



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

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**OFFICIAL MINUTES**  
**29 July 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Wednesday, July 29, 2020, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

- Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, Bowman, and Fetzer.

Absent: Martinez-Flores and Laffoon.

**CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** See list of Public Comments on the Individual Item.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- **No Consent Agenda because Special Hearing for case- 2020-201--335 TRAIL.**

**INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEM**

- **Item # 1. HDRC NO. 2020-201**

ADDRESS: 335 TRAIL

Applicant: June 26, 2020 -Not applicable due to City Council Emergency Orders

**REQUEST:**

Item A: Consideration and approval of a waiver pursuant to City Code Section 35-451 (f) to accept and review the application submitted for the request described below.

Item B: The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a multi-unit residential development (23 units) on the vacant lot located at 335 Trail. The property features lots that are located within the River Improvement Overlay only, as well as those that are located within both the River Improvement Overlay and the River Road Historic District. The applicant has proposed for the residential structures to feature two and three stories in height. Access to the site will be provided from Trail Street and Huisache Street. A revised parking proposal is included in this request.

## **FINDINGS:**

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a multi-unit residential development on the vacant lot located at 335 Trail. The property features lots that are located within the River Improvement Overlay only, as well as those that are located within both the River Improvement Overlay and the River Road Historic District. The applicant has proposed for the residential structures to feature two and three stories in height. Access to the site will be provided from both Trail Street and Huisache Street.
- b. **PREVIOUS REQUESTS** – A previous application which consisted of five, 3-story buildings and one, 2-story building (total of 24 units) was approved with stipulations by the HDRC on December 18, 2019. An appeal of this approval was submitted by a neighboring property owner and by the Board of Adjustment (BOA) on February 17, 2020. The UDC 35-451 (f), *In the case of disapproval of an application by the board of adjustment, a new application for the same work shall not be resubmitted for consideration until one (1) year has elapsed from the date of disapproval unless the indicated changes in the plans and specifications required to meet the conditions have been incorporated into the new application. The commission, by a majority of its membership, may waive the aforementioned time limitation if the application presents new substantial evidence. If such waiver is granted, a new application shall be filed with the historic preservation officer.* Accordingly, HDRC is expressly authorized to review subsequent applications for consideration of waiver of the one-year time limitation if the application presents substantial new evidence. A revised request, heard on June 19, introduced several revisions to the previous proposal including a reduction of units by 1, reduction of building height on Trail Street, elimination of front-loading garages facing Trail Street, and reduced lot coverage to preserve an existing heritage oak. The overall architectural character was also revised with updated porch and column details and material specifications. A motion to approve a waiver based on these revisions failed at the June 19 hearing. Applicant submitted a new request for waiver and revised subsequent application on June 24, 2020. In the current proposal, the applicant has updated the parking plan, which respond to staff's previous recommendations related to parking on Trail. Minor alterations to the street-facing elevations of Buildings 5 and 6 have also been included in the current request. Staff recommends approval of waiver and consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on revisions submitted.
- c. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 8, 2020, and again on May 5, 2020. At those meetings, the committee reviewed updated application documents and discussed front yard parking, density, roof profiles and massing.
- d. **SETBACKS (Trail)** – Both the UDC Section 35-672(b)(A) and the Guidelines for New Construction note that front facades on new construction are to align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. The applicant has noted setbacks of twenty (20) feet on Trail for both buildings 5 and 6. Generally, staff finds the proposed setbacks to be appropriate.
- e. **SETBACKS (Huisache)** – The applicant has noted per the site plan that setbacks on Huisache will match those of the adjacent, one story structures. The site plan notes porch foundations that protrude past the setbacks of the adjacent structures.
- f. Staff finds that the applicant should confirm that no portion of the structures' massing will feature a setback that is less than those of the adjacent, one story structures.
- g. **ENTRANCES** – Both the UDC Section 35-672(b)(A) and the Guidelines for New Construction note that a structure's primary entrance is to be orientated toward the street. The proposed new construction is consistent with the Guidelines and the UDC in regards to entrance orientation.
- h. **SCALE & MASS** – The applicant has proposed for both structures on Trail Street (buildings 5 and 6) to feature two (2) stories in height, while the other structures (buildings 1 through 4) will feature three (3) stories in height. 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. The UDC Section 35-673(c) notes that the maximum construction height for RIO-1 is 5 stories, or sixty (60) feet in height. Additionally, the UDC notes that within each RIO District, a general similarity in building heights should be encouraged in order to help establish a sense of visual continuity and that building heights shall be configured such that a comfortable human scale is established along edges of properties. The River Road Historic District is comprised mainly of single family residential structures. Multi-family residential structures that exist within the District often feature two stories in height. Generally, staff finds the proposed massing throughout to be appropriate. The proposed massing on Trail Street provides an appropriate transition in height as structures to the immediate south feature one story in height.

