CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**
**OFFICIAL MINUTES**
**20 May 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, May 20, 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, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

Absent: Martinez-Flores.

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
  - Item #1, Case No. 2020-162 1803 BROADWAY
  - Item #2, Case No. 2020-181 212 CLAUDIA ST
  - Item #3, Case No. 2020-198 131 ADAMS ST
  - Item #4, Case No. 2020-164 207 ROOSEVELT AVE
  - Item #5, Case No. 2020-193 508 N OLIVE ST
  - Item #7, Case No. 2020-118 816 S COLORADO ST
  - Item #9, Case No. 2020-194 515 NOLAN ST
  - Item #10, Case No. 2019-726 105 PLAZA DE ARMAS
  - Item #11, Case No. 2020-176 403 N PALMETTO
  - Item #12, Case No. 2020-174 5800 ENRIQUE M BARRERA PKWY/Howard W. Peak Greenway Trail System
  - Item #13, Case No. 2020-165 611 N OLIVE ST
  - Item #14, Case No. 2020-188 819 OGDEN ST
  - Item #15, Case No. 2019-727 707 DAWSON ST
  - Item #16, Case No. 2020-171 901 CAMDEN ST
  - Item #17, Case No. 2020-147 720 E CARSON
  - Item #18, Case No. 2020-187 523 E PARK AVE
  - Item #19, Case No. 2020-161 7519 OLD CORPUS CHRISTI RD
  - Item #20, Case No. 2020-167 211 DEVINE ST
  - Item #21, Case No. 2020-184 228 W LULLWOOD AVE

- Item #22, Case No. 2020-126 912 DAWSON ST
- Item #23, Case No. 2020-170 534 MISSION ST
- Item #24, Case No. 2020-186 402 CEDAR ST
- Item #25, Case No. 2020-134 402 CENTER ST, 406 CENTER ST, 120 N CHERRY, 122 N CHERRY ST, 126 N CHERRY ST, 129 N SWISS
- Item #26, Case No. 2020-178 203 MADISON ST

- AGENDA ITEM 6 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 8 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS

Motion: Commissioner Fernandez moved to approve the consent Agenda items 1-5, 7, and 9-26 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **THE MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, 0 NAYS. 2 RECUSAL. 1 ABSENT**

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS**

- **Item # 6. HDRC NO. 2020-159**

ADDRESS: 803 N CHERRY - Future Berkley V. and Vincent M. Dawson Park
Applicant: Sandy Jenkins/City of San Antonio

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting:
1. A Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval of the relocation of the Alamo Plaza bandstand to 803 N Cherry.
2. Conceptual approval of the development of a new park at 803 N Cherry.

**FINDINGS:**
a. The site currently proposed for the new Dawson Park is an existing vacant lot adjacent to the Hays Street Bridge. The site is situated with Lamar to the north, N Cherry to the east, the Hays Street Bridge to the south and the railroad tracks and a parking lot to the west. The new park will be 1.69 acres and will feature a playground, skate park, event space, pavilion, and signage.
b. PREVIOUS HDRC APPROVAL – Final approval to remove the bandstand from Alamo Plaza was approved by the HDRC on December 18, 2019.
c. BANDSTAND RELOCATION – The applicant is requesting final approval to relocate the 1976 bandstand to the proposed Dawson Park in the approximate location shown in the concept plan.

Precise location as final plans for the park are developed is eligible for administrative approval. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Unified Development Code (UDC) Sec. 35-613.

d. PARK AMENITIES – The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to install park amenities such as playground equipment for three (3) playground areas, a beginner's skate park, an advanced skatepark, a restroom, bench seating, a Hays St. Bridge Replica, picnic seating, public art, and lighting. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with UDC Sec. 35-642.

e. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed to install signage in the proposed park. Sign panels are currently proposed in the entry/story-telling plaza, outside of the entry plaza in the Community Story area, and along the walkway referred to as the Historic Timeline Walk. UDC Sec. 35-642(b)(7) stipulates that signs which are out of keeping with the character of the environment in question should not be used. Excessive size and inappropriate placement on buildings results in visual clutter. Signs should be designed to relate harmoniously to exterior building materials and colors. Signs should express a simple clear message with wording kept to a minimum. Staff finds the proposal to install signage generally consistent with the UDC Sec 35-642.

f. WALKWAYS – The applicant has proposed to install walkways throughout the proposed park. UDC Sec. 35- 642(b)(8) states that the site should take into account the compatibility of landscaping, parking facilities, utility and service areas, walkways and appurtenances. These should be designed with the overall environment in mind and should be in visual keeping with related buildings, structures and places. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the UDC Sec. 35-642.

g. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, staff recommends final approval of the relocation of the 1976 Alamo Plaza bandstand based on findings b through c with the following stipulation:

i. That any updates to the precise positioning of the bandstand at its new location be submitted to OHP staff for administrative review.

ii. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

Item 2, staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposal to develop Dawson Park as a new public park based on findings a through g with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant explore alternate locations for the restrooms currently proposed near the bandstand or explore screening options to conceal the restrooms from the bandstand.

ii. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Evelyn Brown supports staff recommendations and no relocation of the gazebo. Conservation Society San Antonio has concerns about the shape of the structure. Gary W. Houston- has concerns about the conceptual plan of project.

