



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**OFFICIAL MINUTES**  
**03 June 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, June 3, 2020, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

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

**ROLL CALL:**

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

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

Absent: Martinez-Flores.

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Norma Elia Cantu supports item 1 for historic neighborhood designation of Rinconcito de Esperanza as it has great impact on preserving cultural heritage; and Dignowity Hill Neighbors- Evelyn Brown, Joseph Garcia, Lulu Francois, Monica Savino, SAlbert, and Valerie Cortez- support all staff recommendations for cases in their districts and hopes to address nforcement from UDC amendments process.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
  - Item #1, Case No. 2020-204 816 S COLORADO ST, 812 S COLORADO ST,  
1024 EL PASO / RINCONCITO DE ESPERANZA
  - Item #2, Case No. 2020-227 102 BUFORD
  - Item #3, Case No. 2020-202 910 S ALAMO ST, 912 S ALAMO ST
  - Item #6, Case No. 2020-229 305 BURLESON ST
  - Item #7, Case No. 2020-208 130 CAMARGO
  - Item #8, Case No. 2020-213 114 W COMMERCE ST/ROW improvements  
near 1200 W Commerce
  - Item #9, Case No. 2020-231 120 KING WILLIAM
  - Item #10, Case No. 2020-224 115 LEXINGTON AVE
  - Item #11, Case No. 2020-168 228 LAVACA ST
  - Item #12, Case No. 2020-207 126 CAMARGO
  - Item #13, Case No. 2020-223 1174 E COMMERCE ST
  - Item #14, Case No. 2020-214 632 LEIGH ST
  - Item #15, Case No. 2020-221 505 E PARK AVE
  - Item #17, Case No. 2020-210 132 CAMARGO

- AGENDA ITEM 4 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 5 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 16 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 27 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL JUNE 17<sup>TH</sup> HEARING

**Motion:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent Agenda items 1-3, 6-15, and 17 with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

### **INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS**

- **Item # 4. HDRC NO. 2020-218**  
ADDRESS: 427 ADAMS ST  
Applicant: Elaine Lutton/LUTTON RICHARD B & ELAINE J

#### **REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a side yard pool.
2. Construct a rear pool pavilion to measure approximately 300 square feet in footprint.
3. Install side yard fencing.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 427 Adams is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1912. It first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The house features a side gable metal roof, a second story extension over a covered carport, stucco cladding, and decorative craftsman-style side lite entry door surrounds. The property sits on a double lot with tree cover on the south side of the property. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. **SIDE YARD POOL INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a 26’ by 12’ in-ground pool in the side yard (second lot) of their property. While the pool will be located in the side yard, versus the rear, staff finds that it is significantly set back from the public right-of-way and does not negatively impact the primary historic structure or adjacent structures.
- c. **PAVILION** – The applicant has proposed to install a pavilion between the rear detached garage and the proposed pool area. The pavilion will feature a brown metal hip roof to match the existing carriage house and will be supported by stucco pillars designed to match the port cochere of the

primary structure. The pavilion will be approximately 300 square feet. Based on the submitted renderings, the pavilion appears to have a significant setback from the primary right-of-way and is subordinate to the primary structure. Staff finds the proposal conceptually compatible with the Guidelines, but the applicant has not submitted building elevations, materials, or dimensions for the pavilion, which are required to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- d. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has proposed to install plantings around the pool, a stucco retaining wall on the east (front) side of the pool to match the existing retaining wall located at the front porch, a patio area, and black metal fencing on the north side of pool area, near the driveway. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the proposed fence not exceed 4 feet in height and that the applicant submits final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submits final elevations drawings, material specifications, and measurements for the pavilion that are consistent with the provided renderings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness as noted in finding c. Staff may issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval administratively provided that the final submitted drawings match those presented for conceptual approval and adhere to an action for approval from the HDRC.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Margaret Leeds- concurs with staff recommendations and not recommend item 3.

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

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

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

- **Item # 5. HDRC NO. 2020-219**  
ADDRESS: 126 E AGARITA AVE  
APPLICANT: catherine nored/nored architecture

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a conceptual approval to construct a 1,338 square foot side and rear addition with a partial second floor.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 126 E Agarita is a 2-story single family residence constructed circa 1925 in the Spanish Eclectic style. The home features wood windows, a stucco façade, and a distinctive castellated roofline. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.

- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **EXISTING REAR STRUCTURE** – Based on the submitted site plan, the applicant has proposed to construct a side addition to connect to both the primary structure and the rear accessory structure. Staff finds that the applicant should provide clear, labeled photos and existing elevation drawings for this structure for final approval to ensure all modifications to existing buildings on the site are accounted for.
- d. **DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT** – The lot features a 2-story single family structure and a rear garage. Adjacent properties on the block are primarily 2 to 2.5-story single family residential structures with heights that eclipse 126 E Agarita. The property also features a slightly greater setback than most on the block face and includes several heritage trees in the front yard, which will not be affected by the proposal. The garage is accessed by an unnamed rear alley. Based on the proposed lot coverage, setback, limited visibility from the public right-of-way, proposed scale and massing, location, siting, and the transparent nature of the connecting element of the addition, staff finds the addition to be appropriate.
- e. **FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new 1-story addition to the primary structure with a partial second floor. The addition will be located to the side of the historic structure and will connect to the existing historic accessory structure. The existing courtyard will remain and the existing alley and surface parking will remain the same. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that new additions should not double the size of the existing structure. Staff finds the proposal appropriate given the site-specific considerations of the property as noted in finding d.
- f. **ORIENTATION AND SETBACK** – The applicant has proposed to orient the addition towards the street. The addition will be significantly set back from the front façade of the primary historic structure. The Guidelines for Additions state that new additions should be located to the rear whenever possible. While the addition is located to the side of the structure, it is subordinate in height, scale, and location. The rear setback is also consistent with historic precedents in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant is responsible for complying with all zoning setback standards and filing for a variance with the Board of Adjustment if applicable.
- g. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed a 1-story addition with a partial second story towards the rear of the lot. The addition will connect to an existing rear accessory structure based on the submitted site plan and floor plan. The Historic Design Guidelines state that new construction should be consistent with the height and overall scale of nearby historic buildings and rear accessory structure. The scale of the proposed structure does not impact or visually compete with primary structure on the lot, and will visually match the height of a rear accessory structure on a neighboring property three houses to the east. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines based on site specific considerations, but also finds that additional information should be submitted for final approval as noted in finding c.
- h. **ROOF** – Per the applicant, the transition to the addition will be roofed with clay tiles to match clay tile details from the existing house. The rear portion of the addition will feature a low parapet. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines, but has not seen a material specification for the roof tiles.
- i. **WINDOW AND DOOR OPENINGS** – The applicant has proposed several window proportions, rhythms, and configurations that are consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the historic structure and district. The applicant has also proposed that the

- connecting element of the addition feature floor-to-ceiling glass doors and windows, resulting a design that distinguishes the addition as new. However, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to the west elevation to maintain a consistent solid-to-void ratio.
- j. **MATERIALS** – Guideline 3.A.i for New Construction states that materials should complement the type, color, and texture of those found in the historic district. Staff generally finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines with the stipulations listed in the recommendation.
- k. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Generally, new buildings in historic districts should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Architectural details should also not visually compete with the historic structure. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant provides elevation and site plan documents that clearly illustrate how the rear accessory structure will be affected by the proposal as noted in the findings. The applicant should submit existing elevations and labeled site photographs in addition to the proposed elevations.
- ii. That the applicant adds additional fenestration to the west elevation as noted in finding i.
- iii. That the applicant submits final fully wood window and door specifications for final 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.
- iv. That the applicant employs a stucco texture that differentiates from the stucco on the existing primary and accessory structure to clearly distinguish the addition as new.
- v. That the applicant submits all material specifications for final approval.
- vi. That the applicant complies with all zoning and setback requirements and obtains a variance from the Board of Adjustment, if applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Paul Kinnison supports conceptual approval.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Carpenter 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 # 16. HDRC NO. 2020-215**

