



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

**HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2023**

The City of San Antonio Historic and Design Review Commission met on Wednesday, December 20, 2023, at 1901 South Alamo Street, San Antonio, Texas 78204.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. for work session.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Savino, Velásquez, Galloway, Mazuca, Guevara, Grube, Cervantes, and Fetzer

**ABSENT:** Gibbs, Castillo, and Holland

**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.
- Reminder that City offices closed on December 23, 2023, through January 1, 2024, and reopened on January 2, 2024.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Savino moved to approve the minutes for the December 6, 2023, Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) meeting.  
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Item 1 – Gene Morales submitted a voicemail in opposition to the case.
- Item 1 – Sandra Trabucco submitted a voicemail in opposition to the case.
- Item 8 – The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.
- Item 9 – The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.
- Item 13 – Dignowity Hill Architectural Review Committee submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.

Vice-Chair Commissioner Savino asked if any commissioner would like to pull items from the consent agenda. No Commissioners requested to pull items from the consent agenda for individual consideration.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Item 1, Case No. 2023-475	222 S ALAMO ST
Item 2, Case No. 2023-473	110 E HOUSTON ST
	143 N MAIN AVE
	114 E HOUSTON ST
	106 E HOUSTON ST
Item 3, Case No. 2023-476	221 NEWELL
Item 4, Case No. 2023-486	1100 BROADWAY
Item 5, Case No. 2023-490	258 QUENTIN DR
Item 6, Case No. 2023-491	436 LABOR ST
Item 7, Case No. 2023-493	1149 E COMMERCE ST
	1403 E COMMERCE ST
	226 N HACKBERRY ST
	506 MONTANA
	935 IOWA ST
	202 CONNELLY ST
	1138 E COMMERCE ST
Item 8, Case No. 2023-496	832 E GUENTHER ST
Item 9, Case No. 2023-497	509 KING WILLIAM
Item 10, Case No. 2023-498	819 E MULBERRY AVE
Item 11, Case No. 2023-480	437 E MULBERRY AVE
Item 12, Case No. 2023-479	302 FLORIDA ST
Item 13, Case No. 2023-489	1214 E CROCKETT ST

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve items 1-13 with staff stipulations.  
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

**ACTION:** The MOTION PASSED with 7 AYES. 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT. 1 RECUSAL.

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION ITEMS:**

**ITEM 14. HDRC NO. 2023-478**  
ADDRESS: 1304 E HOUSTON ST  
APPLICANT: Jeremy Jaramillo/TBA Douglas

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 6-level parking structure at 1304 E Houston Street. This property is located within the Downtown Design Guide area. The proposed new construction will be bounded to the north by E Houston, to the east and south by private property and to the west by Union Pacific railway tracks.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the garage be properly screened to conform with the Downtown Design Guide, as noted in finding d. Screening should be added to the entirety of each façade that conceals spandrel and precast concrete wall panels to the fullest extent possible. Perforated metal is acceptable, per the Downtown Design Guide. Additionally, staff recommends that an increase of 50% of currently proposed façade

materials should be introduced to all non-conforming materials. Elevator and stair towers should be included in screening attempts.

- ii. That the E Houston Street façade be fully designed to appear to feature active space at the ground level, as noted in finding g. Storefront systems should extend the E Houston Street façade, particularly beneath the proposed pedestrian canopy. An alternative solution would be to install evergreen street trees as a screening solution as noted in finding j.
- iii. That signage and public art be developed as specified in the Downtown Design Guide, as noted in findings g and h.
- iv. That building lighting be designed in a manner that does not produce light pollution.
- v. That all landscaping elements adhere to the Downtown Design Guide.
- vi. That any future rooftop canopy elements be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval, as noted in finding k.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION 1:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve with staff stipulation 1 without the increase of 50% (Main Motion) materials on the south façade, and staff stipulations 3-6. Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

**MOTION 2:** Commissioner Savino moved to amend the motion to modify item 2 to read that the E Houston (Amendment) Street facade be revised to feature a perforated design (such as breeze block) in place of a solid wall as the street level. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

