



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2024**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission (“**HDRC**”) met on Wednesday, July 17, 2024, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

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

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Castillo, Savino, Guevara, Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.

ABSENT: Velásquez, Galloway, Mazuca, and Grube.

- Commissioner Grube arrived after roll call at 3:02 p.m.

CHAIR’S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT:

- Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
- OHP staff invite the public to attend upcoming events:
 - Historic Districts Coalition meeting on Saturday, July 20 at the San Antonio Garden Center.
 - The Amazing Preservation Race for Kids on Saturday, July 27 at the Yanaguan Garden at Hemisfair.
- Item 6 was postponed by the applicant prior to the hearing.
- Item 13 was postponed by the applicant prior to the hearing.
- Item 18 was postponed by the applicant prior to the hearing.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Holland moved to approve HDRC minutes for the June 28th, 2024 meeting. Vice-Chair Fetzer seconded the motion.

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Valerie Cortez, on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill, submitted a voicemail with general comments to announce the dissolution of the Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee and re-establishment of Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill.

- Lulu Francois, on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill, submitted a voicemail with general comments continuing Valerie Cortez's previous comments announcing the dissolution of the Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee and re-establishment of Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill.
- Item 2 – Kate Ruckman on behalf of the Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 7 – Barry Clark spoke in support of the case.
- Item 7 – Kate Ruckman on behalf of the Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a voicemail in support of staff's recommendations.
- Item 7 – The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter outlining the same information provided in their voicemail.
- Item 9 – Benjamin Coronado submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 9 – Cynthia Spielman submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 9 – Elizabeth Eichhorn submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 9 – Jerry Lockey submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 9 – Kim Hubbeling submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 9 – Rose Cohen Brown submitted a voicemail in support of the case.

Chair Gibbs asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the Consent Agenda. Vice-Chair Fetzer requested item be pulled 7 from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration. Vice-Chair Fetzer recused from items 2 and 3.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Item 1, Case No. 2024-225 1106 BURLESON ST
 Item 2, Case No. 2024-239 901 NOGALITOS ST
 Item 3, Case No. 2024-230 1210 E ELMIRA ST
 Item 4, Case No. 2024-231 103 9TH ST
 Item 5, Case No. 2024-241 333 N SANTA ROSA
 Item 8, Case No. 2024-248 311 3RD ST
 Item 9, Case No. 2024-250 1032 W Lynwood
 Item 10, Case No. 2024-249 515 RIVERSIDE DR
 Item 11, Case No. 2024-223 310 S ST MARYS ST
 Item 12, Case No. 2024-243 329 W AGARITA AVE

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve items 1-5, and 8-12 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT, 1 RECUSAL.

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 7. HDRC NO. 2024-240
 ADDRESS: 401 VILLITA ST
 APPLICANT: Stephen Guzman/Ford Powell Carson

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to perform various scopes of work at 401 Villita, commonly known as the La Villita Assembly Hall. Within this scope of work the applicant has proposed the following:

Modifications to the existing site:

1. Lower the pedestrian plaza on the northeast side of the building from street level to river level.
2. Modify the existing stair (City owned) between the pedestrian plaza and the Arneson River Theater. This scope of work also includes modifying existing, separating walls between the pedestrian plaza and the Arneson River Theater.
3. Remove the existing retaining wall on the north (river) side and reconstruct pilasters to match the original.
4. Construct a cantilevered outdoor terrace.
5. Remove the existing switchback pedestrian ramp on the north side of the building and construct a public elevator to replace the existing ramp as well as a new stair from the river level to the street level.
6. Create an outdoor dining space and gathering space within an existing courtyard on the southeast corner of the site. Existing limestone walls along Villita Street are to be removed to improve pedestrian circulation. Wood decking is to be installed to replace existing, masonry pavers.

Restroom Structure:

7. Demolish the existing public restroom structure and construct a new public restroom structure.

Modifications to the historic façade:

8. Remove a portion of the original façade on the northeast side and install a new storefront system. This removal will include the roof at the covered entry.
9. Install a clerestory window around the entirety of the structure, minus locations where new storefront elements are proposed.
10. Install new LED lights on the exterior of the structure.

Rehabilitation:

11. Repair and paint the exterior stucco walls and metal trim.
12. Replace the roof structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval of items #1 through #13 based on findings a through o with the following stipulations:

- i. That the reconstructed pilasters from the demolished retaining wall will remain similar to the original in location, profile and finish, as noted in finding f.
- ii. That all public elements, including the proposed ramp, elevator and stair, be submitted to the City's Disability Access Office for review and approval prior to returning to the Commission for final approval, as noted in finding h. Additionally, a landing of at least six (6) feet in depth shall be provided between the elevator's access point and the River Walk path to prevent queueing and blocking of the pedestrian path.
- iii. That final materials specifications and landscape/hardscape plans for the proposed dining and gathering space be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission for final approval, as noted in finding i.

- iv. That the proposed standing seam metal roof for the restroom building feature smooth panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap and a standard galvalume finish or other finish that has been approved in La Villita. An on-site inspection is required prior to roof installation to confirm that the previously noted specifications have been met.
- v. That the proposed storefront system and clerestory windows be complementary of the original design and should feature framing and mullions that are complementary of the original structure in color and profile, as noted in findings l and m.
- vi. That a detailed architectural and site lighting plan be submitted for review and approval when returning to the Commission. Lighting should be designed in a manner that is complementary of the historic structure's original architecture and respectful of the adjacent La Villita Historic District and River Walk.
- vii. That all stucco and façade elements be repaired in-kind and that final colors be submitted to OHP staff.
- viii. That the applicant meet all tree preservation requirements per the City Arborist.
- ix. Archaeology – An archaeological investigation is required. Work within public property is subject to the Texas Antiquities Code. 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 for conceptual approval with staff stipulations with the added stipulations:

- 1. That the applicant further study a horizontal roof plane at the location on the northeast corner of the building where the existing roof plane is being removed.
- 2. That the applicant further study the monumental stair and landscape and shading on site.

Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 13. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2024-227
ADDRESS: 1613 N ALAMO ST
APPLICANT: Ashley Farrimond/Killen, Griffin & Farrimond, PLLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the historic structure at 1613 N Alamo, an individual landmark.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not find that the applicant has met the UDC's requirement for an unreasonable economic hardship, as noted in finding f; however, staff finds that the structure may have experienced a loss of significance.

Should the Historic and Design Review Commission find an unreasonable economic hardship or a loss of significance not caused directly or indirectly by the owner, as noted in finding f, and recommend approval of the demolition of this structure, staff recommends the following:

- i. That the applicant provide documentation of the structure's architectural elements in accordance with the UDC Section 35-614(d).
- ii. That the applicant provide a detailed salvage plan documenting which elements will be salvaged through deconstruction, as required by Code.

All requirements of the UDC Section 35-614(d) and (e) must be satisfied prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve demolition by a loss of significance with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2024-233
ADDRESS: 1203 S ALAMO ST
APPLICANT: George George Rodriguez/Economy Signs

REQUEST:

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

1. Install an approximately 41-square-foot wall mounted sign on the front façade.
2. Reface the existing pole sign to feature a 12-square-foot sign.

RECOMMENDATION:

Items 1 and 2, staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduces the size of the wall-mounted sign so that the overall square footage for signage does not exceed 50 square feet based on finding b. Updated documents must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the pole sign is not internally illuminated, and that the applicant improves the legibility of the sign by modifying the orientation of the lettering and reducing the number of colors on the signage based on finding c. The applicant is required to submit updated graphics and lighting specifications for the pole sign to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter in support of staff's recommendations.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 1 as submitted and approve item 2 with stipulations:

1. That the pole sign features only external illumination and that the applicant considers reorienting the text.
2. Internal illumination of the cabinet is not permitted.

Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2024-247
ADDRESS: 128 ADAMS ST
APPLICANT: Nathan Manfred/French & Michigan

REQUEST:

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to enclose a second-story porch rear porch.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the request to enclose the rear second-story porch, based on findings a and b.

Should the HDRC find enclosing the porch appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed design retains the existing exposed rafter tails.
- ii. That the applicant proposes a window product that conforms to standard specifications for windows in additions and new construction, as noted in finding c.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter in support of staff recommendations to deny approval.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Fetzer moved to approve with stipulations:

1. the second floor porch be enclosed and the existing architectural details, rafter tails, columns, railings are maintained
2. That the applicant proposes a window product that conforms to standard specifications for windows in additions and new construction, as noted in finding c.
3. The applicant provide revised drawings and submit updates to staff for approval.

Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

MOTION: Vice-Chair Fetzer moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations. Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES. 2 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2024-226
ADDRESS: 145 GREENLAWN
APPLICANT: Benedict Torres

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install two dormers of the south-facing (front elevation) roof form.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the installation of two dormers on the front facade based on finding b.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved for conceptual approval for the installation of the dormers on the front elevation of the roof with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant submits material specifications for the dormers, windows, and roof to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
2. That the applicant submit full construction drawings of the proposed modifications to the roof form prior to the return to the HDRC.
3. That the applicant considers a different style of dormer due to the roof slope prior to the return to the HDRC.
4. That the window specifications are as follows: That the applicant installs a fully wood window 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".

Commissioner Castillo seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 18. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING

ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2024-216
 ADDRESS: 1902 W MISTLETOE
 APPLICANT: Isabel Rodriguez/JADAI ENTERPRISES INC & TIJERINA JAIMY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 672 sqft rear addition.

RECOMMENDATION:

There is not sufficient documentation to review for a Certificate of Appropriateness at this time. Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits fully dimensioned drawings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant incorporate window openings on the east, west, and south facades that feature traditional dimensions and proportions as found within the Monticello Park Historic District.
- iii. That the applicant install a door on the east façade that conforms to the architectural style of the property.
- iv. That the applicant meet all setback standards as required by city zoning and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Bianca Maldonado, on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee, submitted a voicemail in support of staff's recommendations.
- The Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter outlinning the same information that was provided in the voicemail.
- Stephen Solis submitted a letter in support of the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations.
 Commissioner Castillo seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2024-178
 ADDRESS: 322 LAMAR ST
 APPLICANT: Gustavo De La Rosa/DLR HOME SERVICES LLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Remove the existing roof and roof framing and reconstruct to match the existing roof form and increase the overall height by 3 feet.
2. Modify the existing roof form of the post-1951 rear addition.
3. Modify the existing roof form of the circa 1912 rear addition.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1: Staff recommends approval of item 1, based on findings a through d, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant retain the existing ridge heights of the original portion at their current elevations.
- ii. That the applicant submit to staff updated construction documents accurately reflecting the items in stipulation i.

Item 2: Staff recommends approval of item 2, based on findings a, c, and e.

Item 3: Staff recommends approval of item 3, based on findings a, c, and f.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Valerie Cortez, on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill, submitted a voicemail support of staff's recommendations and asked for clarification on the elevation drawings regarding potential non-confirming windows.
- The Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill submitted a letter outlining the same information that was provided in the voicemail.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations. Vice-Chair Fetzer seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Gibbs adjourned the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Date: _____