



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**OFFICIAL MINUTES**  
**01 July 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, July 1, 2020, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

- Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

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

Absent: Fernandez, Martinez-Flores, Grube, and Bowman.

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** NONE.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
  - Item #1, Case No. 2020-280 101 E AGARITA AVE
  - Item #2, Case No. 2020-268 107 S PINE ST
  - Item #3, Case No. 2020-279 110 LEXINGTON AVE/El Tropicano Hotel
  - Item #4, Case No. 2020-258 122 BOSTON/126 BOSTON
  - Item #5, Case No. 2020-283 1434 W ROSEWOOD AVE
  - Item #6, Case No. 2020-259 222 W MULBERRY AVE
  - Item #7, Case No. 2020-278 812 BURLESON ST
  - Item #8, Case No. 2020-275 222 W WOODLAWN AVE
  - Item #9, Case No. 2020-257 263 FELISA ST
  - Item #10, Case No. 2020-277 901 CAMDEN ST
  - Item #11, Case No. 2020-274 2231 W MAGNOLIA AVE
  - Item #12, Case No. 2020-253 337 W COMMERCE ST
  - Item #13, Case No. 2020-282 3503 MARTIN LUTHER KING DR
  - Item #14, Case No. 2020-271 404 E MULBERRY AVE
  - Item #15, Case No. 2020-276 603 CEDAR ST
  - Item #16, Case No. 2020-267 610 E LOCUST
  - Item #17, Case No. 2020-235 641 S FLORES ST
  - Item #18, Case No. 2020-269 717 E GUENTHER ST
  - Item #19, Case No. 2020-261 410 BARRERA, 414 BARRERA
  - Item #21, Case No. 2020-263 US 90 underpass near the intersection of Mission

Rd and Steves Ave

- o Item #22, Case No. 2020-256      515 N PALMETTO
- o Item #23, Case No. 2020-260      623 MUNCEY

- AGENDA ITEM 20 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS

**Motion:**            Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent Agenda items 1-19 and 21-23 with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

**Action:**            **THE MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES, 0 NAYS. 4 ABSENT**

- **COMMISSIONER BOWMAN CHIMMED IN MEETING AT 3:16PM**

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS**

- **Item # 20. HDRC NO. 2020-255**  
ADDRESS: 422 FAYN WAY  
Applicant: Juan Fernandez/CVF LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, 2-story residential structure on the vacant lot at 422 Fayn Way. The existing lot is located to the immediate north of the two story, historic structure located at 421 Hays.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, 2-story residential structure on the vacant lot at 422 Fayn Way. The lot is positioned to the rear of the lot addressed as 421 Hays, a two story historic structure.
- 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. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – Fayn Way currently features access points to the rear of lots addressed to Hays and Lamar, as well as small rear accessory structures. This block of Hays features five historic structures with a southern facing orientation, two of which feature two stories in height.
- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has noted a setback from Fayn Way of approximately twenty (20) feet. While there are accessory

- structures built on the alley, there is not an established setback pattern for the alley. Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed a primary entrance toward the south, which is the interior of the lot. Staff finds that entrance elements should be incorporated into the design that address the alley. Appropriate entrance elements would include porch massing.
  - f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The applicant has proposed for both structures to be two stories in height, with an overall height of twenty-five (25) feet, which is subordinate to that of the historic structure at 421 Hays. Given its location and setback from a primary street, staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate.
  - g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block of Hays feature foundation heights of at least two feet in height. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines regarding foundation heights.
  - h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for both structures to feature front facing gabled roofs. Staff finds that the proposed roof forms are appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.
  - i. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant's proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
  - j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding and standing seam metal roofs. Staff finds that composite siding should feature an exposure of four inches, a smooth finish, a thickness of approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$ " , and mitered corners. If cedar siding is used, it should be installed in a lapped profile. Regarding the standing seam metal roof, staff finds that panels should feature 18 to 21 inches in width, seams should feature 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish should be used, and either a crimped ridge seam, or a low-profile ridge cap should be installed.
  - k. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff finds that windows that are consistent with staff's standards for windows in new construction should be installed.
  - l. **FENESTRATION PROFILE** – The applicant has proposed fenestration profiles that are generally in keeping with those found historically within the district; however, staff finds that windows on both the north and south facades should be exposed, and not hidden by screening. Where fenestration does not exist on the north and south façades, staff finds that fenestration should be added.
  - m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – As noted in findings e and k, staff finds that additional architectural elements should be added to the north and south facades to further promote their relationship with Fayn Way and the adjacent historic structures.
  - n. **PARKING** – The applicant has proposed pull in parking off of the alley. Fayn Way is primarily used to access the rear yards of properties that address Hays and Lamar. In these instances, parking pads, driveways and informal parking conditions exist. Generally, staff finds the proposed parking to be appropriate.
  - o. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant has noted the screening of mechanical equipment by fencing. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