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

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

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

**ITEM 15. HDRC NO. 2023-243**  
ADDRESS: 411 E EVERGREEN  
APPLICANT: GLADYS AYARZAGOITIA/GMAM

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install two fixed aluminum windows on the front façade, in window openings 1 and 2, measuring approximately 7.4 ft x 4.4 ft.
2. Install fixed aluminum transoms, sidelites, and salvaged wood doors in the second-floor front façade openings.
3. Install a wood balcony railing
4. Replace the existing first-floor porch decking with boards installed parallel to the front façade wall plane.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1, staff does not recommend approval of the installation of two fixed aluminum windows on the front façade, in window openings 1 and 2, based on finding c. Staff recommends that fully wood one-over-one windows are

installed that do not modify the existing opening and feature traditional operations. New windows must meet the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs a fully wood window 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.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the installation of new windows and salvaged doors within the existing openings based on finding d with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant installs a 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. 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 3, staff recommends approval of the wood railing installation on the balcony based on finding e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submit final material specifications to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- ii. That the applicant submit a measured elevation drawing of the proposed railing to staff for review prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 4, staff recommends approval of the replacement of the first-floor porch decking based on finding f, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the proposed porch decking should feature 1" x 3" tongue-and-groove wood members laid perpendicular to the front façade plane.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Frederica Kushner spoke in opposition to the case.
- The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.
- The Tobin Hill Community Association submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.

**MOTION 1:** Commissioner Savino moved to approve items 1-4 with staff stipulations.  
(Main Motion) Commissioner Grube seconded the motion.

**MOTION 2:** Commissioner Cervantes moved to amend the motion to allow the applicant to use wood material  
(Amendment) on the front windows.  
Commissioner Cervantes retracted his amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

**ITEM 16. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 17. HDRC NO. 2023-485**

ADDRESS: 1223 MARCH AVE

APPLICANT: Vincent Huebinger/Vincent Gerard & Associates, Inc.

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install one (1) communications monopole to feature an overall height of 74' – 0". The proposed pole is located within the Mission Historic District

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through d.

ARCHAEOLOGY – The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology, as applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved for a continuance to a future HDRC hearing to allow the applicant time to meet with neighborhood associations.  
Commissioner Velásquez seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 18. HDRC NO. 2023-483**

ADDRESS: 514 ADAMS ST

APPLICANT: Michelle Burnham

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Replace the existing, asphalt shingle roof with architectural shingles.
2. Modify the existing roof form by increasing the overall structure's plate height, extending the roof's ridgeline to the rear, and constructing one, rear facing hipped roof. This is a modification from the current, roof form which features two, rear facing hipped roof with a shed profile connecting the two. The current, rear roof form is not original. The proposed increase in plate height will not result in an increase in the structure's overall height; however, it will result in a decrease in the ridge height of the structure's cross-gabled roof (porch), resulting in a lower pitch.
3. Adjust the primary beam spanning the porch by increasing its height and removing one existing porch column.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Staff recommends approval of item #1, roof replacement, based on finding b with the stipulation that all original roof forms, profiles, and dimensions should be maintained in the proposed replacement.
2. Staff does not recommend approval of item #2, modifications to the original roof form, as proposed. Staff recommends approval of modifications to the rear roof forms to promote adequate drainage as these roof forms are not original to the structure; however, staff does not recommend approval of an increase in plate heights, nor changes to roof pitches. Staff recommends the following:
  - i. That all original ridge heights, plate heights, roof pitches and profiles or original (front and side roof profiles) be maintained.
3. Staff does not recommend approval of item #3, modifications to the primary porch beam and the removal of a front column. Staff recommends these items be repaired, as needed, in their original profile.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- The King William Association Architectural Advisory Committee submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.

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

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

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

**ITEM 19. HDRC NO. 2023-434**  
ADDRESS: 801 LABOR ST  
APPLICANT: Michelle HippsCruz/LIMINAL Design Studio

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 2-story, 800-square-foot rear accessory structure.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- i. That the applicant further reduces the height of the rear accessory structure based on finding d and submits updated drawings that include the neighboring property for context to staff for review prior to returning to the HDRC.
- ii. That the applicant installs a standing seam metal roof that features panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches high, a crimped ridge seam, and match the current finish or a standard galvalume finish based on finding f. Panels should be smooth without striation or corrugation. Ridges are to feature a double-munch or crimped ridge configuration; no vented ridge caps or end caps are allowed. All chimney, flue, and related existing roof details must be preserved. An inspection must be scheduled with OHP staff prior to the start of work to verify that the roofing material matches the approved specifications.
- iii. That the applicant proposes window sizes, patterns, proportions, operations and trim and sill detailing on the west elevation that are consistent with the Guidelines and historic precedents in the district as noted in finding g and submits updated elevation drawings to staff for review and approval prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding h.
- iv. That the applicant installs wood or aluminum-clad wood windows based on finding j. 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.

