



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
15 July 2020

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, July 15, 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, Grube, Fetzer, and Laffoon.

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

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

PUBLIC COMMENTS: MONICA SAVINO- ON BEHAVE OF SEVERAL DIGNOWITY HILL NEIGHBORS- DISCUSSION OF THE AMMENDED UDC GUIDELINES WILL BE APPLIED FAIRLY ACROSS BOARD.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
 - Item #2, Case No. 2020-299 120 CALLAGHAN AVE
 - Item #3, Case No. 2020-268 15551 NACOGDOCHES RD/ComancheLookout Park
 - Item #4, Case No. 2020-300 2323 BUENA VISTA ST
 - Item #5, Case No. 2020-295 2146 W GRAMERCY PLACE
 - Item #6, Case No. 2020-301 304 E COURTLAND PLACE
 - Item #7, Case No. 2020-293 237 W HUISACHE AVE
 - Item #8, Case No. 2020-313 607 E LOCUST
 - Item #9, Case No. 2020-309 126 GUADALUPE ST/San Pedro Creek
 - Item #10, Case No. 2020-298 250 MARY LOUISE
 - Item #11, Case No. 2020-289 250 BENITA ST
 - Item #12, Case No. 2020-296 103 W JOHNSON
 - Item #13, Case No. 2020-303 501 HAYS ST
 - Item #14, Case No. 2020-285 119 E KINGS HWY
 - Item #15, Case No. 2020-290 3218 KAISER DR/ Jupe Manor NeighborhoodPark
 - Item #16, Case No. 2020-302 619 BARBE ST

- AGENDA ITEM 1 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 18 WAS WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT
- AGENDA ITEM 28 WAS POSTPONED UNTIL FOLLOWING HEARING.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve the consent Agenda items 2-16 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS

- **Item # 1. HDRC NO. 2020-306**
ADDRESS: 118 BOSTON
Applicant: Ben Bowman/Amibo Microestates LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a multi-family residential development on the vacant lot located at 118 Boston, within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed new construction will feature two, 2-story structures connected by an elevated deck.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a multi-family residential development on the vacant lot located at 118 Boston, within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The proposed new construction will feature two, 2-story structures connected by an elevated deck.
- b. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – The context and historic development pattern of Boston Street features 1-story, single family residential structures. Recently, the Historic and Design Review Commission has approved new construction featuring 2-story structures. Additionally, under a separate owner and applicant, the Commission has conceptually approved new construction of a 1- story, single-family residential structure on this lot.
- c. **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 front setback that is consistent with that of the neighboring historic structure, and an orientation that addresses Boston Street. Generally, staff finds that both the proposed setback and orientation are appropriate; however, staff finds that a setback that is greater than that of the neighboring historic structure's setback would be appropriate as it may promote a reduced perception of the proposed 2-story massing.

- d. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Generally, staff finds the proposed lot coverage to be appropriate.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. primary building entrances should be orientated towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed a primary entrance that is oriented toward Boston Street. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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 26' – 7" for the northern structure, and an overall height of 25' – 4" for the southern structure. The applicant has submitted a street elevation noting the proposed new construction in context with the existing, historic structures on the block. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing to be appropriate; however, staff finds that a height or massing transition from the proposed new construction to the adjacent historic structures would be appropriate, if used.
- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., applicants should align foundation and floor-to-floor heights within one foot of floor-to-floor heights on adjacent historic structures. Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has proposed foundation and floor heights that are consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that additional consideration should be given to reduce the visual impact of the proposed concrete foundations, such as an application of stucco or another foundation skirting material.
- h. **ROOF FORMS** – The applicant has proposed for both of the new structures to feature front facing gabled roofs. Gabled roofs are found historically within the district, and are consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Per the submitted elevations, the applicant has proposed window and door openings that are generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include standing seam metal roofs, finished concrete, tri-coat stucco, weathered cedar siding, and double-hung, clad wood windows. Generally staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate; however, staff finds that the applicant should vary siding profiles and exposures and that stucco applications should be traditional in nature and should not include contemporary seams and expansion joints. The proposed standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a

