

**City of Alamo Heights**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**MINUTES**  
March 17, 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, March 17, 2015, at 5:30 p.m.

Members present and composing a quorum of the Board:

Paul Fagan, Chair  
John Gaines  
Al Honigblum  
Grant McFarland  
Mike McGlone  
Phil Solomon

Members absent:

Mary Bartlett

Staff present:

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

\*\*\*\*\*

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Fagan at 5:33p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. McFarland made a motion to approve the minutes of February 17, 2015 as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Solomon.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Honigblum, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon

AGAINST: None

\*\*\*\*\*

**Case No. 578 P – Request of Frank Burney, applicant, representing Aragon Properties, Ltd, owner, for the preliminary design review of the proposed replacement structure(s) at the property located at 110 Chichester (No Action Required)**

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Mickey Conrad, Architect, spoke regarding the case. They propose a 12,000 sq ft, owner occupied structure. They added that they propose a “No Rise” impact on the floodway and explained the proposed placement of the building adding that compliance with the requirements allowed for enhancement of the proposed.

Mr. Honigblum expressed his concerns regarding the proposed drive aisle and asked if the parking was appropriate for the use. Mr. Conrad responded. He informed that a dumpster was not proposed and that the cleaning service would haul away waste.

Mr. Gaines questioned the proposed materials. Additional questions regarding the floodway/floodplain followed. Mr. Conrad stated that rotating the building would not have the same presence the clients are seeking. Mr. Solomon felt that the proposed had a lot of hardscape and went on to ask regarding the proposed landscaping. Mr. McGlone stated that sidewalks should not be against the curbs at Chichester to be able to function better. Mr. Conrad responded that there was no sidewalk at the south side of Chichester currently but were proposing to install one. He added that there was an existing sidewalk at the north end of Chichester.

Mr. Solomon asked questions regarding the proposed lighting on the property. He added that they were not at that level yet but proposes not affecting residential properties, if any.

Chairman Fagan asked if the board had reached a consensus regarding the placement of the building and sidewalks or if they had any other concerns they needed to pass on to the applicant. The board responded. Mr. Solomon stated that they were setting a precedence with the setbacks and should keep a minimum width on all sidewalks they see in the future in an effort to be consistent. A five-foot wide sidewalk would provide relief from the street. 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 updated on the case informing of Council's results. Chairman Fagan asked why the case had been referred back for further review. Mr. Lutz responded adding that the exterior materials were of concern. An open discussion followed regarding stone versus hardi plank materials. Mr. Honigblum stated that he didn't not like the revisions presented adding that the presented was not compatible. Mr. Gaines added that they were satisfied with the design elements and felt uncomfortable telling applicants that they should use one particular siding over another given it was their project and their money.

The board expressed their concerns regarding the project having been referred back by City Council for further review after having delayed the project thirty days to the next regularly scheduled meeting so that the applicant could make revisions which led to the board recommending approval. Mr. Gaines added that there was a lot of hardi plank in the neighborhood. Mr. McGlone stated that maybe the issue was that the structure was one complete uniform material but agreed with Mr. Gaines statement about limiting applicants to certain types of exterior materials. An open discussion followed regarding the previously presented materials in comparison to the current. Mr. Lutz clarified that Council expressed a preference for the stone material but was not meant as direction for the applicant.

Mr. Gaines asked regarding the concerns of the windows. Mr. Lutz informed that the concern was because of the height of the proposed structure compared to the one on the left and being able to "peer" into the home. Mr. Honigblum asked if the proposed met looming standards and Mr. Lutz responded that it did. Mr. McGlone reminded the board that they did have a discussion with the adjacent property owner at the previous meeting. Mr. Honigblum added that they had come to a consensus about the placement of the windows. Mr. Gaines stated that the existing houses had windows that were appropriately configured and consistent throughout and didn't understand why they should ask new builders to reshape or minimize their windows, creating large wall spaces that are not broken up by windows creating an incompatibility. Mr. McGlone spoke regarding the design changes and how the design is modified in an effort to please neighbors but unfortunately making the design more chaotic.

Trey Siller, applicant, spoke regarding the Council's concerns and his working with the neighbors beginning in October 2014. Mr. Siller questioned the fact that the case was referred back for further review asking how many cases had been referred back in the past. The board responded. Mr. Gaines added that the political nature of the concerns had entered into the design process making it difficult and mistreats someone who is trying to accomplish that is positive for the neighborhood.

Chairman Fagan asked Mr. McGlone to briefly speak regarding the board's previous discussion on placement of windows. Mr. McGlone spoke regarding the discussion and the proposed design.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:

April Dickson, 207 Montclair (opposed)

Sam Wright, 246 Montclair (in favor)

Fran Parsons, 212 Montclair (opposed)

Zachry Stinson, 222 Montclair (in favor)

Albert Dickson, 207 Montclair (opposed)

Zachry Stinson read a statement on behalf of Linda Christie, 234 Montclair, expressing favor of the proposed.

Mr. Lutz stated that the case had been referred back as Council felt that the proposed design was not compatible. Mr. Gaines questioned the basis for incompatibility noting the proposed materials or the front yard setback. He added that every design reviewed by the board has some type of opposition. Mr. McGlone felt that the case was referred back possibly because they could not agree unanimously on the design. Mr. Gaines stated that the board was not faced with asking the developer to come up with a design that everyone was happy with adding that he didn't think that was the board's charge. He went on to say that their charge was to look at the designs presented to the board, which they did. Mr. Gaines added that they went through an appropriate process, delayed the project to allow the applicant to return with revisions that satisfied certain standards. He felt that they could not accommodate taste and could not be done by political measure. He expressed his concerns regarding lack of direction to be able to propose modifications.

