CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
01 May 2020

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Friday, May 1, 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 3:00 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

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
  - Item #1, Case No. 2020-121 1947 N NEW BRAUNFELS AVE
  - Item #3, Case No. 2020-081 875 E ASHBY PLACE
  - Item #4, Case No. 2020-109 407 KENDALL ST
  - Item #5, Case No. 2020-130 419 S HACKBERRY ST
  - Item #6, Case No. 2020-103 701 E PYRON AVE
  - Item #7, Case No. 2020-097 607 DAWSON ST
  - Item #8, Case No. 2020-119 128 CITY ST
  - Item #10, Case No. 2019-727 707 DAWSON ST
  - Item #11, Case No. 2020-101 251 ISABEL ST
  - Item #12, Case No. 2020-111 1226 NW 18TH ST
  - Item #15, Case No. 2020-110 103 W GRAYSON ST
  - Item #16, Case No. 2020-141 1022 NOLAN
  - Item #17, Case No. 2020-138 332 FLORIDA ST
  - Item #19, Case No. 2020-148 1103 E COMMERCE ST
  - Item #20, Case No. 2020-131 3021 MISSION RD
  - Item #21, Case No. 2020-048 363 BRAHAN BLVD
  - Item #22, Case No. 2020-158 315 W SUMMIT
  - Item #25, Case No. 2018-374 W COMMERCE ST FROM S SANTA ROSA TO S ST MARY'S
  - Item #26, Case No. 2020-155 130 KING WILLIAM

- Item #27, Case No. 2020-127 212 N ALAMO ST
- Item #28, Case No. 2020-156 311 Pereida
- Item #29, Case No. 2020-135 607 HEMISFAIR BLVD
- Item #30, Case No. 2020-096 632 LEIGH ST
- Item #31, Case No. 2020-160 421 ROOSEVELT AVE

- AGENDA ITEM 2 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 9 WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT
- AGENDA ITEM 13 WAS PULLED FOR RECUSAL BY COMMISSIONER CARPENTER
- AGENDA ITEM 14 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 18 WAS PULLED FOR RECUSAL BY COMMISSIONER CARPENTER
- AGENDA ITEM 23 WAS PULLED FOR RECUSAL BY CHAIRMAN FETZER
- AGENDA ITEM 24 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent Agenda items 1,3, 4-8,10-12,15-22, and 25-31 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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 ITEMS

- **Item # 2. 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 replace the existing, aluminum store front entry doors with new aluminum doors.

FINDINGS:
a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing, aluminum storefront entry doors with new aluminum doors. The applicant has noted that the proposed profile (two doors beneath a transom window) will be maintained. This historic structure no longer features historic storefront elements, such as windows or doors.
b. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i. notes that façade elements that alter or destroy the historic building character of a historic structure should not be introduced. Generally, staff finds that the proposed replacement doors will not destroy the structure's historic building pattern, as the applicant has noted that both the door and transom profiles will remain as the currently exist.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Arvis Holland and Evelyn Brown spoke in support of the case, but does not support vinyl window replacement.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fish 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 # 13. HDRC NO. 2020-136**
  ADDRESS: 428 E MYRTLE
  APPLICANT: Lisa McCorquodale-Robalin

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new iron front yard fence measuring four feet in height, to include a pedestrian gate.

FINDINGS:
a. The primary structure located at 428 E Myrtle is a two-story single-family residence constructed circa 1917 in the American Foursquare style. The home features a combination side-gable and hipped roof, front-facing dormer with jerkinhead roof, and wood one-over-one windows. The home is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.
b. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install front yard fencing to measure approximately 4 feet in height. As proposed, the fencing will be constructed of black aluminum with small finials and a flat top bar. The pedestrian gate is to be located at the existing front walkway and will be rounded. The fencing will turn at the driveway and no front driveway gate along the sidewalk is proposed. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, front yard fencing should not be introduced where fencing did not historically exist, or in locations where fencing is not common. Where fencing is proposed, the design, material, and style should be similar to those found traditionally in the district or historically. Staff generally finds fencing appropriate for this property due its location, but finds that the overall design should be modified to feature a more traditional finial and gate design, similar to original and replicated wrought iron as found in the immediate vicinity and historically.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b with the following stipulations:
i. That the fencing feature a more traditional finial and gate design, similar to original and replicated wrought iron fencing in the vicinity, without a top flat bar. The applicant is required to submit an updated design to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
ii. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Front yard fences shall not exceed four (4)

feet in height at any point. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

