



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
19 August 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, August 19, 2020, via videoconference available to the public for comment.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

- Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

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

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

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
 - Item #1, 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. 2020-309 126 GUADALUPE ST/San Pedro Creek
 - Item #8, Case No. 2020-298 250 MARY LOUISE
 - Item #10, Case No. 2020-289 250 BENITA ST
 - Item #11, Case No. 2020-296 103 W JOHNSON
- AGENDA ITEM 2 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 9 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 16 WAS POSTPONED BY APPLICANT
- AGENDA ITEM 19 WAS POSTPONED BY APPLICANT
- AGENDA ITEM 21 WAS WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT
- AGENDA ITEM 23, 24, AND 25 WERE TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT HDRC HEARING.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve the consent Agenda items 1-6, 9-13, and 15 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS

- **Item # 2. HDRC NO. 2020-318**
ADDRESS: 323 S ALAMO ST
Applicant: Mark Navaro/Fisher Heck Architects

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform various rehabilitative scopes of work and new construction at 323 S Alamo, commonly known as Maverick Plaza. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Remove the existing limestone walls that have enclosed Maverick Plaza along Nueva and S Alamo, remove the fences that separate Maverick Plaza from other portions of La Villita, remove the existing cedar arbor, remove the existing fountain, remove and salvage the existing paving on King Philip V Street, remove the existing concrete and clay tile paving in the plaza and the old Alamo Street walkway, remove portions of low tree planter walls along Alamo Street, remove contemporary CMU addition to Faville House, and remove and relocate electrical panels throughout the plaza
2. Install a variety of new paving materials forming various interlocking patterns including diagonal strips and three quatrefoil patterns.
3. Install a new fountain within the plaza.
4. Install additional trees including sycamore trees within the plaza and trees along the old Alamo Street walkway. The existing twenty-two live oak trees will be preserved.
5. Install lighting throughout the plaza to include general lighting, festoon lighting, tree lighting and entrance lighting.
6. Perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the historic Faville House, including foundation repair and repair to the porch roof's framing and decking, as well as the installation of a new standing seam metal roof.
7. Construct a demonstration kitchen in the plaza for public demonstration and teaching. This structure will include public restrooms.
8. Construct a kiosk to serve as a permanent food both.
9. Construct two smaller kiosks (mobile) to be located near the proposed fountain.
10. Construct new entry features with signage at Alamo St/Nueva St. corner, and Villita Street entry without signage. These elements will also include decorative panels on the S Alamo wall.
11. Relocate Mayor Maury Maverick Statue within the Plaza.

12. Construct screen walls along Nueva St to hide new transformer. Construct screen wall near Faville house to hide back of house equipment for plaza.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform a number of rehabilitative scopes of work as well as new construction at 323 S Alamo, commonly known as Maverick Plaza.
- b. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Committee on March 24, 2020. At that meeting, committee members commented on the proposed plaza improvements, site improvements, paving and landscaping elements. This request was reviewed a second time by the DRC on August 11, 2020. At that meeting committee members asked questions and provided feedback in regards to site paving, stone walls, planters and landscaping elements.
- c. SCALE AND DESIGN – According to UDC Section 35-642, buildings should be designed to be in scale with their adjoining surroundings and harmonious with the surrounding characteristics of the neighborhood. Scale and massing should be compatible with the adjacent area and the design should reflect the highest quality standards. Based on the submitted site plan and drawings, the front of the building, which will face the direction of existing 1-story commercial facilities, will have a multislope roofline that is primarily 1-story in height and a tower with modern Spanish Eclectic details. Staff finds that the proposed structure is consistent with the UDC.
- d. PAVING – The applicant has proposed to install a variety of new paving materials forming various interlocking patterns including diagonal strips and three quatrefoil patterns. Staff finds the proposed scope and patterns to be appropriate.
- e. FOUNTAIN – The applicant has proposed to install a new fountain within the plaza. Staff finds the proposed placement and design to be appropriate.
- f. TREE PRESERVATION – The applicant has proposed to plant new trees within the plaza as well as along the old Alamo Street walkway. Additionally, the applicant has noted the preservation of all existing live oak trees within the plaza. Staff finds the installation of new trees as well as the proposed tree preservation to be appropriate.
- g. LIGHTING – The applicant has proposed to install lighting throughout the plaza to include general lighting, festoon lighting, tree lighting and entrance lighting. Staff finds the proposed lighting to be appropriate.
- h. FAVILLE HOUSE REHABILITATION – The applicant has proposed to perform rehabilitative scopes of work to the historic Faville House, including foundation repair, the removal of a nonoriginal addition, and repair to the porch roof's framing and decking, as well as the installation of a new standing seam metal roof. Staff finds the proposed scope of work to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations. Staff finds that the proposed re-framing and re-decking of the porch roof should be performed in-kind and should not result in a change of roof profile. The new standing seam metal roof should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap is not to be used.
- i. PEDESTRIAN KITCHEN – The applicant has proposed to construct a pedestrian kitchen in the plaza for public cooking. This structure will include restrooms. The applicant has proposed materials that include sand finished plaster, board and batten siding, standing seam metal roofs, porcelain tile and other similar materials. The applicant has also noted

the installation of overhead coiling doors. Generally, staff finds the proposed design and materials to be appropriate. The proposed standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.

