



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO  
**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2024**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission (**HDRC**) met on Wednesday, November 20, 2024, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

Chair Gibbs called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Castillo (virtual), Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Cervantes, Holland (virtual), Fetzer, and Gibbs.

**ABSENT:** Velásquez, Galloway, and Grube.

- Commissioner Grube arrived virtually at 3:25 p.m.

**CHAIR'S STATEMENT:**

Chair Gibbs provided a statement regarding meeting processes, appeals, time limits, decorum.

**ANNOUNCEMENT:**

- Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
- Reminder that city offices are closed for the Thanksgiving holiday and day after.
- Item 6 postponed by the applicant.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Fetzer moved to approve HDRC meeting minutes for November 6, 2024. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**  
AYE: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, and Grube.

**ACTION:** **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- Item 1 – Lulu Francois, on behalf of the Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee, submitted a voicemail requesting the project be presented to the neighborhood association prior to the project being approved.
- Item 1 – The Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee, submitted a letter outlining the same information provided in the voicemail.
- Item 1 – Eddie Martinez submitted a letter in support of the request.

Chair Gibbs asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the Consent Agenda.

- Commissioner Savino requested Item 1 be pulled for individual consideration.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Item 2, Case No. 2024-374 8801 S FLORES ST

Item 3, Case No. 2024-372 ADDRESS

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Fetzer moved to approve items 1 and 2 with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara,  
Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, and Grube.

**ACTION:** MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:**

**ITEM 1. HDRC NO. 2024-371**

ADDRESS: Right of Way on Burleson/10th between N Hackberry and N . Alamo,  
Right of way on Hays between N Hackberry and the Hays Street Bridge,  
Right of way on Burnet/Brooklyn between N Cherry and N Alamo,  
Right of Way on Austin between Burnet/Brooklyn and W Jones,  
Right of way on W Jones between Austin and the Riverwalk,  
Right of way on McCullough between N Alamo and IH37  
APPLICANT: Adrian Garcia/WGI Engineering

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform various modifications to the public right of way to connect multiple public parks to the Hays Street Bridge and the San Antonio Riverwalk via a shared use path and urban trail. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Perform ADA improvements and modifications to include the replacement of ramps and sidewalks throughout the project area.
2. Perform driveway and sidewalk modifications throughout the project area to connect to new street paving.
3. Install new pedestrian street lighting throughout the project area.
4. Replace existing fencing on E Jones Avenue under the IH-37 Overpass and at Maverick Park. Fencing materials will match the existing.
5. Install new landscaping, hardscaping and irrigation elements where trees are proposed along the shared use path.
6. Install two (2) overhead arc signs on each side of the Hays Street Bridge, and wayfinding signage throughout the project area, to include post mounted directional signs, directional pylons, map pylon signs and regulatory signs.
7. Install a retaining wall of less than three (3) feet in height along the shared use path and Austin Street, between the shared use path and TxDOT right of way.
8. Install various site furnishings including waste bins, benches, and dog waste stations.

Proposed scopes of work all are located within the right of way, and portions are located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 2.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of items #1 through #8 based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That all driveways proposed within the Dignowity Hill Historic District feature profiles that are consistent with those found historically within the district, as noted in finding d. Additionally, driveways should be consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- ii. That a site plan noting fencing locations and a fencing detail be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval, as noted in finding f. Fencing should not exceed six (6) feet in height.
- iii. That specifications and details of each of the proposed site furnishings noted in finding j be submitted to OHP
- iv. staff for review and approval.
- v. ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Provided at the beginning of the meeting.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Fetzer moved to postpone until after a public meeting with the neighborhood is held.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, and Grube.

**ACTION:** MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.

**ITEM 4. HDRC NO. 2024-366**  
ADDRESS: 301 LAVACA ST  
APPLICANT: Fernando Morales/Candid Works

**REQUEST:**

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

- 1. Construct an approximately 1,966 sqft rear addition.
- 2. Construct an approximately 360 sqft rear carport accessible from Garfield Alley.
- 3. Install a new concrete apron from Garfield Alley.
- 4. Construct a 6' tall, limestone privacy wall at various locations onsite.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1: Staff recommends approval of the rear addition, based on the findings, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant add fenestration to the Indianola St-facing façade on the proposed rear addition.
- ii. That the applicant meets all setback standards as required by city zoning and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

Item 2: Staff recommends approval of the Garfield Alley carport, based on finding n, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant meet all setback standards as required by city zoning requirements and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

Item 3: Staff recommends approval of the new concrete apron from Garfield Alley, based on finding o, as submitted.

Item 4: Staff recommends approval of the 6' tall, limestone privacy wall, based on finding p, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide staff an example of the limestone prior to installation for final approval.
- ii. That the applicant relocated the southern-most limestone wall further back from the historic structure's front wall plane to be flush with the addition's southern-most wall plane.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 1, 2 with staff stipulations, item 3 as submitted by the applicant, and item 4 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube, Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velásquez and Galloway.