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

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

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

- **Item # 8. HDRC NO. 2020-177**
  ADDRESS: 3903 N ST MARYS ST
  APPLICANT: Jeffrey Watson/Alamo Architects

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage and art at the parking garage located at the San Antonio Zoo. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Install one (1) aluminum, reverse lit channel letter sign to be located on the south façade of the parking structure. The proposed signage will feature an overall length of 41' – 0" and an overall height of 3' – 0" for a total size of 123Square feet. The proposed signage will read "Brackenridge Park".
2. Install one (1) aluminum, reverse lit channel letter sign to be located on the south façade of the parking structure at the pedestrian level. The proposed signage will feature an overall length of 21' – 8" and an overall height of 1' – 8" for a total size of approximately 37 square feet. The proposed signage will read "Brackenridge Park".
3. Install one (1) aluminum, reverse lit channel letter sign to be located on the south façade of the parking structure. The proposed signage will feature an overall length of 28' – 6" and an overall height of 14' – 0" for a total size of approximately 399 square feet. The proposed signage will read "San Antonio Zoo".
4. Install one (1) aluminum, reverse lit channel letter sign to be located on the east façade of the parking structure. The proposed signage will feature an overall length of 19' – 0" and an overall height of 9' – 6" for a total size of approximately 181 square feet. The proposed signage will read "San Antonio Zoo"
5. Install a number of graphics on the facades of the parking structure including a tiger, four butterflies, and two giraffes.

This property is public property, but is not located within the boundaries of the Brackenridge Park National Register of Historic Places District, nor is it located within a local historic district or the River Improvement Overlay.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage and art at the parking garage located at the San Antonio Zoo. This request includes both identification signage for Brackenridge Park and the San Antonio Zoo. This property is public property, but is not located within the boundaries of the Brackenridge Park National Register of Historic Places District, nor is it located within a local historic district or the River Improvement Overlay.

b. SIGNAGE – The applicant has proposed a total of four signs to be wall mounted, constructed of aluminum and to be reverse lit. Staff finds the proposed signs to be appropriate and consistent with the Unified Development Code Section 35-645.

c. GRAPHICS – The applicant has proposed graphics that include a tiger, butterflies, and giraffes. Staff finds the proposed installation to be appropriate.

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

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Tim Morrow- support the case. Mimi Quintanilla, Shannon Prattechet, Gemma Kennedy, Nancy Wilson, Ricardo Romo, Tony Cantu, Mary Alice Cisneros, Nicholas Hollis, Hucanti, Joseph Gambling, Patti Zaiontz- CSSA, Joe Calvert, Tim Swan, Lukin Gilliland Jr., Lucy Wilson, Lewish

F. Fisher, Leticia Van Putte, Joel Earl Linson, Charlotte Slimp Mitchell oppose and request to table the item.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to table item until the 2nd hearing in June.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 27. 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.
c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – In accordance with the commission action issued at the HDRC hearing on May 1, 2020, the applicant met with the Design Review Committee on May 5, 2020. Committee members commented that the proposed doors were generally appropriate, but replacement should only be considered when the original doors are beyond repair. Committee members also asked the applicant to provide photos for each window and door on the house to consider the how front door replacement impacts the total historic integrity of the house.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff 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 information that the doors are beyond repair, then a similar style door or one that is compatible to the style of the house may be appropriate.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Amber West, Rebecca Pearman, Jennifer Carrilleto, Hoffer Gomez, Catherine Lee, Lloyd Newton, Jenkins, Arturo Martinez, Adam Elmer, Elizabeth Gonzalez, Crystal Fuente, Jenelle Moore, and Martha Duke are in support of case .

Motion: Commissioner Fish for to approve as submitted.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 28. HDRC NO. 2020-124**
  ADDRESS: 903 LABOR/603 HANSFORD
  APPLICANT: Andrew Blouet

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate the historic structure currently located at 903 Labor Street within the Lavaca Historic District to the vacant lot located at 603 Hansford, located within the Mission Historic District.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate the historic structure currently located at 903 Labor Street within the Lavaca Historic District to the vacant lot located at 603 Hansford, located within the Mission Historic District.

b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 21, 2020. At that meeting, committee members asked questions regarding the proposed setback, and were generally in support of the proposed relocation.

c. RELOCATION – The UDC Section 35-613 provides guidance for the relocation of a historic structure. Per this section, the Historic and Design Review Commission shall be guided by the following considerations: 1) the historic character and aesthetic interest the building contributes its present setting; 2) whether there are definite plans for the area to be vacated and what the effect of those plans on the character of the surrounding area will be; 3) whether the building can be moved without significant damage to its physical integrity; 4) whether the proposed relocation area is compatible with the historical and architectural character of the building; and 5) balancing the contribution of the property to the character of the historic district with the special merit of the application.

