



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

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2023**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, November 15, 2023, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. for work session.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Velásquez, Galloway, Mazuca, Guevara, Cervantes, Holland, and Fetzer

**ABSENT:** Gibbs, Castillo, Savino, and Grube

\* Commissioner Grube arrived at 3:12 p.m.

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:**

Chairman Fetzer provided a statement regarding meeting and appeal processes, time limits, and decorum.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

- Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
- Welcome new District 4 HDRC Commissioner, Drew Galloway.
- Items 12, 14, 18, and 19 were postponed by the applicants.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Holland moved to approve the minutes for the November 1, 2023, Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) meeting.  
Commissioner Guevara seconded the motion.

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

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Item 1 – Gregory N. Ripps submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Item 3 – Monte Vista Historical Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Item 4 – King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter opposing the request.
- Item 4 – Lisa Lynde on behalf of the King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a voicemail requesting approval of the request be withheld until the applicant can provide additional information.
- Item 5 – Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Item 6 – King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Item 8 – King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter in support of the request.

Chairman Fetzer asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the consent agenda. No items were requested to be pulled from the consent agenda.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Item 1, Case No. 2023-432	1302 HICKS AVE
Item 2, Case No. 2023-429	1010 S FLORES ST
Item 3, Case No. 2023-435	122 W AGARITA AVE
Item 4, Case No. 2023-349	1231 S ALAMO ST
Item 5, Case No. 2023-438	634 MUNCEY
Item 6, Case No. 2023-431	324 ADAMS ST
Item 7, Case No. 2023-443	219 LAVACA ST
Item 8, Case No. 2023-433	210 WICKES
Item 9, Case No. 2023-430	102 HERMINE BLVD
Item 10, Case No. 2023-428	901 RIGSBY AVE

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve items 1-10 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

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

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

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:**

**ITEM 11. HDRC NO. 2023-392**  
ADDRESS: 875 E ASHBY PLACE  
APPLICANT: Jason Cardenas/Aetna Sign Group

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval of a master signage plan for the installation of a total of ten (10) signs for an approximate total square footage of 578 square feet of signage.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the master signage plan based on findings a through f with the following stipulations: That the applicant installs the monument sign (I) in lieu of the previously approved wall-mounted signage (F & G) on the south elevation based on finding c. The applicant must submit an updated master signage plan to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- i. That the applicant submits updated signage specifications featuring only indirect or backlit illumination to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on finding d.
- ii. iii. That the signage will not exceed more than three (3) signs per tenant based on findings c and d.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve with staff stipulations 2 and 3. Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 12. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 13. HDRC NO. 2023-412**

ADDRESS: 501 FURR DR

APPLICANT: Jesus Monarez/Charles Todd Helton Architect Inc.

**REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Demolish the detached garage.
2. Construct a 610-square-foot detached garage.
3. Construct a rear approx. 60-square-foot rear addition.
4. Construct a rear approx. 250-square-foot covered porch.
5. Replace the existing metal backyard fence with a metal and cast stone fence with stone-clad posts.
6. Construct a concrete front porch with stone piers and wood railings.
7. Replace the existing single 15-lite door with French doors.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item 1, the request to demolish the detached garage, based on findings d through h. Should the HDRC find demolition of the detached garage appropriate, the applicant must comply with the City's deconstruction ordinance and select a Certified Deconstruction Contractor to complete deconstruction, form submission, and permitting in accordance with UDC Chapter 12, Article II, as noted in finding h.

Regarding item 2, new construction of a detached garage, should the HDRC find demolition of the existing garage appropriate, then staff recommends that only conceptual approval be granted at this time, based on findings i through k, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits complete materials information, including but not limited to manufacturer's specifications for the garage door and pedestrian doors, as noted in finding h.
- ii. That the applicant reduces the overall footprint of the proposed garage, as noted in finding h.
- iii. That the applicant meets all setback standards as required by city zoning requirements and obtains a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

A demolition permit will not be approved until replacement plans are reviewed and approved by the HDRC via application for a Certificate of Appropriateness and construction permits are pulled for this scope of work.

