



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

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, May 17, 2023**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, May 17, 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: Fish (videoconference), Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube,  
Cervantes (videoconference), Baker (videoconference), Fetzer  
Absent: Gibbs, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

**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.  
Introduction of new staff hire, Meagan Lozano, eventual Board Liaison for HDRC.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Item 3 –Valerie Cortez on behalf of Dignowity Hill neighbors – supports staff's recommendations.  
Item 4 – Kris Joyce, a resident of May St. – opposes the construction of a second story building on the street.  
Item 4 –Valerie Cortez on behalf of Dignowity Hill neighbors – supports staff's recommendations.  
Item 5 –Kathy Krnavek on behalf of the Conservation Society of San Antonio – opposes the case.

Commissioner Fetzer asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the Consent agenda.  
Applicant requested Item 17 be pulled for individual consideration.  
Commissioner Savino requested Item 4 be pulled for individual consideration.  
Commissioner Velasquez requested Item 5 be pulled for individual consideration.  
Commissioner Mazuca highlighted Item 15 to ensure artists selected for the mural are aware the location is a burial site for indigenous and early citizens of San Antonio.  
Chairman Fetzer recused from the consent agenda.

\* Commissioner Gibbs arrived at 3:10 p.m.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Item 1, Case No. 2023-166	601 NOLAN ST
Item 2, Case No. 2023-184	419 FLORIDA ST
Item 3, Case No. 2023-168	915 E CROCKETT ST
Item 6, Case No. 2023-167	101 NEWELL
Item 7, Case No. 2023-175	1012 W MULBERRY AVE
Item 8, Case No. 2023-176	527 HAYS ST
Item 9, Case No. 2023-183	1003 S NEW BRAUNFELS AVE
Item 10, Case No. 2023-179	505 E TRAVIS ST
Item 11, Case No. 2023-181	506 E EVERGREEN
Item 12, Case No. 2023-159	1402 FULTON AVE
Item 13, Case No. 2023-182	320 MADISON ST

Item 14, Case No. 2023-174      212 S FLORES ST  
Item 15, Case No. 2023-171      501 W COMMERCE ST/Milam Park  
Item 16, Case No. 2023-814      814 LAMAR ST

**MOTION:**      Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve with staff stipulations Items 1–3 and 6– 17.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**      AYE: Gibbs, Fish, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Carpenter  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)  
RECUSED: Fetzer

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

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:**

**ITEM 4.            HDRC NO. 2023-164**  
ADDRESS: 118 MAY  
APPLICANT: Adriana Ziga/Ziga Architecture Studio, PLLC

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Provided at the beginning of the meeting.

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

**VOTE:**      AYE: Gibbs, Fish, Savino, Mazuca, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Carpenter  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Velasquez, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)  
RECUSED: Fetzer

**ACTION:**      **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 0 NAYS. 2 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.**

**ITEM 5.            HDRC NO. 2023-173**  
ADDRESS: 300 ALAMO PLAZA  
APPLICANT: Natalie Hugentobler/Gensler

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Provided at the beginning of the meeting.

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

**VOTE:**      AYE: Gibbs, Fish, Savino, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Baker  
NAY: Velasquez, Cervantes  
ABSENT: District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)  
RECUSED: Fetzer

**ACTION:**      **MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 2 NAYS. 1 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.**

**ITEM 17.          HDRC NO. 2023-052**  
ADDRESS: 225 LINDELL PLACE  
APPLICANT: Jonathan Reynolds/Reyven Contracting

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct rear and north additions totaling approx. 537 square feet, plus a 263-square-foot screened-in porch and an 81-square-foot open porch.
2. Replace four wood windows with salvaged wood window systems.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of items 1 and 2, construction of rear and north additions, based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposes a one-over-one window or a pair of one-over-one windows in place of the proposed fixed windows on the rear addition.

Staff recommends approval of item 2, replacing four wood windows with salvaged wood window systems, based on finding k.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve as submitted.  
Commissioner Baker seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantez, Baker, Fetzer,  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2023-143**  
ADDRESS: 1123 SE MILITARY DR  
APPLICANT: Mark Walle/Dutch Bros

**REQUEST:**

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

Install signage throughout the site and on the building's facades.