ADDRESS: 307 CAROLINA ST  
APPLICANT: JEFF COYLE/COYLE JEFFREY M & KATIE J JARL

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the rear fence with an 8-foot-high wood privacy fence with lattice work on top.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property at 307 Carolina is a 1-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1912. It features a metal hip roof, a deep-set front porch, wood cladding, and one-over-one wood windows. It is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. FENCE REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing 6-foot-high wood rear privacy fence with an 8-foot-high wood rear privacy fence featuring a lattice detailing at the top. Guidelines 2.A.ii for Site Elements states that existing fencing should be replaced only when deteriorated sections are beyond repair. Replacement materials should match to the color, texture, size, profile, and finish of the original. Guideline 2.B.v for Site Elements states that new fences should be constructed of materials similar to fence materials historically used in the district. Select materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district, and that are compatible with the main structure. Screening incompatible uses— Review alternative fence heights and materials for appropriateness where residential properties are adjacent to commercial or other potentially incompatible uses. UDC Section 35-514(c)(1) states that the maximum height permitted for rear yard fences is 6 feet.
- c. SITE CONDITIONS – The east side of the property is near a former fuel station and the I-37 overpass. The property is surrounded by other residential properties to the east, north, and west. Although 6 feet is normally an appropriate height for rear privacy fencing, the proposed additional 2 feet of fencing is not solid. Staff finds that as the proposed 2 additional feet of fencing is partially transparent it may be appropriate for the site conditions, given the proximity of the property to the interstate and a vacant former fuel station.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None .

Motion: Commissioner Fish for to approve with stipulation of 7 ft. height fence.  
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

- **COMMISSIONER GRUBE STEPPEDAWAY AT 4:02PM**

- **Item # 18. HDRC NO. 2020-200**  
ADDRESS: 415 WILLOW ST  
APPLICANT: Aldo Ramirez /ARLA Corp

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend the previously approved design regarding fenestration on the street facing façade. The applicant has proposed to modify the three ganged windows under the second story gable to feature two windows, and for the 2 ganged windows under the first story bay to feature two separate window openings.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend the previously approved design regarding fenestration on the street facing façade. The applicant has proposed to modify the three ganged windows under the second story gable to feature two windows, and for the 2 ganged windows under the first story bay to feature two separate window openings.
- b. **PROPERTY HISTORY** – 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. The remaining, unapproved items were reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission on May 1, 2020, where the installed aluminum windows were denied. Staff finds that the denied windows should be addressed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for any additional requests or design amendments.
- c. **WINDOW MODIFICATIONS** – Generally, staff finds this request to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed windows should be consistent with those previously approved by staff, on March 4, 2020. Additionally, staff finds that the applicant should address the all of the installed windows, which were denied by the Historic and Design Review Commission. As previously noted, an appropriate window was approved by staff on March 4, 2020.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. A COA for an appropriate window was issued on March 4, 2020. An amendment to this approval was previously denied by the Commission on May 1, 2020. Staff does not recommend approval of this newly-proposed amendment. Staff recommends that the applicant comply with the original COA issued on March 4, 2020.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association- opposes to the amended project as presented, and supports staff recommendations.

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

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

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

- **Item # 19. HDRC NO. 2020-191**  
ADDRESS: 320 N HACKBERRY ST  
APPLICANT: Johnrudy Balderrama/JRM CONSTRUCTION LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Remove original wood siding and install Hardie siding with faux wood grain.
2. Remove the original wood windows and trim and install vinyl windows and Hardie trim.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 320 N Hackberry was constructed circa 1925, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Prior to recent work without approval, the one-story, single family structure featured a primary front-facing gabled roof with subordinate gable over the covered porch, asbestos lap siding covering 117 wood lap siding, and security bars on wood sash windows.
- b. COMPLIANCE – Staff posted a Stop Work Order on April 16, 2020, after finding that wood windows and siding were replaced prior to approval. Work continued, including the replacement of the last wood window and area of wood lap siding that was still intact during the first site visit. After staff posted another Stop Work Order on April 20, 2020, the applicant submitted an application and paid the post-work application fee to be heard at the next available Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.
- c. SIDING – Prior to work without approval, the property featured non-historic asbestos siding covering original 117 wood lap siding. The applicant has proposed to remove all siding to replace with Hardie siding with faux wood grain with a 6” exposure. While the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alteration 1.B.i. encourages exposing original wood siding if it is currently covered with materials that have not achieved historic significance, the Guidelines 1.B.iii notes that replacement of wood siding should be made in-kind, matching in profile, dimensions, material, and finish, when beyond repair. Staff finds that the proposed Hardie siding is inconsistent with the Guidelines and 117 wood lap siding should be restored.
- d. WINDOWS – Prior to work without approval, the property featured one-over-one, wood sash windows, traditional wood window trim configuration, and non-historic security bars. The applicant has proposed to replace all wood windows and trim with new vinyl windows and Hardie trim. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i., applicants should install new windows to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds that the pair of wood windows that were still on site on April 20, 2020, were in a repairable condition. If the original windows have been permanently discarded, then staff recommends in-kind replacement that adhere to the *Standard Specifications for Wood Window Replacement*.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of siding, trim, and window replacement based on findings b through d. The applicant may work with staff to achieve compliance through in-kind replacement of all historic materials.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association, Evelyn Brown, Joseph Garcia, Lulu Francois, Monica Savino, SAlbert, and Valerie Cortez.