- j. KIOSKS – The applicant has proposed to construct three kiosks, two of which will be mobile to facilitate on site feed sales. Staff finds the overall design and materials proposed for each kiosk to be appropriate. The proposed standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- k. ENTRY FEATURES – The applicant has proposed to construct new entry features with signage at the Alamo and Nueve corners and Villita Street without signage. Staff finds the proposed request to be appropriate.
- l. MAYOR MAURY MAVERICK STATUE RELOCATION – The applicant has proposed to relocate the Mayor Maury Maverick statue from its existing location adjacent to S Alamo to the north side of the plaza. Staff finds this relocation to be appropriate.
- m. SCREENING WALLS – The applicant has proposed to construct screen walls along Neuva to screen new transformer locations as well as to construct screen walls near the Faville House to screen back of house equipment from the plaza. Staff finds this to be appropriate.
- n. ARCHAEOLOGY – The property is located within a River Improvement Overlay District, a Local Historic Landmark, the La Villita Local Historic District, and the La Villita Historic District National Register of Historic Places District. The Texas Sites Atlas indicates that archaeological sites have been previously identified along/adjacent to the San Antonio River. In addition, the project area is in close proximity to previously recorded sites 41BX919, 41BX575, and 41BX2246. Furthermore, a review of historic archival documents identifies structures within or adjacent to the property as early as 1764. Moreover, this is the reported location of the Spanish Colonial Quartel. The property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. Work within public property is subject to the Texas Antiquities Code. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the proposed re-framing and re-decking of the porch roof of the Faville house be performed inkind and not result in a change of roof profile. The new standing seam metal roof is to feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish. A ridge cap is not to be used.
- ii. That the proposed outdoor kitchen and kiosks feature standing seam metal roofs that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam and a standard galvalume finish.
- iii. ARCHAEOLOGY – Archaeological investigations are required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.
- iv.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Diane Hall- -opposed- request that the plaza not be changed. Ralette Shirkengoa- opposed to the changes of La Villita as it brings revenue to the city each year. Peter Monie- opposed to reduction and additional restaurants especially with Covid. Ron Stinson- opposed as there is the effect it has as they are neighbors. Deborah Sibley- opposed because the fountain does not fit the characterization for colonial integral of the village Amy Sanchez- concerned about the significant reduction in the space for NIOSA; Christopher Selwyn- size in reduction, specially for NIOSA. Margaret Leeds- urges to refrain from reduction. Karen M. Davis- concerned about the substantially reduced amount of space for NIOSA as it is the Society's main fundraiser. Marcy Newman—concerned about significant reduction size for Night in Old San Antonio(NioSA). Lindsey Trcka- concerned about the significant changes in Maverick Plaza especially for NIOSA as it the largest fundraiser for the CSSA. Brett Syre- concerned about reduction because of fundraiser. Linda Skop- concerned about the reduction of size due to the it being the largest fundraiser for the conservation society and nationally recognized as the largest fund raiser fo Historic Preservation in the country. Robert Gurley- concerned about the reduction space allowed for NIOSA- as it it's new constructions of kitchens. Velma Nanka-Bruce- concerned about reduction of size and affects the fundraiser for CSSA. Mary Roszell- concerned about it not being air conditioned like the Alamodome. David E. Sanchez- new construction provides limited spacing , and concerns of it not being the same with new restaurants, and goal is to preserve historic buildings in San Antonio, and it serves as the fundraiser for the Conservation Society. Paula D. Bondurant- reluctant to reduce the space available to the onservation Soceit, which has been vital to San Antonio for many years, for NIOSA, especially without its consent. Judith Hartmann- concerned about the significant reduction of space for NIOSA. Sally Lee- Member of the Conservation Society for over 50 years- images of La Villita does not reflect historical significance. Gordon Edward Shults- member of Conservation Society- concerned about the reduction in size and the main fundraiser for the Conservation Soceity. Diana McCalester- member of Conservation Society- concerned about reduction of size and fundraiser. April Smith - Koebel- she embraces idea of having quality restaurants- but opposed to the privatization of public space. Joyce Felter- public in general will not benefit from dividing into smaller spaces. Mary E. Rogers- concerned about the space and bring the walls down to the historic village and provide privacy for the events. Rosemarie Kanusky- concerned about reduction in size as it could be underutilized for the public space. Melinda lange- member of Conservation Society-reduction of space for fundraiser. Laura Butterfield- member of the Conservation Soceity- implores to keep MaverickPlaza free of anything more permanent than the sturdy stones- wishes for community to come together not commercialization. Rev. James James Edward Schellenberg- opposes to the construction of private business over part of Maverick Plaza. Mary Nethery- opposes as we should not Pearlize all of downtown especially open plazas, and making enormous missteps especially in D1. Should not over commercialize downtown. Patricia Seidenberger- concerned about reduction of space and affects of fundraiser. Killis Almond- questioning if there is a need to reduce space as it used for many special events. Owen Seidenberger- member of the conservation society concerned about the reduction of size and fundraiser. Eric Turner Ryniker- opposes as it is the soul as there is no necessary changes to public spacing. David L. Peche- conservation society member reduction in space and affects of main fundraiser event. DeAnna Kay Keeesee- member of Conservation Society concerned about significant reduction of spacing and affects of main fundraiser for CSSA. Stella Tenorio- De La Garza- conservation Society member- reduction of spacing and affects of fundraiser, especially questioning what we need during the pandemic. John Debner- requests to maintain as much open space as possible for NIOSA. Preserve the integrity of the Plaza. Susan W. Beavin- asks to conserve the footprint and considering the significance of revenue that is taken in each for revenue during NIOSA. Margaret Priesmeyer- conservation society member- concerns about significant reduction of space and the effects

of the main fundraiser for the year for the Conservation Society. Jim Hollerbach- member of Conservation Society- concerned about significant reduction of space for main fundraiser for the Conservation Society and further 'commercialize is something that can be supported. Nick Escobar- member of Conservation Society concerned of about reduction of spacing for NIOSA as it is tradition and yearly event in San Antonio- consider the changes that will be made before deciding. Lee Ann Davison- member of the conservation Society- concerned about reduction of spacing for NIOSA the yearly tradition. Kyle L. McVay- opposes to new plans on Maverick Plaza. Terry Schoenert- opposes due significant reduction in spacing We concur with the comments of the La Villita Tenants Association objecting to the removal of all fencing and gates as this would make it difficult to secure the plaza for ticketed events in the future. Robert Baum- conservation society member opposes to changes as it affects the revenue that is brought yearly to the city, and plan. We support the statement of the La Villita Tenants' Association. The Conservation Society opposes two other elements added since we last saw the design. First are the sycamore trees planted in grates in the center of the Plaza itself, further reducing the usable space. .The second are the three oversized planters with integral seating along Alamo St., which create an unnecessary barrier to bringing tourists into the village.

- **City Code Chapter 35, Section 35-803 (j) (1)**A quorum of the commission shall require six (6) members present. The affirmative votes of a majority of the members present is required for action, except in the case of an application for demolition which shall require a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the members present for a recommendation of approval.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations and Added stipulation That the brick is discussed will pilaster to the massing that jumps up to the second floor. Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 9. HDRC NO. 2020-355**
ADDRESS: 511 CLUB DR
APPLICANT: Ricardo Matamoros

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the louver covered window opening on the West elevation with a new aluminum window.
2. Replace the one-over-one wood sash window on the West elevation with a new aluminum window.
3. Replace the glass block and sash window corner on the second floor of the rear addition to feature wood siding and side-facing sliding window.

