



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2024**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission (“**HDRC**”) met on Wednesday, October 16, 2024, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chair Gibbs called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Savino, Galloway (virtual), Mazuca, Cervantes, Fetzer, and Gibbs.

ABSENT: Castillo, Velásquez, Guevara, Grube, and Holland.

- Commissioner Holland arrived at 3:04 p.m.
- Commissioner Grube arrived at 3:11 p.m.

CHAIR’S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

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

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Vice Chair Fetzer moved to approve HDRC meeting minutes for October 2, 2024. Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Savino, Galloway, Mazuca, Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.

NAY: None.

ABSENT: Castillo, Velásquez, Guevara, and Grube.

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

VOICEMAILS

- Item 1 – The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a voicemail with comments concerning the design of the new residential building at the north end of Hemisfair Park.
- Item 2 – Kate Ruckman on behalf of the Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a voicemail in support staff's recommendations.
- Item 2 – Steve Yndo submitted a voicemail in support of the case.
- Item 8 – Robin Foster, on behalf of the Monticello Park Neighborhood Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a voicemail in support of staff’s recommendations, requesting an additional stipulation to correct the typo on the plaque from “WLA” to “WLCA”, and requesting the concrete base on either side of benches be expanded for wheelchair and stroller accommodations.

- Item 9 – Robin Foster, on behalf of the Monticello Park Neighborhood Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a voicemail in support staff's recommendation for approval with stipulations.

LETTERS

- Item 1 – The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.
- Item 2 – Clint Belew submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Item 2 – The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Item 2 – The Lavaca Neighborhood Association submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Item 2 – Rhett Guthrie submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Item 2 – Sarah Brennan submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Item 8 – The Monticello Park Neighborhood Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.
- Item 9 – The Monticello Park Neighborhood Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

IN-PERSON SPEAKERS

- None.

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

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

Item 2, Case No. 2024-325 141 LAVACA ST
 Item 3, Case No. 2024-346 502 NAVARRO ST
 Item 4, Case No. 2024-349 221 NEWELL
 Item 5, Case No. 2024-350 307 PEARL PKWY
 Item 6, Case No. 2024-351 214 LOTUS ST
 Item 7, Case No. 2024-338 332 FLORIDA ST
 Item 8, Case No. 2024-352 1103 CINCINNATI AVE
 Item 9, Case No. 2024-329 2127 W WOODLAWN AVE
 Item 10, Case No. 2024-355 1223 VIRGINIA BLVD

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve items 2-10 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. 4 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 1. HDRC NO. 2024-344
 ADDRESS: E Market at Hemisfair
 APPLICANT: FitzGerald Associate Architects, PLLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a 3-story retail structure to feature two levels above street level and 1 level at river level.
2. Construct a 10-story mixed-use structure to feature retail, 304 residential units and an internal parking structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the construction of a 3-story retail structure based on findings 1a through 1e with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the proposed CFPS system should be detailed and applied to present an appearance similar to applied stucco, with expansion joints comparable to stucco, as noted in finding 1d. Stucco should be true stucco with a traditional troweled finish where highly visible from the ROW. The coarse stucco noted in the application documents should not be used.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the construction of a 10-story mixed-use structure based on findings 2a through 2g, with the following stipulations:
 - ii. That the proposed CFPS system should be detailed and applied to present an appearance similar to applied stucco, with expansion joints comparable to stucco, as noted in finding 2f. Stucco should be true stucco with a traditional troweled finish where highly visible from the ROW. The coarse stucco noted in the application documents should not be used.
 - iii. That the applicant continue to explore ways to meet the UDC's standards regarding the incorporation of modular masonry façade elements above the base level, as noted in finding 2f.
3. Staff recommends additional stipulations relating to site design and overall development:
 - iv. That a detailed lighting plan be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
 - v. That all future outdoor and site furniture be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval prior to installation. All furniture is to be consistent with the UDC Section 35-673(i).
 - vi. That each curb cut and approach should be installed in a manner that does not result in a grade change in the pedestrian path.
 - vii. That primary building signage not face Civic Park, as currently proposed. Signage facing the park should not be internally lit and should not be located above the building's ground level. A master signage plan should be developed and submitted for review and approval. Signage should adhere to the Unified Development Code Section 35-678.
 - viii. ARCHAEOLOGY – An archaeological investigation is required. 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 approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 11. 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 metal carport.
3. Front porch step modifications.
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 d. 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 approval of the installation of the carport based on finding e with the following stipulation:

- i. That the carport features 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.

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

Item 4, staff recommends approval of the front yard fence installation based on finding g 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 h.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lisa Lynde on behalf of the King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a voicemail with comments regarding the case:
 - Item 1: recommend salvage and reuse of materials if demolition of the rear structure is approved.
 - Items 2, 3, and 5: In support of staff's recommendations.
 - Item 4: not in support.
- The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to refer to a site visit Design Review Committee. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Savino, Galloway, Mazuca, Grube, Cervantes, Holland, Fetzer, and Gibbs.

NAY: None.
ABSENT: Castillo, Velásquez, and Guevara.

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

ITEM 12. HDRC NO. 2024-326
ADDRESS: 517 WICKES
APPLICANT: FLORES STEPHANIES & JOE MARK

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the rear accessory structure and conceptual review of a replacement structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the rear accessory structure based on findings a through e. The City's Deconstruction Ordinance shall apply.

Item 2, staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the replacement plans at this time based on finding f. Staff recommends that the applicant propose an accessory structure that is smaller in scale and provides for greater building separation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve item 1, not approve item 2 at this time, and add item 3, a site visit Design Review Committee to address plans. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 13. HDRC NO. 2024-347
ADDRESS: 206 E SUMMIT AVE
APPLICANT: Michelle HippsCruz/Liminal Design Studio

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct 2-story ADU with a building footprint of 440 sf at the SW corner of the property behind the primary structure along McCullough Avenue.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through I with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant maintain the historic setback along the Western property line of the historic mid-rise condos immediately abutting the property. Setback to be field verified by

applicant. Applicant must submit new site plan with revised setback prior to returning to the HDRC as noted in finding c.

- ii. That the applicant submits window specifications to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding i.
- iii. That the applicant submits material specifications of the stacked limestone stairs and integrated planters prior to returning to the HDRC as noted in finding k.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Vice Chair Fetzer moved to approve with staff stipulations and the stipulation that the applicant add additional fenestration to the façade facing McCullough Avenue and provide updated drawings prior to returning to the HDRC. Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2024-348
ADDRESS: 2900 SAN PEDRO AVE
APPLICANT: Christopher Rocha/Master Contracting

REQUEST:

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

- 1. Restore a front entrance on the south facade at the location of a previously-enclosed front porch. Existing windows will be removed, and a new staircase will be installed.
- 2. Enclose one door on Western façade along San Pedro Avenue.
- 3. Install a 6-foot-tall stucco wall along Southern (front yard along Elsmere) edge of the property.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) Staff recommends conceptual approval based on finding b with the following stipulations:
 - a. That windows be retained on this facade, or that the historic porch be restored based on evidence. The resulting facade should read visually as a porch consistent with the Guidelines.
 - b. That detailed architectural drawings be updated and submitted for a COA.
 - c. That materials specifications for the proposed stair be submitted for a COA.
- 2) Staff recommends approval of the side door enclosure based on finding c.
- 3) Staff does not recommend approval of a front yard fence or wall based on finding d.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Vice Chair Fetzer moved to refer to a site visit Design Review Committee. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Gibbs adjourned the meeting at 4:14 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Date: _____

DRAFT