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

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

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

• **Item #20. HDRC NO. 2020-232**

ADDRESS: 311 CEDAR ST

APPLICANT: Robert Alvarado/South Antonio Builders

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Relocate front door to a central location on the front facade.
2. Install a historic wood window at the location of the relocated front door.
3. Replace the full-lite side door with a historic door featuring a 1/3 lite design.
4. Relocate the front porch columns a few inches to accommodate new door and window locations
5. Construct a rear addition measuring approximately 200 square feet.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 311 Cedar is a 1-story single family residential structure constructed circa 1920 in the Queen Anne style. The home features a hipped roof with a front gable, Corinthian columns, a wraparound front porch, wood windows, and woodlap siding. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. **DOOR RELOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to relocate the existing front door to a more central portion of the front façade. The door is currently located below the front gable, which covers a mass that slightly projects from the rest of the front façade. The door features sidelites and a transom window which are common architectural elements of this style. The applicant has indicated that the door relocation will create a more historically appropriate condition. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing façade configurations should remain, unless evidence is provided to substantiate a previous original condition. At this time, the only previous documentation that may illustrate a previous configuration is a 1911-1951 Sanborn Map that shows the front staircase on a central axis versus in its current location. While staff finds that the door location may be stylistically appropriate for a Queen Anne home, staff does not find that enough evidence has been provided to prove that the requested configuration is the original condition of the home.
- c. **WINDOW INSTALLATION** - The applicant has proposed to install a reclaimed wood window with a diamond lite pattern in the location of the existing front door. As noted in finding b, while staff finds that the proposed window may be appropriate stylistically for the home, there is not enough supporting evidence that the existing configuration is not original.
- d. **SIDE DOOR REPLACEMENT** - The applicant has proposed to replace the existing side door with a new reclaimed historic door featuring a 1/3 lite configuration. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- e. **PORCH MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to perform various porch modifications to accommodate the new proposed front façade configuration. Modifications include relocating the existing Corinthian columns slightly to create a rhythm that accommodates the new entry location and window, as well as removing the existing staircase and constructing a new one to be on axis with the relocated front door. As noted in findings b and c, staff does not find the façade modifications consistent at this time and does not recommend porch modifications.

- f. REAR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition with a footprint of approximately 200 square feet. The roofline will be similar to the existing primary structure and the rear façade will feature several windows to create a sunroom condition. Staff generally finds the proposal to be appropriate and eligible for administrative approval with additional information as required for final approval.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the front door relocation based on finding b.  
Item 2, Staff does not recommend approval of the window installation based on finding c.  
Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the side door replacement based on finding d.  
Item 4, Staff does not recommend the porch modifications based on finding e.  
Item 5, Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on finding f with the following stipulations:
- i. That the applicant provide all material specifications and final permit-level drawings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
  - ii. That the applicant submits final wood or aluminum clad wood window and door specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. 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.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** King William Association-supports with staff stipulations.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 3 and 5 with staff stipulations-a pplicant withdrew items 1,2, and 4.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Arreola left the Meeting at 4:30pm*

- **Item # 21. HDRC NO. 2020-228**

ADDRESS: 514 N PINE ST  
APPLICANT: RETERSDORF AARON

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a front yard cattle panel fence to feature four (4) feet in height and a black rock landscaping detail to be beneath the fence.