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

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAY. RECUSAL 1. 2 ABSENT

- **Item # 14. HDRC NO. 2020-115**
  ADDRESS: 218 W HUISACHE AVE
  APPLICANT: Bob Wise

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a second-story addition on a detached garage.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure at 218 W Huisache was constructed circa 1930 in the Craftsman style and first appears on the Sanborn maps in 1935. It is a 1-story, single-family residence and features a hip roof with composition shingles, wide overhanging eaves, a deep-set front porch, brick cladding, and decorative brick detailing. The property features a rear detached garage that sits on the rear property line. The garage features a side gable composition roof, one-over-one wood windows, divided lite garage doors, and stucco cladding. The rear garage is original to the primary structure The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.

b. ADDITION: FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a second-story addition to the existing rear garage. The existing garage is 640 square feet and the proposed second-story addition is 558 square feet. The Guidelines for Additions stipulate that new additions should not double the footprint of the primary structure in plan. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

c. ADDITION: SCALE – The proposed addition will develop an existing 1-story rear garage into a 2-story rear accessory structure. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings. The applicant has provided evidence of multiple 2-story rear accessory structures on adjacent properties and a number of 2-story primary structures on the block. Staff finds the second-story addition to be consistent with the Guidelines in terms of height.

d. ADDITION: FENESTRATION – According to the Historic Design Guidelines and the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction, openings in new construction should use traditional dimensions and profiles found on the primary structure or within the historic district. The applicant has proposed to install windows that match the traditionally sized windows on the existing 1-story rear accessory structure. The new windows will be one-over-one wood windows and the fenestration pattern will correspond to the existing fenestration pattern on the 1-story structure. The applicant has proposed to install three ganged oneover- one windows on

the second-story north elevation to match the width of the garage door opening on the first floor. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

e. ADDITION: MATERIALITY – The applicant has proposed to use "Artisan" Hardie siding and has proposed an optional wainscoting. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that materials should match in type, color, and texture, and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure wherever possible. Any materials introduced to the site as a result of the addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. Staff finds the proposed Hardie siding to be appropriate as it serves to distinguish the addition from the historic structure; however, staff does not find the proposed wainscoting appropriate.

f. ADDITION: ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to install a side gable roof with an overhang to match the existing overhang on the 1-story rear accessory structure. The applicant has proposed a composition shingle roof to match the existing composition shingle roof. Staff finds the roof form and the proposed material to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

g. TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE – The applicant has proposed to introduce 558 square feet to the property in the form of a second-story addition. The proposed addition will not introduce additional square footage to the site. The proposed impervious cover is less than the 50 percent stipulated in the Guidelines. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

h. FENESTRATION MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing window on the east elevation with a new door and transom window to match existing. The proposed door will abut an existing window. Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that applicants should preserve existing window and door openings. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the second-story addition to the existing rear accessory structure based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant submit final window specifications for the proposed replacement windows to staff for review and approval. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

ii. That the applicant does not install the optional wainscoting on the addition.

iii. That the applicant does not modify the existing fenestration pattern on the east elevation of the existing 1-story rear accessory structure. The existing window opening should not be modified.

iv. That the applicant submits final elevations and drawings that reflect stipulations to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Paul Kinnason- 418 W. French Pl- supports staff reccommendations.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter for conceptual approval with staff stipulations. Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

Nays: None .
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Bowman.

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

- **Item # 18. HDRC NO. 2020-132**
  ADDRESS: 430 E MYRTLE
  APPLICANT: Lisa McCorquodale-Robalin

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new front yard iron fence measuring four feet in height.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary historic structure located at 430 E Myrtle is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1920 in the Tudor Revival style with Craftsman influences. The structure features an arched entryway, woodlap and wood shingle siding, and decorative wood screens with a gothic-inspired design. The structure is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.