4. Replace the pedestrian and garage door on the attached garage with new aluminum doors.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 511 Club was constructed circa 1935, first appears on the 1941 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Monticello Park Historic District. The two-story single-family structure features a two-story primary turned gable flanked by one-story bays on each side, and features a Greek Revival influenced double height columns under the pediment.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on July 29, 2020, staff found that window replacement and fenestration modifications were performed outside the approved scope of work. The applicant was cooperative to the Stop Work Order and submitted an application on July 31, 2020, to be heard at the next available hearing.
- c. LOUVER WINDOW – The applicant has proposed to replace the louver-covered window opening with a new aluminum sash window of the same size. Based on typically fenestration patterns, staff finds that window opening is not original to the structure. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B. vi., applicants should replace non-historic incompatible windows with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that the proposed window product is generally consistent with the Standard Specifications for Window Replacement: Missing or Previously-Replaced Windows with the exception of the faux divided lites. The applicant should remove the faux divided lites or submit an appropriate window product to staff.
- d. SASH WINDOW – The applicant has proposed to replace a one-over-one wood sash window, abutting a previously non-original chimney with a new aluminum sash window of the same size. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B. vi., applicants should replace non-historic incompatible windows with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that the proposed window product is generally consistent with the Standard Specifications for Window Replacement: Missing or Previously-Replaced Windows with the exception of the faux divided lites. The applicant should remove the faux divided lites or submit an appropriate window product to staff.
- e. GLASS BLOCK ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to modify the second floor of the southwest corner of the rear addition by removing the glass block and sash window and infilling with matching wood siding and a side-facing sliding window. Staff finds that the proposed modifications are more conforming to the Guidelines for Additions than the previous glass block fenestration pattern.
- f. GARAGE DOORS – The applicant has proposed to replace the pedestrian and garage door on the attached garage with new aluminum doors. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 9.B.i., applicants should ensure that replacement garage doors are compatible with those found on historic garages in the district (e.g., wood paneled) as well as with the principal structure; and 9.B.ii., applicants should replace historic outbuildings only if they are beyond repair. In-kind replacement is preferred; however, when it is not possible, ensure that they are reconstructed in the same location using similar scale, proportion, color, and materials as the original historic structure. Staff finds that the garage door was aluminum and not original to the structure, and that the

side-facing pedestrian door was missing and boarded. Staff finds that the proposed doors are consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings b through with the stipulation that the new windows adhere to Standard Specifications for Original Wood Window Replacement which requires the applicant to remove the faux divided lites or submit an appropriate window product to staff prior to installation and receiving compliance status.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Bianca Maldonado- opposes as applicants nor staff recommendations addresses full scope of violation, and request to move from consent to address full scope of violations.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve with staff stipulations that require the applicant to remove the 4 divided lights and submit an appropriate window application to staff prior to installation.
Commissioner Grube 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 # 12. 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:

- 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.
- 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.
- CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – The Historic and Design Review Commission issued conceptual approval of the proposed new construction with the following stipulations:
 - That the design that featured two front porch roofs be developed for final approval.

- ii. That the applicant incorporate a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines and those found historically on the block.
- iii. That siding feature an exposure of four inches, a smooth finish, a thickness of approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ " 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.
- v. That the applicant incorporate appropriate porch massing.
- d. **PREVIOUS REVIEW & DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was heard by the Historic and Design Review Committee at the August 5, 2020, HDRC hearing. At that hearing, this request was referred to the Design Review Committee. At that meeting, the DRC commented on the applicant's updates, and provided feedback on the design proposals that were most consistent with the Guidelines.
- 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. At the time of conceptual approval, the Commission noted that the proposed setbacks were appropriate due.
- 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-two (22) feet. Additionally, the applicant has proposed two front facing gables to match similar front façade and porch massing as found historically within the district. Generally, staff finds the overall height of the structure to be appropriate; however, staff finds the proposed porch massing to be inconsistent with porch massing found historically within the district.
- 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. As found on historic houses, the foundation height should read clearly, and foundation skirting should be distinguished from the siding.

- 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 wood windows. Staff finds that composite siding should feature an exposure of four inches, a smooth finish, a thickness of approximately ¾”, 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 k, the applicant has proposed wood windows. The wood window that the applicant has proposed is consistent with staff’s specifications for windows in new construction.
- 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 final approval based on findings a through r. Staff recommends that the following items be addressed prior to receiving a recommendation for final approval.

- i. That a setback that is equal to or greater than those found historically on the block be used, as noted in finding d.
- ii. That the proposed massing feature proportions that are consistent with those found historically within the district, as noted in finding f.
- iii. That the proposed foundation height of two (2) feet be read throughout each elevation as it is on the front elevation.
- iv. That the applicant incorporate additional fenestration on each side elevation as noted in finding l, and that fenestration be proportionate to the overall façade, as noted in finding m.

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- supports staff recommendations, and concerns about detail trims. Conservation Society of San Antonio- supports option for front porch considers to be appropriate. Arvis Holland- support the project but would better contextualization for project.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item/option 2 as presented.
Commissioner Velasquez 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 # 13. HDRC NO. 2019-699**
ADDRESS: 911, 913, 915, and 917 N PINE ST
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. **The applicant has incorporated window and door openings that are sized consistently with those found historically within the district; however, there are still window openings that feature contemporarily sized openings.**
 - 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 front yard 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. PREVIOUS REVIEW – This request was reviewed by the Historic and Design Review Commission at the July 17, 2020, HDRC hearing, where it was denied.

- e. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on August 11, 2020. At that meeting committee members provided comments on the updated design.
- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. 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.
- j. 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.
- k. 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 h 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.
- l. 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 provide foundation heights that staff finds to generally be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. 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 a slope that is comparable to those found

- historically within the district; however, the proposed roof massing is atypical for gabled roofs found historically in the district in regards to overall width.
- n. 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 mostly proposed window and door openings that are consistent with those found historically within the district; however, on the primary façade, the applicant has proposed contemporarily sized window openings, which staff finds to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
 - o. 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.
 - p. 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. The applicant has submitted a detailed wall section noting appropriate installation depths and profiles; however, the built example that the applicant has provided does not feature appropriate sill details.
 - q. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – The applicant has provided architectural details for the proposed new construction that are inconsistent with the Guidelines, specifically in regards to materials and roof massing. The applicant has incorporated entrance elements at each porch that reference elements found historically within the district, specifically in regards to porch roofs. As proposed, the new construction features flat porch roofs. As previously noted, staff finds that traditional porch massing would be most appropriate.
 - r. 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.
 - s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has noted landscaping materials on the proposed site plan. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping elements to be appropriate.
 - t. 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.
 - u. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted that mechanical equipment will be located to the north of each structure within areas that will be fenced and screened from view.

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 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.

- iii. That the applicant eliminate the contemporarily sized window openings on the front facades of both structures, as noted in finding n.
- iv. That the applicant propose materials that are consistent with the Guidelines and those found historically within the district as noted in finding o.
- v. That the applicant install windows that are consistent with staff's standard specifications for windows in new construction, as noted in finding p.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Monica Savino- supports staff recommendations and is not compatible with the historic district. Conservation Society of San Antonio concurs with staff recommendations to deny conceptual approval.. Arvis Holland supports project as presented. Nicholas Spyker- opposes to project and roof forms among other characteristics is not appropriate for the historic district.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with stipulation 5.
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 14. HDRC NO. 2020-323**
ADDRESS: 435 MISSION ST
APPLICANT: Nicholas Melde/Architexas

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting review for demolition of the existing circa 1957-58 house located at 435 Mission Street requiring the following actions:

- A. A determination of non-contributing status for the existing house at 435 Mission Street; and
- B. Conceptual review of a new, 2-story residential structure and a new, 2-story rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

Findings related to action item A:

- a. The primary structure located at 435 Mission is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed between 1957- 58 in the midcentury Ranch style. The home features a very low-pitch side gable asphalt shingle roof with wide eaves, thin red brick veneer, steel casement windows, and a concrete slab foundation. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. DEMOLITION – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the primary structure. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Requests for determination of whether an object, building, structure or sign are contributing or non-contributing to a historic landmark or historic district shall be made on an application obtained from the historic preservation officer

through the office of historic preservation. The historic preservation officer shall review the application for completeness and shall make a determination whether the subject of the application is contributing or non-contributing within thirty (30) days of deeming the application complete. The historic preservation officer may, at his or her discretion, present the application to the historic and design review commission for their recommendation. Properties that are determined to be noncontributing are eligible to receive administrative approval for demolition requests by OHP staff.

- c. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – All historic-aged buildings within a district are generally considered contributing unless formally determined otherwise. A Historic Assessment of the property was completed in April 2019 at the request of the applicant. The Historic Assessment found that the property was previously owned by a prominent San Antonio attorney and is an example of a midcentury home constructed during an era of renewed interest in the King William neighborhood. Following the assessment, staff is referring the determination of contributing status to the HDRC for review and recommendation as authorized in the UDC.

Findings related to action item B:

- d. 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 or final approval.
- e. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – The applicant presented the application materials at the Design Review Committee on August 12, 2020. The Commissioners present did not review contributing status at the meeting but asked questions to clarify the results of the Historic Assessment completed in 2019 and to better understand the current condition of the existing structure. The meeting also reviewed the request for conceptual approval of new construction. The Commissioners suggested that the applicant should provide the percentage of lot coverage, an elevation showing the massing of adjacent structures and materials expressing the setback, scale and mass, heights of rooflines, and materials proposed in relation to other existing structures. Additionally, the Commissioners recommended that the applicant provide a landscaping plan and provide precedent studies of historic structures with double-height bay windows.
- f. SETBACK & ORIENTATION – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings should align with the 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 to construct a 2-story, single family residence at 435 Mission. The frontage of the residence will be oriented toward Mission Street, which is the established orientation on the block. The applicant has proposed to construct a carport that will be oriented toward Mission Street and setback at the rear of the property. The proposed orientation and location of the carport is appropriate. Staff finds that the front yard setback could be increased in order to meet the Guidelines.
- g. SCALE AND MASSING – According to Guideline 2.A.i for New Construction, new structures should feature a height and massing that is similar to historic structures in the vicinity. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one story. This block of Mission Street features mostly 1-story historic structures and about nine 2- story structures. Two-story structures make about approximately 27 percent of this block. This block does not currently feature new construction built after 1960. Staff finds that the proposed scale and massing of the structure appears generally appropriate.

- h. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a cross gable roof form. According to Guideline 2.B.i for New Construction, new construction should feature roof forms that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. The adjacent structures on Mission feature front gable, side gable, cross gable, hip, and pyramidal roof forms. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. LOT COVERAGE – Guideline 2.D.i for New Construction stipulates that building to lot ratio for new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings. Limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The applicant has proposed to construct a 2,582-square-foot residence with a 712-square-foot rear accessory structure. The existing property is a double lot, which was historically two individual lots. The existing structure on the lot is 2,300 square feet. The applicant has not yet provided the building to lot ratio. Staff finds that the applicant should provide information regarding the percentage of lot coverage to staff for review.
- j. MATERIALS AND TEXTURES – The applicant has proposed to clad the proposed primary structure in red brick with masonry and wood shingle accents. The applicant has proposed to install a standing seam metal roof. The applicant has not provided material specifications for the rear of the primary structure or the rear accessory structure. Guideline 3.A.i for New Construction stipulates that new construction should use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. For example, corrugated metal siding would not be appropriate for a new structure in a district comprised of homes with wood siding. Consider using traditional materials, such as wood siding, in a new way to provide visual interest in new construction while still ensuring compatibility. The adjacent historic structures generally feature wood siding or stucco cladding and composition shingle or metal roofing material. The existing structure on the property features red brick veneer. The applicant should submit material specifications to staff for approval.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- l. RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS – Guideline 2.C.i for New Construction stipulates that new construction should incorporate window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Windows, doors, porches, entryways, dormers, bays, and pediments shall be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height to width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has submitted renderings of the primary structure that feature windows and doors of traditional proportions and elevations with traditional fenestration patterns. The proposed rear accessory structure is very conceptual in design at this time, staff finds that the applicant should propose window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades and window and doors featuring traditional proportions.
- m. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Guideline 4.A.i for New Construction states that new buildings should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new

construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. Staff finds that the applicant has proposed historically appropriate proportions and a design that serves as an overall contemporary interpretation of existing historic structures. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

- n. DRIVEWAYS – Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements notes that new driveways should be similar to those found historically within the district in regard to their materials, width, and design. Additionally, the Guidelines note that driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. The applicant has proposed to install a 12-foot-wide fully concrete driveway along the north side of the property. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the width of the proposed driveway to comply with the Guidelines.
- o. FRONT WALKWAYS – The Guidelines for Site Elements note that front yard sidewalk should appear similar to those found historically within the district in regard to their materials, width, alignment and configuration. The applicant has proposed to install a front-yard walkway to the entry door. The applicant has proposed to install a walkway constructed of brick pavers that will be 7 feet, 7 inches wide. The majority of front walkways on the block are full concrete walkways. One property features a tile front walkway. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per Guideline 6.B.ii for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right-of-way.
- q. LANDSCAPING PLAN – At this time, the applicant has not provided a landscaping plan. The applicant should install landscape elements that are consistent with those found historically in the district.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation related to action item A:

Staff has referred a determination to the HDRC regarding non-contributing status for the existing structure at 435 Mission Street. If approved, then a demolition permit may be issued administratively by the OHP staff in accordance with UDC 35-619.

Recommendation related to action item B:

If a determination of non-contributing status for the existing house at 435 Mission Street is approved, then staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings d through q with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant increases the proposed front yard setback based on finding f.
- ii. That the applicant submits information regarding lot coverage based on finding i.
- iii. That the applicant submits material specifications to staff for review based on finding j.
- iv. That the applicant submits window specifications to staff for review and approval based on finding k. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. 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.
- v. That the applicant reduces the width of the proposed driveway based on finding n.
- vi. That the applicant submits a landscaping plan to staff for review and approval based on finding q.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society- opposes to the case and concurs with staff findings.
King William Association- opposes to case and non-contribution status.

Item A Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve determination of non-contribution status.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 5 AYES, AND 2 NAY AND 4 ABSENT**

2nd Motion: Commissioner Fish moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations and remand to DRC for revised setback and details on project.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES, 0 NAY, 4ABSENT, AND 1 ABSTAIN.**

• **Item #15. HDRC NO. 2020-242**

ADDRESS: 326 RIVERSIDE DR

APPLICANT: Patrick Christensen

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Demolish a historic structure on the lot at 326 Riverside (noted within this application as structure 3), located within the Mission Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 5.
2. Demolish a historic structure on the lot at 326 Riverside (noted within this application as structure 4), located within the Mission Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 5.
3. Construct twenty-six (26) single-family residential structures.

FINDINGS:

General Findings:

- 2a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to demolish two historic structures on the lot at 326 Riverside, located within the Mission Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 5. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to construct twenty-six (26) single-family residential structures. The two historic structures on the western side of the property will be rehabilitated and are not part of this application.

- 2b. 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.
- 2c. SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY COORDINATION – Per the UDC Section 35-672(c)8, consultation with the San Antonio River Authority regarding direct access to the San Antonio River, landscaping and maintenance boundaries and storm water control measures prior to the submission for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC.
- 2d. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 28, 2020. Committee members also viewed the structures on site. Committee members provided feedback to the applicant, and noted that the western two structure maintained the most character and integrity. Since that time, the applicant has excluded those structures from the demolition request.
- 2e. PUBLIC NOTICE – Demolition notice postcards were mailed to properties within a 200 foot radius of the property, as well as to the registered neighborhood association on August 7, 2020, as required by the Unified Development Code.

Findings related to request item #1

- 2f. The lot at 326 Riverside currently features four historic structures, two of which the applicant is proposing to demolish. This structure, noted as structure three on the site plan features traditional architectural elements, including board and batter siding, a side gabled roof, four over four wood windows and a shed porch roof. Sanborn Maps do not include Riverside in the 1951 update. A 1953 San Antonio Light advertisement notes a “2-r & bath. Also 3-r gar. apt.” at 326 Riverside. This structure contributes to the Mission Historic District given its design, architectural style, and construction date, c. 1940.
- 2g. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

- a. *The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*

[The applicant has provided a detailed estimate of rehabilitative costs for both structures three and four. The applicant has noted a total rehabilitation cost of \$206,701. Neither additional bids, nor a third party bid has been no obtained at this time. Per Bexar County Appraisal District records, the improvement value for all structures at 326 Riverside for 2020 was \$155,030.]

- b. *The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*

[A structural engineer's report has not been submitted; however, the applicant has noted that foundation, framing and roof replacement is needed for this structure. Structure three, per site visits by staff, appears to be structurally sound.]

c. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or

property.

[The property is not currently listed for sale, and was acquired by the current owner on March 8, 2019, per Bexar County Deed Records.]

- 2h. Staff finds that the applicant has not demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship in accordance with the UDC due to the lack of active marketing of the property within the last two calendar years as well as due to the lack of financial information noting that the structures cannot be adaptively reused which would result in a reasonable rate of return. When an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the Historic and Design Review Commission additional information which may show a loss of significance in regards to the subject of the application in order to receive Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation of approval of the demolition. If, based on the evidence presented, the Historic and Design Review Commission finds that the structure or property is no longer historically, culturally, architecturally or archeologically significant, it may make a recommendation for approval of the demolition. In making this determination, the historic and design review commission must find that the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission that the structure or property has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. Additionally, the Historic and Design Review Commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner, and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect.
- 2i. In general, staff encourages the rehabilitation, and when necessary, reconstruction of historic structures. Such work is eligible for local tax incentives. The financial benefit of the incentives should be taken into account when weighing the costs of rehabilitation against the costs of demolition with new construction.

Findings related to request item #2

- 2j. The lot at 326 Riverside currently features four historic structures, two of which the applicant is proposing to demolish. This structure, noted as structure four on the site plan features stucco walls, and two over two wood windows (the roof form has been modified from its previous gabled profile). Sanborn Maps do not include Riverside in the 1951 update. A 1953 San Antonio Light advertisement notes a "2-r & bath. Also 3-r gar. apt." at 326 Riverside. This structure contributes to the Mission Historic District given its design, architectural style, and construction date, c. 1940.
- 2k. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every

attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The criteria for establishing unreasonable economic hardship are listed in UDC Section 35-614 (b)(3). The applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

a. The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;

[The applicant has provided a detailed estimate of rehabilitative costs for both structures three and four. The applicant has noted a total rehabilitation cost of \$157,556 for structure four. Neither additional bids, nor a third party bid has been no obtained at this time. Per Bexar County Appraisal District records, the improvement value for all structures at 326 Riverside for 2020 was \$155,030.]

b. The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;

[A structural engineer's report has not been submitted; however, the applicant has noted that foundation, framing and roof replacement is needed for this structure. Demolition of structure four began without a Certificate of Appropriateness or permits in February 2020.]

c. The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.

[The property is not currently listed for sale, and was acquired by the current owner on March 8, 2019, per Bexar County Deed Records.]

21. Staff finds that the applicant has not demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship in accordance with the UDC due to the lack of active marketing of the property within the last two calendar years as well as due to the lack of financial information noting that the structures cannot be adaptively reused which would result in a reasonable rate of return. When an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the Historic and Design Review Commission additional information which may show a loss of significance in regards to the subject of the application in order to receive Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation of approval of the demolition. If, based on the evidence presented, the Historic and Design Review Commission finds that the structure or property is no longer historically, culturally, architecturally or archeologically significant, it may make a recommendation for approval of the demolition. In making this determination, the historic and design review commission must find that the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission that the structure or property has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose the historic, cultural, architectural or archeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property

for such designation. Additionally, the Historic and Design Review Commission must find that such changes were not caused either directly or indirectly by the owner, and were not due to intentional or negligent destruction or a lack of maintenance rising to the level of a demolition by neglect.

- 2m. In general, staff encourages the rehabilitation, and when necessary, reconstruction of historic structures. Such work is eligible for local tax incentives. The financial benefit of the incentives should be taken into account when weighing the costs of rehabilitation against the costs of demolition with new construction.

Finding related to request item#3

- 3a. The applicant has proposed to construct twenty-six (26) single-family residential structures.
- 3b. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – Riverside Drive between E Southcross and Roosevelt is primarily industrial in nature. There are small, single-family residential structures located on the south side of Riverside Drive; however, these structures feature varying setbacks and orientations.
- 3c. 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 for nine of the twenty-six new structures to feature setbacks from Roosevelt; however, the applicant has not specified setback measurements. Staff finds that new construction should not feature a setback that is less than that of structures one and four on the currently lot.
- 3d. SETBACKS (River) – The Unified Development Code Section 35-673 notes that new construction in RIO-5 must feature a fifty (50) foot setback from the top of bank. The proposed new construction does not meet this standard of the UDC.
- 3e. SCALE & MASS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This lot currently features three, 1-story structures and one, 2-story structure. The applicant has proposed to construct 2-story residential structures. While the proposed massing and height are greater than that found historically on the block staff finds the proposed massing could be appropriate if roof forms and traditional architectural elements were included in the design.
- 3f. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Additionally, new construction should feature entrance massing that is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that traditional entrance massing, including traditional porches should be incorporated into the design. Traditional porch massing is found on the lot in the historic structures that currently exist.
- 3g. 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. At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding foundation heights. Staff finds that the applicant should utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines.