2. Construct a front yard landscaping trellis structure to feature eight (8) feet in height, and eight (8) feet in width. The proposed trellis will feature steel construction and will be detached from the proposed front yard fence. Additionally, the proposed trellis structure will feature landscaping elements.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install both fencing and a landscaping trellis structure at 514 N Pine, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. PREVIOUS APPROVAL – The applicant previously received approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission on May 2, 2018, to install a wood picket fence; however, that Certificate of Appropriateness has since expired, and the applicant has proposed to amend the previously approved fence’s design.
- c. FENCE – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard cattle panel fence to feature four (4) feet in height and a black rock landscaping detail to be beneath the fence. Generally, staff finds the proposed fence installation to be appropriate, as fences are found historically within the district, and are found on this block. The Guidelines for Site Elements 3.A. notes that native xeric materials should be used. Staff finds that if a rock material is installed at the base of the fence, it should feature a native color, rather than the proposed black rock..
- d. FRONT YARD TRELLIS – The applicant has proposed to construct a front yard landscaping trellis structure to feature eight (8) feet in height, and eight (8) feet in width. The proposed trellis will feature steel construction and will be detached from the proposed front yard fence. Additionally, the proposed trellis structure will feature landscaping elements. Per the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii. new fences and walls within front yards should be limited to four (4) feet in height. While not referred to as a fence, staff finds that the proposed trell is structure acts as a fence or screening element, and should be limited to four (4) feet in height.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the installation of a front yard fence with the stipulation that if a gravel element is installed, that it feature native colors, and not black, as proposed, as noted in
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the installation of a front yard trellis structure with the stipulation that it does not exceed four (4) feet in height, as noted in finding d.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association and John Cooley support the case as presented.

**Motion:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approval of item 1 with staff stipulations and deny item 2. Commissioner Laffoon seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 22. HDRC NO. 2020-217**  
ADDRESS: 209 SADIE ST  
APPLICANT: Chris Coker/Blue Line Housing, LLC.

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a 300-square-foot rear addition.
2. Construct a 50-square-foot addition on the front façade.
3. Replace the existing front door.
4. Install new concrete front steps and porch railing.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure at 209 Sadie is a 1-story, single-family home that was constructed circa 1930 and first appears on the Sanborn maps in 1951. The home features a composition shingle hip roof, wood cladding, oneover- one wood windows, a metal porch awning, and wood columns. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. **MASSING AND FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed to construct a small pop-out addition on the front façade to make the front façade wall plane flush beneath the front porch. The front façade addition will approximately 50 square feet. The applicant has also proposed to construct a rear addition that will extend the width of the house and will replace existing enclosed porch additions. The rear addition will be approximately 300 square feet. The Guidelines stipulate that residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. Staff finds the proposed footprint appropriate.
- c. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION: REAR ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing enclosed porch additions at the rear of the structure. The rear additions are not original to the structure. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- d. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION: FRONT ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to demolish existing walls at the front façade in order to construct a small front façade addition to create a flush wall plane. Guideline 7.B.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that applicants should refrain from enclosing front porches. Additionally, Guideline 7.B.v for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that porches should be reconstructed based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. The 1951 Sanborn map shows that the existing footprint of the front façade and front porch is original to the structure. Staff finds the proposal inappropriate.
- e. **ROOF** – The applicant has proposed to extend the existing composition shingle hip roof above the rear addition to match the existing in form and material. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- f. **WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL** – The proposed additions will require the removal of 2 existing original windows and 1 existing original door. The applicant has proposed to salvage the original windows and door and store on the property for future use. The proposed additions will also require the removal of non-original windows from the existing rear additions. 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. The applicant has proposed to install new windows and doors to replace the existing. Staff finds the removal of windows and doors to accommodate the rear addition appropriate.
- g. **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. The applicants proposed front elevation drawing features a transom window above the proposed relocated front door. Staff finds the proposed transom window inappropriate. Staff finds the proposed fenestration pattern of the rear addition to be appropriate.
- h. **NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS** – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff finds wood windows to be most appropriate. Windows 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.