b. FENCING – The applicant has proposed to install front yard fencing to measure approximately 4 feet in height. As proposed, the fencing will be constructed of black aluminum with small finials and a flat top bar. The pedestrian gate is to be located at the existing front walkway and will be rounded. The fencing will turn at the driveway and no front driveway gate along the sidewalk is proposed. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, front yard fencing should not be introduced where fencing did not historically exist, or in locations where fencing is not common. Where fencing is proposed, the design, material, and style should be similar to those found traditionally in the district or historically. Staff generally finds fencing appropriate for this property due its location, but finds that the overall design should be modified to feature a more traditional finial and gate design, similar to original and replicated wrought iron as found in the immediate vicinity and historically.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b with the following stipulations:

i. That the fencing feature a more traditional finial and gate design, similar to original and replicated wrought iron fencing in the vicinity, without a top flat bar.. The applicant is required to submit an updated design to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

ii. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Front yard fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height at any point. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 RECUSAL. 2 ABSENT**

- **Item # 23. HDRC NO. 2020-129**
  ADDRESS: 1703 BROADWAY
  APPLICANT: Leslie Points/Credit Human Federal Credit Union

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

1. Install two (2) building entry signs at entrances on the south and east facades to feature indirect illumination. The proposed signs will feature an overall length of 9' - 0" and an overall height of 1' - 2" for a total size of approximately 10.5 square feet each.
2. Install one (1) monument sign near the intersection of Broadway and Pearl Parkway to feature an overall length of 12' - 0" and an overall height of 5' - 6" for a total size of approximately sixty-six (66) square feet.
3. Install four (4) building signs to be located on each façade at the eleventh (11th) level, to feature an overall length of 43' - 0" and an overall height of 5' - 5" for a total size of approximately 233 square feet each.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 1703 Broadway, new construction located within the River Improvement Overlay, District 2. Within this request, the applicant has proposed both a monument sign, and building signage.

b. ENTRY SIGNAGE – At the street level, the applicant has proposed to install two (2) building entry signs at entrances on the south and east facades to feature indirect illumination. The proposed signs will feature an overall length of 9' - 0" and an overall height of 1' - 2" for a total size of approximately 10.5 square feet each. Staff finds the proposed signage to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

c. MONUMENT SIGN – The applicant has proposed to install one (1) monument sign near the intersection of Broadway and Pearl Parkway to feature an overall length of 12' - 0" and an overall height of 5' - 6" for a total size of approximately sixty-six (66) square feet. This sign will be indirectly illuminated. While larger than the fifty (50) square feet recommended by the UDC, staff finds the proposed signage to be appropriate given the size of the site.

d. BUILDING SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install four (4) building signs to be located on each façade at the eleventh (11th) level, to feature an overall length of 43' - 0" and an overall height of 5' - 5" for a total size of approximately 233 square feet. This sign will be indirectly illuminated. While the proposed signage exceeds that which is recommended by the UDC, staff finds that given the location of each sign, approximately 153 above street level, staff finds it to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through d.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fernandez moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

Recusal: Fetzer.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 RECUSAL. 2 ABSENT**

- **Item #24. HDRC NO. 2020-144**

ADDRESS: 919 E CROCKETT ST
APPLICANT: Jennifer Park/PARK JENNIFER L & JEFFREY S

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 4 ft tall metal fence in the front yard.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure at 919 E Crockett was constructed in 2019 and is located in the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The single-family, two-story structure features a simple, front-facing gable configuration, a shed inset porch, Hardie lap siding, and a standing seam metal roof.

b. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a metal-framed, cattle panel front yard fence including a front driveway gate. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.ii., new front yard fences or walls should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. Staff finds that front yard fences are found on E Crockett and throughout the historic district, and that the installation of a front yard fence is appropriate. Solar or mechanical gate equipment, if used, should be concealed or minimally visible behind the fence from the public right of way.

c. FENCE DESIGN - The applicant has proposed to install a metal-framed, cattle panel fence. 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 fences should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. While metal-framed, cattle panel fences are atypical in historic front yards, staff finds that the proposed design may be appropriate for non-historic, infill construction if the height and configuration is consistent with the Guidelines.

d. DRIVEWAY GATE – The applicant has proposed to include a driveway gate spanning across the front of the driveway at the property line. While staff typically recommends that fences turn at the driveway instead of span across the driveway, and that driveway gates should be set behind the front façade plane of the house, a front gate may be appropriate for this particular property due to the porch corner abutting the driveway and providing no reasonable configuration for the fence to turn or terminate.

e. FENCE HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence with height of 6 feet from the rear carport and stepping down to 4 feet in height before approaching the front yard to meet the existing side fence. 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 the proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval based on finding b through e with the stipulations:

i. That the fence height is no taller than 4 feet at any portion in front of the front façade plane.
ii. That any solar or mechanical gate equipment, if used, be concealed or minimally visible behind the fence from the public right of way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Dignowity Hill Association- supports project with staff recommendations; and, Evelyn Brown does not support case with staff recommendations due to material type for fence.