- low profile ridge cap, and a standard galvalume finish. The applicant has submitted a ridge cap that staff finds to be appropriate.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed double hung, clad wood windows. Generally, staff finds these windows to be appropriate and consistent with staff’s specifications for windows in new construction.
 - l. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details of the proposed new construction to be appropriate.
 - m. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has provided design elements regarding landscaping on the proposed site plan. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping to be appropriate. The site plan notes the locations of various plantings, walkways, and planters.
 - n. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the location and screening of mechanical equipment. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
 - o. SOLAR PANELS – The applicant has proposed to mount solar panels on the southern roof of the southern structure. Staff finds the use and location of the proposed solar panels to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
 - p. PARKING – The applicant has proposed parking in the form of pull in parking stalls on Lowe Street. The proposed parking would match that previously approved by the Commission. In this context, staff finds the proposed two parking stalls to be generally appropriate as they are located near the rear of the lot. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate landscaping elements to screen and buffer the proposed parking.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That additional consideration be given to reduce the visual impact of the proposed concrete foundations, such as an application of stucco or another foundation skirting material as noted in finding g.
- ii. That the applicant ensure that the proposed clad wood windows follow staff’s standards for windows in new construction.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate screening and buffering landscaping elements to mitigate the visual impact of the pull in parking proposed on Lowe Street.

A foundation inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that foundation setbacks and heights are consistent with the approved design. The inspection is to occur after the installation of form work and prior to the installation of foundation materials.

A standing seam metal roof inspection is to be schedule with OHP staff to ensure that roofing materials are consistent with approved design. An industrial ridge cap is not to be used.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Monica Savino and Scott Albert- does not support staff recommendations.

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

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

Nays: Gibbs.

Absent: Fish, Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Bowman.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES AND 1 NAY. 4 ABSENT

- ***COMMISSIONER ARREOLA JOINED MEETING AT 3:35PM.***
- **Item # 17. HDRC NO. 2020-220**
ADDRESS: 619 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: Anahita Moshgbar Bakhshayeshi/Moshgbar Anahita

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1.5 story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 619 Dawson Street, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1.5 story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 619 Dawson Street, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – The context and historic development pattern of this block of Dawson consists primarily of one-story residential structures; however, this block does feature a two-story historic structure. This block also features two-story infill construction.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on June 23, 2020. At that meeting, the Committee noted that there was no concern regarding the proposed setback, that the proposed scale should be more consistent with those found within the district in regards to front façade and porch massing, and that porch elements as found historically within the district should be incorporated into the design.
- d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed a second time by the Design Review Committee on July 7, 2020. At that meeting the committee provided suggestions on how to modify the proportions of the front elevation of the proposed new construction.
- e. 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 less than those of the adjacent historic structures. Staff finds the proposed setback to be inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a setback that is equal to or greater than those found historically on the block should be used.
- f. 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 Dawson. Staff finds the proposed entrance orientation to be consistent with the Guidelines.

- g. **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. As noted in finding b, this block of Dawson primarily features one story structures. The applicant has proposed an overall height of approximately twenty-one (21) feet. Staff finds that the proposed new construction should feature a massing, scale and form that is appropriate for its proposed height, and the historic district. Architectural elements that relate to a height of one story should be incorporated into the design.
- h. **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 Dawson feature foundation height of between two (2) and three (3) feet. The applicant has noted a foundation height of 2 feet. Generally, this is consistent with the Guidelines; however, the foundation height should be shown in elevation.
- i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed for the structure to feature a gabled and hipped roofs. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate roof massing and profiles that are found historically within the district.
- j. **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.
- k. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding, cedar siding, cedar porch decking, a standing seam metal roof, and aluminum windows. 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.
- l. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – As noted in finding i, the applicant has proposed aluminum windows with one over one profiles. Staff finds that the proposed windows are not consistent with staff's standards for windows in new construction, which are listed in the applicable citations. Staff finds that windows that meet these standards are to be used. Additionally, the proposed one over one windows should feature sashes of equal size.
- m. **FENESTRATION PROFILE** – The applicant has proposed full height window openings that staff finds to be generally appropriate and consistent in size with those found historically within the district; however, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to each side elevation, specifically toward the front of the structure.
- n. **FENESTRATION PROPORTIONS** – Staff noted in finding e that the proposed new construction features a massing, form and scale that do not correlate to its proposed height of twenty-eight (28) feet, but should rather correlate to a structure with the height of a traditional one story structure. Staff finds that the proposed mass and form produce fenestration proportions that appear lacking in size and quantity.