- i. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed roof forms that include both front and side facing gabled roofs as well as shed roofs over porch elements. The applicant has also proposed mansard roof forms; however, these forms will be located on the interior of the site, and on Huisache. Generally, staff finds the proposed roof forms to be appropriate.
- j. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Per the UDC Section 35-674(e)(5), fenestration should be well-detailed to add depth and scale to a building’s façade. Additionally, window placement, size, material and style should help define a building’s architectural style and integrity. Generally, the applicant has proposed window openings that relate to those found historically within the River Road Historic District in regards to both the locations and profiles. Staff finds that the applicant should ensure that all ganged windows are separated by a mullion of at least six (6) inches in width.
- k. **LOT COVERAGE** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction, the building footprint for new construction should be no more than fifty (50) percent of the size of the total lot area. Per the application documents, the applicant has proposed a total lot coverage of forty-seven (47) percent within the historically designated portion of the site. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- l. **PROXIMITY TO ACEQUIA** – The applicant has proposed a setback of fifteen (15) feet from building 4 to the acequia, as well as a setback of more than fifteen (15) feet from building 6. While staff finds the increased setbacks to be appropriate; staff finds that additional steps must be taken to further protect the acequia. Staff finds that the applicant must submit a construction management plan. The construction management plan should outline the steps taken to protect the acequia throughout the course of construction. Moreover, the formal construction plans should identify no subsurface work (utilities, grading, etc.) within 5 feet of the extant acequia. In-field protection of the acequia should include orange construction fencing and silt fencing at a buffer distance of 5 feet from the feature. No construction activities will occur within the buffer area. This fencing should be present on-site until construction is completed. As stated previously, the acequia shall not be used for storm water drainage. Furthermore, the acequia shall not be used for storage, equipment cleaning, or any other use during development that could impact the feature.
- m. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant has proposed a number of architectural details that are found historically within the River Road Historic District, including roof forms and materials. As noted in finding j, all ganged windows should be separated by a mullion of at least six (6) inches in width. Additionally, staff finds that appropriate foundation heights should be incorporated. The Guidelines note that foundations in new construction should be within one (1) foot of those found historically on the block.
- n. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that include standing seam metal roofs, composite siding with both board and batten and lap details, and brick. Generally, staff finds the proposed materials to be appropriate. The proposed standing seam metal roofs should feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, crimped ridge seams or low profile ridge caps and a standard galvalume finish. If a low profile ridge cap is to be used,

it must be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval. The applicant has noted a four inch exposure and smooth finish for lap siding; however, staff finds that board and batten siding should feature boards that are approximately twelve (12) inches wide, with batten that are approximately 1 ½ inches wide.