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

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, and 1 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.

- **Item # 32. HDRC NO. 2020-100**

ADDRESS: 310 RIVERSIDE DR
APPLICANT: Kevin Gerrish/Tandemonium, LLC

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a prefabricated carport structure on the existing concrete slab at the rear of the existing structure located at 310 Riverside, located within both the Mission Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay.

FINDINGS:
a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a prefabricated carport structure on the existing concrete slab at the rear of the existing structure located at 310 Riverside, located within both the Mission Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay.
b. CONTEXT & SITE DEVELOPMENT – As noted in finding a, the existing structure at 310 Riverside is located within both the River Improvement Overlay, and the Mission Historic District. The structure features simple architectural forms include a front facing gabled roof form that is obscured by a parapet wall on the north façade, masonry walls and a metal roof. The immediate context features historic, single-family residential structures, commercial and industrial structures, and the San Antonio River to the immediate south.
c. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to install a pre-fabricated carport structure on the existing concrete slab at the south of existing structure, facing the San Antonio River. The Guidelines for Additions 2.A. notes that additions should be in keeping with the historic context of the district, should be located at the side or rear of the building, should feature a similar roof form, should be subordinate to the primary façade of the existing structure, and should feature a transition from the existing structure to the addition.
d. CHARACTER & Design – The Guidelines for Additions 3.A. notes that complementary materials should be incorporated that completement those found historically within the district. Additionally, in regards to architectural elements, the proposed design should feature architectural elements that respect those found historically within the structure or district, and should be consistent with the design of the existing structure. Staff finds that the installation of a pre-fabricated carport structure is not consistent with the Guidelines. While staff does find the installation of a rear structure to be appropriate, staff finds that it should feature site specific construction that responds to both the existing site and structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that the applicant propose a structure that is designed specific for the site and existing structure, and that is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to Design Review Committee (DRC).
Commissioner Velasquez 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 # 33. HDRC NO. 2020-112**

ADDRESS: 602 KAMPMANN BLVD
APPLICANT: Jeffrey Olivarri /OLIVARRI RAY J & ANGELITA Z

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the front set of doors with new steel doors.

FINDINGS:
a. The primary historic structure at 602 Kampmann was constructed circa 1955 and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The single-family, one-story Midcentury structure features a low-slope roof over a wide horizontal front elevation as Colonial Revival influence including the red brick masonry façade and classical columns in the covered front porch.
b. DOOR REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing pair of simple 6-panel white wood doors and white wrought iron security bars with a pair of new black steel and glass door with a woven design. Per the Guideline for Exterior Modifications and Alterations 6.B.i., applicants should replace doors, hardware, fanlight, sidelights, pilasters, and entablatures in-kind when possible and when deteriorated beyond repair; when in-kind replacement is not feasible, applicants should ensure features match the size, material, and profile of the historic element. Staff finds that the existing door is original to the structure and should be repaired. If the applicant provides additional supporting evidence that the doors are beyond repair, then a similar style door or one that is compatible to the style of the house is used.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends does not recommend approval based on finding b. The existing door is original to the structure and should be repaired. If the applicant provides additional supporting evidence that the doors are beyond repair, then a similar style door or one that is compatible to the style of the house is used.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

1st Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to approve as requested by applicant.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

Action: MOTION FAILED with 3 AYES, and 6 NAYS. 2 ABSENT

2nd Motion: Commissioner Fish move to Design Review Committee and site visit.
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**

- **Item # 34. HDRC NO. 2020-105**

ADDRESS: 810/814/816 N OLIVE ST
APPLICANT: Stephen Green/GREEN STEPHEN T

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

1. Construct one, 2-story residential structure on the vacant lot at 816 N Olive, formerly addressed as 810 N Olive.
2. Construct three, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 814 N Olive, formerly addressed at 810 N Olive.
3. Construct a detached, 2-story residential structure featuring a two car garage and dwelling unit on the lot at 816 N Olive.