The applicant has noted a pylon sign in the application documents. This sign is prohibited by code within a local historic district and cannot be included in this request.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install building and site signage on the previously approved new construction at 1123 SE Military, located within the Mission Historic District.
- b. PREVIOUS REVIEW – The proposed new construction at 1123 SE Military was approved by the Historic and Design Review Commission on May 3, 2023. At that hearing, the applicant postponed the request for review of signage.
- c. ALLOWABLE SIGNAGE – The Historic Design Guidelines and Unified Development Code recommends one major and two minor signs per application, not to exceed fifty (50) square feet total. The Commission may approve additional signage and square footage.
- d. WALL SIGNS (Text) – The applicant has proposed to install three (3) wall signs to read “Dutch Bros Coffee”. The proposed signs will feature internally illuminated cabinets and channel letters with acrylic faces. Each wall sign will feature approximately thirty (30) square feet in size. Per the Mission Design Manual and Historic Design Guidelines, signs should feature external or indirect lighting and should feature metal sign faces. Lighting should not result in internally glowing cabinets. Staff finds that the proposed signage should be amended to be consistent with the Guidelines and Mission Design Manual regarding design and lighting. Staff finds that signage should be reduced to one building façade.

- e. **WALL SIGNS (Windmill)** – The applicant has proposed to install three (3) cabinet signs in the shapes of windmills. The proposed signs will feature approximately eighteen (18) square feet each and will be internally illuminated with acrylic faces. Per the Mission Design Manual and Historic Design Guidelines, signs should feature external or indirect lighting and should feature metal sign faces. Lighting should not result in internally glowing cabinets. Staff finds that the proposed signage should be amended to be consistent with the Guidelines and Mission Design Manual regarding design and lighting. Staff finds that signage should be reduced to one building façade.
- f. **MONUMENT SIGN** – The applicant has proposed to install a monument sign to the immediate south of the proposed new construction. The proposed sign will feature an overall height of six (6) feet, an overall width of eight (8) feet, will feature a total size of ninety-six (96) square feet in size, including both sides, and will an aluminum sign face with back lit letters. The Mission Design Manual notes that monument signs should not exceed fifty (50) square feet in size, including both sides (five feet in width and height, per side), should not exceed five (5) feet in height and should be lit by indirect or concealed lighting. Staff finds the installation of the monument sign to be appropriate as there are no other proposed monument signs within this development; however, staff finds that the applicant should reduce the size of the proposed monument sign to be consistent with the Mission Design Manual.
- g. **DIRECTIONAL/INCIDENTAL SIGNAGE** – The applicant has proposed a number of both directional and incidental signage on site to include vehicular directional signage, menu boards and address numbers. Staff finds these signs to be appropriate.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of the installation of signage with the following stipulations. Revised signage documents should be provided to OHP staff prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for signage and permitting.

- i. That the applicant reduces the proposed wall signage to feature signage on only one façade or reduce the overall size of signage to not exceed more than fifty (50) square feet, per façade. This would require amendments to signage as currently proposed for the right and front facades. All wall signage should feature metal sign faces with indirect or halo illumination.
- ii. That the applicant reduces the overall size of the monument sign to feature a height of no more than five (5) feet and no more than twenty-five (25) square feet per side.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velazquez moved to approve with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Gibbs, Velazquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzner  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Savino, Fish, DISTRICT 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2023-081**  
ADDRESS: 8623 OLD CORPUS CHRISTI RD  
APPLICANT: ARMANDO H MARTINEZ/A D A INC.

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: Demolish the primary structure.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 8623 Old Corpus Christi Rd is a 1-story structure featuring a saltbox composition shingle roof, a deep-set front porch, wood porch supports, wood shingle, stucco, and wood board cladding, and replacement windows. The property is contributing to the Mission Historic District.