Staff recommends approval of items 3 and 4, rear addition and rear covered porch, based on findings l and m, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposes a sliding door product in keeping with the material, style, and period of construction of the home, namely one made of wood and without false muntins or side lites.
- ii. That the window on the first floor of the north elevation is retained in place.

Staff recommends approval of item 5, replacement of the existing metal backyard fence with a metal and cast stone fence with stone-clad posts, based on finding n, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the cast stone footer features a smooth plaster finish.

Staff does not recommend approval of items 6 and 7, based on findings o and p.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Robin Foster on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter detailing the Committee's opposition to item 1 and support of items 2-7 with staff recommendations.
- Robin Foster on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee submitted a voicemail with the same information provided in the letter.

**MOTION 1:** Commissioner Grube moved to conceptually approve items 1 and 2, and 3-6 with staff stipulations, deny item 7 and have applicant to return to HDRC for final approval.  
(Main Motion) Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

**MOTION 2:** Commissioner Velásquez moved to amend the motion to include denial of both items 6 and 7.  
(Amendment) Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

Chairman Fetzer called for a vote to approve the main motion as amended.

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

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

**ITEM 14. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2023-405**  
ADDRESS: 3708 ROOSEVELT AVE  
APPLICANT: Guillermo Fabian Diaz/SIGNS LLC

**REQUEST:**  
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a 40 square ft. sign on the structure.

**RECOMMENDATION:**  
Staff recommends approval of the request, based on findings a through e, with the following stipulations:  
i. That the applicant use more durable materials for the sign as noted in finding c rather than the proposed polycarbonate face with vinyl.  
ii. That the applicant use external illumination for the sign as noted in finding d.  
iii. That the applicant use a dark background with light lettering as noted in finding e.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

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

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

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

**ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2023-434**  
ADDRESS: 801 LABOR ST  
APPLICANT: Michelle HippsCruz/LIMINAL Design Studio

**REQUEST:**

Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 2-story, 800-square-ft rear accessory structure.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through k. Staff recommends that the applicant addresses the following stipulations prior to returning to the HDRC:

- i. That the applicant reduces the height of the rear accessory structure based on finding c and submits updated drawings that include the neighboring property for context to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
- ii. That the applicant submits the proposed percentage of lot coverage to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding d.
- iii. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and match the current finish or a standard galvalume finish based on finding f. Panels should be smooth without striation or corrugation. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. All chimney, flue, and related existing roof details must be preserved. An inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications.
- iv. That the applicant proposes window sizes, patterns, proportions, operations and trim and sill detailing on the west elevation that are consistent with the Guidelines and historic precedents in the district as noted in finding g and submits updated elevation drawings to staff for review and approval prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding g.
- v. That the applicant installs wood or aluminum-clad wood windows based on finding i. 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". White manufacturer's color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. The windows should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. 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. Faux divided lites are not permitted.
- vi. That the Hardie siding features a reveal no more than 6 inches and a smooth texture based on finding i. A faux wood grain finish is not permitted.
- vii. That the applicant submits final material specifications for fully wood or aluminum-clad wood doors based on finding i to staff for review and approval prior to returning to the HDRC.
- viii. That the applicant submits column details based on finding i showing that the proposed porch and carport columns will be fully wood to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC. The porch columns should feature a maximum of 6x6" in width and feature a traditional cap and base and chamfered corners.
- ix. That all hand railings are constructed of wood and that the applicant submits updated material specifications for the proposed hand railings and stairs to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding i.
- x. That the applicant retains the existing curb cut and driveway apron width and that the new driveway to the new parking pad does not exceed 10 feet in width. The applicant is required to submit an updated site plan to staff for review prior to the returning to the HDRC based on finding k.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Kelly K. Davis submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Selsa Adham Gonzalez submitted a letter in support of the request.
- Hailey and Layton Hayes submitted a voicemail in support of the request.
- Laura Gross submitted a voicemail in support of the request.

