



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2024**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission (**HDRC**) met on Wednesday, June 6, 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: Mammen, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube (virtual), Cervantes and Fetzer

ABSENT: Galloway, Holland and Gibbs

- Commissioner Holland arrived at 3:04 p.m.

CHAIR'S STATEMENT:

Vice Chair Fetzer provided a statement regarding meeting processes, appeals, time limits, and decorum.

ANNOUNCEMENT:

- Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve HDRC meeting minutes for May 21, 2025.
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

In-person speakers

- Item 1 – James Pointdexter spoke in support of the request.
- Item 1 – Melissa Gohlke spoke in support of the request.
- Item 5 – Jane Henry requested a continuance of the case so the Mission San Jose Neighborhood Association could review the request.

Letters

- Item 1 – Luis Vasquez submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Item 1 – The Tobin Hill Community Association submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.
- Item 2 – The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

Voicemails

- Item 1 – Frederica Kushner, on behalf of the Tobin Hill Community Association, submitted a voicemail in support of the request.
- Item 1 – Luis Vasquez submitted a voicemail in support of the request.
- Item 1 – Sarah Ansbro submitted a voicemail in support of the request.
- Item 2 – Kate Ruckman, on behalf of the Conservation Society of San Antonio, submitted a voicemail concerned with the proximity of the project to the UNESCO protected World Heritage buffer surrounding the San Juan Acequia.

CONSENT AGENDA:

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

- Commissioner Cervantes requested that Item 1 be pulled from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration.
- Commissioner Savino requested that Item 5 be pulled from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration.

MOTION: Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve items 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 with staff stipulations.

Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

Items on Consent:

Item 2, Case No. 2025-141	9427 SE 410
Item 3, Case No. 2025-129	118 PARKVIEW DR
Item 4, Case No. 2025-128	875 E ASHBY PLACE
Item 6, Case No. 2025-146	2046 W MULBERRY AVE
Item 7, Case No. 2025-136	2101 W MAGNOLIA AVE
Item 8, Case No. 2025-135	240 E LULLWOOD AVE

VOTE: AYE: Mammen, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube, Cervantes, Holland and Fetzer.

NAY: None.

ABSENT: Galloway and Gibbs.

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 1. HDRC NO. 2025-127

ADDRESS: N Main Ave, between E Elmira St and E Mistletoe Ave, and the surrounding neighborhood

APPLICANT: Office of Historic Preservation

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting endorsement of the Pride Cultural Heritage District. The district is located along N Main Avenue, between E Elmira Street to E Mistletoe Avenue, and the surrounding neighborhood, bound by W Grayson and N St. Mary's streets to the east and by San Pedro Avenue to the west, with additional clusters of businesses and culturally meaningful sites outside of those general boundaries.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends endorsement of the Pride Cultural Heritage District.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Provided at the beginning of the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve the endorsement of the Pride Cultural Heritage District.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 5. HDRC NO. 2025-090
ADDRESS: 910 E SOUTHCROSS BLVD
APPLICANT: Edward Hernandez/Nirvana Architecture Studio

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new 10,000 sf building housing an auditorium, classrooms, and various auxiliary spaces on the existing campus of LIDS Christian Center at 910 E Southcross Blvd and site work consisting of a master parking and landscaping plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval to construct a new 10,000 sf building housing an auditorium, classrooms, and various auxiliary spaces on the existing campus of LIDS Christian Center at 910 E Southcross Blvd and site work consisting of a master parking and landscaping plan with the following stipulation;

- **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: Commissioner Savino moved for a continuance with a recommendation that the applicant meet with the Mission San Jose Neighborhood Association before returning for review by the HDRC.
Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Mammen, Savino, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube, Holland, and Fetzer.
 NAY: Velásquez and Cervante
 ABSENT: Galloway and Gibbs.