- i. **MATERIALS: FAÇADE** – The applicant has proposed to install wood siding to match existing. 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 recommends that the applicant explore an offset to distinguish the rear addition from the historic structure.
- j. **FRONT DOOR RELOCATION** – The applicant has proposed to relocate the front door opening. Guideline 6.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that existing window and door openings should be preserved. Avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Avoid creating new primary entrances or window openings on the primary façade or where visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant has not provided evidence that the existing door opening is not original to the structure. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- k. **FRONT DOOR REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing front door yet has proposed to salvage the front door and keep on site for future use. Staff finds that the applicant should repair and replace the existing front door in the new front door opening.
- l. **PORCH RAILING REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the front porch railing and install new railing at the rear addition. The applicant has not provided material specifications for the proposed railing material. 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. Staff finds the proposal generally appropriate and finds that the railing should be wood.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on findings a through h with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submits a wood window specification to staff for review and approval. The windows should 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.

Item 2, staff does not recommend approval of the front addition based on findings a through d.

Item 3, staff does not recommend approval of front door replacement based on findings j through k.

Item 4, staff recommends approval of the installation of new concrete front steps and railing based on finding l with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant submits final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

**Motion:** Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1 and 4 with staff stipulations, and deny items 2 and 3.  
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

• **Item # 23. HDRC NO. 2020-192**

ADDRESS: 420 DEVINE ST

APPLICANT: UJU ENTERPRISES LLC

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace the standing seam metal roof with a composition shingle roof
2. Modify the front stone skirting and column bases to feature stucco
3. Remove up to four (4) window openings in the rear of the side elevations

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure at 420 Devine was constructed circa 1905 in the Craftsman style, first appears on the 1911 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Lavaca Historic District. Prior to recent work without approval, the one-story single family structure featured primary hipped roof with a front face gabled window bay and an inset porch with tapered wood columns on faux stone bases and skirting, 1 1/2" wood lap siding, wood sash windows, and standing seam metal roofing material.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on April 2, 2020, staff found that the property at 420 Devine was subject to work without approval including: (a) wholesale replacement of natural lawn with decomposed granite, (b) replacement of wrought iron railing with inappropriate wood railing, (c) replacement of non-conforming shutters, (d) column removal, (e) gable grille removal, (f) change in roofing material, (g) stucco application to skirting and column base, and (i) rear window removal. The applicant has committed to working with staff to correct items a through e, while items f through i as proposed must be heard at a Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.
- c. ROOFING MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to change the standing seam metal roof with composition shingles. 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 1911 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.
- d. FOUNDATION & COLUMNS – The applicant has proposed to modify the front foundation skirting and columns bases by grinding down the faux stone masonry and applying stucco and paint. Staff finds that the modifications are a departure from the Craftsman style and are inconsistent the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations for Architectural Features: Porches, Balconies, and Porte-Cocheres 7.B.iii. through v. and Foundations 8.B.i. The porch

column bases and foundation skirting should be reconstruction based on photographic evidence or the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns (such as brick or wood column bases and wood or Hardie lap skirting). Staff also remains concerned about the craftsmanship of the modifications as performed.

- e. WINDOW REMOVAL – Staff finds that up to four (4) window openings have been removed in rear of the side elevations, based the patched siding on the driveway on northwest elevation and a March 2019 Google Street View of the southeast elevation. If the applicant is unable to produce evidence that windows were removed prior to the period of enforcement, then staff finds that the window openings should be restored according to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. and the *Standard Specifications for Wood Window Replacement*.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items 1 through 3 based on the findings. The applicant may work with staff to achieve compliance including:

- i. Restoring the roofing material in accordance with *Specifications for Metal Roofs*
- ii. Restoring the porch and foundation skirting based on photographic evidence or appropriate Craftsman features
- iii. Restoring the rear window openings in accordance with *Standard Specifications for Wood Window Replacement*.