d. RELOCATION – As noted in finding a, the applicant has proposed to relocate a historic structure from the Lavaca Historic District to the Mission Historic District. Staff finds that the historic context of the block no longer exists, and that the relocation of the historic structure is appropriate. Staff finds that relocation within the Lavaca Historic District would be most appropriate.

e. PROPOSED SITE – The applicant has proposed to site the relocated structure forward of the existing historic structures on the block. The Guidelines for New Construction note that new construction should feature a setback that is equal to, or greater than those found historically on the block. While this is a relocation and not new construction, staff finds that the relocated structure should feature a setback that matches those found historically on the block.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e with the following stipulation:

i. That the relocated structure feature a setback that matches those found historically on the block.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Nick Naldi-Lavaca Neighborhood Assn- oppose to case- concerns about what will take place to the street after demolition; Patti Zaiontz- CSSA- supports relocation of the cottage; Branco Varamarve- supports case.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with the stipulation narrow to 10ft wide and relocated to the northern property line as feasibly possible.
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**

- **Item # 29. HDRC NO. 2020-157**
  ADDRESS: 217 CEDAR ST
  APPLICANT: Catherine Nored/Nored Architecture

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1-story rear addition with a 2-story attached garage at 217 Cedar.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure at 217 Cedar was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and first appears on the Sanborn maps in 1951. The primary structure is a 1-story, single-family residence and features a rectangular plan, a metal cross hipped roof, wood siding, wood windows, and a wraparound front porch. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.

b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant attended a Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting on March 25, 2020. The discussion focused on the overall square footage of the addition, the visibility of the rear addition from the public right-of-way, the setback of the rear addition from the neighboring property, and the fenestration pattern.

c. LOT COVERAGE – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story rear addition with a 2-story attached garage at the rear of the property. The total square footage of the primary structure and the addition is 3,294 square feet. The lot coverage will total thirty-eight (38) percent. Staff finds this consistent with the Guidelines.

d. MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story rear addition with a 2-story attached garage at the rear of the property. The existing structure is currently 1,400 square feet. Guideline 1.B.i for Additions stipulates that residential additions should be designed to be subordinate to the principle façade of the original structure in terms of scale and mass. Guideline 2.B.iv for Additions states that the building footprint should respond to the size of the lot. An appropriate yard to building ratio should be maintained for consistency within historic districts. Residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. The proposed addition features a 2-story attached garage. The proposed rear addition is 1,350 square feet and the proposed garage is 312 square feet. Together the 1,662-square-foot addition will more than double the existing building footprint. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

e. ATTACHED GARAGE – The applicant has proposed to construct a 2-story attached garage to the proposed addition. Guideline 5.A.i for New Construction stipulates that new garages and

outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form. Additionally, Guideline 5.B.i for New Construction states that applicants should match the predominant garage orientation found along the block. Do not introduce front-loaded garages or garages attached to the primary structure on blocks where rear or alley-loaded garages were historically used. The properties along Cedar historically do not feature attached garages. The predominant rear accessory structure and garage development patter in the district is detached, especially on long, narrow lots like 217 Cedar. The 1911-1951 Sanborn Map indicates accessory structures at the rear of the lot. Staff does not find the orientation and placement of the attached garage to be appropriate. Staff finds that a detached garage located at the rear of the lot should be proposed. Staff also finds that the height of a proposed 2-story garage should be minimized where feasible to more closely align with the 1-story development pattern of the block.

f. ROOF – The applicant has proposed to install a front gable roof on the 2-story garage addition that will be visible from the public right-of-way. The portion of the addition connected to the existing structure will feature a shed roof that will slope toward the north side of the property. Only a portion of the front gable roof on the attached garage addition will be visible from the public right-of-way. Guideline 1.A.iii for Additions stipulates that residential additions should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure. While the historic structure features a cross hipped roof form with a front gable, staff finds that the proposed roof form on the addition is complementary to the roof forms of the historic structure. Staff finds the approach to the roof form generally appropriate, but as noted in findings d and e, does not find the attached garage massing to be appropriate.

g. ROOF MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install a metal roof on the rear addition to match the existing roof material on the historic structure. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that additions use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original. Guidelines 3.A.ii for Additions states that new metal roofs should be constructed in a similar fashion as historic metal roofs. Staff finds the roof material consistent with the Guidelines.

h. REAR WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL – The proposed addition will require the removal of one existing one-over-one wood window. The existing window is part of a previous rear addition, According to Guideline 6.A.i for Additions, filling in historic openings should be avoided, especially when viewable from the public right-of-way. This element is not visible from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposal acceptable given the rear location of the addition and encourages the applicant to salvage or reuse the existing window.

i. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to install windows and doors with traditional proportions. Staff's standard window specifications state that new windows should feature traditional dimensions and proportions as found within the district. Staff finds the proposed fenestration pattern to be generally appropriate but finds that all windows, with the exception of transom or clerestory, should feature a one over one configuration. Staff also finds that all joined windows should feature a true ganged trim configuration.

j. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by

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

k. MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to install vertical board and batten siding to match the siding found on the previous rear addition and Hardie board skirting. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that additions should use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.

l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story rear addition with a 2-story attached garage. Guideline 4.A.ii for Additions states that additions should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Details should be simple in design and compliment the character of the original structure. Architectural details that are more ornate or elaborate than those found on the original structure should not be used to avoid drawing undue attention to the addition. Guideline 4.A.iii for Additions states that applicants should consider integrating contemporary interpretations of traditional designs and details for additions. Use of contemporary window moldings and door surroundings, for example, can provide visual interest while helping to convey the fact that the addition is new. Staff finds that the proposal is appropriate but recommends that the addition incorporate architectural details that are respectful of the historic context and are consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of the construction of a 1-story rear addition with a 2-story attached garage based on findings a through k. Staff recommends that the applicant addresses the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

i. That the applicant proposes a detached garage located towards the rear of the lot as noted in findings d and e.

ii. That the applicant reduces the height of the 2-story detached garage where feasible as noted in finding e. The applicant is required to submit a line of sight study to determine the visual impact of the updated structure on the public right-of-way.

iii. That the board and batten siding features boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide.

iv. That the proposed Hardie board skirting feature a smooth finish and no faux wood grain with a maximum reveal of 4 inches.

v. That all vertically oriented windows feature a one over one configuration and true ganged trim as noted in finding i. The applicant is required to submit elevations and trim details that reflect this stipulation.

vi. That the applicant proposes wood or aluminum-clad wood windows that feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

vii. That the standing seam metal roof features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches tall, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. An on-site inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications. All chimney, flue, and related existing roof details must be preserved.

viii. That the applicant complies with all setback requirements as required by Zoning and obtains a variance from the Board of Adjustment, if applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Nikki Conrad- KWNA- support staff recommendations, and Patti Zaiontz- support staff recommendations.

Motion: Commissioner Bowman moved for final approval with staff stipulations except for items 1 and 2. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

- ***Commissioner Fish stepped away from the meeting.***

- **Item #30. HDRC NO. 2020-152**

ADDRESS: 2158 W KINGS HWY
APPLICANT: William Hazlewood

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to enclose the front porch to feature aluminum windows in the two front arches and doors in the side-facing arches.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure at 2158 W Kings Hwy was constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style, first appears on the 1934 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The one-and-a-half story, single-family structure features brick masonry, stucco, and half-timbering façade elements, steep roof pitches with a front facing dormer centered above the front-extending arcade porch.

b. COMPLIANCE – Staff conducted a site visit on April 2, 2020, and found that the property at 2158 W Kings Hwy was subject to front porch enclosure prior to approval. The property previously received administrative approval to reconstruct the porch in-kind after damage from a fallen tree. A subsequest Historic and Design Review Commission application was submitted, which was determined incomplete. The applicant proceeded with the enclosure, and a Stop Work Order was issued.

c. PORCH ENCLOSURE – The applicant has proposed to enclose the front porch by infilling the open arches with matching brick masonry and aluminum windows with faux divided lites. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2.B.i., applicants should refrain from enclosing front porches. Staff finds that the proposed enclosure is inconsistent with the Guidelines and departs from a major character-defining feature of the Tudor Revival structure. Staff also remains concerned about the quality of the submitted drawings and the inconsistency between the drawings and the initiated work without approval, including door and window details.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c. The applicant should perform in-kind reconstruction as approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

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

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

- ***Commissioner Fish stepped back into the meeting.***

- **Item # 31. HDRC NO. 2020-117**

ADDRESS: 230 ADAMS ST
APPLICANT: David Robertson/Build Modern LLC

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Relocate salvageable wood windows from the north, east and south facades to the west (front) façade.
2. Replace damaged, destroyed, or missing wood windows on the north, east and south facades with new double hung, wood windows.

**FINDINGS:**
a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to relocate salvageable wood windows from the north, east and south facades to the west (front) façade, and replace damaged, destroyed, or missing wood windows on the north, east and south facades with new, double hung wood windows.
b. EXISTING CONDITION – A request for window replacement was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission, and was approved with the stipulation that only windows that staff found were beyond repair were eligible for replacement. Currently, many windows that were in repairable condition were damaged or destroyed by a demolition crew performing interior demolition.
c. WINDOW RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate salvageable wood windows from the north, east and south facades to the west (front) façade. Staff finds this request to be appropriate. Additionally, staff finds that any windows that are in repairable conditions, or their elements are to be salvaged and installed in other window openings.
d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace damaged or destroyed wood windows with new, double hung, wood windows. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv. notes that new windows should match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail when the original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds that fabrication of custom wood windows is an appropriate solution that adequately complies with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the relocation of existing, salvageable wood windows from the north, east and south facades to the west façade as noted in finding c with the stipulation that any other

windows, sashes, or their elements that are in a salvageable condition be repaired and installed on other facades.