- b. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the existing structure at 8623 Old Corpus Christi. The applicant is proposing to construct a new primary structure on the site.
- c. PUBLIC NOTICE – Demolition notice postcards were mailed to properties within a 200-foot radius of the property as required by the Unified Development Code.
- d. The loss of a landmark is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any landmark or contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. For full demolition of primary structures, the UDC requires clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship must be presented by the applicant in order for demolition to be considered. The applicant must prove by a preponderance of evidence that:

- a) *The owner cannot make reasonable beneficial use of or realize a reasonable rate of return on a structure or site, regardless of whether that return represents the most profitable return possible, unless the highly significant endangered, historic, and cultural landmark, historic and cultural landmarks district or demolition delay designation, as applicable, is removed or the proposed demolition or relocation is allowed;*

[The applicant has not provided a reasonable rate of return nor the current or potential value of a restored property.]

- b) *The structure and property cannot be reasonably adapted for any other feasible use, whether by the current owner or by a purchaser, which would result in a reasonable rate of return;*

[The applicant has not submitted documentation to satisfy this requirement. The applicant has submitted an Engineer's Report listing the repairs required to meet code, including cladding replacement, window replacement, railing replacement, roof replacement, foundation footing replacement, new framing, interior upgrades, and electrical, plumbing, and mechanical upgrades.]

- c) *The owner has failed to find a purchaser or tenant for the property during the previous two (2) years, despite having made substantial ongoing efforts during that period to do so. The evidence of unreasonable economic hardship introduced by the owner may, where applicable, include proof that the owner's affirmative obligations to maintain the structure or property make it impossible for the owner to realize a reasonable rate of return on the structure or property.*

[The applicant has not submitted documentation to satisfy this requirement.]

- e. Staff finds that the applicant has not demonstrated an unreasonable economic hardship in accordance with the UDC due to lack of marketing of the property.
- f. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANCE – Per the UDC, when an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide to the historic and design review commission additional information which may show a loss of significance. There is evidence that the structure is severely deteriorated due to deferred maintenance and is need of intervention. Staff does not find that the applicant has provided clear and convincing evidence that the structure has lost significance.
- g. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE – Staff conducted a site visit to the property on March 3, 2023, and observed severe deterioration on the exterior and that the structure is a wood-frame structure and does not appear to be of adobe construction. The Design Review Committee met virtually on April 26, 2023, to discuss the proposal and participants and the applicant agreed that a DRC site visit would be helpful. The DRC met on site on May 10, 2023, and observed that the structure has been greatly modified over time and that the structure likely dates to the 1920s or 1930s.
- h. DEMOLITION – The applicant is requesting approval for the demolition of the existing structure. The loss of a contributing structure is an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of San Antonio. Demolition of any contributing buildings should only occur after every attempt has been made, within reason, to successfully reuse the structure. Requests for determination of whether an object, building, structure, or sign are contributing or non-contributing to a historic landmark or historic district shall be made on an application obtained from the historic preservation officer through the office of historic preservation. The historic preservation officer shall review the application for completeness and shall make a determination whether

the subject of the application is contributing or non-contributing within thirty (30) days of deeming the application complete. The historic preservation officer may, at his or her discretion, present the application to the historic and design review commission for their recommendation. Properties that are determined to be noncontributing are eligible to receive administrative approval for demolition requests by OHP staff.

- i. **REPLACEMENT PLANS** – The applicant has proposed to replace the structure with a new 1-story primary structure. The applicant has proposed a 1-story, 1,440-square-foot, single-family residence. The applicant has proposed a composition shingle broken gable roof, Hardie board, stucco, and stone or brick veneer for the cladding material. The applicant has not provided window or door specifications at this time. The applicant has proposed to install an 18-foot-wide concrete driveway at the front of the property. Staff finds that the proposed new construction is inconsistent with the Guidelines and the documentation required for review of new construction is currently incomplete.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through i. The applicant has not satisfied the documentation requirements for demolition of a landmark and the application is incomplete.