- 3h. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature flat and low sloped roofs. Roofs found historically throughout the Mission Historic District typically feature hipped and gabled elements. Staff finds that traditional roof elements should be incorporated into the design.
- 3i. 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 design documents that the applicant has submitted, staff finds the proposed windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines, as there are windows located on both the first and second floors on the primary façades that feature sizes that are not found historically within the district.
- 3j. PORCH MASSING – As noted in finding 2f, staff finds that traditional porch massing should be incorporated into the design for each structure. Traditional porch massing is found on the lot in the historic structures that currently exist.
- 3k. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., applicants should limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The existing lot features 64,760 square feet. The applicant has proposed approximately 16,500 in new building footprint. The proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
- 3l. MATERIALS – At this time the applicant has not specified materials. Staff finds that materials should be consistent with the Guidelines.
- 3m. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff finds that a wood, or aluminum clad wood window should be installed that is consistent with staff’s specifications for windows, which are noted in the applicable citations.
- 3n. As noted in the previous findings, staff finds that architectural forms including roof profiles, massing, fenestration profiles, porch massing and materials should be consistent with those found historically within the district, and those recommended by the Guidelines for New Construction.
- 3o. SITE ELEMENTS – The applicant has proposed an internal drive with a driveway connection to Riverside. The applicant is to comply with the Guidelines for Site Element regarding driveway width (10 feet).
- 3p. PARKING – Attached vehicular parking (including carports) is not found historically within historic districts. Additionally, parking should be located at the rear or detached from a historic structure. The applicant has proposed parking that would align vehicles with the front of each façade, at the block face. This is not consistent with the Guidelines nor the UDC, which notes that vehicular parking is to be located internally on a lot.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, demolition of structure three, as the applicant has not provided substantial information to prove an economic hardship. Staff recommends that this structure be rehabilitated.

2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, demolition of structure four, as the applicant has not provided substantial information to provide an economic hardship. Staff recommends that this structure be rehabilitated.

3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, conceptual approval of twenty-six residential structures based on findings a 3a through 3q. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items be addressed prior to receiving a recommendation for conceptual approval:

- i. That the applicant use setbacks that are consistent with both the Guidelines for New Construction as well as the UDC Section 35-673 in regards to both street and river side setbacks as noted in finding 3c and 3d.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate appropriate roof and façade massing that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 3e.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate traditional entrance elements and porch massing as noted in finding 3f and 3j.
- iv. That the applicant utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding 3g.
- v. That the applicant incorporate appropriate window and door openings that are consistent with the Guidelines as noted in finding 3i.
- vi. That the applicant incorporate materials that are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction as noted in finding 3l.
- vii. That the applicant use windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction, as noted in finding 3m and found in the applicable citations.
- viii. That the proposed driveway comply with the Guidelines for Site Elements, as noted in finding 3o.
- ix. That the applicant eliminate the front loaded parking, and proposed parking that is consistent with both the Historic Design Guidelines and the Unified Development Code, as noted in finding 3p.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 1 and 2 and refer item 3 to DRC. Commissioner Velasquez 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 # 17. HDRC NO. 2020-256**

ADDRESS: 515, 517, 519 N PALMETTO

APPLICANT: Ricardo Mccullough

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct three, 1-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 515 N Palmetto, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct three, 1-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 515 N Palmetto, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – The applicant received conceptual approval at the July 1, 2020, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the applicant utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines, at least one (1) foot in height. **Per the submitted construction documents, this stipulation has not been met.**
 - ii. That the applicant incorporate window and door openings that are consistent with the Guidelines when developing construction documents. **Per the submitted construction documents, this stipulation has not been met.**
 - iii. That each porch feature a depth of at least five (5) feet in depth, and feature a side facing window. **Per the submitted construction documents, this stipulation has not been met.**
 - iv. That all siding feature a four (4) inch exposure, a thickness of ¾”, mitered corners and a smooth finish. Columns should be six inches square, and window materials should meet staff’s standards for windows in new construction, as noted in finding m. Additionally, gable returns should be eliminated from the gabled roofs. **Per the submitted construction documents, this stipulation has not been met.**
 - v. That the applicant install windows that are consistent with staff’s specifications for windows in new construction. **Per the submitted construction documents, this stipulation has not been met.**
 - vi. That additional steps be taken to incorporate a unique design for each structure.
 - vii. That the applicant eliminate the proposed driveways that terminate into the front façade of each structure and consider a rear driveway from the alley.
 - viii. That the applicant install a front walkway to connect to the sidewalk at the right of way, develop a landscaping plan, and screen all mechanical equipment..
- c. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – As noted in finding a, the existing site is currently void of any structures and is bounded by N Palmetto to the east and Florence/Dawson Alley to the west (rear). The lot is approximately 120 feet wide and 130 feet deep for a total size of 15,600 square feet. The applicant intends to sub divide the property into three lots, which will be addressed as 515, 517 and 519 N Palmetto.
- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – Regarding setbacks, the applicant has proposed setbacks for all three structures that are greater than those found historically on the block. This is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. Regarding orientation, the applicant has proposed an orientation that is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **SITE PLAN** – At this time, the applicant has not submitted an updated site plan noting correct driveway locations. Staff finds that an updated site plan should be submitted to staff prior to a recommendation for final approval.
- 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. This block of N Palmetto features five historic structures, only one of which features more than one story in height. Staff finds the proposed height and massing of one story for each structure to be appropriate.

- g. ENTRANCES – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant’s proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. 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 construction documents, the applicant has proposed foundation heights of less than one foot. Staff finds that the applicant should utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines, at least one (1) foot in height.
- i. ROOF FORMS – The applicant has proposed for each of the three structures to feature gabled and hipped roofs. Staff finds each of these roof forms to be appropriate; however, staff finds that gable returns should be eliminated from gabled roofs.
- j. 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. The applicant has incorporated window openings that are consistent with the Guidelines for the front elevations of each structure; however, the other elevations feature contemporary façade openings and window profiles. Staff finds that traditional window openings should be located on each façade.
- k. PORCH MASSING – The applicant has proposed for each porch to feature a massing that is incorporated within the massing of each structure. Staff finds this to be appropriate; however, staff finds that each porch should feature a depth of at least five (5) feet. Additionally, staff finds that a side window should be incorporated into the each porch wall (facing the side wall), consistent with historic examples found throughout the district.
- l. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., applicants should limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. Per the submitted site plan, staff finds that the proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., applicants should limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. Per the submitted site plan, staff finds that the proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
- n. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff finds that a wood, or aluminum clad wood window should be installed that is consistent with staff’s specifications for windows, which are noted in the applicable citations.
- o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – As previously noted, staff finds that traditionally sized windows should be incorporated into the design. Additionally, staff finds that additional window openings should be added in locations on both the north and south (right and left) elevations. Materials are to follow staff’s standard specifications, noted in finding l and in the applicable citations.
- p. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (Unique Design) – The applicant has taken steps to incorporate a unique design for each structure, including roof forms. Staff finds that this should be continued through the selection of paint colors.
- q. SITE ELEMENTS (Driveways) – The applicant has noted the installation of a parking pad at the rear (west) of each lot to accommodate parking for two automobiles. Generally, staff finds this to be appropriate.
- r. WALKWAY – The applicant has noted the installation of walkways within the front yard of each residential structure. This is appropriate; however, these walkways should connect to the sidewalk at the right of way

- s. 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.
- t. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the locations of mechanical equipment at each structure; however, has not noted if the mechanical equipment will be screened. All mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right of way with screening elements.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval at this time. Staff recommends that the applicant first address all stipulations of conceptual approval, as well as the stipulations noted below prior to receiving a recommendation for final approval.