2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the installation of new wood windows provided that they are custom fabricated to match the existing in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance and detail, as noted in finding d.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

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

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

- **Item # 32. HDRC NO. 2020-142**

ADDRESS: 1115 NOLAN ST
APPLICANT: San Antonio San Antonio/MONGEON CHRISTOPHER &

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriate for approval to amend the design of new, rear accessory structure approved on February 5, 2020, to feature one, double-wide garage door, instead of two, single-wide garage doors.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary historic structure at 1115 Nolan was constructed circa 1915 and features two stories in height with double height porch columns, a wraparound front porch, and front and side gabled roofs. The structure contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

b. CASE HISTORY – The Historic and Design Review Commission approved the construction of a two-story rear accessory on December 20, 2017. The Certificate of Appropriateness was reissued on February 5, 2020, including site modifications including rear yard parking and landscaping.

c. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed to amend the design of the rear accessory structure to feature one, double-width door instead of two, single-wide doors. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.v., applicants should incorporate garage doors with similar proportions and materials as those traditionally found in the district. Staff finds that double-wide garage doors are not historically found in the district and the garage should feature two separate vehicle bays and door openings. Minor modifications to the garage door widths and/or their spacing may be considered for administrative approval if the two, single-width door configuration remains.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c. Minor modifications to the garage door widths and/or their spacing may be considered for administrative approval if the two single-width configuration remains.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Dignawity Hill Neighborhood Association and Evelyn Brown and support the case.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve as submitted.
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 # 33. HDRC NO. 2020-133**

ADDRESS: 353 BRAHAN BLVD
APPLICANT: ASTON KIMBERLY

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing clay tile roof on the primary structure with standing seam metal.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The property located at 353 Brahan is a 2-story multifamily residential structure constructed circa 1920 in the Spanish Eclectic style with Neoclassical influences. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including a low pitched roof with red barrel tile, second story iron rail balcony, and a covered porch entry with rounded arches. The home is a contributing structure in the Westfort Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing red clay barrel tile roof with a new standing seam metal roof to match the roofing on a 1-story side addition, which features a red coating.

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iv., roofing materials should be replaced in-kind whenever possible when the roof must be replaced. Historic materials should be retained and reused when large-scale replacement of roof materials is required, specifically roofs constructed of slate or clay barrel tile. New roofing materials should relate to the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile, and style, or select materials consistent with the building style, when in-kind replacement is not possible. The clay barrel tile roofs on the Spanish Eclectic homes within the Westfort Historic District and older neighborhoods of San Antonio overall are character defining features of the style. Staff finds that a standing seam metal roof is not appropriate for the primary roofline on this style of structure, and finds that its installation would substantially alter the style and visual elements of the building.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a and b.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve with metal material that emulates the clay tile roof. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

**<u>Action:</u>** **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT**

- **Item # 34. HDRC NO. 2020-137**

ADDRESS: 3303 BROADWAY
APPLICANT: Zachary Villejo/Villejo Enterprises D.B.A. Good Guys Auto Group

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to place a prefabricated structure on the lot located at 3303 Broadway. The proposed structure will feature approximately 1, 300 square feet in size.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to place a prefabricated structure on the lot located at 3303 Broadway.

b. EXISTING LOT – The lot at 3303 Broadway currently features a number of existing structures, featuring varying architectural styles and site placement. Broadway to the east and Avenue B to the west.

c. SITE DESIGN – The site features asphalt paving which facilitates automobile parking. There are existing site elements which include tile paving and mature trees. At this time, the applicant has not proposed any modifications to the existing site regarding landscaping or parking.

d. ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed to install the structure to be located to the immediate north of an existing portable structure on site. Per the UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(b), two or more buildings on a site should be clustered to create open courtyard spaces. Additionally, the UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(b) notes that primary entrances should be oriented toward the street. Generally, the proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the UDC.

e. FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT – According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a human scale, which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. Generally, the proposed structure features a human scale due to its small footprint; however, the applicant has not provided elevation drawings noting façade openings and separation. Staff finds that the applicant should submit elevation drawings of the proposed structure.

f. FAÇADE ARRANGEMENT – Per the floor plan, the proposed structure will feature large expanses of wall with no separation or fenestration. This is not consistent with the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2).

g. MATERIALS – The applicant has not specified materials at this time. Staff find that the proposed structure should feature materials that are consistent with those recommended by the UDC Section 35-674.

h. WINDOWS – According to the UDC Section 35-674(e)(2), windows help provide human scale and should be recessed at least two (2) inches within solid walls; windows should relate in design and scale to the spaces behind them; windows shall be used in hierarchy to articulate important places on the façade and be grouped to establish rhythms. The proposed structure does feature windows; however, staff finds that additional fenestration should be incorporated into the design, and that all windows be recessed at least two (2) inches.

i. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. The proposed structure features a utility box on the rear façade that faces Appler. This is not consistent with the UDC.

