# HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION 

March 03, 2021

## HDRC CASE NO: <br> ADDRESS: <br> LEGAL DESCRIPTION: <br> ZONING: <br> CITY COUNCIL DIST.: <br> DISTRICT: <br> APPLICANT: <br> OWNER: <br> TYPE OF WORK: <br> APPLICATION RECEIVED: <br> 60-DAY REVIEW: <br> CASE MANAGER: <br> REQUEST:

2021-052<br>418 MISSION ST<br>NCB 945 BLK 2 LOT 32<br>RM-4 CD, H<br>1<br>King William Historic District<br>Deniese Crittenden/SCHEFF DENIESE M \& CRITTENDEN ROBERT JR<br>Deniese Crittenden/SCHEFF DENIESE M \& CRITTENDEN ROBERT JR<br>Front yard fence installation<br>January 25, 2021<br>Not applicable due to City Council Emergency Orders<br>Rachel Rettaliata

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 3-foot-high wrought iron front yard fence.

## APPLICABLE CITATIONS:

Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 5, Guidelines for Site Elements

2. Fences and Walls
A. HISTORIC FENCES AND WALLS
i. Preserve—Retain historic fences and walls.
ii. Repair and replacement-Replace only deteriorated sections that are beyond repair. Match replacement materials (including mortar) to the color, texture, size, profile, and finish of the original.
iii. Application of paint and cementitious coatings-Do not paint historic masonry walls or cover them with stone facing or stucco or other cementitious coatings.
B. NEW FENCES AND WALLS
i. Design-New fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure.
ii. Location-Avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences or wall should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them.
iii. Height-Limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. If a taller fence or wall existed historically, additional height may be considered. The height of a new retaining wall should not exceed the height of the slope it retains.
iv. Prohibited materials-Do not use exposed concrete masonry units (CMU), Keystone or similar interlocking retaining wall systems, concrete block, vinyl fencing, or chain link fencing.
v. Appropriate materials-Construct new fences or walls of materials similar to fence materials historically used in the district. Select materials that are similar in scale, texture, color, and form as those historically used in the district, and that are compatible with the main structure. Screening incompatible uses-Review alternative fence heights and materials for appropriateness where residential properties are adjacent to commercial or other potentially incompatible uses.
C. PRIVACY FENCES AND WALLS
i. Relationship to front facade-Set privacy fences back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning them with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence.
ii. Location - Do not use privacy fences in front yards.

## FINDINGS:

a. The property located at 418 Mission is a 2 -story single family structure constructed circa 1905 . The property first appears on the Sanborn map in 1912 addressed as 318 Mission. The structure features a composition shingle hip roof, wood cladding, original wood windows, and a 2 -story front porch and balcony. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
b. FENCE DESIGN AND HEIGHT - The applicant has proposed to install a 3 -foot-tall wrought iron fence with a pedestrian gate and a front driveway gate at the intersection of the property line and the sidewalk. The proposed fence will feature trident finials on the fence posts. 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. Guideline 2.B.iii for Site Elements states that the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to a maximum of four feet. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. Staff finds that traditional wrought iron fencing is generally appropriate for the King William Historic District and the property.
c. FENCE LOCATION - The applicant has proposed to install a 3-foot-tall wrought iron fence with a pedestrian gate and a front driveway gate at the intersection of the property line and the sidewalk. According to the Historic Design Guidelines, new front yard fences should follow historic fence placements in the district. This block of Mission Street currently features wood picket, cattle panel, garden loop, and wrought iron front yard fencing. Many of the existing fences on Mission Street feature front driveway gates; however, most of these properties feature unique site conditions that necessitate a front driveway gate. Staff finds that the proposed front yard fence at Mission Street should turn at the driveway and the proposed driveway gate should be installed behind the front façade wall plane.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the front yard fence installation based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:
i. That the applicant submits an updated site plan to staff for review and approval showing that the driveway gate is located behind the front façade wall plane.
ii. That the final construction height of the approved gate and fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.
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| SURVEY OF: LOT 32, BLOCK 2, NEW CITY BLOCK WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS. $\begin{aligned} & \text { ADDRESS } \frac{418 \text { MISSION ST, SAN ANTONIO, } 7821}{\text { JOB NO. } \frac{894-171}{}} \begin{array}{l} \text { CERTIFIED TO: VERITAS ACQUISITIONS, LLC - SERIES } 2 \\ \text { EXCEL TITLE GROUP, LLC } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | I, A REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR IN THE STATE OF TEXAS, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE SURVEY PLAT IS A TRUE AND CORRECT REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPERTY HEREON DESCRIBED ACCORDING TO MEASUREMENTS MADE ON THE GROUND, AND THAT THIS SURVEY ACCURATELY DEPICTS THE SUBSTANTIAL VISIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID PROPERTY. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT A FORMAL CERTIFICATION IS BEING MADE BY A COMPANY SPECIALIZING IN THE PROCEDURE OF PROVIDING FLOOD CERTIFICATIONS AND THIS SURVEY MAKES NO REFERENCE TO FLOOD INFORMATION. SETBACKS AND EASEMENTS TO WHICH WE HAVE BEEN INFORMED ARE SHOWN ON DRAWING OR BY REFERENCE. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| (10) MACINA• BOSE ¢ COPELAND \& ASSOC., INC. |  |





