



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

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2023**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. for work session.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Gibbs, Fish, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Carpenter, Grube, Cervantes, Fetzer
Absent: Baker, District 4 Commissioner (VACANT)

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT:

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Item 12 was withdrawn prior to hearing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Item 4 – Valerie Cortez on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill, support staff recommendations, except for the rear sliding glass door.

Chairman Fetzer asked the commission if they would like to pull items from the consent agenda for individual consideration. None pulled.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Item 1, Case No. 2023-145 620 LABOR ST
Item 2, Case No. 2023-151 521 RIVER WALK
Item 3, Case No. 2023-153 Riverwalk improvements from E. Houston to Lexington;
Stairs between E. Houston and E. Commerce
Item 4, Case No. 2022-428 1614 E. HOUSTON STREET

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1-4 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

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

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

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

ITEM 5. HDRC NO. 2023-143
ADDRESS: 1123 SE MILITARY DR
APPLICANT: Mark Walle/Dutch Bros

REQUEST:

1. Construct a commercial structure to feature one story in height to be located in an existing surface parking lot.
2. 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.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the proposed new construction based on findings b through l with the following stipulations:
 - i. That landscaping buffers be added to the greatest extent possible where vehicular circulation is adjacent to or parallel with pedestrian pathways, as noted in finding e.
 - ii. That all stucco feature a smooth finish, that fiber cement siding feature a smooth finish, that all storefront systems feature dark frames and that additional information be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval for the proposed metal façade panels.
 - iii. That all windows be recessed at least two (2) inches within walls, as noted in finding i.
 - iv. That a detailed landscaping plan be submitted for review and approval that is consistent with the Mission Historic District Design Manual as noted in finding l.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, 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 reduce 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 reduce 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 Grube moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 6. HDRC NO. 2023-126
ADDRESS: 1907 W. KINGS HWY
APPLICANT: ERIC SCHNEEMAN/SCHNEEMAN ERIC OLDS

REQUEST:

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

1. Demolish an existing, rear accessory structure.
2. Construct a 1-story, rear accessory structure in the location of the existing, rear accessory structure.
3. Construct a rear addition to feature approximately 110 square feet.
4. Install various rear yard landscaping elements.
5. Install a wood gate on the east side of the primary historic structure.
6. Modify the existing porch steps by installing stacked limestone porch steps and a steel handrail.
7. Modify the existing, full width driveway to be a ribbon strip driveway, install a low rock wall within the front yard and perform front yard landscaping modifications.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the demolition of the existing, rear accessory structure based on findings d through f with the following stipulation:
 - i. That the applicant comply with the City's deconstruction ordinance and selects a Certified Deconstruction Contractor to complete deconstruction, form submission, and permitting in accordance with UDC Chapter 12, Article II, as noted in finding f.
2. Staff recommends approval of item #2, the construction of a rear accessory structure based on findings g through i with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the proposed metal roofing be standing seam and feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a smooth profile, and a standard galvalume finish.
 - ii. That the proposed aluminum clad wood windows adhere to the adopted policy guide for windows in new construction.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3 the construction of a rear addition based on finding j with the following stipulation:
 - i. That the proposed aluminum clad wood window adheres to the adopted policy guide for windows in additions.
4. Staff recommends approval of item #4, the installation of a rear yard landscaping elements, as submitted, based on finding k.
5. Staff recommends approval of item #5, the installation of a side yard fence and gate based on finding l with the stipulation that a detail be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval noting the overall profile and materials.
6. Staff does not recommend approval of item #6, front porch modifications based on finding m, as proposed. While staff finds the installation of a steel handrail to be appropriate, the installation of stacked limestone slabs to function as porch steps is not consistent with the Guidelines not historic examples of porches found within the district. Porch steps should be repaired, in-kind.
7. Staff does not recommend approval of item #7, front yard and driveway modifications. Staff recommends the following:
 - i. That the applicant submit additional information regarding the infill gravel material and that the proposed modification be installed the full length of the driveway.
 - ii. That the applicant submit a detailed landscaping plan for the proposed landscaping bed.
 - iii. That the front walkway be restored to simple poured concrete that flares near the porch steps.
 - iv. That the previously installed flagstone paving be removed from the front yard. The applicant may resubmit a design that features a smaller decomposed granite or steppingstone path if access between the walkway and driveway is necessary while maintaining the majority of the natural front lawn area as native green space.
 - v. That the proposed front wall should be eliminated as there is no precedence for this found historically within the district.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Bianca Maldonado on behalf of the Monticello Park Architectural Review Committee oppose the case.
Ted Guerra on behalf of the Jefferson Neighborhood Association opposed the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve items 1-5 with staff stipulations with an additional stipulation that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued until the violations noted in items 6 and 7 are resolved.
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

VOTE:

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

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

ITEM 7. HDRC NO. 2023-154
ADDRESS: 111 ALAMO PLAZA
APPLICANT: Marco Barros/City Sightseeing Tours

REQUEST:

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

1. Install a mobile vending kiosk with signage and an umbrella on the east side of Alamo Plaza across the street from 111 Alamo Plaza.
2. Install a mobile vending kiosk with signage and an umbrella at the corner of Alamo Plaza and Blum Street, adjacent to Rivercenter Mall.
3. Install a mobile vending kiosk with signage and an umbrella at the corner of Alamo Plaza and E. Crockett, adjacent to the Alamo grounds.
4. Install three (3) A-frame signs in front of the storefront at 111 Alamo Plaza.
5. Approximately twenty (20) other signs have been installed without Certificates of Appropriateness throughout downtown (E. Houston Street, Alamo Plaza, E. Commerce, N. Presa). These signs are unauthorized. Additionally, unauthorized signage has been attached to public safety signs, including stop signs.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, the installation of a mobile vending kiosk with signage and an umbrella to be located directly in front of 111 Alamo Plaza with the following stipulations:
 - i. That the proposed kiosk be installed in location authorized by a lease agreement with Center City Development & Operations Department on the west side of the street, in front of 111 Alamo Plaza. Additionally, the kiosk shall not impede normal pedestrian traffic at any time.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of items #2 and #3, the installation of a mobile vending kiosks with signage and umbrellas at the corner of Alamo Plaza and Blum Street and Alamo Plaza and E. Crockett. Staff recommends the installation of one mobile vending kiosk total.
3. Staff recommends approval of item #3, with the stipulation that only one (1) A-frame sign is located on site. The sign is to be located directly in front of 111 Alamo Plaza.

In addition to the above stipulations, the following unapproved signs are to be removed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- i. All unapproved A-frame signs located downtown. This includes signage throughout Alamo Plaza, on E. Houston Street, on E. Commerce Street, and on N. Presa.
- ii. All unapproved signage located at and in front of 101/105 Alamo Plaza. This includes A-frame signs, signage attached to building columns, and free-standing signs installed on the sidewalk.
- iii. All unapproved signage attached to signage within the right of way, including stop signs.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION 1: Commissioner Fish moved to approve items 1 and 4 with staff stipulations and refer items 2 and 3 to a Design Review Committee.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

MOTION 2: Commissioner Grube moved to amend the motion and for the approval to install one (1) kiosk in front of 111 Alamo Plaza, one (1) kiosk at the corner of Alamo Plaza and Blum Street, adjacent to Rivercenter Mall, and approval to install one (1) kiosk at the corner of Alamo Plaza and E. Crockett, adjacent to the Alamo grounds. The kiosks at Alamo Plaza and Blum and Alamo Plaza at E. Crockett received approval to be installed for twelve (12) months.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED and ADOPTED with 7 AYES. 2 NAYS. 2 ABSENT.**

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

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

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

ITEM 8. HDRC NO. 2023-123
 ADDRESS: 206 SHERMAN ST
 APPLICANT: Jose Lopez, Jr/LAS CASAS 210 LLC

REQUEST:
The applicant requests conceptual approval of a 640-square-foot addition.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff does not recommend conceptual approval of the 640-square-foot addition based on findings a - g. An addition to the existing house may be appropriate as additions to shotgun houses are common across the city. Staff recommends the applicant explore other options for adding to the existing structure that are more compatible with the historic core, that are subordinate to the historic core, and that preserve character-defining features of the shotgun house such as the primary entrance and front porch.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
Valerie Cortez on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill opposed the case.
Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill submitted a letter in opposition to the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved for a continuance to the next Historic and Design Review Commission with a Design Review Committee in the interim.
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 9. HDRC NO. 2023-152
 ADDRESS: 320 MADISON ST
 APPLICANT: MARGRET WILMOTH

REQUEST:
The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 2-story rear accessory structure.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through k with the following stipulations:
i. That the applicant submits a comprehensive site plan showing the proposed setbacks to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on finding c.
ii. That the applicant proposes window sizes, patterns, proportions, and trim and sill detailing 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 the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- iii. 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.
- iv. That the applicant installs single-car garage doors in lieu of the proposed 2-car garage door based on finding h. Updated elevation drawings must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- v. That the applicant submits final material specifications for fully wood garage doors and pedestrian doors based on finding h to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- vi. That the applicant submits porch column details based on finding j showing the proposed wood columns will be a maximum of 6x6” in width and feature a traditional cap and base and chamfered corners.
- vii. That the applicant submits updated elevation drawings that propose architectural details that are in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines and do not feature Juliet balconies based on finding j.
- viii. That any driveway modifications are submitted in a separate application for review and approval based on finding k.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

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

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

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 1 NAY. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 10. HDRC NO. 2023-113
ADDRESS: 119 W ROSEWOOD AVE
APPLICANT: Edward Marvin/MARVIN EDWARD B & SALLY U

REQUEST:

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through g. 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 and finds demolition appropriate, staff recommends the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant comply with the City's deconstruction ordinance and selects a Certified Deconstruction Contractor to complete deconstruction, form submission, and permitting in accordance with UDC Chapter 12, Article II, as noted in finding f.
- ii. Any future requests for replacement of the rear accessory structure will require an additional application for review and approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Juan Valdez submitted a letter in support of the case.

Ann Kenzer supported the case.

Michael Mehl supported the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Fish moved to approve demolition with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

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

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

ITEM 11. HDRC NO. 2023-159
ADDRESS: 1402 FULTON AVE
APPLICANT: Maria Luisa Cesar & Esnire Abigail Gomez

REQUEST:

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

1. Modify the front courtyard wall.
2. Receive Historic Tax Certification.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the courtyard wall modification or Historic Tax Certification based on findings a through d. Staff finds that the applicant should reconstruct the courtyard wall enclosure to match the previously existing retaining wall.

If the HDRC is compelled to approve the courtyard wall modification in the existing configuration, the property is eligible for Historic Tax Certification and the applicant may return to the HDRC for Historic Tax Verification.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The Fulton Neighborhood Association submitted a letter in support of the case.

MOTION: Commissioner Grube moved to approve as submitted by the applicant.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

VOTE: AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Cervantes, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzner
NAY: Fish
ABSENT: Baker, District 4 Commissioner (VACANT)

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES. 1 NAY. 2 ABSENT.**

ITEM 12. APPLICATION WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO HEARING

ITEM 13. HDRC NO. 2023-148
ADDRESS: 419 FLORIDA ST
APPLICANT: Nicholas Melde/Architexas

REQUEST:

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

1. Infill three windows and add four windows to the existing structure.
2. Install eight windows to the rear addition.
3. The modification of the roof form of the previously approved rear addition from a lower sloped shed roof to a steeply sloped shed form.
4. The removal and replacement of all wood 117 waterfall siding on the house and to paint the non-masonry exterior.
5. The replacement of all aluminum and vinyl windows on the existing structure with aluminum-clad wood windows.
6. Install a two-car carport at the rear of the property.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items 1, 2, and 4 through 6, based on findings a through i, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed square, clerestory, and fixed windows be modified to feature window profiles that are more consistent with the established patterns found on the historic structure and in the district. Updated elevation drawings are required for final approval.
- ii. That the applicant retain the historic window openings and replace the non-original windows with the proposed aluminum-clad wood windows.
- iii. That the 117 wood waterfall siding replacement be installed in the same manner as the siding previously removed without additional sheathing to maintain the same wall thickness and detail where the siding meets the existing window trim.
- iv. That the applicant submit to staff carport construction documents for review.

Staff does not recommend approval of item 3, based on findings f. Staff recommends that the applicant retain the roof form previously approved by HDRC. If the single sloped roof form is approved by the HDRC, then the proposed fenestration configuration for the west façade of the addition that includes the clerestory windows may be considered compatible with the approved design.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

MOTION 1: Commissioner Velásquez moved for conceptual approval with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

MOTION 2: Commissioner Grube moved to substitute the motion and approve items, 1,2,4, 5 and 6, with staff stipulations 1, 2, 3 and 4; and, conceptual approval on item 3 to allow the applicant to update the slope and returns to HDRC for final approval on item 3.
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion; thereby withdrawing the motion 1.

VOTE:

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

ACTION: **MOTION PASSED AND ADOPTED with 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. 1 ABSTAIN. 3 ABSENT.**

ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2023-129
ADDRESS: 731 N PINE ST
APPLICANT: Amanda Solis/SOLIZ AMANDA M

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing wood skirting with stucco.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of the request, based on findings a through c. Staff recommends that the stucco be replaced with matching wood siding or a Hardie material that features a similar profile and dimension as the wood siding on the house.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Valerie Cortez on behalf of the Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill provided comments.
The Concerned Citizens of Dignowity Hill submitted a letter with comments.

MOTION: Commissioner Savino moved to approve with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant either remove the stucco skirting and install wood skirting that matches the profile of the existing wood siding found on the structure or install the aforementioned wood skirting on top of the stucco. Alternatively, the applicant may install a Hardie material that features the same profile and dimensions as the existing wood siding on the house. If a Hardie material is chosen, the smooth textured side must be installed outward.
- ii. That the applicant install a water table board for the skirting.

Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

VOTE:

AYE: Gibbs, Savino, Velásquez, Mazuca, Cervantes, Carpenter, Grube, Fetzer

NAY: None.

ABSENT: Fish, Baker, District 4 Commissioner (VACANT)

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

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Fetzer adjourned the meeting at 6:29 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Date: _____