j. SIGNAGE – At this time, the applicant has not submitting information regarding the installation of signage for this structure. All signage must comply with the UDC Section 35-678.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval at this time. Staff recommends that the applicant submit complete construction documents of the proposed structure, including elevation drawings. Additionally, staff finds that windows should be metal and inset at least two (2) inches within walls, that materials follow the UDC's standards, and that all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter move for continuous of case.
Commissioner Gibbs 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 # 35. HDRC NO. 2020-154**

ADDRESS: 126 WICKES
APPLICANT: GARZA BENJAMIN S& MARGARITA

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to reroof the structure including:
1. Modification of the roof form
2. Removal of two brick chimneys

**FINDINGS:**
a. The primary historic structure at 126 Wickes was constructed circa 1905 in the Folk Victorian style and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map. The one-story, single-family structure features a primary hipped with roof with a low-slope portion at the peak of the hip, a front facing gable with a flanking covered porch with Folk Victorian spindle work and turned columns.
b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on March 17, 2020, staff found that the property at 126 Wickes was subjected to roof form modifications and chimney removal prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and permits. After staff posted a Stop Work Order, the applicant submitted an application to be heard at the next available hearing. At this time, the unapproved work has been completed and the bricks from the removed chimneys remain in a pile on the porch roof. The $500 post-work application fee will be accessed in accordance with a commission action.
c. EXISTING ROOF – Prior to work without approval, the roof at 126 Wickes a featured primary hipped roof with composition shingles, with a flat roof portion with standing seam metal and metal cresting. The structure also featured two brick chimneys flanking each side of the flat roof portion.
d. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to eliminate the flat roof portion of the hipped roof to instead feature a pyramidal roof with a single point. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.ii., applicants should preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs when replacement is necessary. Staff finds that the original roof form

should be restored including the flat roof portion, standing seam metal material, and metal cresting.

e. CHIMNEY – The applicant has proposed to remove the two chimneys. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.iii., applicants p reserve and repair distinctive roof features such as cornices, parapets, dormers, open eaves with exposed rafters and decorative or plain rafter tails, flared eaves or decorative purlins, and brackets with shaped ends. While the applicant has verbally agreed to restore the chimneys, no measured drawings or photo documentation that supports a good faith effort towards compliance has been submitted. Staff finds that the chimneys should be restored to their original location and design, features as much original brick material as possible, and that a measured drawing is submitted to staff prior to any further work.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval of item 1 and 2 based on finding b through e. Staff finds that the original roof form should be restored including the flat roof portion, standing seam metal material, and metal cresting. The chimneys should be restored to their original location and design, feature as much original brick material as possible, and that a measured drawing is submitted to staff prior to any further work.

**CASE COMMENT:**
On a site visit conducted on March 17, 2020, staff found that the property at 126 Wickes was subjected to roof form modifications and chimney removal prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and permits. After staff posted a Stop Work Order, the applicant submitted an application to be heard at the next available hearing. At this time, the unapproved work has been complete and the bricks from the removed chimneys remain in a pile on the porch roof. The $500 post-work application fee will be accessed in accordance with a commission action.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Dignawity Hill Neighborhood Association opposed to case.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter move to deny application.
Commissioner Fish 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 # 36. HDRC NO. 2020-172**

ADDRESS: 2115 W GRAMERCY PLACE
APPLICANT: Mark Reina/Alamo City Construction & Supply LLC.

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Install a new porch roof.
2. Wrap the existing metal porch supports with wood to create square columns.
3. Pour new cement topping on porch landing and steps.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure located at 2115 W Gramercy was constructed circa 1950 and first appears on the Sanborn map in 1951. It is a 2-story, single-family residence that features a low-pitch composition shingle hip roof, a central chimney, brick cladding, aluminum and wood windows, and corner windows on the second floor. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.

b. PORCH ROOF REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing flat, semicircular porch roof with a front gable porch roof with composition shingles. Guideline 7.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that replacement elements should be designed to be simple so as to not distract from the historic character of the building. Do not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance. The proposed porch roof would give the structure the appearance of a Colonial Revival style; however, the corner windows, overhanging eaves, and fenestration pattern indicate that the structure was not designed in the Colonial Revival style. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines and recommends replacing the existing porch roof with a more compatible style.

c. COLUMN MODIFICIATIONS – The applicant has proposed to wrap the existing metal porch roof supports with wood to create square columns. Guideline 7.B.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Repair stipulates that porches should be replaced in kind when features are deteriorated beyond repair. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, the design should be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. Staff does not find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

d. PORCH LANDING & STEPS – The applicant has proposed to pour a new cement topping on the existing porch landing and steps. The rendering submitted by the applicant proposes a rectangular landing and rectangular steps in place of the existing semicircular landing and steps. Guideline 7.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres should be preserved. Do not add new porches, balconies, or porte-cocheres where not historically present. Guideline 7.A.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that applicants should preserve original wood or concrete porch floors. Additionally, Guideline 7.B.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that porches and related elements such, such as ceilings, floors, and columns should be replaced in-kind when such features are deteriorated beyond repair. When in-kind replacement is not feasible, the design should be compatible in scale, massing, and detail while materials should match in color, texture, dimensions, and finish. Staff finds the existing porch landing and steps to be character defining features of the primary structure that echo the shape of the existing porch roof. Staff finds the proposal to pour new cement topping to create a rectangular porch landing and steps to be inappropriate. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the existing design of the porch landing and steps.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the existing porch elements based on findings a through d.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube move to Design Review Committee- DRC.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

Nay: None.
Absent: Martinez-Flores.