- o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (Front porch massing) – The applicant has proposed a front porch that is maintained within the overall massing of the historic structure; however, the proposed porch lacks a sense of scale as found historically throughout the district. Historically, porches include porch columns and are not enclosed by louvers.
- p. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As noted in the finding above, staff finds that the proposed proportions and massing of the new construction should be modified. Additionally, staff finds that fenestration patterns and porch massing and design should be modified to be consistent with those found historically in the district.
- q. DRIVEWAY – The lot currently features a retaining wall, curbcut and driveway. Per the submitted renderings, the applicant has eliminated the front yard driveway and parking location. Staff finds that no front yard parking should exist that results in parking in front of the structure.
- r. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.
- s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has included landscaping information in the form of a landscaping plan. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping to be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That a setback that is equal to or greater than those found historically on the block should be used as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant modify the proposed massing and form to be proportionally accurate, rather than reading as a one story structure with an overall height of approximately twenty-one (21) feet.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines and those found historically on the block as noted in finding h.
- iv. 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 l.
- v. That the applicant incorporate appropriate porch massing as noted in finding o.

A foundation inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that foundation setbacks and heights are consistent with the approved design. The inspection is to occur after the installation of form work and prior to the installation of foundation materials.

A standing seam metal roof inspection is to be schedule with OHP staff to ensure that roofing materials are consistent with approved design. An industrial ridge cap is not to be used.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society and Monica Savino concurs with staff recommendations to deny approval.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter move to approve with conceptual staff stipulations 1,3,4,5, and 6 with added stipulation to accept the stepped-down nested gabled steam be accepted as proposed in discussion.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 19. HDRC NO. 2019-699**
ADDRESS: Pine 911-917 N
APPLICANT: Ricardo Turrubiates/Terramark

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct two, 2-story, mixed-use structures on the vacant lots addressed as 911, 913, 915, and 917 N Pine. The lots do not front a public street, but front a private drive that features access to N Pine to the immediate south of the new construction located at 909 N Pine.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct two, 2-story, mixed-use structures on the vacant lots addressed as 911, 913, 915, and 917 N Pine. The lots do not front a public street, but front a private drive that features access to N Pine to the immediate south of the new construction located at 909 N Pine.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – This request received conceptual approval at the February 19, 2020, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant continue to develop entrances that feature elements that reference those found traditionally within the district. **This stipulation has not been met.**
 - ii. That the applicant comply with the Guidelines in regards to an appropriate foundation height. **This stipulation has been met and is noted in the construction documents.**
 - iii. That the applicant propose roof forms that are consistent with the Guidelines and that are consistent with those found historically within the District. **This stipulation has not been met.**
 - iv. That the applicant implement window and door openings that are consistent with the Guidelines those found historically within the district as the design progresses. **This stipulation has not been met.**
 - v. That the applicant propose materials that are consistent with the Guidelines and those found historically within the district. **This stipulation has not been met.**
 - vi. That the applicant install wood or aluminum clad wood windows. 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. **The applicant has proposed aluminum windows.**