**MOTION 1:**  
(Main Motion)

Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve the request with staff stipulations, and stipulate that for item 10 the new proposed driveway apron be recentered.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

**MOTION 2:** Commissioner Velásquez moved to amend the motion to approve the metal railing as submitted by the applicant.  
(Amendment)  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

**MOTION 3:** Commissioner Grube moved to amend the main motion and grant conceptual approval with staff stipulations 1-8, and item 10.  
(Amendment 2)  
Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

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

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

Chairman Fetzer called for a vote to approve the main motion as amended.

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

**ACTION:** **MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED with 7 AYES. 1 NAY. 3 ABSENT.**

**ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2023-360**  
ADDRESS: 915 MASON ST  
APPLICANT: Michael Krause/Mychals Designs LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition.
2. Replace the existing metal posts and railing on the front porch with new square columns and railing.
3. Replace the two existing front doors and side door.
4. Infill, modify, and add windows on the east and west elevations.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the request to construct a rear addition, based on finding d, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits full measured drawings for the addition for staff review.
- ii. That the applicant proposes additional fenestration on the north elevation, as noted in finding d.
- iii. That the applicant installs a fully wood window product that meets 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.

- iv. That the applicant utilizes a setback or recessed area and a small change in detailing at the seam of the historic structure and new addition to provide a clear visual distinction between old and new building forms.

Staff recommends approval of item 2, replacement of the existing metal posts and railing on the front porch with square columns and railing, based on finding e, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits measured drawings and materials information for the proposed new columns.
- ii. That the proposed columns are wood, no wider than 6" square, and feature both capital and base trim and chamfered corners.
- iii. That the new railing be constructed of wood, feature both top and bottom rails and a simple design that does not detract from the historic structure and be raised off the deck surface.

Staff recommends approval of item 3, replacement of the two existing front doors and one side door, based on finding f, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant proposes a replacement product that compliments the style and period of construction of the structure, namely a Craftsman-style, fully wood door product.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 4, infilling, modifying, and adding windows on the east and west elevations, based on findings g and h.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 1-3 with staff stipulations and approve item 4 with the proposed locations with the same material specifications and that the applicant return to the commission with final drawings.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 18. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 19. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2023-441**  
**ADDRESS: 2310 W KINGS HWY**  
**APPLICANT: Katherine Smith/UNKNOWN**

**REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

- 1. Paint the previously unpainted brick.
- 2. Replace the bay window on the primary elevation with a fixed metal frame window.
- 3. Replace the wood column on the front porch with a breezeblock wall.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of items 1 through 3 based on findings a through h.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Robin Foster, on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee, submitted a letter opposing the request.
- The Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee submitted a voicemail with the same information provided in the letter.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Cervantes moved for a continuance.  
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2023-440**  
ADDRESS: 107 PASO HONDO  
APPLICANT: PEDRAZA CESAR

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with a standing seam metal roof in "Medium Bronze."

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the standing seam metal roof replacement, based on findings a and b, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof featuring panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and match the current finish or a standard galvalume finish. Panels should be smooth without striation or corrugation. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. All chimney, flue, and related existing roof details must be preserved. An inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications. No modifications to the roof pitch or roof form are requested or approved at this time.
- ii. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof in a standard galvalume finish or in a pre-weathered galvalume finish based on finding b.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Valerie Cortez Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter agreeing with staff's recommendations and asked if the front yard fence was administratively approved.
- The Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee submitted a voicemail with the same information provided in the letter.

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

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

**ACTION:** **MOTION FAILED with 4 AYES. 4 NAYS. 3 ABSENT. No majority.**

**MOTION 2:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulations 1 and 2.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 1 NAY. 3 ABSENT.

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

**APPROVED**

---

Jeffrey Fetzer, Chair  
Historic Design Review Commission  
City of San Antonio

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