**<u>Action:</u>** **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT**

- **Item # 37. HDRC NO. 2020-153**

ADDRESS: 226 CAMARGO
APPLICANT: MEVT HOLDINGS LLC

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Replace and expand a rear side wood deck.
2. Replace a rear wood privacy fence with a new wood privacy fence.
3. Install 4-foot tall metal-framed cattle panel front yard fence to include a driveway gate.
4. Perform front yard landscaping modifications.
5. Install brick along the sidewalk and patio.
6. Paint the exterior.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary historic structure at 226 Camargo was constructed circa 1905 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 a turned and front-facing gable flanked by a covered porch with two front doors, wood lap siding, wood sash windows, and a standing seam metal roof. The structure contributes to the Lavaca Historic District.

b. COMPLIANCE – Upon review of the requested items, staff found that the porch columns were replaced, and the natural lawn had been removed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant and new owner explained that some work was initiated by the previous owner and that they will cooperate with the review process before continuing anymore work.

c. REAR SIDE DECK – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing deck located in the inset of the side elevation with a new deck that protrudes beyond the side elevation plane by approximately 5 feet. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.ii., Alterations to side and rear porches should result in a space that functions, and is visually interpreted as, a porch. Staff finds that the proposed modification is not visible from the public right-of-way, does not affect historic materials, and is generally consistent with the Guidelines.

d. WOOD PRIVACY FENCE – The applicant has proposed to replace the rear privacy fence with a new wood fence featuring horizontal and vertical 6-inch wood planks and wood posts and framing. Staff finds that the proposed request is typically eligible for administrative approval with the stipulation that no portion of the rear yard fence exceeds 6 feet in height nor encroach past the front façade plane.

e. FRONT YARD FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot tall, metal framed cattle panel fence in the front yard, including a front driveway gate.

f. FENCE DESIGN – The proposed fence features a metal-framed cattle panel design as depicted in the measured drawing. 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 framed cattle panel fence are found in the district at historic structures and would be more appropriate than a metal framed fence.

g. FENCE 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 Camargo and within the Lavaca 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.

h. FENCE HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence with a height of 4-feet at its tallest point at the pedestrian and driveway gate. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii., applicants should limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds that the proposed height of 4- 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.

i. LANDSCAPE – The applicant has proposed to replace portions of the natural front lawn with multiple plant beds, areas of low ground cover, and small portion of flagstone pavers. Staff finds that the front yard landscaping plan is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.ii through iv.

j. BRICK WALKWALK AND PATIO – The applicant has proposed to install brick into the walkway and patio. At this time, no site plan or drawing has been submitted. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.i, applicants should repair minor cracking, settling, or jamming along sidewalks to prevent uneven surfaces; and retain and repair historic sidewalk and walkway paving materials—often brick or concrete—in place. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.ii., applicants should replace those portions of sidewalks or walkways that are deteriorated beyond repair. Every effort should be made to match existing sidewalk color and material. Staff finds that the walkway and patio should be repaired in kind, and in place and the applicant should avoid adding new brick material.

k. PAINT – The applicant has proposed to paint the exterior where the previous owner had left exposed or unfinished. Staff finds that the proposed request is typically eligible for administrative approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 based on findings b through j with the following stipulations:

i. No Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued until work without approval has been corrected or approved, including but not limited to restoring the original design of the front porch columns.

ii. That no portion of the rear yard fence exceeds 6 feet in height nor encroach past the front façade plane.

iii. 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.

iv. That no portion of the front yard fence exceeds 4 feet in height, and if the driveway gate is relocated behind the front façade plane of the house, it may feature a maximum height of 6-feet.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 5, adding brick to the walkway and patio, based on finding j.

**CASE COMMENT:**

Upon review of the requested items, staff found that the porch columns were replaced, and the natural lawn had been removed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant and new owner explained that some work was initiated by the previous owner and that they will cooperate with the review process before continuing anymore work

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve with staff stipulations except stipulation 3- and added stipulation that gate manual and for the gate to swing inward.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES, and 4 NAYS. 1 ABSENT**

- ***Commissioner Grube and Bowman left the meeting.***

- **Item # 38. HDRC NO. 2020-128**

ADDRESS: 344 W ROSEWOOD AVE
APPLICANT: Mark Olivares.- David Olivares Representing.