- o. WINDOW MATERIALS – Per the applicant’s submitted documents, an aluminum clad wood window is to be installed. Additionally, the applicant has submitted a window installation detail noting that windows will be sufficiently recessed within openings, per staff’s standards for windows in new construction. Staff finds that all standards for windows in new construction should be followed. These standards are found above in the applicable citations.
- p. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per the UDC and Historic Design Guidelines, all mechanical and service equipment, to include trash enclosures are to be screened from view at the public right of way. The applicant is responsible for complying with this requirement.
- q. AUTOMOBILE ACCESS – The applicant has proposed units to be constructed on Trail to the eastern most extent of the lot. As proposed, automobile access would dead end, as currently existing on Trail. The applicant is responsible for all compliance with Transportation and Capital Improvements in regards to access for emergency vehicles and automobile traffic.
- r. PARKING ON TRAIL – For units on Trail, the applicant has proposed parking spaces in front of the proposed units, as well as parking within the landscaped courtyard between buildings 5 and 6. The Guidelines for Site Elements discourage the addition off-street parking areas within the front yard setback as to not disrupt the continuity of the streetscape. They also indicate that access to parking areas should utilize alleys or secondary streets. The predominant parking configuration in this residential district is a single driveway located to one side of the primary structure. Traditional front lawn spaces are also a distinctive characteristic of the district. This portion of Trail Street features two homes with a traditional driveway configuration, one commercial parking lot, and one street-facing overhead garage door. The remainder of the street consists of privacy fences. As proposed, the parking configuration responds to previous recommendations and creates the appearance of traditional front yard spaces for each unit. The Guidelines for Site Elements 3.D.i. notes that mature trees and heritage trees should be preserved and protected. The addition of new spaces in the landscaped courtyard should be further evaluated to avoid impacts to the existing heritage oak which is proposed to be retained.
- s. LANDSCAPING – The applicant has submitted landscaping information that notes the locations of various landscaping materials, as well as the locations of existing, and heritage trees. Generally, staff finds the proposed landscaping plan to be appropriate.
- t. SITE DESIGN - The applicant has submitted a drainage plan to include an on-site rainwater catchment system (cisterns) and permeable pavers within driveways to handle rooftop and pavement drainage. The cisterns and pavers will be designed to capture a two year (2-yr) storm event, or approximately the first four (4) inches of rainfall. Rainfall in excess of the 2-yr storm or in areas that do not drain to the pavers would be captured by drains throughout the site and conveyed to the proposed on-site detention pond at the northeast corner of the site. The detention pond will release water along Huisache. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a small wall/curb to deter runoff from entering the acequia from the site. Public Works Stormwater Review staff has determined that the overall drainage plan would result in a reduction of runoff entering the acequia adjacent to the site when compared to existing conditions. Public Works staff also concurs that the design is generally compliant with storm water code requirements and does not use the acequia as part of the proposed drainage infrastructure.
- u. SIDEWALKS – The UDC requires that a pedestrian sidewalk be provided across properties. The applicant has received an administrative variance to not install sidewalks from Development Services Department. The applicant and neighborhood are in agreement on not installing sidewalks.
- v. TREE PRESERVATION – The applicant has submitted a tree preservation plan noting percentages of trees, including heritage trees that have been preserved.

- w. ARCHAEOLOGY – The archaeological investigation has been completed. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
- x. ARCHAEOLOGY – Staff has general concern about the sensitivity of the site and the impacts of construction to the acequia. Detailed construction management plans should be developed and provided prior to permitting that includes the limits of construction in proximity to the historic acequia and measures taken to mitigate potential impacts during construction. The UDC Section 35-672 does not allow drainage into the acequia.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Item A: Staff recommends that the proposal has been sufficiently revised to warrant approval of a waiver of the one year time limitation. Previously, the HDRC did not approve such a waiver based on the documented revisions, and the current request has not been substantially modified from the date of this previous action.

Item B: If a waiver is approved, then staff recommends approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following stipulations:

- i. That the proposed parking spaces in the heritage oak courtyard be eliminated or designed to avoid any negative impacts to the preserved tree. The parking design should be developed with a licensed arborist and coordinated between OHP and the City Arborist.
- ii. That front setbacks along Huisache be accurately represented and that all portions of Buildings 1 or 2 meet or exceed the front setback established by the primary wall planes of the existing homes on Huisache per finding e.
- iii. That all windows follow staff's standards for windows in new construction as noted in finding n.
- iv. That all ganged windows be separated by a mullion of at least six (6) inches in width as noted in the findings.
- v. That the proposed standing seam metal roofs feature panels that are 18 to 21 inches wide, seams that are 1 to 2 inches in height, a crimped ridge seam or a low profile ridge cap, and a standard galvalume finish. If a low profile ridge cap is used, it must be submitted to OHP staff for review and approval. Additionally, all other materials are to adhere to the specifications outlined in finding m.
- vi. That the applicant use a foundation height that is within one (1) foot of those found historically on Trail, as noted in finding l.
- vii. That all mechanical equipment be screened from view at the public right of way as noted in finding o.
- viii. That the applicant comply with all Transportation and Capital Improvements department requirements regarding emergency vehicle access, automobile access, storm water management and parking.
- ix. ARCHAEOLOGY – The archaeological investigation has been completed. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology. The Upper Labor Acequia shall be preserved and shall not be impacted by new construction. Staff has general concern about the sensitivity of the site and the impacts of construction to the acequia. Detailed construction management plans should be developed and provided prior to final approval that includes the limits of construction in proximity to the historic acequia and measures taken to mitigate potential impacts during construction. The UDC Section 35-672 does not allow drainage into the acequia. Moreover, the formal construction plans should identify no subsurface work (utilities, grading, etc.) within 5 feet of the extant acequia. In-field protection of the acequia should include orange construction fencing and silt fencing at a buffer distance of 5 feet from the feature. No construction activities will occur within the buffer area. This fencing should be present on-site until construction is completed. As stated previously, the