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

ITEM 9. HDRC NO. 2025-098
 ADDRESS: 303 CEDAR ST
 APPLICANT: Cameron Smith/Smithdish Architecture

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove the existing rear accessory structure located at the SE portion of the lot and construct an approx. 956 sf rear accessory structure at the SE corner of the lot featuring a two-car garage, studio, and porch.
2. Replace the existing historic window and non-historic windows of the primary structure.
REMOVED FROM REQUEST PER APPLICANT
3. Install decorative iron guardrails on the front porch, stairs, and ramp and a steel fence and operable steel vehicular gate at the side yards set fully behind the front façade wall plane.
4. Install an approx. 140 sf rear patio at the SE corner of the primary structure providing coverage of newly proposed ramps.
5. Install several landscaping elements to include river rock at the front and side yards, decomposed granite in the rear yard and side yard, raised beds, various plantings throughout the lot, an approx. 1,050 sf brick paver motor court at the rear of the lot and a brick walkway leading from the street to the main entrance of the primary structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

- Staff recommends approval to remove the existing rear accessory structure located at the SE portion of the lot and to construct an approx. 956 sf rear accessory structure at the SE corner of the lot featuring a two-car garage, studio, and porch with the following stipulations based on findings a, b, j, k, l, and m.
 - That the applicant salvage as much existing material as possible, including wood siding and structural members, and the punched tin sconce on the exterior of the structure for reuse on site, resale, or donation.
 - That the applicant submit final drawings and all materials specifications to include siding, standing seam metal roof installation details, column details, siding specifications, and manufacturer specifications of the exterior door and garage door selections.
 - That the applicant meet all setback standards as required by city zoning and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable based on finding j.
- Staff recommends approval to replace the non-historic windows of the contemporary addition with an aluminum clad wood window product with the following stipulation based on findings a and c.
 - That the applicant installs a fully wood or clad wood window product 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.

- 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".
- That the applicant submit manufacturer specifications for review prior to the issuance of aCOA.
- Staff does not recommend approval to replace the existing historic windows of the primary structure, instead staff finds the applicant should repair the existing historic windows in-kind based on findings a and c.
- Staff recommends approval to install decorative iron guardrails on the front porch, stairs, and ramp and a steel fence and operable steel vehicular gate at the side yards set fully behind the front façade wall plane with the following stipulations based on findings a, d, and g.
 - That the applicant submit all material specifications and design drawings of the iron guardrail and proposed gate/fencing.
- Staff recommends approval to install an approx. 140 sf rear patio at the SE corner of the primary structure providing coverage of newly proposed ramps with the following stipulation based on findings a and f;
 - That the applicant submit additional drawings of the column details and standing seam metal roof specifications.
- Staff recommends approval to install several landscaping elements to include river rock at the front and side yards, decomposed granite in the rear yard and side yard, raised beds, various plantings throughout the lot, an approx. 1,050 sf brick paver motor court at the rear of the lot and a brick walkway leading from the street to the main entrance of the primary structure.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lisa Lynde, on behalf of the Architectural Advisory Committee of the King William Association, submitted a voicemail in support of staff recommendations and findings with stipulations for approval except for an item requested in #5.
- The Architectural Advisory Committee of the King William Association, submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve items 1, 3, 4, and 5 with staff stipulations:

- That the applicant submit final drawings and all materials specifications to include siding, standing seam metal roof installation details, column details, siding specifications, and manufacturer specifications of the exterior door and garage door selections.
- That the applicant meet all setback standards as required by city zoning and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable based on finding j.
- That the applicant submit all material specifications and design drawings of the iron guardrail and proposed gate/fencing.
- That the applicant submit additional drawings of the column details and standing seam metal roof specifications.

- That the applicant remove the installation of the steel edged planting beds along the front porch from the design as requested in item #5.
- That the applicant salvage as much existing material as possible, including wood siding and structural members, for reuse on site, resale, or donation. Full deconstruction by hand would yield a larger quantity of reclaimed materials available for resale or reuse in other projects. A comprehensive salvage plan is required to be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness outlining the materials to be reclaimed and their final destination or proposed use.

Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: Vice Chair Fetzer adjourned the meeting at 3:51 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Date: _____