FINDINGS:
General Findings:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 2-story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 816 N Olive, and to construct three, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 814 N Olive. Both lots were formerly addressed at 810 N Olive. At this time, the applicant has only requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for three structures at the rear of the lot.

b. PREVIOUS APPROVAL – This request was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on July 18, 2018. Certificates of Appropriateness are valid for 180 days, and the issued Certificate of Appropriateness subsequently has expired.

Findings related to request item #1:

1a. 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. Staff finds that the applicant should confirm that the proposed new construction's setback will be greater than those of the adjacent, historic structures, as previously approved.

1b. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i, primary building entrance should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant's proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.

1c. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of N Olive features one story historic structures; however, the proposed massing features architectural element which relate it to the massing of the adjacent historic structures. The total height noted by the applicant is 27' – 3". Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate.

1d. FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. The applicant has noted floor heights of eleven (11) feet and a foundation height of 1' – 6". This is consistent With the Guidelines.

1e. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed both front and side gabled roofs. The proposed roof forms are Found predominantly throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed roof forms are consistent with the Guidelines.

1f. WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Generally, the proposed window and door openings are consistent with the Guidelines and feature window openings that are comparable to those found on nearby Folk Victorian structures.

1g. 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. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.

1h. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include cement fiber siding and wood siding a standing seam metal roof. The proposed materials are consistent with the Guidelines. All composite siding should feature as mooth finish. Board and batten siding should feature board that are 12 inches wide and battens that are 1 – ½" wide. Horizontal wood siding should feature an exposure of 4 inches or less. The standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.

1i. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of fiberglass clad wood windows; however, per the submitted wall sections, the windows will not feature an installation depth that is consistent with staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction. Staff finds that the applicant should comply with staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction.

1j. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed architectural details that are generally in keeping with the Guidelines for New Construction and Folk Victorian historic structures found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

1k. DRIVEWAY/WALKWAY– The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway located on a shared easement through the center of the lot. Parking for this structure is proposed to be located at the rear of the primary structure in a rear accessory structure. Staff finds the propose driveway location and width to be appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a front yard walkway centered on the front porch. Staff finds the proposed location to be appropriate.

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

2a. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – At the rear of the lot, adjacent to the rear alley, the applicant has proposed to construct three, two story residential structures. The proposed rear structures are oriented and placed adjacent to the rear alley, similar to accessory structures found historically on this block. The proposed setbacks and orientations of the proposed structures are consistent with the Guidelines.

2b. SCALE & MASSING – The Guidelines for New Construction note that accessory structures are to appear smaller in scale than the primary structure on the lot. While two story accessory structures are not found historically on this block, staff finds that due to the proposed location, near the center of the lot as well as the setbacks from primacy streets, the proposed scale and massing is appropriate. The proposed height of each rear accessory structure is 25' – 4".

2c. MATERIALS – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. notes that new accessory structures are to relate to the primary structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified proportions. The applicant has proposed for each rear structure to feature board and batten siding, corrugated metal siding and corrugated metal roofs. Staff does not find the use of

corrugated metal for siding or roofing materials to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that standing seam metal roofs as found historically throughout thedistrict should be used and that the proposed corrugated metal siding should be eliminated from the proposed design. Standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap, and a standard galvalume finish. If a low profile ridge cap is proposed, it must be reviewed and approved by staff. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed composite siding feature a smooth finish and that the board and batten siding should feature boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.

2d. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of Pella fiberglass windows that are to feature white frames. Staff finds that windows that meet staff's standards specifications for windows should be installed, and that wood or aluminum clad wood windows would be appropriate.

2e. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed architectural details that are generally in keeping with the Guidelines for New Construction and Folk Victorian historic structures found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

2f. CARPORTS – The applicant has proposed attached carports to each structure to provide parking for two automobiles. Staff finds the proposed massing and location of the carports appropriate.