If the HDRC finds the application to be complete, staff does not recommend approval.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velazquez move to approve demolition and refer the new construction to DRC. Commissioner Baker seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velazquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Fish, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2022-428**  
ADDRESS: 1614 E HOUSTON ST  
APPLICANT: William Brewer/Done Right Construction DBA

#### **REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: Construct a 1.5-story, single-family structure.

#### **FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary historic structure located at 1614 E Houston is a single-family, residential structure constructed circa 1928 in the Craftsman style. The structure first appears on the 1931 Sanborn Map. The historic structure features a low-pitched, composition shingle roof with side gables, wood siding, an asymmetrical front porch with wrought iron columns, and one-over-one wood windows. The rear of the property features an accessory structure with a low-pitched, composite shingle roof, wood siding, a wood garage door, and a wood entry door. The property is contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. At this time, the applicant is requesting final approval to construct a new single-family structure to replace the existing structures on the lot.
- b. **CASE HISTORY** – On May 3, 2023, the HDRC approved the request for conceptual approval for new construction of a 1.5-story single-family structure. The applicant has provided a salvage plan, replacement plans, and a plan that shows the salvaged architectural elements. The applicant has submitted replacement plans for final approval. The plans meet the HDRC stipulation for the reconstruction of the front façade.
- c. **GENERAL DESIGN** – As stipulated at the time of demolition approval, the applicant must reconstruct the original façade. The original house featured a low, cross-gabled roof with inset front porch and side entry. The proposed design includes an inset porch at a similar location and a reconstruction of the original design as stipulated. The proposed roof form is compatible with the original structure. Staff further finds that a side-

facing entry is appropriate and is consistent with the reconstruction of the front façade as stipulated by the HDRC Commission.

- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION (HOUSTON)** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings should align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has indicated that the structure will be in the same location as the previous structure, which is consistent with the adjacent historic structure located to the east. The applicant has expressed that the adjacent properties feature a setback of 24.7’ as shown in the provided site plan. At this time, the applicant has provided a detailed site plan that shows the location of the neighboring structure. Staff finds that the proposed front setback is generally appropriate. The applicant has modified the setback on the west side of the property to be consistent with the neighboring setback; however, the neighboring setback will remove the portion of the porch that wraps around the east façade.
- e. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed to construct an approximately 1,056 square-foot 1.5-story residential structure. According to Guideline 2.A.i for New Construction, new structures should feature a height and massing that is similar to historic structures in the vicinity. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one story. This block within the Dignowity Hill Historic District features 1-story historic structures. Staff finds that the proposed scale and massing of the structure appears generally appropriate.
- f. **PORCH RECONSTRUCTION** – The original front porch form featured a side entryway, two sashed windows, and four wrought iron columns. Additionally, the existing front porch extends beyond the front façade projection and wraps beyond the front façade to the east. The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the porch to include the side entryway, two sashed windows, and four porch columns. Staff finds the proposed front porch to be consistent with the reconstruction of the front porch as required by the HDRC.
- g. **DRIVEWAY** – The applicant is requesting to extend the existing driveway apron to 16.4 feet in width and continue the driveway to the rear of the structure. Staff finds this request to be inconsistent with Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i., to retain and repair in place historic driveway configurations, such as ribbon drives. Incorporate a similar driveway configuration—materials, width, and design—to that historically found on the site. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed driveway be separated from the proposed new construction by a landscaping strip, and be no more than ten (10) feet in width.
- h. **ROOF (FORM)** – The applicant has proposed a hipped roof form with a dormer for the proposed new construction. According to Guideline 2.B.i for New Construction, new construction should feature roof forms that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. Staff finds this request is reflective of the roof forms found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District and is consistent with the guidelines.
- i. **LOT COVERAGE** – Guideline 2.D.i for New Construction stipulates that building-to-lot ratio for new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings. Limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building-to-lot ratio. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines, per the submitted site plan.
- j. **MATERIALS AND TEXTURES** – The applicant has proposed to reconstruct the front façade with salvaged materials from the deconstruction of the primary structure and construct the remaining of the residence with Hardie siding and a composition shingle roof. The applicant has also expressed that they would like to install salvaged materials from the original structure pending the deconstruction of the structure. Staff finds this request to be inconsistent with the guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. The materials on the existing structure is 117 waterfall siding, salvaged materials and selected matching wood siding must be coordinated with staff.  
**WINDOW MATERIALS** – The applicant has expressed that they would like to install salvaged windows from the deconstructed structure. Additionally, the applicant will likely need to introduce matching, new wood windows. Staff finds that any new windows should be fully wood and feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Faux divided lites are not permitted. Staff finds that all windows installed should feature

traditional operations and that the applicant should submit product specifications for review prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