**CASE COMMENT:**

On a site visit conducted on April 2, 2020, staff found that the property at 420 Devine was subject to work without approval including: (a) wholesale replacement of natural lawn with decomposed granite, (b) replacement of wrought iron railing with generic wood railing, (c) replacement of non-conforming shutters, (d) column removal, (e) gable grille removal, (f) change in roofing material, (g) stucco application to skirting and column base, and (i) rear window removal. The applicant has committed to working with staff to correct items a through e, while items f through i as proposed must be heard at a Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to deny, and if the application shows proof of removal before owner purchased, if so, it does not need to be placed back.  
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

- *Commissioner Grube returned to meeting at 4:58pm*

- **Item # 24. HDRC NO. 2020-225**

ADDRESS: 7519 OLD CORPUS CHRISTI RD  
APPLICANT: ZABRINA SILVA/COMET SIGNS LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 7519 Old Corpus Christi Road to include 1 set of internally illuminated channel letters that are to read “Self Storage”. The proposed signage will feature approximately fifty-eight (58) square feet in size.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. he applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at 7519 Old Corpus Christi Road to include 1 set of internally illuminated channel letters that are to read “Self Storage”. The proposed signage will feature approximately fifty-eight (58) square feet in size, and will be located on the east elevation of the structure.
- b. PREVIOUS APPROVALS – The Historic and Design Review Commission approved approximately 235 square feet of signage at this address on May 20, 2020. At that time, signage was proposed on both the north and east elevations of the structure.
- c. SIGNAGE AMOUNT & SIZE – The Unified Development Code, Section 35-678(e) notes that signage should be proportioned to the structure that it is to be located on, and that total signage for applications should not exceed fifty (50) square feet, unless additional signage and/or square footage is approved by the Commission, as it was previously. Generally, staff finds the additional signage to be redundant in location as there is already approved signage on the east elevation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube move to approve as submitted.  
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

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

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

• **Item # 25. HDRC NO. 2020-205**

ADDRESS: 125 W GRAMERCY PLACE

APPLICANT: HICKS DALE & THERESA ERIN

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to modify the existing front fenestration of the rear garage to include three single bay garage doors.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 125 W Gramercy is a 2-story residential structure constructed circa 1925 in the Colonial style. The home features a stucco façade, ganged wood windows on the second floor and wood windows with divided lites on the first floor, and a prominent front entry with pilasters. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The property also contains a 1-story rear accessory structure, also contributing to the district.

- b. **GARAGE MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the fenestration of the rear accessory structure. The structure currently contains a single bay garage door, pedestrain door with stairs, and windows. The window assemblies are not original and are not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines. The applicant has proposed to modify the elevation to feature three single bay garage doors. The applicant provided original blueprints that indicate the original configuration of the garage featured two bays and a maids quarters. Based on these elevations, the easternmost third of the structure maintains its original configuration, including a window and a door with steps. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, existing openings should be preserved. Previous openings should be restored with sufficient documentation. Replacement garage doors should be compatible with those found on historic garages in the district (e.g., wood paneled) as well as with the principal structure. Staff finds that restoring the original second garage door bay is appropriate, but finds that installing a third bay where the maids quarter originally existed inappropriate.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant retains the door, stairs, and window on the easternmost portion of the front elevation as noted in finding b. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings that reflect this change.
- ii. That the applicant submits accurate, measured, permit-level elevation and plan drawings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iii. That the applicant submits final material specifications for review and approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube move to approve with item 2 and 3 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES, and 4 NAYS. 2 ABSENT**

- ***Commissioner Fernandez, Fish, and Bowman left meeting at 5:26pm***

- **Item # 26. HDRC NO. 2020-216**

ADDRESS: 2160 W SUMMIT AVE

APPLICANT: Sarah Manzke/MANZKE SARAH S & MARC D &

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install two additional feet of height to the existing 6-foot-high rear privacy fence.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property at 2160 W Summit Carolina is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1920. It features a composition shingle cross-hip roof with wide overhanging eaves, a front façade chimney with decorative features, painted brick cladding, and six-over-six windows. It 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend the approval based on findings a through b.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

Motion: Commissioner Grube move to approve as submitted.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 4 AYES, and 2 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

**ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer  
Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey Fetzer', written over the printed name and title.