

City of Alamo Heights
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
January 20, 2015

The Architectural Review Board held its regularly scheduled meeting at the Council Chambers of the City of Alamo Heights, located at 6116 Broadway St, on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, at 5:30 p.m.

Members present and composing a quorum of the Board:

Paul Fagan, Chair
Mary Bartlett
John Gaines
Al Honigblum
Mike McGlone

Members absent:

Grant McFarland
Phil Solomon

Staff present:

Jason B Lutz, Director of Community Development Services
Lety Hernandez, Planner

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Fagan at 5:34p.m.

Mr. Honigblum made a motion to approve the minutes from January 20, 2015. It was seconded by Mr. Gaines.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Bartlett, Gaines, Honigblum, McGlone
AGAINST: None

Case No. 571 P – Request of Broadway Ellwood, LLC, owner, for the preliminary design review of the proposed replacement structure(s) at the property located at 5514 Broadway St

Mr. Lutz presented the case adding that no action would be taken on this case. John Burnham, Argyle Residential, and Rick Archer, Overland Partners, spoke regarding the case.

Mr. Burnham clarified that they were proposing to “shut down” a portion of Ellwood and to “shut down” Ausway as well adding this was what was envisioned under the Comprehensive Plan, taking that as a guideline for what the citizens wanted to see at this location, and moving forward with the proposed design and potential purchase of the right-of-way (ROW) parcels. He provided information regarding proposed units and square footage of the proposed commercial usage. Mr. Burnham went on to speak regarding the purchase of ROW. He went on to say they had a preliminary Traffic Impact Study but were looking at completing the four-day study, a weekend and weekday, to get a real idea of the potential impact of the added traffic and closure of Ellwood and Ausway. They are not looking at asking the City to spend any money to upsize utilities – they would incur that cost. He spoke regarding parking adding that one and one-half (1.5) spaces per unit was an industry standard for residential and the commercial ratio was one (one) space per 134 sq ft. He went on to say that they had done a preliminary analysis per FEMA standards that would generate a 0% rise in the floodway and, therefore, no impact on the properties downstream of the proposed. They are in the process of completing an additional study and will be receiving results soon. Mr. Burnham spoke regarding the increase of students to the school district. They calculate the addition of five (5) students. He spoke regarding the proposed entrances and how it would be used to more accurately

project traffic. He spoke regarding the architectural firms adding that they wanted to create the nicest mixed-use development in Alamo Heights, and the greater San Antonio area. He spoke regarding “liner units”, that would be along Austin Hwy, and the articulation of the proposed building.

Mr. Fagan reminded the applicants that they should address the board and not the audience. Mr. Archer spoke regarding the proposed and how it fit within the Comprehensive Plan, although not codified. He pointed out that the proposed were items that were envisioned in the plan, although they were not proposing some of the items envisioned (i.e. six-story building). He spoke regarding the different elevations, articulation, height of the building, parking, and the liner units that would be accessible from the sidewalk in order to be life to the street adding that this was what envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Archer spoke regarding the trees within the City and the commercial corridor.

Mr. Burnham spoke regarding the increase in real estate taxes at an estimated 30 million dollars and its economic impact.

Mr. Gaines asked for clarification regarding the “liner units”. Mr. Archer responded. Mr. Honigblum asked for clarification regarding the proposed sizes of the different size units. Mr. Burnham responded.

There was an open discussion regarding the right-of-way and parking.

Those present and speaking in opposition of the case were as follows:

Elliott Weser, 301 Lamont Ave
Pryn Hildebrand, 320 Primrose
Lisa Price, 207 Alta Ave
John Joseph, 206 Joliet
Marcia Goren Weser, 301 Lamont Ave
Sylvia Wong, 407 Circle St
Debra Nason, 111 Redwood
Julian Hall, 515 Circle St

Those present and speaking in favor of the case were as follows:

Mitch Meyer, 9 Penny Lane

Concerns of the citizens included density, traffic impact, location, flood, selling of public land, lack of water, and dysfunction of the overall process. Citizens were in favor of reduction in the building height, not selling of public land, progress in the City.

Mr. Burnham, Mr. Gaines, and Mr. Honigblum spoke regarding the proposed density. Mr. Honigblum spoke regarding the flood issues adding that the project would need to prove a “no rise” in the BFE before any construction would commence. There was a discussion regarding water usage and compared the differences between a single family residence and apartment usage. Mr. McGlone spoke regarding the review process and how the board is an advisory body only. He added that their role was to look at the scale, landscaping, etc.

Mr. Gaines reminded attendees to keep comments to the architectural design of the proposed. Ms. Bartlett added if the project gets approval from other boards, they would like to see examples of materials. Mr. Gaines agreed with Ms. Bartlett adding that this concept, or another, would be a centerpiece type of development in the community.

No action was taken.

Case No. 567 F – Request of Ironside Building Group, applicant, representing Jacyn Calhoun, owner, for the compatibility review of the proposed structure located at 208 Montclair under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010) in order to construct a new single family residence

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Trey Siller of Ironside Building Group, and owner, addressed the board. Mr. Fagan asked for the applicant to update on the recent modifications and Mr. Siller updated.