- k. **RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS** – Guideline 2.C.i for New Construction stipulates that new construction should incorporate window and door openings with a similar proportion of wall-to-window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Windows, doors, porches, entryways, dormers, bays, and pediments shall be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height-to-width ratio from adjacent historic facades. The applicant has proposed a fenestration pattern on the front façade that features a side entryway and double-hung windows that are reflective of the original structure, staff finds this to be appropriate. The fenestration pattern on the remaining elevation consists of double-hung windows, two rear doors, and a wooden entry door. Staff finds that the applicant’s proposed fenestration to feature traditional proportions and window configurations commonly found in the district.
- l. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – Guideline 4.A.i for New Construction states that new buildings should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. Additionally, architectural details should be complementary in nature and should not detract from nearby historic structures. Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be appropriate.
- m. **FENCING** – The applicant has proposed to install a four-foot-tall wrought iron fence in the front yard and a six-foot-tall wood rear privacy fence. Per the Fence Policy that was adopted in September 2021, rear yard privacy fences should be no taller than six feet in height and should feature wood construction. Front yard fences should match the height of neighboring fences or should be limited to four feet in height. Staff finds this request to be appropriate and eligible for Administrative Approval. A driveway gate is not shown in the drawings; more information about design and placement of the gate will need to be submitted for future consideration.
- n. **REAR DECK** – The applicant is requesting to install a rear deck measuring approximately 284.05 square feet. The applicant has not submitted materials for the rear deck. Generally, staff finds the size of the deck appropriate; however, this portion of the request is incomplete, and staff finds that the applicant should submit a separate Certificate of Appropriateness application for rear deck installation to staff for review.
- o. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – Per Guideline 6.B.ii for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right-of-way.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

- i. That any new windows be fully wood and include the specifications listed in finding l. Any new windows should be fully wood and feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening. Faux divided lites are not permitted. All windows installed should feature traditional operations and that the applicant should submit product specifications for review prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval. Accurate drawings must be submitted for verification by staff.
- ii. That the applicant submits an accurate site plan for the proposed rear deck for staff review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on finding p.
- 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.
- iv. That the proposed driveway be separated from the proposed new construction by a landscaping strip, and be no more than ten (10) feet in width. The width of the existing curb cut should be maintained. A new walkway from the sidewalk to the front porch should be installed to similar to what was previously on the site.
- v. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed reconstruction with Hardie siding based on finding j. Staff recommends the applicant replace the siding with materials that match the existing siding in profile, dimensions, material, finish, and reveal.



**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Valerie Cortez on behalf of Dignowity Hill neighbors agrees with OHP stipulations. Questions what the small structure on p. 31 of the application is and the function of other design elements for the primary building.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulations with modification to stipulation 1 that the final window material and specifications be submitted to OHP staff.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Fetzer  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Fish, Baker, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2023-156**  
ADDRESS: 114 DEWBERRY ST  
APPLICANT: Jim Tafoya/BRIO BUILDERS