Jim Taylor, Planning & Zoning Commissioner, asked the board to clarify regarding the front setback. The board responded. Commissioner Taylor stated that the applicant chose to exercise his right to build to the setback but also, from a neighborly point of view, chose to ignore the fundamental stability along the street which respects the street line. He suggested simplifying the front façade. Mr. Gaines responded. Mr. Honigblum stated that the board has spent a lot of time working with the applicant and asked if the board could recommend approval of the previous design. Mr. Gaines asked for clarification on the meeting date when the board recommended approval.

Mr. Gaines made motion to repropose the design approved at the January 20, 2015 Architectural Review Board meeting and resubmit said design as approved to City Council. Mr. McFarland seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Fagan, Gaines, Honigblum, McFarland, Solomon

AGAINST: McGlone

\*\*\*\*\*

**Case No. 575 F – Request of Jerry & Judy Pierce, owners, for the significance review of the structures located at 217 Alta Ave under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010) in order to demolish 100% of the existing main structures.**

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Jerry Pierce, owner, spoke regarding the proposed demolition.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:

Beverly Barhop, 214 Alta

Ray Novak, 225 Alta

Mr. McFarland made a motion to declare that the existing structure does not meet the significance requirements as set out in the code and recommended approval of the demolition. Mr. Honigblum seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following votes:  
FOR: Gaines, Honigblum, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon  
AGAINST: None

\*\*\*\*\*

**Case No. 576 F – Request of Uptmore Custom Homes, LLC, owner, for the compatibility review of the proposed main structure located at 610 Ogden Lane 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, owner, spoke regarding the case.

The proposed is a custom home for a buyer. Mr. McGlone expressed concerns with the proposed design. The board asked several questions regarding the streetscape. Mr. Uptmore informed that the proposed buyers had worked diligently with the surrounding neighbors to be able to address any concerns they had. Mr. McGlone expressed his concerns regarding the roof plan. He suggested altering the proposed roof.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:  
Jeff Lubick, 415 Normandy (favor)

Mr. Gaines questioned the design and what they were trying to achieve with the proposed. He asked if altering the roof would alter the design of the home. An open discussion followed regarding the proposed roof, drainage, and exterior materials.

Mr. Honigblum made a motion to recommend approval of the design as compatible with two modifications: 1) remove the shed roof at the rear of the building allowing it to die underneath the flat roof above and 2) that the rock material used in the front of the house be more in the family of grey cut lueders limestone. Mr. McFarland seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following votes:  
FOR: Gaines, Honigblum, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon  
AGAINST: None

Mr. Uptmore asked permission to address the board. He stated that he understood the previous builder's frustration although he didn't agree with the design. He stated that having gone to the council meeting where they addressed what was approved by the ARB, there seemed to be a disconnect. The board agreed.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Case No. 579 F – Request of Patrick W Christensen, applicant, representing University of the Incarnate Word, owner, for the final design review of the proposed replacement structure and renovations at the properties located at 4600 Broadway & 107, 111, and 115 Burr Rd under Chapter 2 Administration for Architectural Review.**

Mr. Lutz presented the case. A discussion followed regarding lighting and exterior materials/colors. Mr. Christensen spoke regarding the Planning & Zoning meeting. Commissioner Taylor spoke regarding the proceeding adding that they did not have jurisdiction over certain items.

Mr. McGlone stated there should be no spill over to the east or to the residential area behind the neighboring bank. Mr. Solomon asked for clarification regarding the landscape buffer and proposed materials.

Jim Taylor, Planning & Zoning Commissioner and Commercial Code Committee Chairman, spoke regarding mitigation and encouraged the applicant to mitigate on site. He suggested the applicant

returning with a more detailed landscaping plan, including plants conducive to the area and drought resistant, and a mitigation plan.

The board discussed the proposed placement of the windows, design of the building, and exterior materials. Mr. McGlone asked if the applicant had a roof plan with rooftop units (RTU) for their review. One was not provided by the applicant.

Mr. McGlone suggested having a member of the board present at that upcoming Council meeting. Chairman Fagan agreed.

Mr. Honigblum made a motion to recommend conditional approval pending the following items return to ARB for further review: 1) review landscape and lighting plans, 2) all exterior elements, 3) roof plan with location of the RTU's, 4) starting in the alley, going towards Burr Rd, relocate first man door to alley side, eliminate second man door, and replace both panels with spandrel glass, 5) review all exterior signage, and 6) consider possibly eliminating one or two parking spaces at the rear of the property to accommodate shade trees for the rear parking lot. The revised site plan shall include as much mitigation as possible along Broadway, the parking lot, the alleyway, Burr Rd, and rear alley buffer. The motion was seconded by Mr. McGlone.

The motion was approved with the following votes:

FOR: Gaines, Honigblum, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon

AGAINST: None

\*\*\*\*\*

There being no further business, Mr. Gaines made a motion to adjourn. Mr. McFarland seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 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)

ACTING  
CHAIR

04/21/2015

Date Signed & Filed



Lety Hernandez  
Planner  
Community Development Services