- vii. That the applicant propose parking that is consistent with the Guidelines and does not result in a frontyard parking condition. **Generally, staff finds that this stipulation has been met.**
- viii. That the rear wall plane of each structure be separated as to not appear as a solid mass. **Generally, staff finds that this stipulation has been met.**
- ix. That the applicant return to the Design Review Committee as the design progresses.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 7, 2020. At that meeting, committee members comments on how the design should feature historic elements found within the district, and that window openings, materials and architectural forms should be adjusted to reference those found historically within the district.
- d. CURRENT SITE – The current sites are void of any existing structures. The lots do not front a public street, but front a private drive that features access to N Pine, to the immediate south of the new construction located at 909 N Pine. These lots are zoned IDZ (Infill Development Zone), which allows for zero lot line construction.
- e. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – The primary, historic development pattern of this block of N Pine and the Dignowity Hill Historic District features a primary structure fronting the right of way at the street with a rear accessory structure.
- f. 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. Per the submitted application documents, each structure’s footprint is consistent with the Guidelines, as approximately 37.6% of each lot is occupied by the proposed building space.
- g. SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.ii. note that the front facades of new buildings should be orientated to be consistent with the predominant orientation of historic buildings along the street frontage. The proposed orientation is not consistent with the Guidelines; however, the lot layout is atypical for the historic development pattern of the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- h. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street, in this case, N Pine. Per the application documents, the applicant has oriented the primary entrance of each structure to the private drive. The proposed development pattern is atypical to that which is found historically within the district. Generally, staff finds that entrances that are oriented toward the private drive could be appropriate provided they feature traditional entrance massing and detailing.
- i. SCALE & MASSING – The Guidelines for New Construction 2.A. notes that 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-two (22) feet. This block of N Pine features eleven singlefamily residential structures. Each of these structures features one story in height; however, many of these structures feature heights that approach twenty (20) feet in height. Given the location of the proposed new construction, at the rear of an existing structure, and approximately seventy (70) feet from the right of way, staff finds an overall height of twenty-two (22) feet to be appropriate.

- j. **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 submitted application documents do not provide specific measurements of foundation heights; however, per the submitted application documents, the proposed foundation heights appear to be appropriate. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines regarding foundation heights, and should submitted construction documents with annotated measurements.
- k. **ROOF FORMS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i. notes that roof forms of new construction should feature pitches, overhangs and orientations that are consistent with those found historically on the block. Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has proposed roof forms with very low slopes. Generally, this is inconsistent with roof forms found historically throughout the district, and is inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- l. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.i. notes that windows and door openings featuring similar proportions to those of historic structures in the vicinity should be used. Per the submitted application documents, the applicant has proposed windows openings that feature contemporary profiles, and windows that feature fixed sashes. Staff finds that both window openings and window profiles should be consistent with the Guidelines, and historic examples found throughout the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- m. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite board and batten siding, exposed steel C-channel members, a metal façade application consisting of steel pipes and painted cement panel walls. Staff finds the proposed materials to be inconsistent with the historic examples found throughout the district, and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that materials that are consistent with the Guidelines should be used.
- n. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed to install aluminum windows. Staff finds that the proposed window should be consistent with staff’s specifications for windows in new construction, which are noted in the applicable citations.
- o. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding specific architectural details; however, the applicant has submitted information regarding and building form and materials that are generally inconsistent with the Guidelines and the materials found historically throughout the district. Staff finds that the proposed roof form, metal siding, entrance profiles and parking configuration should be revised to be consistent with the Guidelines and district.
- p. **SITE ELEMENTS (Driveways)** – The applicant has incorporated driveways for each structure that terminate to the side of the proposed new construction. The Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. notes that front yard parking should not be added into the front yard

setbacks. Generally, the proposed driveway locations are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, as proposed, the driveways feature a width that is inconsistent with the Guidelines. The applicant should submit detailed site documents regarding driveways that clearly note materials and overall widths at the driveway approach and apron. Additionally, driveways on separate lots should be separated, and should not read as a continuous driveway condition.

- q. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted landscaping materials on the proposed site plan. As noted in the above findings, staff finds that driveways should be consistent with the Guidelines and that driveways on separate lots should read as such.
- r. DRAINAGE – The applicant has provided documents to address drainage on site, including a drainage plan noting that water will not drain to neighboring historic structures, but to the existing parking lot and N Pine.
- s. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has not noted the location of mechanical equipment at this time. Staff finds that all mechanical equipment should be screened from view from the public right of way.

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. Many of these items were stipulations of conceptual approval.