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to: construct a two-story residential structure on the vacant lot at 114 Dewberry.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a two-story residential structure on the vacant lot at 114 Dewberry.
- b. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE:** The applicant met with the Design Review Committee (DRC) on Tuesday, July 26, 2022. Commissioners noted that the proposed structure was massive compared to neighboring homes and suggested the applicant review Historic Design Guidelines regarding massing in historic districts. Commissioners expressed concern about the form of the front porch; the foundation height; the fenestration pattern, with particular attention to wall spans that lack fenestration; and the attached garage, noting the proposed structure did not conform to patterns found elsewhere in the neighborhood. Commissioners suggested the applicant provide more context for the block, including photos of properties on both sides of the proposed structure as well as to the rear of the proposed structure. Finally, commissioners suggested the applicant attend another DRC meeting once plans are revised. Notes from the DRC meeting are included in the attached exhibits.
- c. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN:** This lot is currently void of any structures. This block currently lacks any street-facing buildings. However, staff finds that new construction on this block should follow the development pattern of the rest of the historic district.
- d. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION:** According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed a setback of approximately 14 feet from the property line. Though there are no other street-facing structures on this block, the rest of the River Road historic district features setbacks roughly 11 to 20 feet from the right-of-way. Staff finds that the proposed setback for this new construction features a setback that is equal to or greater than those found historically on the block, and thus conforms to guidelines. A greater setback would be most appropriate for a two-story structure.
- e. **ENTRANCES** – According the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i. primary building entrances should be orientated towards the primary street. The proposed entrance orientation is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines; however, staff finds that the proposed entrance massing and detailing is not consistent with the Guidelines. Entrance massing should feature traditional forms and details, as found historically within the district.
- f. **SCALE & MASS:** Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height

and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. Though there are no other street-facing structures on the block, as noted in finding b, River Road predominately features one-story and one-and-a-half-story residences, with a handful of examples of two full stories. The applicant has proposed a massing and scale that is not consistent with the massing and scale of historic residential structures found within the River Road historic district, specifically with regard to architectural form. Staff finds that massing and scale that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction should be incorporated into the design. A two-story structure may be appropriate provided architectural forms are consistent with the Guidelines and historic two-story structures found within the district.

- g. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS:** According to the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of neighboring structure's foundation and floor heights. Though there are no other street-facing structures on this block, as noted in finding b, the foundation of proposed new construction should align with other structures in the historic district. Nearby historic structures on this block feature foundation heights of between one and three feet. The applicant has proposed a foundation on grade. Staff finds the proposed foundation height should be increased to at least one foot in height.
- h. **ROOF FORM:** The applicant has proposed a complex roof form comprised of front-gabled roofs and shed roofs. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, as the Guidelines note that roof forms for new construction should be comparable with those found historically within the district. While the front-gabled roof forms are appropriate, staff finds a different treatment should be proposed in place of the shed roof found on the primary elevation.
- i. **ROOF (MATERIALS):** The applicant has proposed to install a standing-seam metal roof with smooth panels and 2" seams. Standing-seam metal roofs should feature 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 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. Staff finds the proposed metal roof conforms to guidelines.
- j. **LOT COVERAGE:** Per the Guidelines, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. The proposed residence has a footprint of 2,484 square feet, which includes the garage and porches. The lot is 6,011 square feet, so the proposed house footprint is 41% of the lot size. Staff finds the lot coverage consistent with the Guidelines.
- k. **MATERIALS:** The applicant has proposed a structure clad in stucco and wood siding with wood posts on the front porch. The applicant did not submit specs for windows, doors, or garage doors. Houses in the River Road historic district are predominately stucco- or wood-clad. Staff finds the use of stucco and wood cladding to be generally appropriate.
- l. **WINDOW MATERIALS:** The applicant did not submit window specs for conceptual approval. Staff finds that a wood or aluminum-clad wood window that is consistent with the staff's standards for windows in new construction should be installed.
- m. **FENESTRATION PROFILE:** The applicant has proposed fenestration profiles that feature both window profiles and locations that are inconsistent with the Guidelines and historic fenestration profiles found throughout the district. Staff finds that the proposed fenestration profiles should be amended to be consistent with the Guidelines. Additionally, staff finds that additional fenestration should be added throughout, specifically in locations void of fenestration. Windows should feature traditional sizes and a one-over-one profile. Contemporarily sized windows and fixed windows should be eliminated from the proposed new construction.
- n. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS:** Generally, staff finds the proposed architectural details to be inconsistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. Staff finds that the proposed massing and form, roof form, porch/entrance configuration, materials, and fenestration profiles should be revised to be consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found throughout the district.
- o. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (PORCHES):** Historic structures within the River Road historic district feature front porches that are a prominent architectural feature of the structure. Historically, porches feature their own massing and roof form. The applicant has proposed an entrance and front porch that are not within the context of a traditionally-sized porch. Staff finds that the proposed entrance element and front porch should be amended to feature traditional porch massing.