- p. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted conceptual landscaping information. Staff finds that a detailed landscaping plan that is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements should be submitted when further developing the project.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That the applicant incorporate additional entrance elements on the alley façade (north façade) as noted in finding e, to include traditional porch massing.
- ii. That the applicant comply with the Guidelines regarding foundation heights as noted in finding g.
- iii. That siding feature an exposure of four inches, a smooth finish, a thickness of approximately ¾” and mitered corners. Additionally, the standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a standard galvalume finish, and either a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate windows that meet staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction as noted in finding j.
- v. That the applicant install additional window fenestration on the north and south facades, consistent with that of historic structures found in the district.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Conservation Society- opposes to the project because of the massing and the density-it’s out of character.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to postpone the case.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES AND 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT**

- **Item # 24. HDRC NO. 2020-230**  
ADDRESS: 418 BARRERA  
APPLICANT: Thomas Stamp/Currahee Property Solutions LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct four (4), multi-story, residential structures on the vacant lot at 418 Barrera, located within the Lavaca Historic District. The lot is currently subdivided into four separate parcels.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct four (4), multi-story, residential structures on the vacant lot at 418 Barrera, located within the Lavaca Historic District. The lot is currently subdivided into four separate parcels. This item was heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 17, 2020, where it was continued to a future HDRC hearing.
- b. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – As noted in finding a, this lot is currently void of any structures. This parcel is located at the northeastern edge of the district, adjacent

- to a vacant lot, and a lot where the Historic and Design Review Commission has previously approved construction featuring multiple stories in height. There are both residential and non-residential structure in the immediate vicinity that feature multiple stories in height.
- c. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – As noted in finding a, this lot is currently void of any structures. This parcel is located at the northeastern edge of the district, adjacent to a vacant lot, and a lot where the Historic and Design Review Commission has previously approved construction featuring multiple stories in height. There are both residential and non-residential structure in the immediate vicinity that feature multiple stories in height.
  - d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback that is equal to that of the adjacent historic structure. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate. Regarding orientation, the applicant has begun to incorporate architectural elements that address Barrera. Staff finds that additional elements should be added to the Barrera elevation, to provide a visual orientation toward Barrera, such as additional porch elements. The proposed new construction should appear to address Barrera, rather than simply feature minor architectural elements that relate to Barrera.
  - e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed an entrance to face Barrera; however, as noted in finding d, staff finds that additional entrance elements should be addressed toward Barrera, to relate to entrances found historically on the block.
  - f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. The applicant has proposed an overall height of approximately twenty-seven (27) feet for the front structure, and an overall height of approximately twenty-nine (29) feet for the three rear structures. The applicant has submitted a street elevation noting the proposed front structure’s massing in relationship to the adjacent historic structures. Generally, staff finds the overall height and massing of the proposed first structure to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should eliminate the third story from the rear three structures. As proposed, the third story structure features a flat roof.
  - g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. The applicant has noted an overall foundation height of one (1) foot. The adjacent historic structures feature foundation heights of approximately two to three feet. Generally, staff finds the proposed foundation heights to be appropriate.
  - h. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include side gables and shed roofs over entrances. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. roofs.
  - i. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed lot coverage exceeds that which is recommended by the Guidelines.
  - j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding, standing seam metal roofs, and composition shingle roofs. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate; however, staff finds that standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a

standard galvalume finish, and a crimped ridge seam or low profile ridge cap. If a ridge cap is proposed, it should be submitted to staff for review and approval. Additionally, staff finds that all siding should feature an exposure of four (4) inches or less (as proposed), smooth finishes, a thickness of ¾ of an inch and mitered corners. The applicant has noted that staff's stipulations will be followed.

- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff finds that a window that meets staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction should be used. These specifications are noted above, in the applicable citations.
- l. FENESTRATION PROFILE – The applicant has proposed a fenestration profile that is generally consistent with those found historically throughout the district. Staff finds that all square picture windows should be modified to feature profiles that are consistent with those found historically within the district, and that all windows should feature a one over one profile.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in finding e, staff finds that additional entrance elements should be introduced to the proposed new construction, specifically in relationship to the front structure's street facing façade. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed third story massing should be eliminated.
- n. DRIVEWAY – The applicant has proposed a driveway width of fifteen (15) feet in width. The Guidelines for Site Elements notes that driveways within historic districts should not feature more than ten (10) feet in width.
- o. PARKING – The applicant has proposed tuck under parking for each structure in the form of carports without garage doors. While not located on the front façade, staff finds that parking located within the footprint of the structure is inappropriate within historic district.
- p. PARKING (FRONT STRUCTURE) – The applicant has proposed a gravel parking location within the front yard setback of the proposed structure that is to address Barrera. The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. notes that front yard parking should not be added into the front yard setbacks. Staff finds the proposed parking location to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- q. WALKWAY – Historic structures within the Lavaca Historic District feature walkways leading from the front porch to the sidewalk at the public right of way. Staff finds that this should be incorporated into the applicant's front yard design.
- r. LANDSCAPING – At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding landscaping. A detailed landscaping plan should be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval. Landscaping should be consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- s. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted on the site plan that mechanical equipment will be screened.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval at this time based on findings a through s. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to receiving a recommendation for approval:

- i. That the applicant incorporate addition entrance elements on the street facing façade such as traditional porch elements as noted in findings d and e.
- ii. That the applicant eliminate the third story massing as noted in finding f.
- iii. That the applicant propose a lot coverage that is consistent with Guidelines, as noted in finding i.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate windows that meet staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction as noted in finding k.

- v. That the applicant incorporate a driveway width that is consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding n
- vi. That the applicant eliminate the front yard parking as noted in finding p and eliminate parking within the footprint of the proposed new construction as noted in finding o.
- vii. That the applicant incorporate a front yard walkway and submit a detailed landscaping plan as noted in findings q and r.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Conservation Society concurs with staff recommendations to deny conceptual approval..

**Motion:** Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations 1,4-5, and 7. Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES AND 0 NAY. 4 ABSENT**

- **Item # 25. HDRC NO. 2020-251**  
ADDRESS: 2158 W KINGS HWY  
APPLICANT: John Speegle, speegle & KIM-davis Architecture

**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 subsequent 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. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The request was referred to a Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting at the Historic and Design Commission (HDRC) at the May 20, 2020 hearing. The applicant met with DRC on May 28 and June 9, 2020. The committee members emphasized the need to reintroduce the arch forms, full height brick siding, recessing of the windows and doors to reference the depth of original porch columns in order to garner support for enclosure. The applicant explained that restoring the arch forms is in infeasible and submitted an update that includes references to the primary historic structure’s stucco and Tudor fenestration elements. The request was reset at the June 17, 2020 hearing for the applicant to revise and resubmit. The applicant submitted a proposal that now features front facing doors in an attempt to reintroduce the height and depth of the original arches.

- d. **PORCH ENCLOSURE** – The applicant has proposed to demolish the arched porch and reconstruct as an enclosed room with a salvaged brick masonry base recessed steel windows, and stucco siding with Tudor-influenced trim. 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:** Conservation Society of San Antonio- concurs to deny conceptual approval.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved for approval as submitted- and no lines of the boards and brick slopes to match boards.  
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 4 AYES AND 3 NAY. 4 ABSENT**

- **COMMISSIONER FISH REJOINED MEETING AT 4:05PM**
- **Item # 26. HDRC NO. 2020-252**  
ADDRESS: 328 E JOSEPHINE  
APPLICANT: Kristen Weber/Don B. McDonald, Architect

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Eliminate the south facing clerestory window and install a north facing clerestory window on the Boehler's Bar structure.
2. Add three, north facing window to the Boehler's Bar structure.
3. Construct a restaurant structure utilizing the doors, windows, exterior materials, chimney brick and interior siding of the Boehler's House, where feasible. The Boehler's House will be demolished.
4. Shift the previously proposed north stone wall to the south to act as a parapet wall to the Boehler's Bar kitchen addition.
5. Create two barbeque pits and roofs with exhaust vents in the Boehler's Bar kitchen courtyard.
6. Extend the previously approved arbor structure the full length of the parking lot to Josephine Street.
7. Construct a brick walk beneath the arbor structure and adjacent to the walkway to run from the Boehler's Bar north across the concrete parking lot to Josephine Street.
8. Construct a site wall to be located at the corner of Josephine and Avenue A to span the length of the original location of Boehler's and at the corner of the property along Josephine. Two additional low walls are proposed at the Josephine Street parking approach and the Avenue A pedestrian circulation.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to amend the previously

approved design for Boehler's Bar and House, located at 328 E Josephine. Previous designs were approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on March 6, 2019, and February 5, 2020. These structures are located within the River Improvement Overlay, District 2, and are not zoned historic.