- i. That the applicant incorporate traditional entrance elements into the design of each unit, as noted in finding h.
- ii. That the applicant comply with the Guidelines in regards to an appropriate foundation height as noted in finding j.
- iii. That the applicant propose roof forms that are consistent with the Guidelines and that are consistent with those found historically within the District as noted in finding k.
- iv. That the applicant implement window and door openings that are consistent with the Guidelines those found historically within the district as noted in finding l.
- v. That the applicant propose materials that are consistent with the Guidelines and those found historically within the district as noted in finding m.
- vi. That the applicant install windows that are consistent with staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction, as noted in finding n.
- vii. That the proposed driveways be separated at lot lines, as noted in findings p and q.
- viii. That the applicant identify the location of mechanical equipment, and screen it from view from the public right of way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society of San Antonio and Monica Savino- concurs with staff recommendations to deny approval because of issues of massing and scaling; and, Nicholas Spiker opposes as it no complaint to neighborhood and not affordable.

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

Vote: Ayes: Gibbs, Velasquez, Grube, and Bowman.
Nays: Fish, Velasquez, and Arreola.

Absent: Fernandez, Martinez-Flores, and Bowman.
Recusal: Carpenter

Action: MOTION PASSED with 4 AYES AND 3 NAY. 3 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL

- ***COMMISSIONER CARPENTER LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:00PM***
- **Item # 20. HDRC NO. 2020-308**
ADDRESS: 931 HAYS ST
APPLICANT: ADAM SANCHEZ/CENTER CITY HOMES, LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install wood window screens to the new construction located at 931 Hays. The proposed wood window screens are a solution to the denied vinyl windows that are currently installed. The vinyl windows were installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness, and were denied at the February 5, 2020.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install wood window screens to the new construction located at 931 Hays. The proposed wood window screens are a solution to the denied vinyl windows that are currently installed. The vinyl windows were installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness, and were denied at the February 5, 2020.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant constructed a mockup that was reviewed by staff at a site visit. The proposed mockup was subsequently commented on by the Design Review Committee who commented that while the window screens may be appropriate in style and profile, they did not find the proposed screens to be an adequate solution to the vinyl windows, which were previously denied by the Commission as noted in finding a.
- c. WINDOW SCREENS – As noted in finding a, the applicant has proposed to install window screens at 931 Hays to cover the installed vinyl windows. While the installation of window screens may be appropriate in new construction, staff does not find the proposed window screens to be an appropriate solution to the installed vinyl windows.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the applicant install windows that are consistent with those that were originally approved, aluminum clad wood windows, rather than install a wood window screen to cover the previously denied vinyl windows.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Monica Savino- Supports staff recommendations based on the February 5th decision.

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

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES AND 1 NAY. 5 ABSENT

• **Item # 21. HDRC NO. 2020-292**

ADDRESS: 801 LABOR ST

APPLICANT: Rudy Macias/LOCKE-MACIAS CHRISTINA ANN & RODOLFOMACIAS

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing chain link fence on the north elevation with a 4-foot metal cattle panel fence.
2. Install a new 3-foot-high metal cattle panel fence on the front and south elevations.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 801 Labor is a 1-story, single family residence constructed circa 1910 with Craftsman and Neoclassical influences. The property first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The home features a full-width front porch, a hipped roof with four dormers, and a symmetrical façade. The home is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing chain link fence on the north side of the property with a 4-foot-high iron cattle panel fence and to install a 3-foot-high iron cattle panel fence on the front and south sides of the property. The house is located on a corner lot and the proposed fencing will extend from the neighboring property line on Labor to the existing chain link fence at the rear of the property line on Sadie Street. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Staff find that cattle panel fencing is generally appropriate for the district, but finds that the posts and rails should be wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence. Fully wood fencing is more consistent with fence materials historically used in the Lavaca Historic District.
- c. FENCE LOCATION – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should follow historic fence placements in the district. The proposed fence will follow the established fence line along Labor Street and will extend to the rear property line on Sadie Street. The proposed fence will meet an existing chain link fence at the rear property line. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the installation of front and side yard fencing based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

- i. That posts and rails are wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence as noted in finding b.