- p. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS (GARAGES):** The applicant has proposed for the structure to feature one street-facing garage door on the front of the new construction and a garage door facing the back yard. Attached garages located on the front façade of houses is not found historically within the district and is inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that the proposed garage should be eliminated, and that parking should be located elsewhere on the site.
- q. **LANDSCAPING:** The applicant has not provided a formal landscaping plan as part of conceptual approval; however, through renderings, the applicant has noted that the majority of the yard will feature grass, which is consistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that a detailed landscaping plan should be submitted for final approval that is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements.
- r. **DRIVEWAYS:** The applicant has proposed one driveway that is 10' wide, flaring to 12' at the apron. Staff finds the proposed driveway configuration to be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- s. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT:** The applicant has not noted the location of mechanical equipment at this time. All mechanical equipment should be screened from view from the right of way, per the Guidelines.
- t. **FENCING:** The applicant includes fencing on the site plan submitted to staff, but does not provide materials, dimension, or other design details. Fencing details must be submitted to staff and are not included in this review.
- u. **ARCHAEOLOGY:** The project area is within a River Improvement Overlay District, San Antonio Downtown and River Walk Historic District National Register of Historic Places District and is a designated Local Historic Landmark. Furthermore, the property is traversed by the Navarro Acequia, a previously recorded archaeological site. Therefore, an archaeological investigation is required if excavations are necessary for the project. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through t. Staff recommends that the applicant address to the following recommendations prior to pursuing final approval for new construction:

- i. That the applicant incorporates entrance massing and elements that are consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found throughout the district, as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant incorporates proposed massing and scale consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction, in particular, incorporating an overall building width or arrangement of bays that is compatible with surround historic structures, as noted in finding f.
- iii. That applicant incorporates a foundation height that is consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in finding g.
- iv. That in place of the shed roof form on the primary elevation, applicant incorporates a roof form that is consistent with the Guidelines and historic examples found throughout the district, as noted in finding h.
- v. That, as noted in finding i, the standing-seam metal roofs 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 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.
- vi. That a wood or aluminum clad wood window that is consistent with the staff's standards for windows in new construction be installed, as noted in the applicable citations and in finding k.
- vii. That the applicant amends the proposed fenestration profile and incorporate additional window openings throughout the proposed new construction, as noted in finding m. Proposed windows should feature a one over one profile.
- viii. That the proposed entrance element and front porch be amended to feature traditional porch massing, as noted in finding o.
- ix. That the proposed front-loading garage be eliminated, and that parking should be located elsewhere on site, as noted in finding p.
- x. That a front walkway constructed of materials consistent with other walkways in the district be installed, as noted in finding p.
- xi. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for review that adheres to the Guidelines for Site Elements, as noted in finding q.
- xii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view from the public right of way, as noted in finding s.
- xiii. That fencing details be submitted to staff; fencing is not included in this review.

xiv. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – An archaeological investigation is required if excavations are necessary near the rear of the property. Impacts to the Upper Labor Acequia shall be avoided. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

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.

An inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work on the standing-seam metal roof to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Chris Crystal agrees with staff stipulations.

Barbara Woodall agrees with staff stipulations.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to move the application to another DRC meeting.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer  
NAY:  
ABSENT: Fish, Gibbs, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2023-161**  
ADDRESS: 503 E GUENTHER ST  
APPLICANT: Daniel Cruz/Design Coop

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a 6' metal fence at the rear of the property.
2. Install a 4' metal fence at the front of the property with a 4' metal gate across the driveway.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The property at 503 E Guenther is a 2.5-story Italianate-style residence built c 1892. The building is clad in red brick with a battered limestone skirt. The east and south elevations are dominated by a two-story wraparound porch. The house has a standing-seam metal roof and wood windows that predominately appear as two-over two, except for windows on the turret of the primary elevation. There is a detached carport and pool in the backyard. The house contributes to the King William Historic District.
- b. **FENCE (REAR):** The applicant requests a 6' metal fence at the rear of the property. Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 2.C.i says to set privacy fences back from the front façade of the building to reduce their visual prominence. Staff finds this request conforms to guidelines.
- c. **FENCE (FRONT) DRIVEWAY GATE:** The applicant requests approval to install a 4' metal fence along the east and north sides of the parcel, to include a 4'-tall driveway gate in front of the primary elevation. Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.iii says to limit the height of new fences and walls within the front yard to a maximum of four feet. The Policy Guide for Fences in Historic Districts states that vehicle gates should be set behind the front façade wall plane. While a 4' fence in a front yard would conform to guidelines, the inclusion of the driveway gate in the proposed location does not conform to the policy guide.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of item 1, installation of a 6' metal fence at the rear of the property, based on finding b, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the rear fence does not exceed the maximum height of 6' at any portion of the fence.

Staff recommends approval of item 2, installation of a 4' metal front-yard fence with driveway gate, based on finding c, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant proposes a driveway gate set behind the front façade wall plane, with the 4' front yard fence turning west along the south edge of driveway and extends to meet the gate.
- ii. That the front-yard fence does not exceed the maximum height of 4' at any portion of the fence.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** One letter on file for Commission to review.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Grube, Fish, Baker, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ITEM 23. HDRC NO. 2023-172**  
ADDRESS: 427 ADAMS ST  
APPLICANT: SUE ANN PEMBERTON/Mainstreet Architects Inc.

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a shade structure with a standing seam metal roof and tube steel posts in the backyard.
2. Alter the existing awing condition at the front porch. Two existing pillars will be lengthened into porch columns, and the awning will be extended to meet the new columns.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The primary structure located at 427 Adams is a 2-story, single-family residence constructed circa 1912. It first appears on the 1951 Sanborn Map. The house features a side gable metal roof, a second story extension over a covered carport, stucco cladding, and decorative craftsman-style side lite entry door surrounds. The property sits on a double lot with tree cover on the south side of the property. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. SHADE STRUCTURE – The applicant is requesting to construct a 24'4" x 19'10" shade structure with a standing seam metal roof and 6x6" steel tube posts. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. stipulates to relate new outbuildings to the period of construction of the principal building on the lot through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. Staff finds that the shade structure generally conforms to Guidelines; however, staff recommends the applicant use 6x6" wood column posts rather than the proposed 6x6" steel tube posts.
- c. ORIENTATION & SETBACKS – The applicant has proposed both an orientation and setback for the shade structure that is consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.B. In some instances, a variance may be required.
- d. PORCH ROOF EXTENSION – The applicant is requesting to extend the existing front porch roof towards the northeast. Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B. ii. states to preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs. Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.A.i. states to preserve porches, balconies, and porte-cocheres. Staff finds the proposed porch roof extension does not conform to Guidelines.

- e. **COLUMN MODIFICATIONS** – The applicant is requesting to extend the existing stucco pillars from 5’6” to 10’ 37/8” in height. The Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B. iv. states to not add new elements and details that create a false historic appearance. Staff finds the proposed column modifications do not conform to Guidelines.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval of item 1, based on findings a through c, 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 6x6” square wood columns rather than the proposed steel tube posts. Staff does not recommend approval of item 2, based on findings d and e. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the historic front porch condition.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 2, based on findings d and e. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the historic front porch condition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

One letter on file for Commission to review.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velasquez moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations and item 2 to a DRC meeting for further investigation of design solutions.  
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** AYE: Savino, Velasquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Baker, Fetzer  
NAY: None.  
ABSENT: Gibbs, Fish, District 4 Commissioner (Vacant)

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

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chairman Fetzer adjourned the meeting at 5:49 p.m.

**APPROVED**

---

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

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