- b. CLERESTORY WINDOW – The applicant has proposed to eliminate the previously approved south facing clerestory window and construct a north facing clerestory window. This design amendment is not proposed on a primary façade, and staff finds it to be appropriate. The proposed windows should be consistent with those existing on the structure in regards to their profile, materials and installation depth.
- c. WINDOW ADDITIONS – The applicant has proposed to install three, north facing windows on the ground floor of the Boehler's Bar structure. Staff finds the proposed windows to be appropriate; however, their materials and installation are to match those previously existing on the structure.
- d. NEW CONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to construct a new restaurant structure to replace the existing structure, commonly known as Boehler's House. The applicant has proposed to demolish Boehler's House, and to construct a new structure using the doors, windows, exterior materials, chimney brick and interior siding of the Boehler's House, where feasible. The Boehler's House is not a designated historic property and is eligible for demolition. If the HDRC approves the request as proposed, a demolition permit will be issued administratively by staff.
- e. NEW CONSTRUCTION – As noted in finding d, the applicant has proposed to construct a restaurant structure adjacent to the historic Boehler's Bar. The applicant has proposed an overall massing, height, materials, and architectural form that are appropriate and consistent with the UDC. Additionally, the applicant has incorporated the proposed new construction into a campus-like setting, which is appropriate and consistent with the UDC. Staff finds that materials that are not deteriorated beyond use be salvaged and incorporated into the new construction. If materials that are salvageable are not planned to be used in the proposed new construction, they should be salvaged for use at another historic property.
- f. STONE WALL – The previously approved design included a north wall on the property line that was to act as a screening element. The applicant has proposed to shift this wall to the south to be adjacent to the previously approved additions. The relocated wall will act as a wall to the addition. Staff finds the proposed relocation of the rear wall to be appropriate.
- g. BARBEQUE PITS – To the interior of the proposed development, the applicant has proposed to install two barbeque pits and a roof structure to feature two exhaust vents. These barbeque pits will be internal to the site, and staff finds their location to be appropriate.
- h. ARBOR EXTENSION – The applicant has proposed to extend the previously approved arbor structure the full length of the parking lot to Josephine Street. Staff finds this extension to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- i. BRICK WALK – The applicant has proposed to construct a brick walk beneath the arbor structure and adjacent to the walkway to run from the Boehler's Bar north across the concrete parking lot to Josephine Street. Staff finds the proposed brick walk to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- j. PARKING LOT WALLS – The applicant has proposed to construct a site wall to be located at the corner of Josephine and Avenue A to span the length of the original location of Boehler's and at the corner of the property along Josephine. Two additional low walls are proposed at the Josephine Street parking approach and the Avenue A pedestrian circulation. Staff finds the proposal to screen parking from the public right of way to be appropriate, and find the proposed

methods and materials to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the overall height of the walls should not exceed six (6) feet in height, per the UDC.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the amendment to the location of the proposed clerestory windows based on finding b with the stipulation that windows match those existing in regards to profile, material and installation depth.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the installation of three new windows on the south façade based on finding c with the stipulation that windows match those existing in regards to profile, material and installation depth.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, the construction of a new restaurant structure with the stipulation that materials from the Boehler’s House be salvaged for use in the new construction, or use at another historic property. The Boehler’s House is not a designated historic property and is eligible for demolition. If the HDRC approves the request as proposed, a demolition permit will be issued administratively by staff.
4. Staff recommends approval of the relocation of the northern brick wall as submitted based on finding e.
5. Staff recommends approval of the proposed barbeque pit addition as submitted based on finding f.
6. Staff recommends approval of the proposed arbor extension as submitted based on finding g.
7. Staff recommends approval of the proposed brick walkway based as submitted based on finding h.
8. Staff recommends approval of the proposed parking lot walls based on finding i with the stipulation that the proposed walls do not exceed six (6) feet in height.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Conservation Society of San Antonio opposes demolition, and supports relocation; and, Federica Kushner agrees with recommendation concerning the Boehler House and Boehler Bar Building.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 RECUSAL. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item # 27. HDRC NO. 2020-272**  
ADDRESS: 2110 W KINGS HWY  
APPLICANT: Robert Guerrero /JR Guerrero Roofing

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing asphalt shingles and install a standing seam metal roof.