acequia shall not be used for storm water drainage. Furthermore, the acequia shall not be used for storage, equipment cleaning, or any other use during development that could impact the feature. (The applicant has noted that they will comply with this stipulation.)

**PUBLIC COMMENTS: SUPPORT:** Trayce Cerwick- support the property location for business, airport, and DT. Site looks very well throughout and attractive. Kristi Marmorstein- supports project because it brings new quality housing in this area as a chance to bring together a small infill project and attract more families closer to the downtown area. Jim Young-beliefs SA can benefit greatly from appropriate density that serves variety of income levels. Jana Sullivan- had initial concerns, and now supports development after Mr. Morin explained. Frank Garrison- nice to see townhomes and smaller multifamily sites in the area. Dr. Sandi Wolff supports project as been thoughtfully developed and Commissioners have worked with applicant for an appropriate solution. Tom Googles-support of the efforts of changes. Lucy Wilson- Wonderful asset to the neighborhood Robert Price- approves of the design and developer has gone a long way and happy to save the oak tree. Kevin Dela Garza- supports that the townhouses bring life to the neighborhood. Jessica Cervantes- support of the project because they are looking to pick up the livelihood around there. Rosemary Martinez- supports the efforts. Frank Navarro now supports the project after the improvements that have been done. Benjamin Sanders- supports project. Charles Morin- supports development. Daniel Harvey- public amenities sees that this is an appropriate project for the development and move forward. Derek Alonso Salinas- support projects because it is good development and economic advantages within this project

**Oppose-** Beth Bender Wells- not enough

CSSA- it offers minor alterations not enough substantial change in the plans.

Mary A Kunz- massing and scaling issues, Richard Reed- current reviews do not have substantial changes and oppose. Mark Canaan- suggests the waiver to be denied because there are not substantial change. Myfe Moore- disrespectful and disconcert from the developer. Blanquita Sullivan- no significant change, as scaling and massing still being inappropriate- deny the request. Christopher Cullum- opposes. Christopher Christal- no new substantive change and integrity of the neighborhood. Sarah Christal- new substantive change- on scaling and density. David Schmidt- does not respect the content of the neighborhood. Mark Valadez-reconsider approval. William Jack Sibley- wishes to stick to the 2021 mandate. Margaret Day- opposes because the drainage issues have not been addressed properly and explains how it will affect the acequia.

. George Nash- oppose to case and supports to deny COA. Barbara Witte Howell- opposes- supports and inclusion and direct solutions- but believes are not enough parking, and massing issues. Emily Ferry- opposes projects- against project, due to density, parking issues and to many units, and not enough change has occurred.

John Hertz- opposes- to massive, to dense, and to many units. Patricia Pratchett- oppose as there are number of mis-representations- scaling and massing issues. Mimi Quintanilla- not speaking to developers enough, and not appropriate for the district.

Royce Schweers- not appropriate yet. Due to density and scaling. Gemma Kennedy- opposes to case insufficient changes and not appropriate for CoA. Raleigh Wood- opposes as there are not sufficient changes and requests to deny the waiver. Larry Clark- not sufficient changes and developer has not listened and substantial evidence or changes for the project to be approved.

Motion: Commissioner Grube moved to approve the waiver based on substantial change based on staff findings and application submitted.  
Commissioner Arreola seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Arreola, Carpenter, Grube, and Bowman.  
Nays: Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, and Fetzer.  
Absent: Martinez-Flores and Laffoon.

mtg Minutes 7.29.20

**Action:** MOTION FAILED with 5 AYES AND 4 NAY. 2 ABSENT  
***\*NEEDS TO HAVE A MINIMUM OF 6 COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL IN ORDER FOR MOTION TO PASS\****

**ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer  
Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey Fetzer', written over the printed name and title.