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a curb cut and install a 12-foot wide concrete driveway on the east side of the property.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The primary structure located at 344 W Rosewood is a 2-story, single-family structure and was constructed circa 1920. The property fist appears on the Sanborn maps in 1924. The house features a side gable composition shingle roof, a front gable porch roof with gable end returns, one-over-one replacement windows, and composition cladding. The property features rear accessory structures and rear parking accessible from alley. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.

b. DRIVEWAY CONFIGURATION – The applicant has proposed to install a fully concrete slab driveway at the east side of the property. The Historic Design Guideline 5.B.i. for Site Elements states that historic driveway configurations should be retained and repaired in place. Additionally, Guideline 5.B.ii for Site elements stipulates that applicants should avoid introducing new curb cuts where not historically found. The property has historically featured rear parking accessible from the alley. Staff finds the proposal is inconsistent with the Guidelines.

c. TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES – The applicant has proposed to install a fully concrete slab driveway at the east side of the property. The property features a character-defining sloped front lawn, installing a driveway on the east side of the property will impact this topographic feature. Guideline 1.A.i for Site Elements stipulates that applicants should avoid significantly altering the topography of a property (i.e., extensive grading). Do not alter character-defining features such as berms or sloped front lawns that help define the character of the public right-of-way. Additionally, Guideline 1.A.iii for Site Elements stipulates that applicants should minimize changes in topography resulting from new elements, like driveways and walkways, through appropriate siting and design. New site elements should work with, rather than change, character-defining topography when possible. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

d. DRIVEWAY MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to install a 12-foot, fully concrete driveway at the east side of the property. Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements stipulates that applicants should retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives. Incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. The applicant has submitted a photo of an adjacent property with a fully concrete driveway as

precedent; however, driveways on this block of W Rosewood historically feature ribbon driveways. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d.

If the HDRC finds the installation of a front driveway appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulation:

i. That the applicant install a driveway no wider than 10 feet and submit a revised landscaping plan to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Paul Kinnosan- Monte Vista Neighborhood Association support with staff stipulations.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve with stipultions.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item # 39. HDRC NO. 2020-172**

ADDRESS: 2115 W GRAMERCY PLACE
APPLICANT: Mark Reina/Alamo City Construction & Supply LLC.

**REQUEST:**
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:
1. Install 4”x4” wood brackets under the front door cover.
2. Construct a wood deck with 2”x4” decking and 4”x4” posts over the front concrete patio.
3. Install a 4’ tall cattle panel fencing in the front yard including a driveway gate.
4. Repair the existing sidewalk by filling in cracks with Quickcrete.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The structure at 1335 E Crockett first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The one-story commercial structure features a turned gable with a standing seam metal roof, a centered door flanked by a pair of ganged wood sash windows on each side, and cinder block construction.

b. PORCH COVER BRACKETS – The applicant as proposed to install 4”x4” wood brackets under the front door cover. 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 and applicants should not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance. Staff finds that the proposed brackets are inconsistent with the Guidelines. If the existing door cover is subject to failure, staff finds in-kind structural repairs instead of adding new elements to be appropriate.

c. FRONT PORCH DECK – The applicant has proposed to install a wood deck over the existing front concrete patio. The proposed deck features 6’ in depth, 12 to 17’ in width, 4” in height with 2”x4” decking and 4”x4” posts. 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; if no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff finds that the front porch deck is an inappropriate addition to a commercial cinder block structure set at grade. Staff finds the existing concrete patio should be repaired in-kind and a minimal concrete incline may be installed to meet ADA compliance per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.v.

d. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a 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.

e. FENCE DESIGN - The applicant has proposed to install a wood-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. Staff finds that the proposed fence design is appropriate to the style and location of the historic structure.

f. DRIVEWAY GATE – The applicant has proposed to include a driveway gate spanning across the front at the property line. Staff finds that the property does not currently feature a driveway and the installation of a driveway gate would perpetuate inappropriate front yard parking.

g. FENCE HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence with a height of 4 feet in the front yard. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii, applicants should limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. Staff finds the proposed height is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. WALKWAY – The applicant has proposed to repair the front concrete walkway by filling in cracks with Quickcrete. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.i., applicants should repair minor cracking, settling, or jamming along sidewalks to prevent uneven surfaces. Staff finds the proposed treatment appropriate if the concrete patching matches the existing texture and color.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**
Staff does not recommend approval of item 1., the installation of wood brackets, and item 2. The installation of a wood deck based on findings b and c. If the existing door cover is subject to failure, staff recommends in-kind structural repairs instead of adding new elements. Staff recommends the existing concrete patio is repaired in-kind and a minimal concrete incline may be installed to meet ADA compliance per the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.A.v. instead of installing a deck.

Staff recommends approval of item 3., the front yard fence based on findings d through g with the following stipulations:

i. That the driveway gate is removed from the design and the fence instead spans across the front of the property

j. That no portion of the fence exceeds 4 feet in height

Staff recommends approval of item 4., walkway repair with the stipulation that the concrete patches matches the existing walkway in texture and color.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Arvis Holland- DHNA- does not support item 1 or 2; Evelyn Brown does not support staff recommendations.

<u>Motion:</u> Commissioner Carpenter move to approve item 1 &2 as submitted—approve item 3&4 with staff stipulations and to include a landscape plan for COA.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

**ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:28 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair