



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

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2024**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission (“HDRC”) met on Wednesday, May 15, 2024, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

Chairman Gibbs called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Castillo, Velásquez, Galloway, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube, Cervantes, Fetzner, and Gibbs.

**ABSENT:** Savino and Holland.

- Commissioner Holland arrived at 3:08 p.m.

**CHAIRMAN’S STATEMENT:**

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

**ANNOUNCEMENT:**

- Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
- OHP staff invited the public to more events celebrating Preservation Month.
- Item 7 was postponed by the applicant.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Fetzner moved to approve the HDRC meeting minutes for May 1, 2024.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- Item 1 – The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter in support of staff recommendations.
- Item 4 – Mark Cooper submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Item 4 – Robin Foster, on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee, submitted a letter supporting staff’s recommendations.
- Item 4 – Robin Foster, on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee, submitted a voicemail with the same information outlined in their letter.
- Item 4 – Mary Barton Rivera submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 4 – Joseph Rivera submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 4 – Julia Cambell submitted a voicemail in support of the case.

- Item 4 – Marie Cooper submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 4 – Sandy Villarreal submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 5 – The Monte Vista Historical Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter in support of staff's recommendations.

Chairman Gibbs asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the Consent Agenda.  
No commissioners requested an item from the Consent Agenda to be pulled for individual consideration.  
Commissioner Fetzer recused from the consent agenda for item #6.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Item 1, Case No. 2024-171	400 EAGLELAND DR
Item 2, Case No. 2024-176	139 THORAIN BLVD
Item 3, Case No. 2024-165	8801 S FLORES ST
Item 4, Case No. 2024-167	1943 W SUMMIT AVE
Item 5, Case No. 2024-160	227 W WOODLAWN AVE
Item 6, Case No. 2024-129	1301 E ELMIRA ST

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve items 1-6 with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** MOTION PASSED with 9 AYES. 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:**

**ITEM 7. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

ADDRESS:  
APPLICANT:

**ITEM 8. HDRC NO. 2024-183**

ADDRESS: 325 E LOCUST  
APPLICANT: ricardo mccullough

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Partial demolition of the rear cmu addition.
2. Construct a new, two-story rear addition.
3. Modify the structure's fenestration pattern.
4. Modify the front porch.
5. Modify the existing roof form and materials and remove the rear chimney.
6. Install rear parking.
7. Modify the existing landscape.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1: Staff recommends conceptual approval of partial demolition of the rear addition, based on findings a through e.

Item 2: Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the proposed rear addition at this time. While the proposed footprint may be appropriate, the design does not conform with Guidelines in terms of subordination and distinction from the original house.

Item 3: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the fenestration modifications, based on findings a through d and finding q, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant retain the historic window openings found on the east elevation.

Item 4: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed front porch alterations with the stipulations that:

- i. The columns be no wider than 6", feature chamfered corners, and a traditional base and cap.
- ii. That the existing roof form remain unaltered; this is shown on the updated front elevation but is absent on the proposed east elevation drawings.
- iii. That replacement windows be fully wood and meet staff's stipulations for replacement windows.

Item 5: Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the new roof configuration, materials, and rear chimney removal. Existing roof forms, including the original hipped mass on the east elevation, should be preserved and remain distinguishable from any proposed additions. Removing the historic building's roof form does not conform to Guidelines. The existing materials include a pressed metal shingle which is unique to the property and should be repaired in kind where present. Existing chimneys should be preserved in place.

Item 6: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear parking, based on findings a through c and finding t, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs a permeable material for the parking area.

Item 7: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the landscape modifications, based on findings a through c and finding u, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant includes plantings within the proposed gravel area.
- ii. That the applicant installs gravel not exceeding 2 inches in size.
- iii. That the applicant installs gravel natural in color.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Frederica Kushner submitted a voicemail in support of staff's recommendations.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Cervantes moved to refer the request to the next available setting for a Design Review Committee site visit review.  
Commissioner Fetzer seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES. 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT.**

**ITEM 9. HDRC NO. 2024-144**  
ADDRESS: 700 N ST MARYS ST  
APPLICANT: Katherine Moltz/Chandler Signs

## REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval of a master signage plan at 700 N St Mary's, located within the Downtown Zoning District and the River Improvement Overlay, District 3. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following signs for multiple tenants:

1. One (1) face lit channel letter sign mounted on a backer panel to feature an overall width of 40' – 0" and an overall height of 12' – 0" for a total size of approximately 480 square feet. The applicant has proposed two locations for this sign, both on the north façade at the primary roof parapet level, approximately 230' feet above street level. These two options are identified as **A1.1 and A1.2 (Tenant 1)** in the application documents.
2. One (1) face lit channel letter sign mounted on a backer panel to feature an overall width of 40' – 0" and an overall height of 12' – 0" for a total size of approximately 480 square feet. The applicant has proposed two locations for this sign, both on the east façade at the primary roof parapet level, approximately 230' feet above street level. These two options are identified as **A2.1 and A2.2 (Tenant 2)** in the application documents.
3. One (1) face lit channel letter sign mounted on a backer panel to feature an overall width of 40' – 0" and an overall height of 7' – 0" for a total size of approximately 280 square feet. This sign will be located on the north façade, approximately 70' feet above street level. This sign is identified as **A3 (Tenant 3)** in the application documents.
4. One (1) face lit channel letter sign mounted on a backer panel to feature an overall width of 32' – 0" and an overall height of 5' – 7 1/4" for a total size of approximately 148 square feet. This sign will be located on river facing (north) façade of the parking structure's elevator and stair tower. This sign is identified as **A4 (Tenant 4)** in the application documents.
5. One (1) face lit channel letter sign mounted on a backer panel to feature an overall width of 27' – 11 3/4" and an overall height of 8' – 5" for a total size of approximately 235 square feet. The applicant has proposed two locations for this sign, both on the south façade at the primary roof parapet level, approximately 230' feet above street level. These two options are identified as **A5.1 and A5.2 (Tenant 5)** in the application documents.
6. One (1) face lit channel letter sign mounted on a backer panel to feature an overall width of 40' – 0" and an overall height of 12' – 0" for a total size of approximately 480 square feet. The applicant has proposed two locations for this sign, both on the south façade at the primary roof parapet level, approximately 230' feet above street level. These two options are identified as **A6.1 and A6.2 (Tenant 6)** in the application documents.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through d f and g with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed internal illumination does not produce a glare.
- ii. That all signage feature uniform installation profiles, to including mounting and illumination.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #3 and #4 based on findings e, i and j. The UDC Section 35-681(c)(2) notes that the maximum allowable size for any sign on the river side of property abutting the publicly owned River Walk shall be eight (8) square feet. If a building surface is used for signage, the letters or design shall not exceed a surface area of eight (8) square feet. Staff recommends the installation of one (1) sign on the river side of the property that does not exceed eight (8) square feet and features indirect illumination and metal construction.

Staff does not recommend approval of items #5 and #6 based on finding d. The Downtown Design Guide, Chapter 10, Signage, notes that primary signs near the top of a high-rise office building should contain only the name of the major building tenant. Staff recommends that signage for only one (1) tenant should be displayed at or near the top of the building, not to exceed two (2) total signs.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

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

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

**ACTION:** **MOTION PASSED with 10 AYES. 0 NAYS. 1 ABSENT.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chairman Gibbs adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

**APPROVED**

---

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

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