



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 2024**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission (“**HDRC**”) met on Wednesday, August 7, 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, Velásquez, Galloway, Mazuca, Guevara, Vasquez, Cervantes, Fetzer, and Gibbs.

ABSENT: Holland.

- CTAB Vice Chair Vasquez served as the District 7 alternate for Commissioner Grube.
- Commissioner Holland arrived at 3:10 p.m.

CHAIR’S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT:

- Spanish interpreter services available to the public during the hearing.
- OHP welcomed, Caitlin Brown-Clancy, a new OHP Senior Historic Preservation Specialist.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION: Vice Chair Fetzer moved to approve HDRC meeting minutes for July 17, 2024. Commissioner Castillo seconded the motion.

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

In Person Comments

- Item 1 – Tony Garcia spoke in opposition to the case.
 - Joe Todd yielded his time to Tony Garcia.

Voicemails

- Item 1 – Jean Dahlgren submitted a voicemail in opposition to the case.
- Item 1 – Marilyn Johnson submitted a voicemail in opposition to the case.

- Item 1 – Rose Courchesne submitted a voicemail in opposition to the case.
- Item 8 – The San Antonio Conservation Society submitted a voicemail inquiring if bollards could be used for this project in place of the proposed traffic control gate arm at Commerce Street and the Promenade.

Letters

- Item 8 – The San Antonio Conservation Society submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.
- Item 12 – The Monte Vista Historical Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter in support of staff’s recommendations for approval with stipulations.

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

- Commissioner Savino requested items 1 and 8 be pulled from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration.
- Vice Chair Fetzer recused from the vote for the consent agenda items.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- Item 2, Case No. 2024-236 849 E COMMERCE ST
- Item 3, Case No. 2024-252 405 N ST MARYS ST
- Item 4, Case No. 2024-256 205 E HOUSTON ST
- Item 5, Case No. 2024-259 100 N MAIN
- Item 6, Case No. 2024-258 207 ROOSEVELT AVE/Parcel at the corner of S St Mary’s/Roosevelt Avenue/ and Roosevelt Park Drive
- Item 7, Case No. 2024-260 123 ALAMO PLAZA
- Item 9, Case No. 2024-264 300 ALAMO PLAZA/Paseo Del Alamo
- Item 10, Case No. 2024-253 824 W MAGNOLIA AVE
- Item 11, Case No. 2024-269 413 E MISTLETOE
- Item 12, Case No. 2024-271 254 E SUMMIT AVE

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve items 2 – 7 and 9 – 12 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 1. HDRC NO. 2024-001
ADDRESS: 402 CARLETON
APPLICANT: Liza Jensen/Alpha Home Inc.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish a two-story, detached rear accessory structure.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through h with the stipulation that the structure be deconstructed by a Certified Deconstruction Contractor, as required by the Chapter 12, Article II of the City Code of Ordinances.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Provided at the beginning of the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve the removal of two, 1-story non-contributing additions, and deny the demolition of the historic, 2-story structure
Commissioner Vasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 8. HDRC NO. 2024-263
ADDRESS: 300 ALAMO PLAZA/Alamo Plaza and Promenade
APPLICANT: Natalie Hugentobler/Gensler

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to perform site and landscaping modifications within Alamo Plaza to complete work to both the plaza and promenade. The proposed scope of work includes the following:

1. Various landscaping scopes of work to include the installation of new trees, planting beds, and raised planting beds at heritage oak trees.
2. The removal of existing pavement, curbs, bollards, and lighting poles and the installation of new paving, seating and lighting elements.
3. The continuation of interpretive paving for the Alamo Mission footprint.
4. The installation of a Sculpture Trail and an interpretive timeline and wayfinding signage.
5. The installation of a security gate arm and bollards.

The scope of work for the plaza will take place to the north of Plaza de Valero and the Mission Gate and Lunette. The scope of work to the promenade will take place to the south of Plaza de Valero.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

- i. That all lighting details be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval, as noted in finding d.
- ii. That construction and material details for the proposed interpretive timeline and wayfinding signage be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
- iii. That final details for interpretive panels and wayfinding signage be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.
- iv. That any removed Valmont street light poles be returned to CPS for placement elsewhere downtown.
- v. That final details and finishes for the proposed security gate and bollards be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval.