Mr. McGlone asked for clarification regarding there being no closets illustrated in the bedrooms. Mr. Siller informed that as the proposed was a spec home, they would leave it to the buyer to choose or place them where best functional. Mr. McGlone spoke regarding the placement of the windows while not affecting the interior. Ms. Bartlett agreed adding that there were other options to not affect the privacy of the neighbors. There was an open discussion regarding placement of the windows and the proposed floorplan. Mr. Siller agreed adding that they changes had been made due to privacy concerns of the neighbors although they had not specifically asked for that size window(s). A discussion followed between the board members and Mr. Siller regarding placement of the windows and their sizes. The board felt that consistency was key adding that clearstory windows would not break up the mass.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:

Albert Dickson, 207 Montclair (opposed)
Fran Parsons, 212 Montclair (opposed)
Zachry Stinson, 222 Montclair (favor)
Linda Christie, 234 Montclair (favor)
Lars Lunsford, 239 Montclair (favor)
Paul Watkins, 215 Montclair (opposed)
Veronica Pierce, 215 Montclair (opposed)
Sam Wright, 246 Montclair (favor)

Concerns of the citizens in opposition included placement of the structure, design, and mass. Citizens in favor commended the improvements, design, lots of windows, construction of a single family residence instead of a multi-family structure, willingness of the builder to work with neighbors, compatibility of the proposed with the community, and variation amongst the houses.

Mr. Gaines stated that Alamo Heights was not a cookie-cutter community and that variability was a positive if done correctly. Mr. Honigblum asked the applicant if he would be willing to push the structure back 4ft as compromise and the builder responded that he did not want to lose more of the backyard as they are already made adjustments to the rear porch.

Mr. Fagan asked for suggestions regarding the windows. Mr. Gaines suggested mirroring the other elevation.

Mr. Honigblum moved to approve the proposed design as compatible recommending approval with the modification on the west elevation to delete the two (2) clear story windows in the master bedroom to the north and replace with two (2) 3'0"x7'0", separated. On the 2nd story, replace clear story with two (2) 3'0"x5'0" independent windows. Mr. Gaines seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Bartlett, Gaines, Honigblum, McGlone
AGAINST: None

Case No. 568 F – Request of Uptmore Homes, owner, for the significance review of the structures located at 610 Ogden Lane under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010) in order to demolish 100% of the existing main structure

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Jack Uptmore spoke regarding the case. He spoke regarding the subdivision of the lot and the disrepair of the existing structure.

Mr. Gaines made a motion to declare the structure as not significant and recommend approval of the demolition as requested contingent upon completion of pest and rodent abatement procedures be completed prior to the demolition. Ms. Bartlett seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Bartlett, Gaines, Honigblum, McGlone

AGAINST: None

Case No. 569 F – Request of Uptmore Homes, owner, for the significance and compatibility review of the structures located at 421 Normandy under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010) in order to construct a new single family residence

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Jack Uptmore spoke regarding the case.

Mr. Fagan asked for clarification regarding the Pecan tree in the front yard setback classified as a removal near the existing driveway. Staff responded. Mr. McGlone expressed his concerns regarding the proposed circular drive. An open discussion followed.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:

Sarah Reveley, 436 Corona (opposed)

Milby Hartwell, 431 Corona (neutral)

Concerns of the neighbors included removal of the trees, notification procedures, and proposed streetscape.

Ms. Bartlett made a motion to declare the structure as not significant recommending approval of the demolition as requested and recommending approval of the compatible design contingent upon completion of pest and rodent abatement procedures be completed prior to the demolition. Mr. Honigblum seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Bartlett, Gaines, Honigblum, McGlone

AGAINST: None

Case No. 570 F – Request of David & Jenna Rose, owners, for the significance and compatibility review of the structure located at 152 E Edgewood Place under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010) in order to demolish 100% of the existing roof

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Mr. and Mrs. Rose, owners, spoke regarding the case.

Mr. Gaines asked for clarification and suggested extending the eave/overhang of the 2nd floor on the east/west access. Mr. Rose responded that it would be consistent but not visible from the front due to

two (2) large trees in front of the residence. Mr. McGlone suggested extending the addition or centering it to give a symmetrical look.

Mr. McGlone made a motion to declare the structure as not significant recommending approval of the design as compatible. The applicant shall have the option to 1) to relocate the 2nd story volume more to the center of the house or 2) increase the footprint of the 2nd floor volume at their discretion recommending that the overhangs and barge rafters on the gable ends be consistent with the existing house. Mr. Honigblum seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Bartlett, Gaines, Honigblum, McGlone

AGAINST: None

Case No. 566 F – Request of Daniel Salazar of Ideal Shoes, applicant, for installation of one (1) storage shed on an existing permanent foundation and enclosure of the existing front canopy at the property located at 6421 Broadway St under Chapter 2 Administration for Architectural Review

Mr. Fagan announced that the case was rescheduled for the February 17, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Lutz updated on recent City Council actions on ARB cases.

There being no further business, Mr. Honigblum made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Gaines seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING ARE ALSO DIGITALLY RECORDED, AND THESE MINUTES ARE ONLY A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING. THESE MINUTES ARE NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND DO NOT PURPORT TO INCLUDE ALL IMPORTANT EVIDENCE PRESENTED OR STATEMENTS MADE.



Paul Fagan, Chair
(Board Approval)

2/17/15
Date Signed & Filed



Lety Hernandez
Planner
Community Development Services