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Laffoon moved to table item until the following hearing. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item #22. HDRC NO. 2020-262**

ADDRESS: 327 BARRERA

APPLICANT: Eloy Garcia/BALCONES MUSTER INC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace a non-original bay window with a new vinyl window.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 327 Barrera was constructed circa 1905 in the Folk Victorian style, first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on April 30, 2020, staff found that the front bay window was replaced prior to approval. The applicant was cooperative to the Stop Work Order and submitted an application on June 9, 2020, to be heard at the next available hearing.
- c. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replacement the front bay window with a new vinyl window that matches the existing, non-conforming windows on the structure. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., applicants should replace non-historic incompatible windows with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. While the new vinyl window is an improvement to the previous non-conforming aluminum window and matches the others non-conforming windows on the structure, staff finds that the windows do not meet the Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement. However, per the provision for missing or previously replaced windows an alternative material to wood may be considered by the HDRC when the proposed replacement product is more consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines in terms of overall appearance.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval as proposed based on finding c. Replacement with wood sash windows that adhere to the Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement is eligible for administrative approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

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

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

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

• **Item # 23. HDRC NO. 2020-291**

ADDRESS: 101 CROFTON

APPLICANT: Joe Hernandez

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace twelve (12) existing aluminum windows with vinyl windows.
2. Perform fenestration modifications on the rear elevation.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 101 Crofton is a 2-story condominium complex built circa 1980. The property features existing aluminum windows. The property is located within the King William Historic District and the rear of the property faces the San Antonio River.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace twelve (12) aluminum windows with Window World 4000 Series Double-Hung and Double-Sliding vinyl replacement windows. Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new windows should be installed to match the existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. While vinyl windows may be an appropriate replacement material for a structure constructed circa 1980, staff finds that the proposed windows feature elements that are much wider than the standard window specifications allow. According to the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction, meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25”. Stiles must be no wider than 2.25”. Top and bottom sashes must be equal in size unless otherwise approved. The proposed vinyl windows feature meeting rails that are 1.81” tall and stiles that are 2.91” wide. Additionally, the proposed vinyl windows feature top and bottom sashes that are unequal in size. Due to the condition of the existing windows and construction date of the structure, staff finds the proposal to replace the existing windows appropriate. However, staff does not find the proposed replacement product appropriate and finds that the

- applicant should explore replacement window products that more closely match the existing windows in size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail.
- c. FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing rear door and a rear window with one sliding patio door. Guideline 6.B.ii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new entrances, when necessary, comply with other regulations and are compatible in size, scale, shape, proportion, material, and massing with historic entrances. Guideline 6.B.vii states that non-historic incompatible windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of the vinyl window replacement product based on finding b.

If the HDRC finds the vinyl window replacement product appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant replaces the existing window with a vinyl window replacement product that meets staff’s standard window stipulations and submits updated specifications 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 recommends approval of the proposed fenestration modifications based on finding c.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: King Williams Association- concurs with staff findings and recommendations not to approve vinyl windows.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve item 1 with staff recommendations and approval of item 2 as submitted.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

• **Item # 24. HDRC NO. 2020-237**

ADDRESS: 1438 W ROSEWOOD AVE

APPLICANT: Erasmo Castillo/Castillo's Complete Construction

REQUEST:

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

1. Install a rear addition on the East elevation to feature an inset covered porch
2. Install a rear addition on the West elevation to square out the original footprint
3. Removal and infill of full height picture windows on the East elevation

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 1438 W Rosewood was constructed circa 1925 with Tudor influences, first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Keystone Park Historic District. The one-story structure features a steep front-facing gable and brick chimney flanking the primary turned gable roof, with an original porte-cochere with a subtle arch over the driveway, asbestos tile, composition shingle roofing, and a combination of original and replacement windows.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on April 27, 2020, staff found the property at 1438 W Rosewood subject to construction of a rear addition prior to approval and issued a Stop Work Order. The applicant continued to complete the work by infilling a wall plane despite receiving an incomplete notice for the initial application materials. Additional photos of the completed work were last submitted on June 26, 2020, to be reviewed at the next available commission hearing.
- c. EAST REAR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition on the rear of the east elevation featuring a 6'-6" deep by 8' wide enclosed room with a 6' deep rear-facing covered porch. The proposed addition features the reuse of existing windows, wood lap siding with a 6" exposure, and a subordinate shed roof with vertical trim pieces between old and new wall planes. Staff finds the addition generally consistent with the Guidelines for Additions.
- d. WEST REAR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a rear addition on the rear of the west elevation to square off the inset corner of the existing building footprint. The proposed addition features approximately 5' in depth and width, wood lap siding with a 6" exposure, a subordinate shed roof, and vertical trim pieces between old and new wall planes. Staff finds the addition generally consistent with the Guidelines for Additions. Staff finds that any historic wood windows should be kept on site and that replacement vinyl or aluminum windows should be verified with staff prior to discarding.
- e. WINDOW REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove and infill a set of full height picture windows on rear east elevation adjacent to the driveway. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Alterations and Maintenance 6.A.i., applicant should preserve existing window and door openings, avoid enlarging or diminishing to fit stock sizes or air conditioning units, and avoid filling in historic door or window openings. While staff finds that the windows may not be original to the structure, staff finds infilling the wall plane with new wood lap siding as proposed creates an elevation that lacks fenestration and an inappropriate contrast between asbestos shingle and wood lap siding on the