- vi. Archaeology – Archaeological investigations are required. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable. Moreover, the project shall comply with the Texas Antiquities Code and Health and Safety Code of Texas. The archaeology consultant shall submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation for review and approval prior to beginning field efforts. Archaeological investigations on City of San Antonio property and right-of-way shall be coordinated with the OHP throughout construction of the project.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Provided at the beginning of the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve with staff stipulations. Commissioner Guevara seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.**

ITEM 13. HDRC NO. 2024-193
ADDRESS: 508/510 BOOKER ALLEY
APPLICANT: Mitsuko Ramos/GRGTX Lobbyin LLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a 2-story, single-family residential structure on the lot identified as 510 Booker Alley; identified as lot 9 on the site plan.
2. Construct a 2-story, residential accessory structure on the lot identified as 508 Booker Alley; identified as lot 10 on the site plan. This structure has been positioned as an accessory structure to the structure on lot 9.

These structures are proposed on separate lots; however, they are one request from the applicant. Both lots are located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval at this time. The proposed architectural design, materials, form, massing, and parking configuration are not consistent with adopted Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant address the following items prior to receiving a recommendation for final approval:

- i. That the proposed new construction features a front setback that is equal to or greater than the side setbacks of the two structures that are adjacent to the alley, addressed as 512 N Cherry and 515 N Mesquite, and one that is greater than the new construction that front the alley at the rear of the lot addressed as 511 Dawson. The applicant is responsible for submitting a setback diagram to confirm appropriate setbacks. A foundation inspection is to be scheduled with OHP staff to ensure that foundation setbacks and heights are consistent with the approved design. The inspection is to occur after the installation of form work and prior to the installation of foundation materials.
- ii. That a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines be installed, as noted in finding g.

- iii. That roof forms that are found historically within the district be incorporated into the design; primarily gabled or hipped roof forms, as noted in finding h.
- iv. That an accurate calculation of both structure's footprints be submitted, as noted in finding i, and that footprints should not be greater than fifty (50) percent of the total lot area. Building footprints, including unconditioned porch, patio, and garage space should be included.
- v. That materials and their profiles and details, should reflect those found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, and should be incorporated into the design, as noted in finding j. The proposed stacked stone and predominance of stucco should be eliminated.
- vi. That windows that are consistent with the adopted standards for windows in new construction should be installed, as noted in finding k. These specifications are noted in the above applicable citations.
- vii. That both window and door openings that relate to those found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District be incorporated into the design, as noted in finding l.
- viii. That the proposed structure's massing be modified to feature traditionally positioned and massed porch elements, as noted in finding m.
- ix. That architectural elements that are both consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found within the district should be incorporated into the design, as noted in finding n. There are numerous elements of the proposed design that staff finds to be inconsistent with the Guidelines, such as the proposed commercial style canopies and awnings, the lack of a front porch that is integrated into the massing of the house, and the alternating masses and forms that generally makes the proposed design fall outside of what architecturally would be consistent with historic structures found within the historic district.
- x. That a hipped or gabled roof form, traditional materials found within the district, traditionally sized and profiled windows and a metal garage door with true window lites should be incorporated into the proposed secondary structure, as noted in finding p.
- xi. That the proposed front-loading garage of the primary residential structure be eliminated, as noted in finding q. Attached parking is not found historically within the footprint of primary residential structures within the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- xii. That a detailed landscaping plan be developed and submitted for review and approval as noted in finding f. Landscaping should be developed in a manner that is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- xiii. That both proposed driveways be reduced in width to no more than ten (10) feet in width, as noted in finding t. Driveways should be located on either side of the primary structure to allow for on-site parking that is not limited to the front yard.
- xiv. That a straight, continuous walkway leading from the primary entrance to the right of way be installed, consistently with the Guidelines and historic examples found within the district, as walkways are historically found from primary structures to the right of way at which they are addressed. Walkways should feature between three and four feet in width.
- xv. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way, as noted in finding u.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Kate Ruckman, on behalf of the Conservation Society of San Antonio, submitted a voicemail in support of staff's findings and recommendations.
- Valerie Cortez on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill, submitted a voicemail in support of staff's recommendations to deny the application.
- The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

- The Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill Antonio submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

MOTION 1: Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Motion failed. No commissioner seconded the motion.

MOTION 2: Commissioner Holland moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Holland withdrew his motion.

MOTION 3: Commissioner Holland moved to deny the request.
Commissioner Vasquez seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2024-215
ADDRESS: 401 KENDALL ST
APPLICANT: Shannon Follansbee/KEN 401 LLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct an approximately 1,212 sqft, two-story rear addition.
2. Enlarge and relocate the existing E Myrtle-facing porch to approximately 101 sqft.
3. Modify the existing fenestration pattern on the property to eliminate and resize windows.
4. Partially reopen a second story porch on the front (east) facade of the structure.
5. Install vertical wood siding over portions of the previous front addition.
6. Modify the existing roof form.
7. Modify the existing landscape to include the installation of 21' wide pervious driveway and four pervious parking spots at the rear.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the two-story rear addition, based on findings a through n, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant install fully wood windows 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".