- v. That the Hardie siding features a reveal no more than 6 inches and a smooth texture based on finding j. A faux wood grain finish is not permitted.
- vi. That the applicant submits final material specifications for fully wood or aluminum-clad wood doors to staff for review and approval prior to returning to the HDRC based on finding j.
- vii. That the proposed columns are fully wood and feature a maximum of 6x6" in width and a traditional cap and base and chamfered corners based on finding j.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Emily Alder submitted a voicemail in support of the case.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Velásquez moved to approve items 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 with staff stipulations. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 20. HDRC NO. 2023-359**  
ADDRESS: 518 E PARK AVE  
APPLICANT: Mychal Krause/Mychals Designs LLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Demolish the existing one-story accessory structure.
2. Construct a new two-story accessory structure with roof deck.
3. Construct a new one-story shed on a concrete slab foundation.
4. Add a 19.5' concrete connection from the existing driveway to the proposed two-story accessory structure.
5. Add a gravel parking area at the rear of the property.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff does not recommend approval of item 1, demolition of the detached rear one-story garage, based on findings b through g. Staff recommends that the applicant further explore retention or incorporation of the existing structure into the proposed accessory structures.

Should the commission find that the conditions required for approval of demolition have been met, staff recommends approval of items 2 through 5, construction of one two-story and one one-story accessory structure, based on findings h through r, with the following stipulations:

- i. That salvaged materials be used in the new construction of the two-story accessory structure to the fullest extent possible.
- ii. That the applicant reduce the mass and scale of the two-story accessory consistent with the guidelines including reduction of the footprint to not exceed 50% of that of the primary, and a reduction in height.
- iii. That the second-floor and roof deck railing should feature wood posts and top rails, as noted in finding k.

- iv. That the applicant simplifies the number of styles of windows on the two-story accessory structure by replacing the fixed windows with one-over-one windows as proposed elsewhere on the structure, as noted in finding l.
- v. That the applicant proposes a simplified design for the roof deck stairs that is in keeping with the period of construction of the main house, as noted in finding m.
- vi. That the applicant proposes wood or clad-wood doors for both accessory structures, as noted in findings k and p.
- vii. That the applicant meets all setback standards as required by city zoning and obtain a variance from the Board of Adjustment if applicable.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Frederica Kushner spoke in opposition to the case.
- The Conservation Society of San Antonio submitted a letter concurring with staff recommendations.
- The Tobin Hill Community Association submitted a letter with comments on the case.

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

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

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

**ITEM 21. HDRC NO. 2023-445**  
**ADDRESS: 128 W FRENCH PLACE**  
**APPLICANT: Laura Pommer**

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Install a 4-foot-tall wood front yard fence.
2. Install an 18-foot-wide concrete driveway apron.
3. Install a 12-foot-wide crushed granite driveway on the east side of the property.
4. Install a 648 sf, parking pad on the east side of the property.
5. Install a 440 sf brick patio to the front entryway.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the installation of a 4-foot-tall wooden fence to the front yard, based on finding b with the following stipulation:

- i. That the final construction height of the approved pedestrian gates and fencing may not exceed the maximum height of 4 feet as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, the pedestrian gates and fencing must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

Item 2, staff does not recommend approval of the installation of concrete driveway apron, based on finding d. Staff recommends that the property owner utilize the existing curb cut on Howard St (west). If the HDRC is compelled to approve the new curb cut request, the new curb cut should not exceed 12' in width.

Item 3, staff recommends approval of the installation of a crushed granite driveway, based on finding e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant installs a rear driveway utilizing the existing curb cut on Howard Street and that the new driveway is oriented parallel to W. French Pl, south of the primary structure.
- ii. That new driveway should not exceed 10' in width. The applicant is required to submit an updated measured site plan to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.



Item 4, staff does not recommend approval of the installation of a 648 sf, parking pad based on finding f.

Item 5, staff recommends approval of the installation a 440-sf brick patio to the front entryway based on finding g.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- The Monte Vista Neighborhood Association Architectural Review Committee X submitted a letter in support of the case.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations and items 2-5 as presented by the applicant.  
Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 22. HDRC NO. 2023-481**  
ADDRESS: 232 CAMARGO  
APPLICANT: Fernando Morales/Candid Works PLLC