2g. DRIVEWAY/WALKWAY– The applicant has proposed a ribbon strip driveway located on a shared easement through the center of the lot. Parking for this structure is proposed to be located at the rear of the primary structure in a rear accessory structure. Staff finds the propose driveway location and width to be appropriate. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a front yard walkway centered on the front porch. Staff finds the proposed location to be appropriate.

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

3a. At the rear of the primary structure, the applicant has proposed to construct a detached garage featuring parking for three automobiles as well as a second story residential unit. Per the application documents, staff finds the proposed location and massing of the detached garage appropriate.

3b. CHARACTER – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. notes that new accessory structures are to relate to the primary structure on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified proportions. The applicant has proposed for each rear structure to feature materials that match those of the primary structure. The applicant is responsible for complying with the specifications noted in finding 1h.

3c. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has noted the installation of fiberglass clad wood windows; however, per the submitted wall sections, the windows will not feature an installation depth that is consistent with staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction. Staff finds that the applicant should comply with staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends that the Historic and Design Review Commission extend the Certificate of Appropriateness for an additional 180 days with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant confirm that the primary structure addressed as 816 N Olive features a setback greater than those of the adjacent historic structures.

ii. That the applicant install windows for both structures that are consistent with staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction.

iii. That the proposed three rear structure feature materials that are consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in finding 2c.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter move to approve extension of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Commissioner Velasquez 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 # 35. HDRC NO. 2020-122**

ADDRESS: 533 E CARSON
APPLICANT: Mary Jo Vargas/VARGAS MARY JOSEPHINE

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Replace the 117 wood lap siding on the enclosed front porch with smooth Hardie siding.
2. Replace the 105 wood lap siding on the rear addition with smooth Hardie siding.
3. Install smooth Hardie siding where original siding has been missing after fire damage (Muncey wall plane on historic structure; intact wood siding is to remain).
4. Replace wood windows in non-original porch enclosure and rear addition with new wood windows.
5. Install a new wood window where original window has been missing after fire damage (Muncey wall plane on historic structure).

FINDINGS:
a. The primary historic structure at 533 E Carson was constructed circa 1920, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Government Hill Historic District. The two-story multi-family structure features a wraparound porch and an enclosed balcony, a standing seam metal roof with wood shingled gable faces, wood sash windows, and a variety of wood and aluminum siding.
b. PROPERTY HISTORY – In 2009, the property underwent complete interior and exterior renovations. In 2017,the structure was subjected to fire damage, and foundation and electrical work was performed subsequently. The applicant has identified to following non-historic features: a balcony enclosure, a combination of four (4) siding profiles, and brick chimney removal. The structure features approximately 7% original wood siding, 10% 117 siding, 13% 105 siding, and 70% aluminum-clad wood siding.
c. SIDING REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace existing wood siding on the non-original porch enclosure and rear addition with smooth Hardie lap siding. While composite materials have been used for non-original features, staff finds that intact wood siding should not be replaced for less conforming materials. Staff finds that wholesale replacement of all siding with new composition siding is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.A.i through iii. Staff finds that installing wood siding that matches the historic profile is the most appropriate treatment for the restoration of the structure. If the exact historic profile cannot be obtained or custom milled, a comparable wood profile such as 105 or 117 may be considered, whereas aluminum or composite materials should be avoided on historic wall planes.
d. WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace seven (7) wood windows on the front porch enclosure, five (5) wood windows on the rear addition, and one (1)

missing at the area of fire damage on historic structure with new wood window matching in size and configuration (PELLA Architect series). Per the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement - Scope of Repair:* When individual elements such as sills, muntins, rails, sashes, or glazing has deteriorated, every effort should be made to repair or reconstruct that individual element prior to consideration of wholesale replacement. Staff finds that only one (1) missing window (Window E) is eligible for wholesale replacement. The other intact windows are found to be repairable, where the applicant may replace missing or deteriorate elements such as individual sashes or casing, instead of discarding the complete historic window system. For window(s) found to be completely missing or beyond repair, staff finds that the submitted window product (PELLA Architect series) is generally consistent with *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement.*

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval of items 1, 2, and 3 based on finding c. All existing wood siding should be restored in place, and any completely missing or fired damaged areas should feature wood lap siding that matches the historic profile.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 4. window replacement on the porch enclosure and rear addition. The wood windows are found to be repairable. All window repair and replacement must adhere to *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement.*

Staff recommends approval of item 5. installing a new wood window where the original window is completely missing after fire damage. All window repair and replacement must adhere to *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement.*

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Marlyn Hawkins opposed to case.

