



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
5 August 2020

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, August 5, 2020, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

- Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

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

Absent: Velasquez, Arreola, and Martinez-Flores.

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
 - Item #2, Case No. 2020-299 120 CALLAGHAN AVE
 - Item #3, Case No. 2020-268 15551 NACOGDOCHES RD/ComancheLookout Park
 - Item #4, Case No. 2020-300 2323 BUENA VISTA ST
 - Item #5, Case No. 2020-295 2146 W GRAMERCY PLACE
 - Item #6, Case No. 2020-301 304 E COURTLAND PLACE
 - Item #9, Case No. 2020-309 126 GUADALUPE ST/San Pedro Creek
 - Item #10, Case No. 2020-298 250 MARY LOUISE
 - Item #11, Case No. 2020-289 250 BENITA ST
 - Item #12, Case No. 2020-296 103 W JOHNSON
 - Item #13, Case No. 2020-303 501 HAYS ST
 - Item #15, Case No. 2020-290 3218 KAISER DR/ Jupe Manor NeighborhoodPark
- AGENDA ITEM 7 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 8 WAS POSTPONED BY APPLICANT
- AGENDA ITEM 14 WAS PULLED BY COMMISSION FOR COMMENTS
- AGENDA ITEM 17 WAS WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

- AGENDA ITEM 21 WAS POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

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

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

Action: **THE MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES, 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL**

- *COMMISSIONER VELASQUEZ JOINED MEETING AT 3:05PM*

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS

- **Item # 7. HDRC NO. 2019-278**
ADDRESS: 2265 AUSTIN HWY
Applicant: Debra Dockery/Debra J. Dockery, Architect, P.C.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting final approval to construct a new fire station.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to construct an approximately 16,000 square foot fire station on the lot addressed 2265 Austin Hwy. The lot currently features a non-conforming pole cabinet sign, a surface parking lot, and an open field.
- b. The applicant received conceptual approval from the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) on June 5, 2019. The approval carried the following stipulations:
 1. That the applicant submits all material specification information and a full landscaping and hardscaping plan for final approval; **this stipulation has been met.**
 2. That the applicant submits comprehensive information on proposed signage for final approval, if applicable; **this stipulation has not yet been fully met.**
 3. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology; **this stipulation applies to final approval.**
- 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. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed a metal roof and a combination of brick, stucco, stone masonry, and metal paneling for the façade. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC regarding materiality, which states that materials should be suitable to the building typology and should be human scale at the pedestrian level. Colors should be harmonious with the surrounding environment. Staff finds the proposal appropriate. The applicant is responsible for obtaining a variance for any materials as applicable.
- e. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The applicant is responsible for screening all mechanical equipment in conformance with UDC Section 35-642(b)(6).
- f. **HARDSCAPING AND PARKING** – The applicant has proposed to install new driveways, which will provide access to the new facility. The larger driveway will access the fire truck bay and the smaller driveway will provide access to a rear parking lot for employees and visitors, as well as a trash receptacle area. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the UDC. Staff is responsible for complying with UDC standards for screening and landscaping as noted in finding f, and for verifying parking and egress requirements with the appropriate Development Services Department divisions and reviewers.
- g. **LANDSCAPING** – According to the UDC, parking areas should be screened from view from the public rightof- way and should feature attractive fences, berms, plantings, or other means appropriate to the site. Per the submitted site plan, landscaping elements will be incorporated on the northern, western, and eastern edges of the proposed structure to screen parking and the building. Staff finds this to be generally consistent with the UDC.
- h. **SIGNAGE** – The submitted renderings and drawings indicate potential proposed signage, but to not include detailed drawings. The applicant is required to submit final signage design details to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- i. **WIN ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That the applicant submits comprehensive information on proposed signage prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The signage shall comply with all applicable sections of the UDC.
- ii. That the applicant obtains a variance for any material specifications as applicable as noted in finding d.
- iii. That the proposed landscaping buffers and plans comply with all applicable sections of the UDC.
- iv. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

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

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter 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 Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 14. HDRC NO. 2020-255**
ADDRESS: 422 FAYN WAY
APPLICANT: Juan Fernandez/CVF LLC

REQUEST:

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

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two, 2-story residential structure on the vacant lot at 422 Fayn Way. The lot is positioned to the rear of the lot addressed as 421 Hays, a two story historic structure. This request was previously heard by the Historic and Design Review Commission on June 1, 2020. At that hearing, the Commission postponed this request to allow the applicant time to provide additional exhibits relating to building placement and massing, and to consult with the neighborhood.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on July 21, 2020, where committee members commented on the proposed massing, and asked questions in regards to the building to lot ratio, materials, and the proposed parking configuration.
- d. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – Fayn Way currently features access points to the rear of lots addressed to Hays and Lamar, as well as small rear accessory structures. This block of Hays features five historic structures with a southern facing orientation, two of which feature two stories in height.
- 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 noted a setback from Fayn Way of approximately twenty (20) feet. While there are accessory structures built on the alley, there is not an established setback pattern for the alley. Generally, staff finds the proposed setback to be appropriate.
- 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 to orient the new construction to Fayn Way. Generally, staff finds the proposed 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. The applicant has proposed for both structures to be two stories in height, with an overall height of twenty-five (25) feet, which is subordinate to that of the historic structure at 421 Hays. Given its location and setback from a primary street, staff finds the proposed height to be appropriate.
 - 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 Hays feature foundation heights of at least two feet in height. The applicant has proposed a foundation height of 1’ – 4” for both structures. Staff finds the proposed foundation heights to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
 - i. ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed for both structures to feature front facing gabled roofs. Staff finds that the proposed roof forms are appropriate for the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines.
 - 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 and standing seam metal roofs. 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 – At this time, the applicant has not specified window materials. Staff finds that windows that are consistent with staff’s standards for windows in new construction should be installed.
 - m. FENEESTRATION PROFILE – The applicant has proposed fenestration profiles that are generally in keeping with those found historically within the district; however, staff finds that windows on both the north and south facades should be exposed, and not hidden by screening. Where fenestration does not exist on the north and south façades, staff finds that fenestration should be added.
 - n. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate; however, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added to both the north and south facades as noted in finding m.
 - o. PARKING – The applicant has proposed pull in parking off of the alley. Fayn Way is primarily used to access the rear yards of properties that address Hays and Lamar. In these instances, parking pads, driveways and informal parking conditions exist. Generally, staff finds the proposed parking to be appropriate.

- p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the screening of mechanical equipment by fencing. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- q. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted conceptual landscaping information. Staff finds that a detailed landscaping plan that is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements should be submitted when further developing the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

- i. That siding feature an exposure of four inches, a smooth finish, a thickness of approximately 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.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate windows that meet staff’s standard specifications for windows in new construction as noted in finding l.
- iii. That the applicant install additional window fenestration on the north and south facades, consistent with that of historic structures found in the district.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society and Monica Savino with DHN oppose due to density and out character for the neighborhood.

Motion: Commissioner Grube move to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 16. HDRC NO. 2020-220**
ADDRESS: 619 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: Anahita Moshgbar Bakhshayeshi/Moshgbar Anahita

REQUEST:

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

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 1.5 story, single family residential structure on the vacant lot at 619 Dawson Street, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN – The context and historic development pattern of this block of Dawson consists primarily of one-story residential structures;

however, this block does feature a two-story historic structure. This block also features two-story infill construction.

- c. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – The Historic and Design Review Commission issued conceptual approval of the proposed new construction with the following stipulations:
 - i. 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. **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.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant has proposed a primary entrance toward Dawson. Staff finds the proposed entrance orientation to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. 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.
- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Historic structures on this block of 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.

- h. 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.
- i. LOT COVERAGE – Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The applicant’s proposed lot coverage is consistent with the Guidelines.
- j. MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed materials that include composite siding, 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.
- k. WINDOW MATERIALS – As noted in finding i, 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.
- l. 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.
- m. 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.
- n. 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.
- o. 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.
- p. 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.
- q. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – The applicant has noted the location and screening of all mechanical equipment.
- r. 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: Conservation Society of San Antonio and Monica Savino- concurs with staff recommendations to deny approval; and, Scott Albert opposes as it no complaint to neighborhood and not affordable.

1st Motion: Commissioner Velasquez moved for final approval of item 1 as addressed during presentation, and item 2 and remove stipulation 2, item 3- verify with staff the drawing issues and 4 as submitted as room 102 and 106 east and west fenestrations. To match existing window in living room.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION FAILED with 4 AYES AND 4 NAY. 2 ABSENT. 1 STEPPED AWAY**

2nd Motion: Commissioner Bowman moved to Design Review Committee-DRC .
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 18. HDRC NO. 2020-336**
ADDRESS: 333 W CEVALLOS
APPLICANT: David Abrego/Signs Up

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a temporary, real estate sign at 333 W Cevallos for 90 to 120 days. The proposed sign will feature an overall size of 192 square feet to be visible from interstate highway 10. This property is located within RIO-7.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a temporary, real estate sign at 333 W Cevallos for 90 to 120 days. The proposed sign will feature an overall size of 192 square feet to be visible from interstate highway 10. This property is located within RIO-7.
- b. The UDC Section 35-612(f)(5) and Section 35-678(f)(5) both limit the size of real estate signs to eight (8) square feet. The UDC permits thirty-two (32) square feet for construction signs. Given the size of development and parcel, staff finds that a temporary sign of thirty-two (32) square feet would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a and b with the stipulation that no more than one (1) sign be installed at not larger than thirty-two (32) square feet. The sign shall be removed 120 days from the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve for the 96 square foot temporary signage and shall be removed in 120 days.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAY. 2 ABSENT. 1 STEPPED AWAY.**

- **Item # 19. HDRC NO. 2020-326**
ADDRESS: 277 W WILDWOOD
APPLICANT: San Antonio San Antonio/GONZALEZ ANGELIQUE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing composition shingle roof with a new metal roof on the primary structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property located at 277 W Wildwood is a 1-story single family home constructed circa 1935 in the Minimal Traditional style. The property first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Maps. The structure features a limestone façade, a cross gable composition shingle roof, a central chimney, aluminum divided lite windows, a front porch with turned columns. The structure is contributing to the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District.
- b. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920's, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to its fire resistance, ability to be customized in regard to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation.
- c. According to Sanborn Maps, homes in the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District were originally constructed with composition shingle roofs. There does not appear to be a historic precedent for metal roofs in this area except in limited uses specific to front porch stoops on very few homes.
- d. The applicant submitted a windshield survey of the surrounding blocks within the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District on July 29, 2020 to determine if many of the roofs in the area had been replaced with standing seam metal. On W Wildwood, between cross streets Belknap Place and San Pedro Avenue, two roofs have been replaced with standing seam metal. Overall in the district, the applicant noted approximately 28 homes that feature a metal roof replacement. Photos of these homes are included in the exhibits.
- e. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should only be installed on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a metal roof is not appropriate for this style of house or within the context of the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District, regardless of whether this application of materials is regionally popular.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding e. Staff recommends that an in-kind replacement of composition shingles be installed.

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

1st Motion: Commissioner Laffoon moved to deny application.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

Action: MOTION FAILED with 4 AYES AND 5 NAY. 2ABSENT

2nd Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve standard staff recommendation for metal roof replacement.
Commissioner Bowman seconded the motion.

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

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 1 NAY. 2ABSENT

• **Item #20. HDRC NO. 2020-315**

ADDRESS: 1112 MUNCEY

APPLICANT: Daniel Long

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the existing wood siding with composite, board and batten and lap siding.
2. Replace the existing balcony porch decking and install a balcony railing.
3. Reconstruct the rear deck and install a spiral staircase.
4. Modify the historic fenestration pattern by removing original window openings.
5. Replace all existing wood windows with aluminum windows.
6. Replace all existing wood doors with steel doors.
7. Reconstruct an exterior water heater closet.
8. Install new metal foundation skirting.
9. Replace the existing wood porch columns.
10. Install a new soffit and fascia resulting in the removal of the roof's rafter tails.
11. Paint the historic structure.
12. Install a gravel driveway to feature ten (10) feet in width.

FINDINGS:

- a. The historic structure at 1112 Muncey was constructed circa 1925 and is first found on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The structure currently features original wood windows, wood siding, wood porch columns and most of its original architectural elements. This structure is contributing to the Government Hill Historic District.
- b. Staff performed a site visit on July 23, 2020, and found the existing wood windows and wood siding to be in a repairable state.
- c. **SIDING REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all of the original wood siding with new, composite siding, featuring two new profiles that are not

consistent with the historic siding profile. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1.B note that siding that is not deteriorated beyond repair should be maintained. When siding is beyond repair, in-kind materials that are similar in size, sale and character should be installed. The applicant's request is not consistent with the Guidelines. As noted in finding b, staff performed a site visit and found the existing siding to be in a repairable state. Where existing siding is damaged, staff finds that matching siding should be installed.

- d. **BALCONY DECKING AND RAILING** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing porch balcony decking and railing. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iii. porches and porch elements should be repaired in-kind. Per photos, the structure features 1x3 tongue and groove decking. Staff finds that 1x3 tongue and groove decking should be installed, perpendicular to the front façade. Regarding the proposed porch railing, the existing railing features a historic profile that staff finds should be matched.
- e. **REAR DECK RECONSTRUCTION** – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the existing rear, double height porch and construct a spiral staircase. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to eliminate the existing porch roof. Per the 1951 Sanborn map, the existing double height porch is not original to the historic structure. Staff finds the proposed reconstruction of the reach porch to be appropriate; however, the applicant has not submitted a detail of the proposed spiral staircase. Staff finds that the new porch should feature 1x3 tongue and groove decking, installed perpendicular to the rear façade, as currently exists. A detail of the spiral staircase must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a COA.
- f. **FENESTRATION MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing, historic fenestration profile by removing window openings on the north, south and east elevations. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. existing window and door openings should be preserved. The proposed fenestration modifications are neither appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the existing window openings should remain as they exist.
- g. **WOOD WINDOW REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing wood windows with aluminum windows. Per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, historic windows should be preserved. As noted in finding b, staff performed a site visit on July 23, 2020, and found the existing windows to be in a repairable condition. Staff finds the request of window replacement to be inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- h. **DOOR REPLACEMENT** – The applicant has proposed to replace all existing doors with new, steel doors. The existing front doors on the first floor do not appear to be original and feature nontraditional profiles; however, the second story door on the front façade as well as both rear doors feature traditional profiles and should be maintained. If doors are deteriorated beyond repair, they should be replaced with wood doors, per the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.ii.
- i. **WATER HEATER CLOSET RESTORATION** – The applicant has proposed to construct an exterior water heater closet, currently located on the north (side) elevation. Staff finds this reconstruction to be appropriate; however, the reconstruction should be in-kind, maintaining the existing profile and use matching siding.

- j. FOUNDATION SKIRTING – Foundation repair has been approved through an administrative Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant has noted the installation of metal foundation skirting, which is not consistent with the Guidelines nor historic skirting materials found throughout the district. Staff finds that new foundation skirting should either be wood to match the profile of the existing siding and may feature composite siding as it approaches the ground to prevent future wood rot.
- k. PORCH COLUMN REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing, wood porch columns that feature capital and base trim with new porch columns that are simple 6x6 square posts. This request is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B. If the existing porch columns are structurally unsound, or deteriorated beyond repair, the new porch columns should match the existing in profile and detail.
- l. FASCIA & SOFFIT INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to introduce a new fascia and soffit, resulting in the loss of the historic roof profile and exposed rafter tails. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.ii and iii.
- m. PAINTING – The applicant has proposed to paint the historic structure and has submitted paint color to staff. Staff finds the proposed painting to be appropriate.
- n. DRIVEWAY – The current site does not feature a driveway; however, a curbcut and approach are on site. The applicant has proposed to install a gravel driveway to feature ten (10) feet in width. Staff finds the proposed driveway installation to be appropriate; however, the proposed driveway should feature gravel with a color that is native to San Antonio.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Staff does not recommend approval of item #1, siding replacement, based on finding c. Staff recommends that the existing siding be repaired in place. Where siding is missing or deteriorated beyond repair, it should be replaced with matching wood siding.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, porch decking and railing replacement based on finding d with the following stipulations:
 - i. That 1x3 tongue and groove decking be installed, perpendicular to the front façade.
 - ii. That the new porch railing match the existing in profile and material. A detailed drawing is to be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of a COA.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, rear porch reconstruction based on finding e with the following stipulations:
 - i. That 1x3 tongue and groove decking be installed, perpendicular to the rear façade.
 - ii. A detail of the spiral staircase must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a COA.
4. Staff does not recommend approval of item #4, fenestration modifications based on finding f. Staff recommends that all existing window openings remain as they currently exist.
5. Staff does not recommend approval of item #5, wood window replacement based on finding g. Staff recommends that all existing wood windows be repaired.
6. Staff recommends approval of item #6, door replacement for only the front doors on first floor, as noted in finding h. The applicant must submit replacement wood doors to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a COA.

7. Staff recommends approval of item #7, the reconstruction of the hot water heater closet with the stipulation that the existing form be maintained, and that the reconstructed closet feature siding to match that of the historic house, as noted in finding i.
8. Staff recommends approval of item #8, foundation skirting installation with the stipulation that wood skirting be installed instead of the proposed metal skirting, as noted in finding j. A composite material may be used at the ground to prevent wood rot.
9. Staff does not recommend approval of item #9, porch column replacement, based on finding k. Staff recommends that the existing columns be repaired. If the existing columns are deteriorated beyond repair or are structurally unsound, the new columns should match the existing, with a detailed drawing being submitted and approved by staff prior to the issuance of a COA.
10. Staff does not recommend approval of item #10, soffit and fascia installation based on finding l. Staff recommends the historic form of the roof be maintained as it exists.
11. Staff recommends approval of item #11, painting, as submitted, based on finding m.
12. Staff recommends approval of item #12, driveway installation with the stipulation that gravel that is natural to San Antonio in regards to its size and color be installed. A photo of the proposed gravel is to be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a COA.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve *item 1* to remove the siding in order to necessary repairs, and replacing front St façade with salvaged material for original profile, and other 3 facades receive a new material similar to viewed profile as reviewed by staff. *Item 2-* approve and the stipulation of the 4 in spacing balustrades requested by applicant and required by code. *Item 3-*approve reconstruction of the porch be wood using 2 X6 material framed perpendicularly to the structure- and accepted the stairs as presented today. *Item 4-* denial, but approve of interior blocking of window for functionality in the space. *Item 5-* approve, but should have final approval by staff. *Item 6* approve with staff recommendation as noted in finding h. *item 7-* approve with staff stipulations. *Item 8-* with staff stipulations. *Item 9-*staff stipulations, but using similar material for new column match the base trimming as existing, *item 10-* deny item, and approve *items 11 and 12* with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Fish seconded the motion.

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

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

• **Item # 22. HDRC NO. 2020-292**
ADDRESS: 801 LABOR ST
APPLICANT: Rudy Macias/LOCKE-MACIAS CHRISTINA ANN & RODOLFOMACIAS

REQUEST:

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

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

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 801 Labor is a 1-story, single family residence constructed circa 1910 with Craftsman and Neoclassical influences. The property first appears on the 1912 Sanborn Map. The home features a full-width front porch, a hipped roof with four dormers, and a symmetrical façade. The home is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant’s request was previously heard at the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) hearing on July 15, 2020. During the hearing, the applicant stated that a Certificate of Appropriateness had been previously issued for the side yard fence. Staff was not familiar with a prior approval and did not locate an approval in OHP files during the hearing. The HDRC moved to postpone the case in order to clarify the request and whether any prior approvals had been issued for fencing on the property. Following the July 15th hearing, staff determined that the side yard fencing had already been installed during a site visit on July 16, 2020. The property does not have any previously issued Certificates of Appropriateness for side yard fencing and the property has not been issued a permit for the installation of side yard fencing. The request for both side yard and front yard fencing remains the request under review before the HDRC.
- c. **SIDE YARD FENCING: FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing chain link fence on the north side of the property with a 4-foot-high iron cattle panel fence. The house is located on a corner lot and the proposed fencing will extend from the neighboring property line on Labor to the existing chain link fence at the rear of the property line on Sadie Street. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Staff find that cattle panel fencing is generally appropriate for the district but finds that the posts and rails should be wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence. As the proposed side yard fence will replace an existing chain link fence, staff finds the fully metal cattle panel fence appropriate.
- d. **FRONT YARD FENCING: FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed to install a 3-foot-high iron cattle panel fence on the front property line. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Staff find that cattle panel fencing is generally appropriate for the district but finds that the posts and rails should be wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence. Fully wood fencing is more consistent with fence materials historically used in the Lavaca Historic District.
- e. **FENCE LOCATION** – According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should follow historic fence placements in the district. The proposed fence will follow the established fence line along Labor Street and will extend to the rear property line on Sadie Street. The proposed fence will meet an existing chain link fence at the rear property line. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the installation of the side yard fence based on findings a through c.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the front yard fence installation based on findings d through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the posts and rails of the front yard fence are wood in lieu of the proposed fully metal fence as noted in finding d.
- ii. The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish move to approve as submitted Item 1 and 2.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

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

- **Item # 23. HDRC NO. 2020-337**

ADDRESS: 100 N SANTA ROSA

APPLICANT: Image360 San Antonio West

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Install an internally illuminated sign to feature individually illuminated channel letters at the corner of W Commerce and N Santa Rosa to read “Inspire Downtown”. The sign will feature an overall width of approximately fourteen (14) feet and an overall height of 5.4 feet for a total size of approximately seventy-six (76) square feet. The sign will feature aluminum construction with polycarbonate letters.
- 2. Install four (4) internally illuminated parking signs to feature black aluminum faces and polycarbonate letters to be located at the corners of W Commerce and N Laredo, W Houston and N Laredo, N Santa Rosa and W Houston, and N Santa Rosa and W Commerce. The proposed signs will feature an overall size of approximately fifty-two (52) inches in height and thirty (30) inches in width for a total size of approximately 21.5 square feet, including both sides. The total square footage requested for all three signs is approximately 64.5 square feet.
- 3. Install one (1) internally illuminated parking sign to feature black aluminum face and polycarbonate letters to be located at the corner of W Commerce and N Laredo. The proposed sign will feature an overall height of twelve (12) feet and an overall width of three (3) feet for a total size of seventy-two (72) square feet, including both sides.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to install signage at 100 N Santa Rosa. Within this request the applicant has proposed one building sign and four parking signs.
- b. **ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE** – The UDC Section 35-678 notes that Applicants may apply for up to three (3) signs total. Total signage for all applicants shall not exceed fifty (50) square feet unless additional signs and/or additional total square footage is approved. Additional square footage may be approved provided that the additional signage is in conformity with, and does not interfere with, the pedestrian experience on the Riverwalk. The additional square footage shall be based upon the size and scope of the site. Signs should reflect the type and speed of traffic they are meant to attract. Signs designed for pedestrians and drivers of slow moving cars should not be the same size as signs designed for highway traffic.
- c. **BUILDING SIGN** – The applicant has proposed to install an internally illuminated sign to feature individually illuminated channel letters at the corner of W Commerce and N Santa Rosa to read “Inspire Downtown”. The sign will feature an overall width of approximately fourteen (14) feet and an overall height of 5.4 feet for a total size of approximately seventy-six (76) square feet. The sign will feature aluminum construction with polycarbonate letters. Staff finds the proposed design to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC. Given the size of the structure, staff finds the proposed size to also be appropriate.
- d. **PARKING SIGNS (Request item #2)** – The applicant has proposed to install four (4) internally illuminated parking signs to feature black aluminum faces and polycarbonate letters to be located at the corners of W Houston and N Laredo, W Commerce and N Laredo, N Santa Rosa and W Houston, and N Santa Rosa and W Commerce. The proposed signs will feature an overall size of approximately fiftytwo (52) inches in height and thirty (30) inches in width for a total size of approximately 21.5 square feet, including both sides. The total square footage requested for all three signs is approximately 64.5 square feet. Generally, staff finds the proposed signs, including their design, size, and locations to be appropriate.
- e. **PARKING SIGN (Request item #3)** – The applicant has proposed to install one (1) internally illuminated parking sign to feature black aluminum face and polycarbonate letters to be located at the corner of W Commerce and N Laredo. The proposed sign will feature an overall height of twelve (12) feet and an overall width of three (3) feet for a total size of seventy-two (72) square feet, including both sides. Staff finds the proposed parking sign to be in excess of what has been demonstrated in this application to be sufficient directional signage for parking. As proposed, this sign is greater than the size of the smaller three parking signs combined. Staff finds that this sign should feature a size that is noted for the smaller three parking signs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #3 based on findings a through e with the stipulation that the parking sign noted in request item #3 be reduced in size to match those noted in request item #2; approximately fifty-two (52) inches in height and thirty (30) inches in width for a total size of approximately 21.5 total square feet.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 3, window removal and infill based on finding e.

Staff recommends that appropriately-sized fenestration be installed in the opening and that infill siding either match existing or original siding in appearance.

MTG MINUTES 8.5.20

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Steven Arnald- opposes due to excessive signage; and, Carol Wood- opposed- due not to understand the historical context and should not be allowed or is appropriate for area.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to continue until the next hearing.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

Nay: None.

Absent: Arreola, and Martinez-Flores.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:02 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey Fetzer', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.