- i. That the applicant utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines, at least one (1) foot in height as noted in finding g.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate traditionally sized window openings on each façade and incorporate additional window openings on both the north and south facades, as noted in finding i.
- iii. That each porch feature a depth of at least five (5) feet in depth, and feature a side facing window as noted j.
- iv. That all siding feature a four (4) inch exposure, a thickness of 3/4", mitered corners and a smooth finish. Columns should be six inches square, and window materials should meet staff's standards for windows in new construction, as noted in finding m. Additionally, gable returns should be eliminated from the gabled roofs.
- iv. That the applicant install windows that are consistent with staff's specifications for windows in new construction, as noted in finding m.
- v. That the applicant develop a landscaping plan and screen all mechanical equipment as noted in findings r and s.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Monica Savino- on behalf of several Dignawity Hill Neighbors- supports recommendations, but encourages staff to site issues. Arvis Holland- HPARC does not support the project as presented and supports staff recommendations. The HPARC has strong concerns with non historic detailing of the structures as well.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve with staff stipulations with the additional stipulation to provide documentation to staff before issuing Certificate of Appropriateness(COA). 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 # 18. HDRC NO. 2020-333**
ADDRESS: 430 E MULBERRY AVE
APPLICANT: Peter DeWitt/Adapt Architecture and Construction

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Replace all of the original one over one wood windows with new Sierra Pacific brand wood windows to match in configuration, dimensions, and inset.
2. Reconstruct modified or missing wood window screens.
3. Remove a non-original rear addition.
4. Construct a new rear addition.
5. Demolish the contributing 1-story rear accessory structure.
6. Construct a new 1-story rear accessory structure closer to the east and rear lot lines.
7. Reconfigure the driveway to include paving towards the rear of the lot.
8. Install a rear inground pool.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 430 E Mulberry is a 1-story residence constructed circa 1925 in the Craftsman style. The structure features woodlap siding, original wood windows and screens, and an eyebrow dormer. The structure is contributing to the Monte Vista Historic District. The structure also features an original rear accessory structure, also contributing to the district.
- b. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: CONDITION AND SITE VISIT** – Staff performed a site visit with the applicant on July 29, 2020, to assess the condition of the windows. Most windows have been protected from the exterior by the original wood window screens. Most of the glass in the sashes featured metal stripping consistent with an older security system. While the windows exhibited some signs of deterioration, including chipping paint and moving sash joints, staff found the windows to be in very good condition and fully repairable.
- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY** – The applicant has expressed concern to staff regarding the need to improve the energy efficiency of the house. However, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a house. Improving the energy efficiency of historic windows should be considered only after other options have been explored such as improving attic and wall insulation. The original windows feature single-pane glass which is subject to radiant heat transfer. Products are available to reduce heat transfer such as window films, interior storm windows, and thermal shades. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. Over 112 million windows end up in landfills each year, and about half are under 20 years old. Historic wood windows were constructed to last 100+ years with old growth wood, which is substantially more durable than modern products, and original windows that are restored and maintained over time can last for decades. Replacement window products have a much shorter lifespan, around 10-20 years, and cannot be repaired once they fail. On average, over the lifetime of an original wood window, replacement windows will need to be again replaced at least 4 times. The total lifecycle cost of replacement windows is also much more energy intensive than the restoration of existing windows, including material sourcing, manufacture, transportation, and installation. Finally, window repair and restoration utilizes the local labor of craftspeople. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of windows whenever possible.
- d. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii., and 6.B.iv., in kind replacement of windows is only appropriate

when the original windows are beyond repair. As noted in finding b, staff does not find the original windows to be beyond repair. Replacement of any kind is not consistent with the Guidelines.

- e. WINDOW SCREEN RECONSTRUCTION – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct original wood windows screens to match the existing, including one on the front façade that has been modified to accommodate a window AC unit. Staff finds the request eligible for administrative approval.
- f. REAR ADDITION REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove a non-original rear addition. Based on staff’s observation during a site visit conducted on July 29, 2020, the rear addition is not contributing to the structure and does not feature any material or cultural significance. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- g. NEW REAR ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct a new rear addition in the general footprint of the existing. The addition will feature a side wall plane that closely matches the wall plane of an original side gable on the east façade. The addition will feature materials to match the existing structure, including new one over one wood windows that meet staff’s specifications, and will tie into the existing roofline. Staff finds the request consistent with the Guidelines.
- h. DEMOLITION OF REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historical development pattern within a historic district.
- i. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – The existing 1-story rear accessory structure as a one story, single bay garage structure constructed in 1925 featuring a hipped roof, non-original garage door, and wood windows. The structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. On July 29, 2020, staff conducted a site visit to evaluate the condition of the property. While several original materials exist and the original footprint appears to be intact, the structure has undergone several ill-executed modifications over the years, including opening adjustments that are causing the structure to separate or collapse in various places. Large portions of the walls have also been replaced or fully reframed due to water damage. The rear roofline is bowed and the existing sharp grade of the site results in rainwater runoff collecting in and around the structure. While staff finds that the structure is rapidly deteriorating, the structure is still contributing to the district.
- j. 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. In the submitted application, the applicant has indicated that the structure no longer serves a purpose and poses a safety and health hazard due to water damage and deterioration. The applicant indicated that they attempted to collect reasonable costs for repair and restoration. The location of the structure, which makes it prone to water damage, presents an issue for the long-term viability of restoration and investment in a condition that creates inherent vice. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) has been met based on the documentation provided.
- k. 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. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to the modifications and substantial deterioration of original materials.

- l. **NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE** – The applicant has proposed to construct a new 1-story rear accessory structure. While the new structure will feature a footprint comparable to the existing structure to be removed, the new structure will be located behind on the structure towards the east and closer to the rear property line to more closely match the development pattern of rear structures on this block of E Mulberry. The siting will also allow for more interior lot space and will eliminate water runoff issues caused by the slope of the driveway and grade of the property from E Mulberry. The new structure will feature woodlap siding, a garage door, and a hipped roof. Staff finds the request appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- m. **HARDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to extend the driveway towards the rear of the lot to meet the new garage door, which will face west. The driveway will accommodate a turning radius for cars. The portion of the driveway visible from the street will not be modified in configuration, and the new hardscaping will not be visible from the public right-of-way due to the grade of the site. While staff finds the modifications generally appropriate, staff finds that the impervious cover on the site will be significantly increased based on the full scope of the project. Staff finds that the applicant should reduce the amount of hardscaping as much as possible in favor of pervious cover, such as decomposed granite, gravel, pavers with pervious joints, or native groundcover where appropriate.
- n. **INGROUND POOL** – The applicant has proposed to install an inground pool in the rear of the lot. Staff finds the request generally eligible for administrative approval, but finds that any decking or continuous surface should be pervious where feasible as noted in finding m.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, Staff does not recommend approval of the window replacement based on findings b through d.

If the HDRC recommends approval of the replacement, staff recommends that the following stipulation apply:

- i. That the windows meet the following stipulations: windows must be fully wood windows and feature a true one-over- one configuration. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. 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 wood window screen reconstruction based on finding e.

Item 3, Staff recommends approval of the removal of the non-original rear addition based on finding f.

Item 4, Staff recommends approval of the rear addition based on finding g with the following stipulations:

- ii. That the windows meet the following stipulations: windows must be fully wood or aluminum-clad wood windows and feature a true one-over-one configuration. 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 5, Staff recommends approval of the demolition based on findings h through k with the following stipulation:

- i. That materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding, structural elements, interior shiplap, wood doors, and wood windows be salvaged and stored for use on site in future construction or donated.

Item 6, Staff recommends approval of the construction of a new 1-story rear accessory structure based on finding l with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant complies with all development and setback requirements as required by the Development Services Department and obtains a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.
- ii. That the windows meet the following stipulations: windows must be fully wood or aluminum-clad wood and feature a true one-over-one configuration. 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.

Items 7 and 8, Staff recommends approval of the hardscaping modifications and inground pool based on findings m and n with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduces the amount of impervious hardscaping as much as possible in favor of pervious cover, such as decomposed granite, gravel, pavers with pervious joints, or native groundcover where appropriate. The applicant is required to submit an updated site plan to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Paul Kinnoson- opposed as no issued has been addressed, and suggest revised drawings be submitted for review before issuing Certificate of Appropriateness(COA).

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 2-8 with staff stipulations and provides additional stipulation that the board-batten be issued on the garage wood-carriage style suggest garage door used per recommended by the neighborhood.
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 # 20. HDRC NO. 2020-345**
ADDRESS: 370 QUENTIN DR
APPLICANT: Kelly Hoopes/Pella South Texas

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace two (2) metal casement windows on the front of the house with wood casement windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure at 370 Quentin is a 1-story, single-family structure constructed circa 1950 in the Ranch style. The home features a side gable composition shingle roof, asbestos shingle siding, steel casement and oneover- one wood windows, and stone veneer skirting. The property is contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
- b. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – The applicant has proposed to replace two existing steel casement windows located on the front façade. The windows appear to be original to the structure. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing window with Pella Architect Series Traditional Casement windows that are fully wood. Guideline 6.A.iii for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that historic window should be preserved. 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. SITE VISIT – Staff performed a site visit on August 14, 2020 and observed the following conditions: paint peeling or chipping, cracked or missing caulking, extensive rusting, cracked or broken glass, and broken or missing hardware. Only one bank of windows in window opening #3 is operable. The windows in opening #23 are operable, but the window cranks and hardware are do not work properly. While the windows are in a state of disrepair, staff finds that the windows are repairable.
- d. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: REPLACEMENT PRODUCT – The applicant has proposed to replace two existing steel casement windows located on the front façade. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing windows with Pella Architect Series Traditional Casement windows that are fully wood. 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. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Velasquez moves to remand 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

• **Item # 22. HDRC NO. 2020-343**

ADDRESS: 526 MISSION ST

APPLICANT: Delia Bara/BARA DELIA

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 480 square foot rear accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary historic structure at 526 Mission was constructed 1955, does not appear on the 1951 Sanborn map, and contributes to King William Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features a primary front-facing gable with a covered porch. The property also features a 240 square foot detached garage.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on July 9, 2020, staff found that an attached addition was being constructed on the existing accessory structure at 526 Mission. The applicant submitted revised plans for a detached accessory structure that met the requirements for review on July 24, 2020.
- c. REAR ACCESSORY – The applicant is requesting to construct a new 480 square feet rear accessory structure adjacent to the existing accessory structure that will feature one-story gable roof with composition shingle, vertical beadboard wood siding, a double door, and no windows, set on concrete blocks.
- d. MASSING AND FORM – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i., applicants should design new garages and outbuildings to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form. The proposed accessory structure features a front facing gable with 24-foot wide façade and 20-foot deep side elevations. Staff finds the massing and form consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. BUILDING SIZE – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii., new outbuildings should be no larger in plan than 40 percent of the principal historic structure footprint. The proposed accessory structure features 480 square feet adjacent to the existing 240 square foot detached garage. Staff finds that the proposed structure adjacent to existing structure exceeds 40% or 424 square feet relative to the 1059 square foot primary structure.
- f. CHARACTER – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii., applicants should relate new garages and outbuildings to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The proposed rear accessory structure matches the primary structure in roof form and materials. Staff finds the proposed character generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. WINDOWS AND DOORS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iv., applicants should design window and door openings to be similar to those found on historic garages or outbuildings in the district or on the principal historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions. The proposed accessory structure features a centered double door and no windows. Staff finds the proposed front elevation lacks fenestration that relates to the historic structure and should feature flanking sash windows that adhere to *Standard Specifications for Windows in New Construction*.
- h. ORIENTATION – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.i., applicants should match the predominant garage orientation found along the block. The proposed accessory structure is set the rear corner of the rear yard, adjacent to the existing rear accessory structure, with entry facing the interior of the yard. Staff finds the proposed orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.
- i. SETBACK – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B.ii., applicants should follow historic setback pattern of similar structures along the streetscape or district for new garages and outbuildings. The proposed rear accessory structure features a setback of 5 feet to the side and

rear property line and a separation of 3 feet from the existing accessory structure. Staff finds the proposed setback is consistent with the Guidelines; the applicant is responsible for meeting all setback requirements for permitting.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings e and g. regarding building size and windows and doors. Accessory structures of that size, quantity, and fenestration pattern are atypical to historic development patterns of the block and King William Historic District. If the commission is compelled to approve or the applicant would like to resubmit, staff recommends a reduction of square footage to be consistent with the Guidelines for Additions and incorporating front-façade windows that adhere to *Standard Specifications for Windows in New Construction*.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mario Hernandez, Mario Santos, and David Heigal supports the case.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moves to remand to Design Review Committee-DRC.
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**

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair

