an 8-lite configuration with a new metal door featuring a single glass lite. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, applicants should only replace doors, hardware, fanlight, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures in-kind when possible and when deteriorated beyond repair; when in-kind replacement is not feasible, replacement elements should match the size, material, and profile of the historic element. Staff finds that the original wood door should be restored and that the proposed door is a departure from the Craftsman style of the structure. If the door has been discarded, then a salvaged Craftsman style wood door or a custom fabricated wood door should be installed. The applicant should use the existing front-facing original door as a reference to match.
  - h. DOOR REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to enclose the existing, street facing front door opening. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i, applicants should preserve existing window and door openings and avoid filling in historic door or window openings. The proposed enclosure is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the door and door opening should be preserved in place.
  - i. WATER HEATER CLOSET – The applicant has proposed to install a water heater closet on the rear elevation of the structure to feature dimensions of 36” x 36” x 90”, with matching siding and a composition shingle shed roof. Staff finds that the proposed closet is eligible for administrative approval as it is minor in nature and not visible from the public right of way at E French. However,

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. SKIRTING - Staff recommends approval of item #1, skirting replacement based on finding c with the stipulation that new skirting features 117-profile wood lap siding with a Hardie plank or metal flashing member at grade.
2. COLUMNS - Staff recommends approval of item #2, porch column reconstruction based on finding d with the stipulation that columns match in proportion to the previous columns based on photographic evidence.
3. STEPS - Staff recommends approval of item #3, porch step reconstruction based on finding e with the stipulation that a measured drawing featuring equal size poured concrete porch steps is submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

4. WINDOW RELOCATION - Staff recommends approval of item #4, window relocation based on finding f with the stipulation that that fenestration modification should be performed in a manner that minimizes the alterations of the wall framing of the original window opening.
5. DOOR REPLACEMENT – Staff does not recommend approval of item #5, door replacement based on finding g. The original wood door should be restored; if the door has been permanently discarded, then a salvaged Craftsman style wood door or a custom reconstructed wood door should be installed instead. The applicant should use the existing front-facing original door as a reference to match.
6. DOOR REMOVAL – Staff does not recommend approval of item #6, door removal based on finding h. An interior treatment such as a furr wall does not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.
7. WATER CLOSET HEATER – Staff recommends approval of item #7 the installation of a rear water heater closet based on finding i.

All work without approval should be resolved with a commission action prior to receiving additional Certificates of Appropriateness.

**CASE COMMENT:**

On a site visit conducted in August 2019, staff found that the front porch columns had been removed prior to approval. The property was then sold to the current owner who reconstructed new porch columns, and replaced front door prior to approval. Other inappropriate modifications include stucco and corrugated metal skirting, and the removal of eave brackets.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Federica Kushner- supports staff recommendations and recommends to follow-up with the violation.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1-4 & 7 with staff stipulations and deny items 5-6. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

**Action: MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT**

• **Item # B-10. HDRC NO. 2020-087**

ADDRESS: 114 GLORIETTA

APPLICANT: juan aleman/ALEMAN J PROPERTIES LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Modify a single front window to feature two ganged windows.
2. Replace the front window with new aluminum windows.
3. Replace natural front lawn with crushed granite and scattered plantings.
4. Construct an 87 square foot front addition.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary historic structure at 114 Glorietta was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map. The one-story, single-family structure features a modified L-plan with both front and side facing gabled roofs, a covered porch, and wood lap siding. Non-conforming

- modifications include a concrete front porch and ramp, wrought iron porch columns, and aluminum windows.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on March 1, 2019, staff found that the front window opening had been modified to feature two ganged windows, that front windows had been replaced with new aluminum windows, and that the front yard had been covered with decomposed granite. The property owner became aware of the previous violations when submitted a recent Certificate of Appropriateness application.
  - c. WINDOW MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to modify the single window opening under the front facing gable to feature two ganged windows. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., applicants should preserve existing window and door openings and should avoid creating new window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the single window opening is original to the structure and proportionate to the gabled roof. Staff finds the proposed modification to be inappropriate and that it should be reversed.
  - d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, non-original aluminum windows with new aluminum windows with faux divided lights. Per the Standard Specifications for Wood Window Replacement, where original windows are found to be missing or previously-replaced with a nonconforming window product by a previous owner, an alternative material to wood may be considered when the proposed replacement product is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines in terms of overall appearance. Staff finds that the proposed windows are not consistent with the standard specifications by including faux divided lights and sashes that do not feature traditional dimensions. Staff finds that a non-wood product may be approved if it otherwise meets the appropriate depth profile and light configuration.
  - e. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to remove all natural lawn to install crushed gravel and scattered plantings. The applicant has worked with staff to incorporate more plantings back into the front yard. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.ii., applicants should not fully remove and replace traditional lawn areas with impervious hardscape, limit the removal of lawn areas to mulched planting beds or pervious hardscapes in locations where they would historically be found, such as along fences, walkways, or drives. Low-growing plantings should be used in historic lawn areas; invasive or large-scale species should be avoided. Historic lawn areas should never be reduced by more than 50%. Staff finds that xeriscaping may be appropriate with the inclusion of additional landscaping elements that are consistent with the Guidelines.
  - f. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to install an 87 square foot front addition. Proper site plans and elevation drawings have not been submitted for the request. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., an addition to the front of a building would be inappropriate.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the modification to the existing window opening. Staff recommends that the two ganged windows be restored to the original single window opening.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, window replacement. The applicant may work with staff for administrative approval of non-original window replacement that is consistent the *Standard Specifications for Wood Window Replacement and the Historic Design Guidelines*.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, xeriscaping. Staff recommends that that the applicant incorporate additional landscaping elements that are consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, the construction of a front addition, based on finding f. Staff recommends an addition at the rear of the structure and that adequate construction documents be submitted for review.

**CASE COMMENT:** On a site visit conducted on March 1, 2019, staff found that the front window opening had been modified to feature two ganged windows, that front windows had been replaced with new aluminum windows, and that the front yard had been covered with decomposed granite. The property owner became aware of the previous violations when submitted a recent Certificate of Appropriateness application.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved for deny application.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Bowman, Fetzer and Laffoon.

Nay: None.

Absent: Martinez-Flores.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT**

**ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer  
Chair