historic portion of the structure. Staff finds that appropriately-sized fenestration be installed in the opening and that infill siding either match existing or original siding in appearance.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of item 1 and 2, the rear additions based on findings c and d with the stipulation that any historic wood windows should be reused or kept on site and that new windows products if used should be verified with staff prior to installation; no new window products are approved at this time.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 3, window removal and infill based on finding e. Staff recommends that appropriately-sized fenestration be installed in the opening and that infill siding either match existing or original siding in appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved for approval item 1, 2 and 3 with the stipulation that infill siting match the existing or original siting as suggested by staff does not include new fenestration.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

• **Item # 25. HDRC NO. 2020-294**

ADDRESS: 129 E SUMMIT AVE

APPLICANT: Kelly hoopes

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace one wood window.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 129 E Summit was constructed circa 1920 and first appears on the Sanborn Maps in 1951. The property is a 2-story, single-family residence featuring a side gable red tile roof, stucco cladding, ornamental door and window surrounds, and original eight-over-eight wood windows. The property is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – The applicant has proposed to replace one one-over-one wood window located on the west elevation. The window may be original to the structure but does not match the other eight-over-eight windows on the house. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing window with a fully wood Pella

Reserve Traditional Hung Window. Guideline 6.A.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that historic window should be preserved. Additionally, Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new windows should be installed 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. The documentation provided does not provide evidence that the window is deteriorated beyond repair. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines and finds that the existing window should be repaired in place.

- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: REPLACEMENT PRODUCT** – The applicant has proposed to replace an existing one-over-one wood window with a fully wood Pella Reserve Traditional Hung Window. According to the Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement, meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25”. Stiles must be no wider than 2.25”. Top and bottom sashes must be equal in size unless otherwise approved. The proposed replacement product matches the existing product in material, configuration, and form. However, the proposed replacement product features meeting rails that are 1.75” tall and stiles that are 1.43” wide. The meeting rails proposed are taller than the specified 1.25”. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

If the HDRC finds the window replacement appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant replaces the existing window with a fully wood window product that meets staff’s standard window specifications and submits updated specifications 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.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

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

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

Nay: None.

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

Abstain: Arreola

Action: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 4 ABSENT. 1 ABSTAIN

• **Item # 26. HDRC NO. 2020-284**

ADDRESS: 724 N PINE ST

APPLICANT: Sunnie Diaz/SOFLIN DAVID & DIAZ SUNNIE R

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the rear accessory structure at 724 N Pine.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a rear accessory structure to replace the existing accessory structure that is proposed to be demolished.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure located at 724 N Pine was constructed circa 1910 and first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. A rear accessory structure first appears on this property on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The 1951 Sanborn Map features a rear accessory structure on the lot, with a position further to the west of the original structure's location, consistent with the location of the current accessory structure on site.
- b. DEMOLITION – At this time, the applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historic development pattern within a historic district.
- c. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – As noted in finding a, the structure is found on the 1951 Sanborn Map and features a footprint that is generally consistent with the footprint presently found on site.
- d. UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614, no certificate shall be issued for demolition of a historic landmark unless the applicant provides sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission of unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant. In the case of a historic landmark, if an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information regarding loss of significance. In order for unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. The applicant has provided a cost estimate for the reconstruction of the rear accessory structure with adequate structural elements totaling approximately \$52,800.
- e. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or