- ii. That the applicant install fully wood Craftsman doors where indicated in the submitted construction documents.
- iii. That the siding be installed and specified to appear similar to a traditional wood siding installation such as board and batten or similar installation. No faux wood grain products are permitted. Final product specifications must be submitted to staff for final review.
- iv. That the applicant install porch railing featuring both a top and bottom rail. The bottom rail should feature a vertical orientation and should be installed approximately three to four inches above the porch decking. Both top and bottom rails should be constructed from 2"x4" members. The proposed railing should not feature an overall height of more than three (3) feet.
- v. That the applicant install wood columns and pilasters no wider than 6" square, feature both capital and base trim and chamfered corners.
- vi. That the applicant install porch decking to feature 1" x 3" tongue-and-groove wood members laid perpendicular to the front façade plane and pitched to allow water runoff toward the yard.
- vii. That the applicant incorporate additional window openings on the west façade.
- viii. That the applicant submit a measured, to-scale roof plan for final review.

Item 2: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the E Myrtle-facing porch modifications, based on findings a through c and finding o, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant revise their porch request to include a simplified stoop design that provides shelter for the side entrances to be more consistent with the Guidelines.

Item 3: Staff does not recommend approval of the modification to the existing fenestration pattern on the property, based on the findings. All original window location, sizes, and configurations should remain intact or only modified slightly in location to accommodate changes in floor plan. Staff recommends the addition of new, traditionally-dimensioned windows in the front (east) facade at the location of the non-original front addition. Selected window products must meet staff's standards for wood windows including the installation of full side-lite windows on either side of the front door.

Item 4: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the partial reopening of the second story porch on the front façade, based on findings a through c and finding s, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the porch footprint and corner column locations not exceed the current footprint of the enclosed porch.
- ii. That column design and specifications be submitted to staff for final review. Generally, columns should feature chamfered corners and a traditional cap and base.
- iii. That the applicant install window products must meet staff's standards for wood windows including the installation of full side-lite windows on either side of the front door.

Item 5: Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the installation of vertical wood siding over portions of the previous front addition. An alternative wood siding profile that is more compatible with the existing home may be eligible for administrative approval.

Item 6: Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the roof form modifications, based on findings a through c and finding u. Staff recommends the applicant retain the existing roof forms and reconstruct the damaged dormers in situ if beyond repair.

Item 7: Staff recommends approval of the landscape and site work modifications, based on findings a through c and findings v through y.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Frederica Kushner, on behalf of the Tobin Hill Community Association, submitted a voicemail with requests to retain what they believe to be the original portions of the property and have no objection to the new rear, or north and west side addition, as long as the roofline of that addition does not obscure the perception of the original hipped roof on the main part of the building.
- The Tobin Hill Community Association submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

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

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2024-257
ADDRESS: 800 W RUSSELL PLACE
APPLICANT: Eduardo Quintana/BCR BEST CONCEPT RENOVATIONS LLC

REQUEST:

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

1. Replace the wood siding with composite siding with a wood grain finish.
2. Replace the battered skirting with a non-battered skirting.
3. Complete fenestration modifications.
4. Replace the existing wood windows and replacement windows with a vinyl window product.
5. Replace the stone front porch columns with wood columns.
6. Enclose the rear side porch.
7. Install a fascia board to enclose the open eaves, obscuring the exposed rafter tails.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, staff does not recommend the approval of the installation of composite siding with a faux wood grain finish based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant installs fully wood siding to match the previous profile, dimensions, material, and finish. The applicant must submit material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, staff does not recommend approval of the proposed skirting modifications based on finding e. Staff finds that the battered skirting should be retained and that the applicant should install fully wood siding at the skirt to match the previous profile, dimensions, material, and finish. The applicant must submit 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 proposed fenestration modifications based on findings f through h. Staff recommends that the original window opening locations and proportions are retained on the east, south, and west elevations. The applicant is required to submit updated

elevations drawings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 4, staff recommends approval of window replacement based on finding i with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs a fully wood window product that meet staff's standard window stipulations and submits updated specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. 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.