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

**ITEM 5. HDRC NO. 2024-341**  
ADDRESS: 634 CEDAR ST  
APPLICANT: Victoria Gough/Lush GreenScape Design

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Demolish the existing rear accessory structure.
2. Install a rear carport.
3. Modify the existing front porch steps.
4. Install a 4-foot-tall, louvered wood picket front yard fence and driveway gate located behind the front porch.
5. Install brick planter boxes.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of the demolition of the rear accessory structure based on findings a through h. If the HDRC is compelled to approve the demolition of the rear accessory structure, the City's Deconstruction Ordinance shall apply.

Item 2, if the HDRC is compelled to approve the demolition of the rear accessory structure, staff recommends the following:

- A. If Option A is approved, staff recommends the applicant incorporate wood posts and beams in lieu of the proposed steel posts and beams. The applicant is required to submit updated drawings and material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- B. If Option B is approved, staff recommends the applicant incorporate board and batten siding featuring boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½" wide for the carport's gabled areas as represented in the applicant's drawings.

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

Item 4, staff recommends approval of the front yard fence installation based on finding k with the following stipulation:

- I. That the final construction height of the approved 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.

Item 5, staff does not recommend approval of the brick planter installation based on finding l.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Lisa Lynde on behalf of the King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a voicemail in support of staff recommendations for items 1, item 2 option B proposed by the applicant, item 3, and item 5, and oppose item 4.
- the King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter outlinging the same information provided in the voicemail.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Savino moved to approve item 1, approve item 2 the carport design featured in Option B, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant incorporate board and batten siding featuring boards that are twelve (12) inches wide with battens that are 1 – ½” wide.
- ii. That the applicant reduce the total carport height.
- iii. That the applicant change the roof form to a hipped roof featuring an overhang and exposed rafter tails.
- iv. That the applicant provide updated and measured elevation drawings and a site plan to staff for final approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- v. That the applicant incorporate salvaged material from the removed rear accessory structure.

Deny item 3, approve item 4 with staff stipulation i, and deny item 5.  
Vice Chair Fetzer seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube,  
Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velásquez and Galloway.

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

**ITEM 6. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING.**

**ITEM 7. HDRC NO. 2024-323**  
ADDRESS: 509 MADISON ST  
APPLICANT: Christopher Rocha/Master Contracting

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a detached carport along the Northern side of the property over the existing driveway. The applicant has

proposed two options for consideration. Option 1 is a hipped roof standing seam carport with columns. Option 2 is a cantilevered monopitch carport with aluminum framing and polycarbonate corrugated panels.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend either carport option at this location based on the findings. If the HDRC finds that a carport is appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulations be considered.

- I. The freestanding, wood construction carport design is preferred over the metal option.
- II. That the carport be set behind the front façade wall plane and reduced in length to accomplish this stipulation.
- III. That fully dimensioned and to-scale drawings that meet the stipulations be submitted to staff to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

A variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment must be approved prior to issuance of a permit.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Lisa Lynde on behalf of the King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a voicemail in support of staff findings and recommendations
- the King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter outlining the same information provided in the voicemail.

**MOTION 1:** Commissioner Cervantes moved to approve with the staff stipulation II. Commissioner Castillo seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**  
AYE: None.  
NAY: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Cervantes, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, Grube and Holland.

**ACTION:** MOTION FAILED with 0 AYES. 7 NAYS. 4 ABSENT.

**MOTION 2:** Commissioner Savino moved to deny the request. Vice Chair Fetzer seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**  
AYE: Castillo, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Cervantes, Fetzer, and Gibbs.  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, Grube and Holland.

**ACTION:** MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. 4 ABSENT.

**ITEM 8. HDRC NO. 2024-369**  
ADDRESS: 1933 FREDERICKSBURG RD  
APPLICANT: Milton Saunders/SIGNS LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install flush mounted, internally illuminated signage reading “Crush Cake Shop” above their respective storefront measuring 58 sq ft.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommend approvals to install exterior signage measuring 58 sqft. with the following stipulation;

- a. That the proposed signage features reverse lit channel letters with metal / opaque faces. Updated specifications must be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Bianca Maldonado on behalf of the Monticello Park Neighborhood Association submitted a voicemail, requesting staff recommendations be approved for this request with the added stipulation that a master signage plan be developed for this property.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Fetzer moved to approve with staff stipulations. Commissioner Castillo seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Castillo, Mazuca, Guevara, and Fetzer.  
NAY: Savino, Cervantes and Gibbs.  
ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, Grube and Holland.

**ACTION:** MOTION PASSED with 4 AYES. 3 NAYS. 4 ABSENT.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chairman Gibbs adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

**APPROVED**

---

J. Maurice Gibbs, Chair  
Historic Design Review Commission  
City of San Antonio

Date: \_\_\_\_\_