## **FINDINGS:**

- a. The property located at 2110 W Kings Hwy is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including a cross gable configuration with steep roof pitches, a textured stucco facade, and a prominent side stone chimney. The home also features an attached carport with a gothic-influenced archway. The home is a contributing structure in the Monticello Park Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace an existing composition shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof.
- b. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920's, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to its fire resistance, ability to be customized in regards to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation. Often marketed as being able to mimic the appearance of slate tile roofs, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material for Tudor Revival Style homes throughout the 20th century.
- c. According to Sanborn Maps, homes in the Monticello Park Historic District were originally constructed with asphalt, clay barrel tile, or cementitious tile roofs. There does not appear to be a historic precedent for metal roofs in this area except in limited uses specific to front porch stoops on very few homes.
- d. Staff performed a windshield survey of the surrounding blocks within the Monticello Park Historic District on June 18, 2020, to determine if many of the roofs in the area had been replaced with standing seam metal. Overall in the district, approximately 20 of over 1,200 homes feature a roof replacement.
- e. In general, the proliferation of the Tudor Revival Style in the United States represents a movement which rejects industrialization in favor of a more hand-crafted aesthetic. Tudor Revival homes, such as the one at 2110 W Kings Hwy, often featured local materials. Roofs were typically shingled (usually with wood, slate or composition shingles).
- f. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should only be installed on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a metal roof is not appropriate for this style of house or within the context of the Monticello Park Historic District, regardless of whether this application of materials is regionally popular.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding f. Staff recommends that an in-kind replacement of asphalt shingles be installed. If metal is desired by the applicant for its lifespan, then staff recommends a metal product that mimics the appearance of traditional shingles based on finding e.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

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

**Action:**           **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES AND 0 NAY. 1 RECUSAL. 3 ABSENT**

• **Item #28. HDRC NO. 2020-281**

ADDRESS: 311 CEDAR ST

APPLICANT: Gabriel Rosa/Property Solution Experts LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to paint the exterior brick of the historic structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The structure located at 250 Thorain is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1950. It first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The house is rectangular in plan and features a side gable composition shingle roof with overhanging eaves, two-tone brick veneer, aluminum windows, and an attached two-car garage. The property is contributing to the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District.
- b. PAINTING – The applicant is requesting approval to paint the brick façade of the historic structure a neutral color with Romabio Masonry Textured pure potassium silicate paint. The existing brick is unpainted and was not originally painted. Guideline 2.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that applicants avoid painting historically unpainted surfaces. The Guidelines state that exceptions may be made for severely deteriorated material where other consolidation or stabilization methods are not appropriate. The two-toned brick veneer is a character defining feature of the structure and staff does not find that painting the historically unpainted brick will mitigate the ongoing cracking in the building envelope. Staff does not find the painting of the façade to be appropriate.
- c. According to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, historically unpainted brick should not be painted. Brick structures built prior to the 1870s were largely constructed of handmade bricks, which were generally softer, more porous, and weaker than bricks made at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These handmade bricks were frequently painted or coated because the strength of the brick was insufficient without a coating for stabilization. However, as machine-made bricks became the standard during the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, bricks became inherently stronger and did not require paint or coatings for protection and strength. These bricks commonly featured harder “dress” surfaces, which were meant to face the exterior of the structure and remain unpainted. 250 Thorain was constructed circa 1950 and was historically unpainted. Painting historically unpainted brick on structures of this era can lead to trapped water in the porous material, eventually destroying the brick due to the damaging effects of water infiltration and freeze-thaw cycles. Unpainted brick of this era is inherently high strength and low maintenance on its own. Once these structures are painted, consistent repainting is required to maintain the aesthetics of the brick.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

**Vote:**           **Ayes:** Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.  
                  **Nay:** None.

Absent: Fernandez, Martinez-Flores and Grube.

