



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2023**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, January 18, 2023, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m. for work session.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Cervantes, Baker (videoconference), Fetzer
Absent: Gibbs, Fish, Grube, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:

Chairman Fetzer provided a statement regarding meeting and appeal processes, time limits, and decorum.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve the minutes for the Wednesday, December 21, 2022, Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) meeting.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)
ABSTAIN: Carpenter

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT. 1 ABSTAIN.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Spanish interpreter services are available to the public during the hearing.
Staff extends an invitation to the public and Commissioners to attend upcoming Office of Historic Preservation events for February 2023.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Item 2 – Shelly Galbraith opposes the case.
Item 2 – King William Association submitted letter in support of the case.
Item 4 – Frederica Kushner supports the case.
Item 6 – Lisa Lynde on behalf of the King William Architectural Advisory Committee supports staff's recommendations and opposes the aluminum commercial storefront window wall proposed for the new hallway.
Item 6 – King William Association submitted letter in support of the case.
Item 12 – Bianca Maldonado on behalf of Monticello Park Neighborhood Assoc. support staff's recommendations.
Item 8 – King William Association submitted letter in support of the case.
Item 9 – King William Association submitted letter in support of the case.

Commissioner Fetzer asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the Consent agenda.
Commissioner Mazuca requested Item 10 be pulled for individual consideration.

* Commissioner Gibbs and Commissioner Grube arrived at 3:14 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Item 1, Case No. 2022-591	938 Dawson St
Item 2, Case No. 2023-001	401 King William
Item 3, Case No. 2023-007	328 E HUISACHE AVE
Item 4, Case No. 2022-592	1602 N MAIN AVE
Item 5, Case No. 2022-593	109 W MULBERRY AVE
Item 6, Case No. 2023-013	130 WICKES, 134 WICKES
Item 7, Case No. 2023-011	823 DAKOTA ST
Item 8, Case No. 2023-014	427 MISSION ST
Item 9, Case No. 2022-586	311 EAGLELAND DR
Item 11, Case No. 2022-595	2602 N FLORES ST
Item 12, Case No. 2023-004	235 FURR DR
Item 13, Case No. 2023-015	526 E COURTLAND PLACE

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve with staff stipulations Items 1-9 and 11-13. Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 10. HDRC NO. 2022-478
ADDRESS: Right-of-way at Frio & W Commerce
APPLICANT: Bianca Alvarez/Department of Arts & Culture, City of San Antonio

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: permanently install two public art sculptures within Cattleman Square.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve as submitted. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2023-005
ADDRESS: 719 E CARSON
APPLICANT: Stetson Holland/Rhino Roofers and Construction

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with a metal roofing product that is to appear as historic, wood shake roofing shingles.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with a metal roofing product that is to appear as historic, wood shake roofing shingles.
- b. The historic structure at 719 E Carson was constructed circa 1900 in the Queen Anne style and is first found on the 1904 Sanborn Map, where it is noted that the structure has a shingle roof; most likely wood shake. The structure is contributing to the Government Hill Historic District.
- c. ROOF REPLACEMENT (Previous Approval) – The applicant received an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness on October 18, 2022, to replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with a synthetic wood shake roofing material.
- d. ROOF REPLACEMENT – At this time, the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with composite roofing product that is to appear as historic, wood shake roofing shingles. The proposed material is supplied in 14” x 52” sheet. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.A. iv. notes that roofing materials should be replaced in-kind whenever possible. Additionally, the Guidelines recommend that replacement roofing materials should match the original materials in terms of their scale, color, texture, profile, and style, or that materials that are consistent with the building style should be selected. Staff finds that the composite roofing sheets that are to appear as wood shake shingles are not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that in-kind replacement or replacement with a synthetic wood shake would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d. Staff recommends the applicant replace the roof in-kind, or with a synthetic wood shake that features individual shakes.

All historic roof elements, including architectural moldings, chimneys and flues, dormers and attic vents are to be repaired and remain in place.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube motioned to approve with staff stipulations. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer
NAY: Cervantes, Baker
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 2 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2023-008
ADDRESS: 120 W LYNWOOD
APPLICANT: Robert Frankland/Frankland 4 Company LLC

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Replace the existing concrete driveway with a concrete paver driveway, expanded to ten (10) feet in width.
- 2. Modify the existing retaining wall in a stacked limestone configuration.
- 3. Install an eight (8) inch curbing on the west side of the driveway in a dry stack position.
- 4. Install a 6-foot-tall swinging driveway gate with a motor pad to match the existing rear privacy fence.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 120 W Lynwood is a two-story residential structure constructed circa 1935 in the Colonial Revival style. The property makes its first appearance in the 1936-1937 City

Directory and the 1938 Sanborn map. The structure features a side gable shingle roof featuring three dormers, stone cladding, a front gable porch with square columns, a pedimented door, and two chimneys. The property is a contributing structure to the Monte Vista Historic District.

- b. SCOPE OF WORK- The applicant is proposing to widen the existing driveway from seven (7) feet to ten (10) feet, replace the driveway approach and sidewalk, replace the retaining wall with stacked limestone and add an eight-inch stem wall in the dry stack position, install a swinging gate to the driveway with a maximum height of six (6) feet, paint the existing gate to match the proposed new driveway gate, and install grey pavers to the driveway in a herringbone style.
- c. CASE HISTORY- On December 1, 2022, a report was received by OHP staff about the modifications to the retaining wall and driveway. Staff conducted a site visit on December 1, 2022, and observed work being conducted. Staff issued a stop work order and let the laborers on site that work cannot be conducted without the issuance of a COA. Staff also noticed no permits were pulled either.
- d. DRIVEWAY REPLACEMENT - The applicant has proposed to replace the existing 7-foot-wide fully concrete driveway with a 10-foot-wide driveway featuring grey concrete pavers installed in a herringbone pattern. According to Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements, applicants should incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Historic driveways are typically no wider than 10 feet. Pervious paving surfaces may be considered where replacement is necessary to increase stormwater infiltration. Staff finds that the widening of the existing driveway to ten (10) feet is generally appropriate; however, the replacement of the existing fully concrete driveway with a concrete paver driveway is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. RETAINING WALL REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing limestone-clad retaining wall with a stacked limestone retaining wall. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Guideline 2.A.ii for Site Elements states that only sections of historic fences and walls that are deteriorated beyond repair should be replaced. Match replacement materials (including mortar) to the color, texture, size, profile, and finish of the original. Staff finds this request is inconsistent with the guidelines and that the replacement retaining walls should match the existing.
- f. CURBING REPLACEMENT - The applicant has proposed to replace the existing curbing on the west side of the driveway with an 8-inch stacked limestone replacement curb. Guidelines for Site Elements 5.C.i. states to retain historic curbing wherever possible. Historic curbing in San Antonio is typically constructed of concrete with a curved or angular profile. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.C.ii. also state to replace curbing in-kind when deteriorated beyond repair. Where in-kind replacement is not be feasible, use a comparable substitute that duplicates the color, texture, durability, and profile of the original. Retaining walls and curbing should not be added to the sidewalk design unless absolutely necessary. Staff finds this request is inconsistent with the guidelines and that the replacement curbing should match the existing.
- g. DRIVEWAY GATE INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to install a metal swinging driveway gate measuring six feet in height to meet the existing rear fencing behind the front façade wall plane. The proposed gate will be painted to match the existing fencing. The Guidelines for Site Elements note that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. The Policy Guide for Fences in Historic Districts states that vehicle gates should be set behind the front façade wall plane. Guideline 5 B.ii for Site Elements states to screen service areas, air conditioning units, and other mechanical equipment from public view using a fence, hedge, or other enclosure. Staff finds the installation of the proposed driveway gate and motor pad to be appropriate provided that the proposed driveway gate and fencing are set behind the front façade of the property.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the driveway replacement based on finding d with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs a fully concrete driveway to match the existing material.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of retaining wall replacement based on finding e with the following stipulation:

- i. That the replacement retaining walls match the existing retaining walls in material, height, and configuration. The replacement retaining walls should feature random pattern limestone veneer to match existing.

Item 3, staff recommends approval of the curbing replacement based on finding f with the following stipulation:

- i. That the replacement curbing match the existing curbing in material, height, and configuration. The replacement curbing should feature limestone cladding to match existing.

Item 4, staff recommends approval of the driveway gate installation based on finding f with the following stipulations:

- i. That the driveway gate is located behind the front façade wall plane in the same location as the existing rear fencing.
- ii. That the final construction height of the approved gate may not exceed the maximum height of 6 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the gate must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

PUBLIC COMMENT: One letter on file for Commission to review.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer
NAY: Velasquez, Cervantes, Baker,
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 3 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2022-527
ADDRESS: 108 SCHREINER PLACE
APPLICANT: John Russell/RUSSELL JOHN R

REQUEST:

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

FINDINGS:

- a. 108 Schreiner Place is a one-story, single-family residence designed by O’Neil Ford and built in 1948. The house features a flat roof over the residential core of the house, with a standing-seam metal shed roof over a two-bay garage that was added by 1955, per historic arial photography. Both roof forms have wood fascias and soffits. The house is clad in brick and horizontal wood siding. The front of the house features a courtyard screened from view by a tall brick wall; the front yard is primarily grass with a large concrete driveway and parking pad leading to the two-bay garage. The property contributes to the Monte Vista Historic District.
- b. VIOLATION: On September 28, 2022, OHP staff learned through a citizen report that a detached metal-framed carport was constructed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff posted a Notice of Investigation and Stop Work Notice on site the same day. The report is included in this case file.
- c. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: On December 21, 2022, the HDRC referred this request to the Design Review Committee (DRC) for an on-site meeting. On January 4, 2023, the applicant met on site with the DRC. Notes are included in this case file.

- d. **CARPORT (MASSING AND FORM):** The applicant installed a detached metal-framed carport with a flat R panel metal roof on the east side of the property. Though it is detached, the carport is taller than the primary flat roof form and overlaps the east edge of the roof. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 5.A.i states that new garages and outbuildings should be designed to be visually subordinate to the principal historic structure in terms of their height, massing, and form. Staff finds the carport does not conform to guidelines.
- e. **CARPORT (MATERIALS):** The applicant installed a detached metal-framed carport with a flat R-panel metal roof on the east side of the property. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 5.A.iii states additions should relate to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. The primary structure on the lot is clad in brick and horizontal wood siding, and the shed roof is clad in standing-seam metal. The use of metal is consistent with the architectural style of the home and conforms to guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval to construct a carport based on findings d and e, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant proposes a carport with a roof form subordinate to that of the primary structure, specifically one that is shorter than the primary roof.
- ii. That the applicant meets all setback standards as required by city zoning requirements and obtains a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENT: One letter on file for Commission to review.

MOTION: Commissioner Velasquez moved to deny the application.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2023-003
ADDRESS: 2001 W KINGS HWY
APPLICANT: Iskander Afram/Alamo Remodeling & Construction LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: paint the exterior of the primary structure and detached garage, including unpainted brick and stone cladding.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure located at 2001 W Kings Hwy is a single-story Tudor Revival residence with detached garage-built c 1934. The property sits on the northwest corner of W Kings Hwy and Vollum Ave and has a low stone wall along the south and east edges of the parcel along the sidewalk. The house features decorative stickwork in the gables above brick and stone cladding on all sides of the home and garage. The cross-gable roof form is clad in composition shingles, and there is an inset porch with round columns. One-over-one wood windows appear alone or in ganged pairs on both structures. The split-bay garage opens onto a double-width driveway that faces Vollum Ave with a pedestrian door on the south side, facing the house. The property contributes to the Monticello Park historic district.
- b. **VIOLATION:** On December 14, 2022, OHP staff learned through a citizen report that the house and detached garage at 2001 W Kings Hwy were being painted without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff spoke with contractors on site and posted a Stop Work Notice on site the same day. The report is included in this case file.

- c. **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:** The applicant requests to paint wood siding, stickwork, wood trim, wood columns, and other non-masonry elements. These scopes of work are eligible for administrative approval and do not require review by the commission.
- d. **PAINTING (MASONRY)** – The applicant requests approval to paint the brick and stone cladding of the primary structure and detached garage. The existing brick and stone cladding is unpainted and was not originally painted. Guideline 2.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations stipulates that applicants avoid painting historically unpainted surfaces. The Guidelines state that exceptions may be made for severely deteriorated material where other consolidation or stabilization methods are not appropriate. The brick and stone cladding is a character defining feature of the structure, and staff does not find that painting the historically unpainted brick and stone will mitigate the ongoing cracking in the building envelope. Staff does not find the painting of the brick and stone cladding appropriate.
- e. According to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, historically unpainted brick should not be painted. Brick structures built prior to the 1870s were largely constructed of handmade bricks, which were generally softer, more porous, and weaker than bricks made at the turn of the 20th century. These handmade bricks were frequently painted or coated because the strength of the brick was insufficient without a coating for stabilization. However, as machine-made bricks became the standard during the latter half of the 19th century, bricks became inherently stronger and did not require paint or coatings for protection and strength. These bricks commonly featured harder “dress” surfaces, which were meant to face the exterior of the structure and remain unpainted. 2001 W Kings Hwy was built c 1934 and was historically unpainted. Painting historically unpainted brick on structures of this era can lead to trapped water in the porous material, eventually destroying the brick due to the damaging effects of water infiltration and freeze-thaw cycles. Unpainted brick of this era is inherently high strength and low maintenance on its own. Once these structures are painted, consistent repainting is required to maintain the aesthetics of the brick.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends denial of the request to paint the unpainted brick and stone cladding based on findings a thru e.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bianca Maldonado on behalf of Monticello Park Neighborhood Association – supports staff’s recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to deny request.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2022-558
ADDRESS: 202 CAMARGO
APPLICANT: David Hannan Jr/FISHER HECK ARCHITECTS

REQUEST:

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

1. Expand the existing front porch.
2. Replace non-historic aluminum windows on the historic core of the house with wood one-over-one and wood casement windows.
3. Remove vinyl siding on the historic core of the house and refinish the wood lap siding beneath.
4. Demolition of a rear addition.
5. Construct an addition to the rear and southeast sides of the house.

6. Replace the existing full-width concrete driveway with drivable pavers and gravel.
7. Replace the existing chain-link fence with a picket fence.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 202 Camargo is a one-story, single-family vernacular residence built c 1896 with a rear addition present by 1912 and enclosed after 1951. The property is at the southeast corner of Camargo and San Arturo streets with a driveway along the back of the house entered via San Arturo St. The property features a standing-seam metal side-gabled roof form with a flat standing seam metal roof that extends over the rear addition. The house is clad in vinyl siding with metal-sash windows. The front door is on a stoop with a separate shed roof and square post on a concrete porch with concrete stairs and a short walkway leading to the sidewalk. The parcel has a chain link fence with a gate at the front walkway and at the driveway. The property contributes to the Lavaca historic district.
- b. **FRONT PORCH:** The applicant requests approval to expand the existing front porch and add a wood balustrade railing, composite wood T&G decking, cement board panel skirting, and wood-framed steps with the existing concrete porch encapsulated by the new framing. Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A.i says to preserve porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres, and do not add new porches, balconies, or porte-cocheres where not historically present. The property first appears on a Sanborn Fire Insurance map in 1904 with a front stoop that matches the existing porch in plan. Staff finds the request to expand the porch does not conform to guidelines.
- c. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT:** The applicant requests approval to replace non-historic metal-sash windows on the historic core of the home with wood one-over-one and wood casement windows. Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii says to replace non-historic incompatible windows with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds the wood one-over-one windows conform to guidelines.
- d. **SIDING:** The applicant requests approval to remove the vinyl siding on the historic core and refinish the wood lap siding beneath. Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations says avoid removing materials that are in good condition or that can be repaired in place, and consider exposing original wood siding if it is currently covered with vinyl or aluminum siding, stucco, or other materials that have not achieved historic significance. Staff recommends retention of any existing historic siding with new siding to match the existing wood siding style and dimensions. Should the remaining wood siding below the existing vinyl require repair or partial replacement, staff recommends replacing it with siding that matches the existing wood in style and dimensions for the historic core of the home.
- e. **PARTIAL DEMOLITION:** The applicant requests approval to demolish a rear addition. The addition first appears on Sanborn Fire Insurance maps in 1912 as a small addition to the rear west corner of the house with a covered porch to the east. According to Sanborn maps, the porch was enclosed after 1951 to create the current conditions. Staff finds the request to remove this addition generally appropriate.
- f. **ADDITION (MASSING):** The applicant proposes to construct a rear addition that includes two porches. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 1.B.iv states that residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. The existing house is 1,050 square feet, and the proposed addition is 875 square feet. Staff finds the addition generally appropriate.
- g. **ADDITION (ROOF FORM):** The applicant proposes to use the same standing-seam metal roof across the historic core and new addition to the house but creates a cross-gabled roof form to connect the old and new. Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs should be retained. The house features a side-gabled form with a flat roof at the rear, a typical form for this style of house. Staff finds the proposed hipped roof does not conform to guidelines.
- h. **ADDITION (WINDOWS):** The applicant proposes clad-wood windows, both fixed and one-over-one, for the rear addition that are smaller in size than those found on the historic core of the house. Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction state that new windows on additions should relate to the windows of the primary historic structure in terms of materiality and overall appearance, and whole window systems should match the size of historic windows on property unless otherwise approved. The proposed aluminum-clad wood window product conforms to guidelines, but their size does not.
- i. **ADDITION (DOORS):** The applicant proposes adding two half-lite doors and retaining and repairing the existing half-lite front door. The policy document for substitute materials says that where original doors are

missing, replacement doors that are appropriate for the architectural style or construction period of the house should be installed. Staff finds the half-lite doors conform to guidelines.

- j. **ADDITION (MATERIALS):** The applicant proposes an addition clad in cement board siding with a 4” exposure to differentiate between old and new. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i says to use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original structure. Staff finds the proposed siding for the addition does not conform to guidelines.
- k. **PORCHES:** The applicant proposes two porches, an uncovered porch on the east side of the house in front of the proposed rear entrance, and a 6.33’x13.5’ covered porch on the west side. Historic Design Guidelines for Additions 7.B.v says to reconstruct porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres based on accurate evidence of the original, such as photographs. Staff finds the porches generally appropriate.
- l. **PAVERS:** The applicant proposes to remove the existing full-width concrete driveway and replace it with drivable pavers filled with gravel. Historic Design Guidelines 5.B.i says to incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Staff finds the proposed drivable pavers generally appropriate but that the apron should not exceed 12’ at the flare.
- m. **FENCE:** The applicant proposes to remove the existing chain-link fence and replace it with a picket fence. Historic Design Guidelines 2.B.i states that the design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Staff finds the proposed picket fence conforms to guidelines. It should be wood, transparent, and no taller than 4 feet.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends denial of item 1, expanding the existing front porch, based on finding b.

Staff recommends approval of item 2, replacement of non-historic aluminum windows on the historic core of the house with wood one-over-one and wood casement windows, based on finding c.

Staff recommends approval of item 3, removing vinyl siding on the historic core of the house and refinishing the wood lap siding beneath, based on finding d, with the following stipulations:

- i. That any wood siding that requires repair or partial replacement be replaced with siding that matches the existing wood in style and dimensions for the historic core of the home.

Staff recommends approval of item 4, demolition of a rear addition, based on finding e.

Staff recommends approval of item 5, construction of an addition to the rear and southeast sides of the house, based on findings j and k, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposes a roof form that conforms to guidelines, namely retention of the side gabled form at the front of the house that transitions into a flat roof at the rear.
- ii. That the applicant proposes windows for the addition that match the windows proposed for the historic core in size and dimensions.
- iii. That the applicant use cement board siding with the same exposure as found on the historic core of the house and utilize a trim piece to differentiate between old and new.

Staff recommends approval of item 6, replacement of the existing full-width concrete driveway with drivable pavers and gravel, based on finding l, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the apron not exceed 12’ wide at the flare.

Staff recommends approval of item 7, replacement of the existing chain-link fence with a picket fence, based on finding m, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the fence be wood, transparent, and no taller than 4 feet.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved to approve item 1 as presented by the applicant; approve items 2-4 and 6-7 with staff stipulations; and, approve item 5, construction of an addition to the rear and southeast sides of the house, with the following stipulation:
1. That the applicant use cement board siding with the same exposure as found on the historic core of the house and utilize a trim piece to differentiate between old and new.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2023-006
ADDRESS: 520 DAWSON ST
APPLICANT: Brenna MANN/MANN BRENN BREANN

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: install a front yard wrought iron fence on the property. An eight (8) feet powered sliding vehicular gate is proposed on the east side of the property with a pedestrian gate to coincide with the existing sidewalk in the new front fence.

- FINDINGS:**
- a. The property at 520 Dawson is a one-story, Craftsman residence built c. 1924. The house is clad in wood waterfall siding with a dual front-gabled standing-seam metal roof. The property contributes to the Dignowity Hill historic district. A few front yard fences are present on the block, none of historic age. Historic front yard fences can be found in some areas of the district.
 - b. FENCE LOCATION: The applicant proposes to install a wrought iron fence with metal posts and rails along the north, east, and west edges of the property. Staff finds the proposed fence location generally conforms to guidelines.
 - c. DRIVEWAY GATE: The applicant has proposed a motorized driveway gate to be located at the front property line. The historic design guidelines recommend that this type of gate be set back from the street, behind the front façade of the home. The proposed gate is not consistent with the Guidelines.
 - d. MATERIALS: The applicant proposes to install a wrought iron fence with metal posts and rails. Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Wrought iron fences are found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and the proposed material is general appropriate. However, the fence should be more similar to historic fence designs and feature a traditional picket with finials based on the Guidelines.
 - e. HEIGHT: Guideline for Site Elements 2.B.iii states that the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The applicant did indicate the height of the proposed fence through email and saved in their file that the fence would not exceed four feet in height.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Staff recommends approval to construct a front yard wrought iron fence based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submit an updated design that features true pickets with finials based on finding d;
- ii. That the fence not exceed four feet in height when measured at any point; and
- iii. That the proposed driveway gate be set back behind the front façade of the home based on finding c.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 20. **HDRC NO.** 2022-596
ADDRESS: 211 W SHERIDAN
APPLICANT: Lilian Otterbach/SPESEN MANAGEMENT LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: replace 14 existing wood windows and add one fixed-pane window to the southwest elevation of the house.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 211 W Sheridan includes a one-story Craftsman style residence built c. 1915. The house is clad in wood waterfall siding with a front-gabled standing-seam metal roof that transitions to a hip at the rear. It has an inset full-width porch below wide eaves with a decorative brace at the peak. One-over-one wood windows appear as single, paired gangs, and three ganged windows. Some historic six-over-one wood screens appear. The rear of the property has a screened-in porch. The property is designated as an individual historic landmark.
- b. **WINDOWS (CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT):** The applicant requests approval to replace 14 wood windows on the primary structure. Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii states that historic windows should be preserved. Staff conducted a window inspection Monday, January 09, 2023, with the applicant present. Staff determined that the wood windows on the front, street-facing elevation are in reparable condition and should be retained. Other windows found on the property were found to be in various states of disrepair. Due to their condition and unusual framing conditions, staff believes that many of these windows have been previously altered, poorly repaired, or are not original to the structure. These windows, located on non-primary facades, are eligible for replacement.
- c. **WINDOWS (REPLACEMENT: MATERIALS):** The applicant requests approval to replace 14 wood windows on the primary structure; 10 windows located on non-primary facades are eligible for replacement per staff's conditions assessment. Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii states that historic windows should be preserved, and 6.B.iv says that when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair, new windows should match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. Though staff finds these windows eligible for replacement, the vinyl product proposed by the applicant does not conform to guidelines. Windows should be replaced in-kind through either a new wood window or salvaged wood windows consistent with the guidelines.
- d. **FENESTRATION CHANGES:** The applicant requests approval to add one fixed-pane clerestory window on the southeast elevation of the house. According to the guidelines, new windows should match existing in size, style, and appearance. A one-over-one wood window would conform to the guidelines and would be more appropriate.
- e. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND MAINTENANCE** – In terms of efficiency, in most cases, windows only account for a fraction of heat gain/loss in a building. 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. The historic house already features an inherent

barrier in window screens. Additionally, air infiltration can be mitigated through weatherstripping or readjusting the window assembly within the frame, as assemblies can settle or shift over time. The wood windows were designed specifically for this structure and can accommodate the natural settling and movement of the structure as a whole throughout seasons. Modern replacement products are extremely rigid, often resulting in the creation of gaps, cracks, and major points of air infiltration at the window frames and other areas of the exterior wall plane over time due to material incompatibility when considering the structure as whole integrated system.

- f. **WINDOW REPLACEMENT: WASTE AND LIFESPAN** – 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 wood and clad 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 and the depletion of natural resources and forests, petroleum-heavy manufacturing methods, transportation, and installation. Finally, window repair and restoration utilizes the local labor and expertise of craftspeople versus off-the-shelf, non-custom composite products. Staff generally encourages the repair and restoration of original windows whenever possible.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the four windows located on the front, street-facing elevation be retained and repaired.
- ii. That the remaining 10 windows be replaced in-kind with either a new wood window or salvaged wood windows consistent with the guidelines.
- iii. That the applicant proposes a window for the southeast elevation that conforms to guidelines, namely one that is a one-over-one wood sash window.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Cervantes moved to schedule the case for a DRC meeting.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer
NAY: None.
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (vacant)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Fetzer adjourned the meeting at 7:34 p.m.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer, Chair
Historic Design Review Commission
City of San Antonio

Date: _____