Item 5, staff recommends approval of the porch column replacement based on finding j with the following stipulation:

- i. That new wood columns be a maximum of 6x6" in width and feature a traditional cap and base and chamfered corners. The applicant must submit updated drawings and column specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 6, staff does not recommend approval of the side porch infill based on finding k. Staff recommends that the side porch and all related architectural details are retained so that the space functions and is visually interpreted as a porch. The applicant is required to submit updated elevation drawings with architectural details and material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 7, staff does not recommend approval of the fascia board installation based on finding l. Staff recommends that the fascia board is removed, and the open eaves and exposed rafter tails are retained and preserved. The applicant is required to submit photos of the corrected work to bring the property into compliance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mario Guitierrez spoke in support of the case.
- Jose Engler submitted a letter in support of the case.
- Ten (10) neighbors from the Alta Vista Neighborhood signed a letter of support for the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve with the stipulations that the applicant add fenestration to the east elevation, that the applicant reinstall the decorative dormer framing, and that the applicant install architectural enhancement details to the side porch.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 16. HDRC NO. 2024-229
ADDRESS: 1514 W LYNWOOD
APPLICANT: ELENA ANGELES SANCHEZ/MOVEHOUSE INVESTMENT CORP

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to:

1. Demolish the rear accessory structure.
2. Replace the existing metal front porch columns on the primary structure with wood columns.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the rear accessory structure based on findings a through g. This structure is subject to the City's deconstruction ordinance and a Certified Deconstruction Contractor must complete deconstruction, form submission, and permitting in accordance with UDC Chapter 12, Article II, as noted in finding g.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the replacement of the front porch columns based on finding h with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs fully wood front porch columns that are no wider than 6" square, featuring both capital and base trim and chamfered corners, in the approximate location of the previously existing metal columns. Updated material specifications and an updated elevation drawing must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve as submitted by the applicant.
Commissioner Holland seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2024-270
ADDRESS: 2100 N MAIN AVE
APPLICANT: Haley Serna/Elevate Architecture, PLLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct an approximately 1,500-square-foot addition.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the construction of the addition based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submits the total height of the proposed addition and an updated site plan addressing the northwest corner of the addition to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on finding b.
- ii. That the standing seam metal roof features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and a standard galvalume finish. Panels must 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. The applicant is required to submit a roof plan to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on finding c. An inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications.
- iii. That the applicant submits final material specifications for all the proposed doors to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on finding d.
- iv. That the applicant modifies the cladding material to feature either stucco or a metal cladding in a board-and-batten profile to be more consistent with the Guidelines based on finding f. The applicant is required to submit updated material specifications and drawings to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- v. That the applicant submits a final site plan showing the dimensions and material specifications for any site work modifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and explores the use of permeable surfacing in lieu of additional concrete on the site based on finding h.
- vi. That the applicant submits a separate application for signage with a comprehensive signage plan based on finding i.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- The Monte Vista Historical Association Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter in support of staff recommendation for conditional approval with stipulations

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

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2024-268
ADDRESS: 301 LAVACA ST
APPLICANT: Fernando Morales/Candid Works PLLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Construct an approximately 1,966 sqft rear addition.
2. Construct an approximately 360 sqft rear carport accessible from Garfield Alley.
3. Construct an approximately 360 sqft rear carport accessible from Indianola St.
4. Install a new concrete apron from Garfield Alley.
5. Construct a 6' tall, limestone privacy wall at the rear.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item 1: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear addition, based on findings a through k, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant provide a measured roof plan and material specifications for the flat roof portions prior to final review.
- ii. That the applicant provide unobstructed, measured elevation drawings of the proposed addition prior to final review.
- iii. That the applicant provide a landscape site plan prior to final review.
- iv. That the applicant installs a window 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.
- v. 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.
- vi. That the applicant incorporate a traditional fenestration pattern on the rear addition to include sashed windows.
- vii. That the applicant meets all setback standards as required by city zoning and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

Item 2: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the Garfield Alley carport, based on finding l, with the following stipulations:

- i. The steel members be painted to match the existing natural tones and colors found on site.
- ii. That the applicant meet all setback standards as required by city zoning requirements and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

Item 3: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the Indianola St carport, based on finding m, with the following stipulations:

- i. The steel members be painted to match the existing natural tones and colors found on site.
- ii. That the applicant meet all setback standards as required by city zoning requirements and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

Item 4: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the new concrete apron from Garfield Alley, based on finding n, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant provide measurements of the proposed concrete apron prior to final review.

Item 5: Staff recommends conceptual approval of the 6' tall, limestone privacy wall, based on finding o, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant provide staff an example of the limestone prior to installation for final approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Melissa Stendahl on behalf of the Lavaca Neighborhood Association submitted a voicemail in supports staff’s recommendations.
- The Lavaca Neighborhood Association submitted a letter with the same information outlined in the voicemail.

MOTION: Commissioner Velásquez moved moved for conceptual approval minus stipulations iv and vi for item 1, stipulations i for items 2 and 3, and added the stipulation that the applicant consider adding fenestration to the Indianola St-facing façade on the proposed rear addition." To item 1.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: MOTION PASSED with 11 AYES. 0 NAYS. 0 ABSENT.

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Gibbs adjourned the meeting at 6:44 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Date: _____