Motion: Commissioner Grube move to deny items 1-3 and approve items 4-5 with staff stipulations. 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**

- **Item # 36. HDRC NO. 2020-149**

ADDRESS: 415 WILLOW ST
APPLICANT: Eduardo villalon/VILLALON EDUARDO L

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify a previously approved design with the following:
1. Install aluminum windows in place of the previously approved one over one wood windows.
2. Modify the previously approved fenestration pattern to feature modified and additional window openings.
3. Install an asphalt shingle roof in place of the previously approved standing seam metal roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify a previously approved design in regarding to window profiles and materials, fenestration patterns and roofing materials. The new construction at 415 Willow was approved by the Commission on July 18, 2018, and a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on March 4, 2020, when all stipulations of approval were met.

b. A site visit was conducted on March 26, 2020, where OHP staff observed work being done outside of the scope of approval that included the installation of aluminum windows, the installation of an asphalt shingle roof, the installation of faux wood grain composite siding, the installation of gable returns, and fenestration patterns that were inconsistent with the design previously approved. A stop work order was issued during this site visit. Since that time, the applicant has agreed to remove the gable returns and install smooth siding.

c. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum windows in place of the previously approved one over one wood windows. The applicant has proposed an aluminum window that features a nailing fin, faux divided lites, and at certain locations, no sashes. The proposed aluminum window is inconsistent with staff's specifications for windows in new construction, and is inconsistent with the previous approval. Staff finds that the applicant should either install wood windows, as submitted and approved by staff on March 4, 2020, or install a window that meets staff's recommended specifications.

d. FENESTRATION PROFILES – The applicant has proposed to modify the previously approved fenestration pattern to include windows that are generally sized consistently with those found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to add additional fenestration that was not previously included in the original design. Generally, staff finds the proposed fenestration modifications to be appropriate; however all additional windows should be consistent with staff's standards for windows in new construction.

e. ROOFING MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install an asphalt shingle roof in place of the previously approved standing seam metal roof. Generally, staff finds the installation of an asphalt shingle roof to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, the installation of aluminum windows based on finding c. Staff recommends that the applicant either install wood windows, as submitted and approved by staff on March 4,2020, or that the applicant install a window that meets staff's recommended specifications for windows in new construction.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the modifications to fenestration patterns based on finding d with the stipulation that all windows adhere to staff standards for windows in new construction.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the installation of an asphalt shingle roof as submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter move to deny item 1 and approve item 2 and 3.
Commissioner Grube 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 # 37. HDRC NO. 2020-092**

ADDRESS: 1017 N PALMETTO
APPLICANT: GUIZAR AUTO CENTER LLC & GUIZAR BUILDING LLC

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the standing seam metal roof with composition shingles.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary historic structure at 1017 N Palmetto was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style, first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The one-story, single family structures features a primary standing seam hipped roof with a front facing gable with a flanking covered porch, Folk Victorian spindle work and turned columns, wood lap siding.

b. COMPLIANCE – During the review of the current request, staff found that the front door was recently placed prior to approval. Other non-conforming alterations performed circa 2013 and earlier include window replacement and front door opening removal per the 1994 photograph.

c. ROOF – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, red standing seam metal roof with a new composition shingle roof. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.iv., applicants should replace roofing materials in-kind whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Per the 1912 Sanborn map, staff finds that the standing seam metal roof is an original feature of the structure and should be replaced in-kind per the standard specifications for metal roofs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff does not recommend approval of changing roofing material based on finding b and c. In-kind replacements of standing seam metal roofs are eligible for administrative approval with the standard specifications. All work without approval, such as door replacement, must be address with corrected or approved prior to the issuance of future Certificates of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter move to approval in-kind replacement of metal roof with staff stipulations, and asphalt roof shingles not acceptable.
Commissioner Velasquez 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 5:56 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey C. Fetzer

Digitally signed by Jeffrey C. Fetzer
DN: cn=Jeffrey C. Fetzer, o, ou, email=jfetzerllc@gmail.com, c=US
Date: 2020.05.26 17:24:44 -05'00'

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair