CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
COMMISSION ACTION

This is not a Certificate of Appropriateness and cannot be used to acquire permits

September 15, 2021

HDRC CASE NO:	**2021-360**
ADDRESS:	615 E EVERGREEN
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	NCB 399 BLK 27 LOT 11
HISTORIC DISTRICT:	Tobin Hill
APPLICANT:	TX3 PROPERTIES LLC - PO BOX 15824
OWNER:	TX3 PROPERTIES LLC - PO BOX 15824
TYPE OF WORK:	Garage/carport, New construction, Demolition of Historic Landmark

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: (1)demolish the existing rear accessory structure, (2)construct a new 1-story, 308-square-foot rear accessory structure with an attached carport, (3)reduce the length of the front porch, (4)construct a 1-story, 323-square-foot rear addition, (5)install a rear covered patio, (6) remove and enclose 4 existing windows, (7)replace 22 existing wood windows with new aluminum-clad wood windows, (8)replace the existing metal roof with a composition shingle roof, (9)modify the existing footprint of the driveway and retaining wall.

FINDINGS:

a. The primary structure located at 615 E Evergreen is a 1-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1920 in the Craftsman style. The structure features a standing seam metal hip roof with front gables and widely overhanging eaves, a deep-set front and side porch on square wood columns, one-over-one wood windows, and wood cladding. The property first appears on the Sanborn Map in 1951. The property is contributing to the Tobin Hill Historic District.

b. DRC SITE VISIT – The request was referred to a Design Review Committee (DRC) site visit at the HDRC hearing on August 18, 2021, to review the requests for front porch modification, driveway modifications, and window replacement. A DRC site visit was conducted on September 7, 2021. The property lines and existing driveway conditions were discussed and staff and the Commissioners examined the window conditions of the existing windows from the interior of the primary structure.

c. DEMOLITION OF REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the rear accessory structure only. In general, accessory structures contribute to the character of historic properties and the historical development pattern within a historic district.

d. CONTRIBUTING STATUS – The structure is a 1-story structure likely constructed after 1951. A rear accessory structure appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map in a similar location with a smaller footprint. On August 11, 2021, staff conducted a site visit to evaluate the condition of the rear accessory structure. While most of the original materials exist and the original footprint is intact, the structure shows signs of severe deterioration. The vertical elements have experienced significant deterioration and the support elements are water damaged and show evidence of rot. The structure is sinking into the surrounding earth and the interior shows evidence of significant structural damage. While staff finds that the structure has significantly deteriorated, the structure is contributing to the district.

e. UNREASONABLE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP – In accordance with UDC Section 35-616, no certificate shall be

issued for demolition of a historic landmark unless the applicant provides sufficient evidence to support a finding by the commission of unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant. In the case of a historic landmark, if an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the Historic and Design Review Commission additional information regarding loss of significance. In order to unreasonable economic hardship to be met, the owner must provide sufficient evidence for the HDRC to support a finding in favor of demolition. In the submitted application, the applicant has provided a cost estimate of $36,250 for the rehabilitation of the structure from a contractor. The applicant has additionally provided a cost estimate of $21,900 for the construction of a new rear accessory structure. The estimate does not include an estimate for the demolition cost. The applicant has indicated that in its current condition, the existing rear accessory structure is not structurally sound and cannot be reasonably adapted for use. Staff finds that evidence for UDC Section 35-614(b) has been met based on the documentation provided.

f. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – In accordance with UDC Section 35-614(c), demolition may be recommended if the owner has provided sufficient evidence to support a finding that the structure has undergone significant and irreversible changes which have caused it to lose historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological significance, qualities or features which qualified the structure or property for such designation. The 1-story rear accessory structure features wood construction with a front gable corrugated metal roof and a front opening with a sliding barn door. The structure does not currently feature additional openings. Staff finds that a loss of significance may have occurred due to the modifications and substantial deterioration of original materials.

g. REPLACEMENT PLANS – The applicant is requesting to replace the existing rear accessory structure with a 1-story 308-square-foot rear accessory structure with an attached carport. While the existing rear accessory structure is contributing to the district and is representative of historical development patterns within the historic district, due to the condition of the existing structure, staff finds the proposal appropriate.

h. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: SETBACKS & ORIENTATION – The applicant has proposed to construct a new 1-story, 308-square-foot rear accessory structure with an attached carport. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic example found on the block. The applicant has proposed to orient the structure on the lot to generally reflect that of the historic structure currently on the site. The applicant has proposed a 5-foot side setback and a 20-foot rear setback. The applicant is required to comply with the Unified Development Code.

i. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: 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. The existing rear accessory structure is 1-story in height. The applicant has proposed a 1-story structure at 12'-8" in height with an attached 280-square-foot carport. The overall configuration of the building in terms of its footprint, roof form, and architectural details is consistent with the development pattern of the district.

j. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed a footprint of approximately 308 square feet with an attached 280-square-foot carport. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings in terms of the building to lot ratio. At this time, the applicant has not provided total lot coverage for the property with the proposed modifications. Staff finds that the applicant should submit total lot coverage to staff. The total building footprint should not exceed 50 percent of the total lot area.

k. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: ROOF FORM – The applicant has proposed a front gable roof form. The roof form on the existing rear accessory structure is front gable, staff finds the form consistent with the Guidelines.

l. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. The applicant has proposed to install a single-car garage door on the front façade of the proposed rear accessory structure. The applicant has not proposed to install any windows on the structure. The applicant has not submitted material specifications for the proposed garage door. Staff finds that the applicant should submit material specifications to staff for review and approval. A wood garage door would be most appropriate.

m. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install composition shingle roofing, wood siding, and wood carport columns to match the primary structure. Staff finds that the material proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

n. NEW REAR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS – New buildings should be designed to reflect their time while representing the historic context of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. The proposed architectural details are appropriate for the Tobin Hill Historic District.

o. FRONT PORCH MODIFICATIONS – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing front porch by reducing the width to the east by 2'-6". The reduction of the front porch width will a ccommodate the width of the

driveway. Guideline 7.A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that porches should be preserved. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

p. ADDITION: MASSING AND FOOTPRINT – The applicant has proposed to construct a 1-story, 323-square foot rear addition. The proposed addition will remain within the footprint of the existing structure and will not be visible from the public right-of-way. Guideline 1.A.i for Additions states that residential additions should be sited at the rear of the building whenever possible to minimize views of the addition from the public right-of-way, an addition to the front of a building would be inappropriate. Guidelines 1.A.ii. for Additions states that new residential additions should be designed to be in keeping with the existing, historic context of the block. For example, a large, two-story addition on a block comprised of single-story homes would not be appropriate. According to Guideline 1. B.v, the height of new additions should be determined by examining the line-of-sight or visibility from the street. Addition height should never be so contrasting as to overwhelm or distract from the existing structure. The Guidelines stipulate that residential additions should not be so large as to double the existing building footprint, regardless of lot size. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

q. ADDITION: ROOF – The applicant has proposed to install a front gable composition shingle roof to match the proposed material change on the primary structure. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions states that materials should match in type, color, and texture. 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 that the roof material on the addition should match the HDRC-approved roof material on the existing primary structure.

r. ADDITION: WINDOW AND DOOR REMOVAL – The proposed addition will require the removal of three one-over-one wood windows and one door on the north (rear) elevation. The wood windows on the rear elevation should be salvaged and stored on the property for future use or incorporated into the design for the new addition. The proposed addition will also require the removal of one wood door from the north (rear) elevation. The door may be original to the structure but is deteriorated. Staff finds the removal of the window and door to accommodate the rear addition appropriate.

s. ADDITION: NEW WINDOWS: SIZE AND PROPORTION – The applicant has proposed to install a small one-over-one window, a large, fixed window, and a full-lite door on the rear elevation of the addition, a large one-over-one window on the east elevation of the addition, and a traditional-sized one-over-one window on the west elevation. Staff's standard window specifications state that new windows should feature traditional dimensions and proportions as found within the district. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate a more traditional fenestration pattern on the proposed rear addition.

t. ADDITION: NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS: MATERIALS – The applicant has proposed to install a small one-over-one window, a large, fixed window, and a full-lite door on the rear elevation of the addition, a large one-over-one window on the east elevation of the addition, and a traditional-sized one-over-one window on the west elevation. The Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions and New Construction states that new windows on additions should relate to the windows of the primary historic structure in terms of materiality and overall appearance. Windows used in new construction should be similar in appearance to those commonly found within the district?in terms of size, profile, and configuration. While no material is expressly prohibited by the Historic Design Guidelines, a high-quality wood or aluminum-clad wood window product often meets the?Guidelines with staff's standard window stipulations. Whole window systems should match the size of historic windows on property unless otherwise approved. Staff finds that the applicant should install fully wood or aluminum-clad wood windows in the rear addition. A fully wood door is most appropriate.

u. ADDITION: MATERIALS: FAÇADE – The applicant has proposed to clad the rear addition in wood siding to match existing. Guideline 3.A.i for Additions stipulates that additions should use materials that match in type, color, and texture and include an offset or reveal to distinguish the addition from the historic structure whenever possible. Any new materials introduced to the site as a result of an addition must be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the original. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.

v. REAR PATIO INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to install a covered rear patio off of the proposed rear addition. The rear patio will feature a concrete slap, wood columns, and roofing to match existing. The applicant has not provided total square footage for the proposed rear patio. Staff finds that the applicant should submit the square footage of the patio for review.

w. FENESTRATION MODIFICATION: WINDOW REMOVAL – The applicant has proposed to remove 3 windows from the east elevation and 1 window from the west elevation. The existing windows feature broken or missing cords but are in repairable condition. The window removal is requested to accommodate changes to the interior floor plan. The applicant has proposed to enclose the window openings with siding to match existing. Guideline 6. A.i for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that existing window openings should be preserved. Avoid filling in historic door or window openings. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

x. WINDOW REPLACEMENT: EXISTING CONDITION – The applicant has requested to replace 22 existing wood

windows with aluminum-clad wood windows. Staff conducted a site visit to assess the condition of the existing windows on August 11, 2021. Staff observed the following conditions from the exterior: broken or missing sash cords, peeling or chipping paint, and missing glass. The applicant has provided documentation that includes interior photos which show signs of wood rot, water damage, missing sash elements, and uneven sashes. Staff and DRC Commissioners completed an additional site visit on September 7, 2021, and assessed the condition of the windows from the interior. Staff finds that the windows are in repairable condition based on the documentation provided and the site visits, with most windows requiring intervention such as the reworking of the sashes, the replacement of sash elements, and reglazing, along with refitting into the trim and frames. Staff and the Commissioners observed that one (1) window on the rear west elevation (window #14) features missing sash elements due to animal bites. The removal of window #14 and the replacement of the damaged window with one of the existing windows relocated to accommodate the proposed rear addition is appropriate.

y. WINDOW REPLACMEMENT: 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. 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 seas o ns. 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.

z. 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.?

aa. WINDOW REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace 22 existing wood windows with replacement aluminum-clad wood windows. According?to the Historic Design Guidelines, wood windows should be repaired in place and restored whenever possible, unless there is substantial evidence that the windows are deteriorated beyond repair. Guideline 6.B.iv for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations states that new windows should be installed to match the historic or existing windows in terms of size, type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail when original windows are deteriorated beyond repair. As noted in finding w, staff finds that the windows are in repairable condition.

bb. ROOF REPLACEMENT – The applicant has proposed to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a composition shingle roof. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, when roof replacement is required, the roof should be repaired in-kind. According to the Sanborn Map, the property historically featured a metal roof. Additionally, the existing roof appears to be original or has been in place for several decades. Metal roofs in the existing configuration are typical of the style of the home. Staff finds the proposal inconsistent with the Guidelines.

cc. DRIVEWAY AND RETAINING WALL MODIFICATION – The applicant has proposed to modify the existing footprint of the driveway apron, retaining wall, and ribbon driveway so that they are located within the property line. Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements states that historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives, should be retained and repaired in place. 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. The applicant has proposed to install a 10-foot-wide fully concrete driveway apron and a 9-foot-wide ribbon driveway extending to the rear of the property. As the driveway apron, driveway, and retaining wall modifications require the removal of a portion of the front porch, staff finds the request inappropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the existing rear accessory structure based on findings a through f with the following stipulation:

i. That materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding and wood doors be salvaged and stored on site for use in future construction.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the construction of a new rear accessory structure based on findings g through m with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant submits final material specifications for a fully wood garage door to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

ii. That the applicant submits the percentage of total lot coverage to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The total building footprint should not exceed 50 percent of the total lot area.

Item 3, staff does not recommend approval of the front porch modification based on finding n.

Item 4, staff recommends approval of the construction of a rear addition based on findings o through t with the following stipulations:

i. That the existing wood windows are salvaged and stored on site for future use or installed on the rear addition. An existing wood window may be re-used in place of the damaged window (#14) on the west elevation.

ii. That the applicant proposes a fenestration pattern, window opening proportions, and materials that are more consistent with the Guidelines and the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions as noted in findings r and s. The applicant is required to submit updated elevation drawings showing windows on the rear addition that match the existing window proportions on the primary structure to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

iii. That the applicant installs wood or aluminum-clad wood windows on the rear addition as noted in finding s. Windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. The applicant is required to submit final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

iv. That the roofing material on the addition matches the HDRC-approved roof material on the existing primary structure.

Item 5, staff recommends approval of the installation of a covered rear patio based on finding u with the following stipulation:

i. That the applicant submits the total square footage for the rear patio to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 6, staff does not recommend approval of the window removal and enclosure based on finding v. Staff recommends that the existing windows are retained and repaired in place.

Item 7, staff does not recommend approval of window replacement based on findings w through z. The Historic Design Guidelines always recommend that the repair of historic-age windows be prioritized over replacement. If the HDRC is compelled to approve window replacement, staff recommends the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant installs fully wood windows that meet staff's standard window stipulations and submits updated specifications to staff for review and approval. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.

ii. That the existing wood windows are salvaged and stored on site for future use or donated to a local architectural salvage store.

Item 8, staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the existing standing seam metal roof with a composition shingle roof based on finding aa.
Item 9, staff does not recommend approval of the driveway and retaining wall modifications based on finding bb. In-kind repairs are eligible for administrative approval.

COMMISSION ACTION:
Approved with stipulations:

Item 1, the demolition of the existing rear accessory structure is approved with the following stipulation:
i. That materials from the historic accessory structure including salvageable wood siding and wood doors be salvaged and stored on site for use in future construction.

Item 2, the construction of a new rear accessory structure is approved with the following stipulations:
i. That the applicant submits final material specifications for a fully wood garage door to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
ii. That the applicant submits the percentage of total lot coverage to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The total building footprint should not exceed 50 percent of the total lot area.

Item 3, the front porch modification is approved as submitted.

Item 4, the construction of a rear addition is approved with the following stipulations:
i. That the existing wood windows are salvaged and stored on site for future use or installed on the rear addition. An existing wood window may be re-used in place of the damaged window (#14) on the west elevation.
ii. That the applicant proposes a fenestration pattern, window opening proportions, and materials that are more consistent with the Guidelines and the Standard Specifications for Windows in Additions as noted in findings r and s. The applicant is required to submit updated elevation drawings showing windows on the rear addition that match the existing window proportions on the primary structure to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
iii. That the applicant installs wood or aluminum-clad wood windows on the rear addition as noted in finding s. Windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25" and stiles no wider than 2.25". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. The applicant is required to submit final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
iv. That the roofing material on the addition matches the HDRC-approved roof material on the existing primary structure.

Item 5, the installation of a covered rear patio is approved with the following stipulation:
i. That the applicant submits the total square footage for the rear patio to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 6, denied.

Item 7, denied.
Window repair is eligible for administrative approval.

Item 8, denied.
Replacement with in-kind metal roofing material is eligible for administrative approval.

Item 9, the driveway and retaining wall modifications are approved as submitted.

Shanon Shea Miller
Historic Preservation Officer