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

1. Replace two existing aluminum windows on the existing rear addition with wood windows and modify the openings.
2. Construct a rear covered deck.
3. Construct a rear carport.
4. Replace the existing rear gravel apron with a concrete apron.
5. Replace the existing rear gravel driveway with a new gravel driveway with brick features.
6. Replace the existing east side chain link fence with a metal post cattle-panel fence.
7. Replace the existing east side chain link driveway gate with a corrugated metal sliding driveway gate.
8. Replace the existing garage doors with modern steel garage doors.
9. Construct a side addition on the west façade of the existing rear addition.
10. Construct a rear addition.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Item 1, staff recommends conceptual approval of the fenestration modifications to the existing rear addition's rear façade, based on findings a and b, with the following stipulation:

- 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. An alternative window material may be considered by staff if the window conforms to the following stipulations. 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 2, staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear covered deck construction, based on findings a and c, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant replace the proposed steel tube columns with new wood columns to be a maximum of 6x6" in width and feature a traditional cap and base and chamfered corners.
- ii. That the applicant install 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.

Item 3, staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear carport construction, based on findings a and d, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant replace the proposed steel framing with wood construction and steel tube columns with new wood columns to be a maximum of 6x6" in width and feature a traditional cap and base and chamfered corners.
- ii. That the applicant install 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.
- 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.

Item 4, staff recommends conceptual approval to replace the existing gravel apron with a concrete apron, based on findings a and e, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant install a concrete apron not to exceed 12 feet in width.

Item 5, staff recommends conceptual approval to replace the existing gravel driveway with a gravel driveway with brick features, based on findings a and f, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the driveway follow the existing footprint of the current driveway.
- ii. That the applicant use gravel natural in color and not exceed 2 inches in size.

Item 6, staff recommends conceptual approval of the east side chain link fence replacement, based on findings a and g, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant submit to staff a fence site plan prior to the applicant returning for final review.
- ii. That the fence does not exceed 6 feet in height.
- iii. That the applicant use wood posts and railing.

Item 7, staff recommends conceptual approval to replace the existing east side chain link driveway gate, based on findings a and h, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant to staff a fence site plan prior to the applicant returning for final review.
- ii. That the gate does not exceed 6 feet in height.
- iii. That the applicant submits a gate system that conforms to guidelines.

Item 8, staff recommends conceptual approval to replace the existing garage doors, based on findings a and i, with the following stipulation:

- i. That the applicant install a fully wood garage door or a garage door with a design that mimics wood construction and features a smooth finish without a faux wood grain texture. Final garage door specifications must be submitted to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 9, staff recommends conceptual approval of the side addition, based on findings a and j through q, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant use complementary materials for the proposed siding and foundation skirting.

- ii. That the applicant use a conforming roof form such as a gabled or shed roof.
- 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.

Item 10, staff recommends conceptual approval of the rear addition, based on findings a and r through z, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant use complementary materials for the proposed siding and foundation skirting.
- ii. That the applicant use a conforming roof form such as a gabled or shed roof.
- 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.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to conceptually approve items 1, 2, 4-8, 9, and 10 with staff stipulations. Item 3 as presented by the applicant with the setback stipulation, and item 8 as presented by the applicant. With the added stipulation to discuss the changes in materials in a Design Review Committee.  
Commissioner Savino seconded the motion.

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

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

**ITEM 23. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 24. POSTPONED PRIOR TO HEARING**

**ITEM 25. HDRC NO. 2023-484**  
ADDRESS: 5000 SAN PEDRO AVE  
APPLICANT: Daniel Ruiz/Linegraphix, LLC.

**REQUEST:**

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install three wall mounted signs and to reface the existing pole sign.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the request, based on findings a through f, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduce the total square footage of the signage to 50 square feet or less.
- ii. That the applicant reduce the total number of signs to one major and two minor signs on the property.
- iii. That the applicant use a dark background with light lettering on the requested signs.
- iv. That the applicant use a durable signage material.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Grube moved to approve with the stipulations that the applicant reduces the total square footage of the signage to 50 square feet or less, that no more than four (4) total signs be placed on the property, and that the applicant uses the signage material presented by the applicant. Commissioner Cervantes seconded the motion.

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

ABSENT: Gibbs, Castillo, and Holland

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

**ITEM 26.     HDRC NO. 2023-482**  
ADDRESS: 251 GREENLAWN  
APPLICANT: Paul Medina

**REQUEST:**

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

1. Construct a brick, stone, and iron front yard fence ranging from 4'7" to 6' tall.
2. Construct three (3) red iron gates.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the request, based on findings a through f, with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant construct a fence and gate that conforms to the historic district such as simple wood or split-rail fence.
- ii. That the fence and gate does not exceed four (4) feet in height.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

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

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

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

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

**APPROVED**

---

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

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