- features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. The applicant has submitted an engineer's letter noting structural deterioration of the existing structure.
- f. **NEW CONSTRUCTION** – The applicant at this time is requesting conceptual approval to construct a rear accessory structure in the location of the existing rear accessory structure.
 - g. **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.
 - h. **MASSING & FORM** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that rear accessory structures are to feature a massing and form that is visually subordinate that that of the primary historic structure in regards to their height, massing and form, should be no larger in plan than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure's footprint and should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic structure. The applicant is proposing an overall footprint for the proposed new construction of approximately 1,000 square feet, not including the proposed covered carport. While the proposed footprint is larger than forty (40) percent of the historic structure's footprint, staff finds the proposed footprint to be appropriate given the overall size of the lot.
 - i. **MASSING & FORM** – Regarding the overall height, the applicant has proposed to construct a one story accessory structure to feature an overall height of approximately sixteen (16) feet. Staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate.
 - j. **ORIENTATION & SETBACKS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. notes that the predominant garage orientation and historic setback patterns of the block should be followed. Generally, staff finds the proposed location, orientation and setbacks associated with the proposed accessory structure to be appropriate and consistent with both the Guidelines and existing structure's location.
 - k. **CHARACTER** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A. notes that new accessory structures should relate to the primary historic structure in regards to their materials and window and door openings. The applicant has proposed materials that include poly carbonate roofing materials, corrugated corten siding, perforated metal, wood siding, a corrugated metal roof and a standing seam metal roof. Per the Guidelines, materials that are found historically within the district should be used in new construction. Corten metal, poly carbonate roofing and corrugated metal roofing are not found historically within the district. Staff finds that materials that are found historically within the district should be used in the new construction.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition of the accessory structure based on findings a through e. Staff finds that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to prove both the loss of structural integrity as well as an unreasonable economic hardship. Materials that are salvageable should be salvaged for use on site.

Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed massing and footprint of the proposed accessory structure based on findings f through k. Staff recommends that the applicant utilize building materials found historically within the district in the development of the proposed new

construction, and that materials that are not deteriorated beyond use be salvaged from the existing structure and incorporated into the proposed new construction.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Monica Savino- supports case.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve of proposed demolition and move for conceptual approval for massing and footprint with staff's stipulation.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

• **Item # 27. HDRC NO. 2020-307**

ADDRESS: 515 BURLESON ST

APPLICANT: Stephanie Padua

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 2x6 treated boards as porch decking.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 515 Burleson was constructed circa 1920 and first appears on the 1951 Sanborn map. The one-story single-family structures originally featured a primary gable-on-hip roof with a number of dormers and secondary gable of the front door of the front porch, shake shingles in the front facing gables, sashed wood windows, and Corinthian columns and pilaster in the front porch. The property was subjected to a variety of non-conforming modifications including the installed of flagstone skirting, window replace on the driveway side elevation, and front porch reconstruction including simple square columns and wrought iron railing.
- b. COMPLIANCE – The applicant has been making progress towards window restoration and correcting work without approval per the Commission Action at the June 5, 2019, HDRC hearing. No additional Certificate of Appropriateness may be issued until all corrections have been completed.
- c. PORCH DECK – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing plywood decking with 2 x 6 wood planks laid parallel to the front façade plane. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.v., applicants should reconstruct porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs; if no such evidence exists, the design should be based on the architectural style of the building and historic patterns. Staff finds that historic porches should be reconstructed with 1 x 3 tongue-and-groove wood decking laid perpendicular to the front façade plane and that the proposed 2 x 6 planks are inconsistent with the Guidelines.

Mtg Minutes 7.15.20

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on finding b with the following stipulations:

- i. That 1 x 3 inch tongue-and-groove wood decking laid perpendicular to the front façade plane is used instead the proposed 2 x 6 inch wood planks laid parallel,
- ii. That no additional Certificate of Appropriateness may be issued until all corrections per the June 6, 2019, Commission Action have been completed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Monica Savino- supports staff recommendations; and, Scott Albert- says their needs follow-up based on pictures.

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair