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

- *Commissioner Arreola and Bowman left the Meeting at 5:00pm*

- **Item # 29. HDRC NO. 2020-273**

ADDRESS: 504 KING WILLIAM

APPLICANT: Daniel Cruz/Design Coop

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 6-foot tall masonry and steel fence in the front and side yard.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 504 King William is a 2-story single family home constructed in 1883 and is designed in an eclectic style with Queen Anne influences. The home was designed by prolific architect Alfred Giles. The home underwent a major renovation in 1915, which added the turret, the carved stone decorative band, and the existing square porch columns. The structure is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. FENCING: LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install new masonry and steel fencing in the front and side yards of the property. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist should be avoided, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. This property currently features a very low front yard fence of similar materials. Front yard fencing is an established historic pattern of fencing along King William St. Based on a historic photo, a front yard fence historically existed on this property. Staff finds new fencing appropriate based on the specific context of this property and street.
- c. FENCING: HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed a six foot tall front and side yard fence comprised of a masonry base and capped columns with steel fencing. According to the Guidelines, the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. If a taller fence or wall existed historically, additional height may be considered. As noted in finding b, based on a historic photo of the structure, a front yard fence used to exist on the property that is similar in scale and design as the fencing across the street at the Steves Homestead. The fencing does not appear to eclipse four feet. Staff does not find a six foot fence to be appropriate. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the height to a maximum of four feet to adhere to the Historic Design Guidelines.
- d. FENCING: DESIGN – The applicant has proposed a fence design comprised of a masonry base and capped columns with steel fencing. The applicant has proposed to include growing vines on the entirety of the fence. According to the Guidelines, new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. The design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. While staff generally finds the masonry and steel materiality and configuration to be characteristic of the district and, in particular, King William St, staff does not find the concealment of the fencing with vines and plantings to be consistent in terms of transparency and character. In addition to the Historic Design Guidelines, the UDC Section 35-614 for fencing requires that front yard fences be predominantly open. Staff finds that the proposed vegetation should be removed from the fence design.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of front yard fencing based on findings a through d with the following stipulations:

- i. That the steel fencing be reduced in height to a maximum of 4 feet noted in finding c. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings to staff for review and approval that reflects this change.
- ii. That the applicant removes the proposed greenery from the fencing to adhere to predominantly open front yard fencing requirements outlined in UDC Section 35-614 as noted in finding d.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Conservation Society of San Antonio- opposed to the proposed fence heights, and concurs with staff finding and recommendation.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

• **Item # 30. HDRC NO. 2020-264**

ADDRESS: 223 BRAHAN BLVD  
APPLICANT: Dillon Bomba/Window World

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace two (2) existing wood windows with new vinyl windows located at the rear of the primary structure.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary historic structure at 223 Brahan was constructed circa 1920, is first featured on the 1922 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Westfort Historic District. The two-story, multi-family structure features stucco siding, a flat roof with clay barrel tile skirting, and two sizes of one-over-one wood sash windows.
- b. **EXISTING WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to replace two (2) wood windows on the northwest corner of the structure, facing, but not visible from Broadway. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., 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 windows are in a repairable condition and should not be replaced.
- c. **REPLACEMENT WINDOWS** – Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.iv., 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 and in compliance with the *Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement*. Staff finds that the proposed windows do not match the existing windows in material, depth, trim, and color, and are not consistent with the Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend replacement based on finding b; the existing, wood windows should be repaired.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

• **Item # 31. HDRC NO. 2020-270**

ADDRESS: 563 E CRAIG PLACE

APPLICANT: Alexis Bondoc/Bondoc Roofing

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing composition shingle roof and install a standing seam metal roof.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property located at 563 E Craig Pl is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style. The home features several quintessential elements of the style, including a cross gable configuration with steep roof pitches, decorative half-timbering in the front gable, and a gabled entry with prominent timbering. The home is a contributing structure in the River Road Historic District. The applicant is requesting approval to replace an existing composition shingle roof with a new standing seam metal roof.
- b. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920’s, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to its fire resistance, ability to be customized in regards to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation. Often marketed as being able to mimic the appearance of slate tile roofs, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material for Tudor Revival Style homes throughout the 20th century.
- c. According to Sanborn Maps, Tudor Revival-style homes in the River Road Historic District were originally constructed with asphalt, clay barrel tile, or cementitious tile roofs. There does not appear to be a historic precedent for metal roofs in this area for Tudor Revival residential structures except in limited uses specific to front porch stoops on very few homes. Metal roofs are common on Craftsman and Minimal Traditional style structures in the vicinity.
- d. In general, the proliferation of the Tudor Revival Style in the United States represents a movement which rejects industrialization in favor of a more hand-crafted aesthetic. Tudor Revival homes, such as the one at 1919 W Gramercy Place, often featured intricate detailing and local material. Roofs were typically shingled (usually with wood, slate or composition shingles).
- e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should only be installed on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a metal roof is not appropriate for

this style of house or within the context of the River Road Historic District, regardless of whether this application of materials is regionally popular.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding e. Staff recommends that an in-kind replacement of asphalt shingles be installed. If metal is desired by the applicant for its lifespan, then staff recommends a metal product that mimics the appearance of traditional shingles based on finding d.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

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

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

• **Item # 32. HDRC NO. 2020-225**

ADDRESS: 347 FURR DR

APPLICANT: RODERICK MCKINLEY SR/DECORUM CONSTRUCTION, LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove the existing rear addition to construct a new 550 square foot rear addition.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The historic structure at 347 Furr was constructed circa 1930 in the Tudor Revival style, is first featured on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The one-story, single-family structure features brick masonry facades, an arched front porch, entryway, and buttress, and steep front and side-facing gable roofs.
- b. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to remove the existing, non-historic addition to construct a 515 square foot rear addition to feature matching shingle roofing, HardiePlank siding, and vinyl picture windows (Inspire Vinyl PW).
- c. ADDITION VISUAL IMPACT & CONTEXT – The applicant has proposed to set the addition to the rear of the structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., applicants should site residential additions at the side or rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way. Staff finds the proposed orientation appropriate.
- d. ADDITION ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed to construct a hipped and rear-facing gabled roof from the existing height of the historic roof. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iii., applicants should utilize a similar roof pitch, form, overhang, and orientation as the historic structure for additions. Staff finds the proposed roof plan appropriate.
- e. ADDITION TRANSITION – The applicant has proposed to feature an inset of approximately 6 inches between side elevations and a change in materials between wall

planes. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.iv., applicants should utilize a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms. Staff finds that the proposed addition features an appropriate transition between new and old forms.

- f. **ADDITION FOOTPRINT** – The applicant has proposed an additional 515 square feet to the existing 1672 square foot footprint of the historic structure. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv., 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; and residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. Staff finds the proposed additional square footage appropriate.
- g. **ADDITION HEIGHT** –The applicant has proposed to construct the addition roof forms approximately 2 feet below the maximum height of the historic roof. Per the Guidelines for Additions 1.B.v., generally, the height of new additions should be consistent with the height of the existing structure; the maximum height of new additions should be determined by examining the line-of-sight or visibility from the street; and the addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate.
- h. **ADDITION MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to feature matching shingle roofing, HardiePlank siding with faux wood grain texture, and vinyl picture windows (Inspire Vinyl PW). Per the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., applicant 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 structure. Staff finds the roofing material to be appropriate. However, staff finds that stucco siding is a more appropriate material than the proposed HardiePlank in relation to the brick masonry historic structure. The stucco should feature a color that matches the brick, and should feature textures that are comparable with those found historically in the district.
- i. **ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed to feature matching shingle roofing, HardiePlank siding, and vinyl picture windows (Inspire Vinyl PW), shake shingle gables and brackets, a rear deck with two sets of double doors Per the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i., applicants 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. Staff finds the proposed details generally appropriate with the exclusion of the wood lap siding with faux wood grain texture and the vinyl picture windows, which are addressed in finding h.
- j. **ADDITION FENESTRATION & WINDOWS** – The applicant has proposed to install five (5) vinyl picture windows (Inspire Vinyl PW). Staff finds that the proposed quantity and location of the new windows appropriate. However, staff finds that the window size, configuration, and depth profile do not adhere to the *Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction*. The applicant should submit a oneover- one sash window that matches the size and depth profile of windows found on the historic structure and updated elevation drawings prior the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That stucco siding is used instead of the proposed HardiePlank siding, and that the stucco should feature a color that matches the brick, and should feature textures that are comparable with those found historically in the district.

mtg minutes 7/1/20

- ii. That the applicant should submit a one-over-one sash window that matches the size and depth profile of windows found on the historic structure and updated elevation drawings prior the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

**Motion:** Commissioner Fish move to approve with staff stipulations and that the HardiePlank siting would have smooth finish instead wood grain texture.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

**Action:** **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 5 ABSENT**

**ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer  
Chair

7/16/20