

City of Alamo Heights
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
February 23, 2021

The Architectural Review Board held a special meeting via Zoom and telephone conference on Tuesday, February 23, 2021, at 5:30p.m. due to pandemic, COVID-19, also known as coronavirus.

Members composing a quorum of the Board:

John Gaines, Chairman
Mary Bartlett
Diane Hays
Mike McGlone
Phil Solomon
Lyndsay Thorn

Members absent:

Grant McFarland

Staff members present:

Nina Shealey, Assistant City Manager
Lety Hernandez, Planner
Richard Lindner, City Attorney

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gaines at 5:36 p.m.

Mr. McGlone moved to approve the meeting minutes of November 17, 2020 and December 15, 2020. Mr. Thorn seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 830 S – Request of Comet Signs, applicant, for permanent signage at 5410 Broadway St (CareNow Urgent Care)

Ms. Shealey presented the case and provided background on the previously approved façade signage. Steve Munson of Comet Signs was available and addressed the board.

There were discussions regarding the proposed design and location. The board expressed concerns due to the amount of signage and felt that the proposed was out of proportion to the building. Staff clarified adding that the City does not dictate lighting based on the size of the signs. They expressed concerns regarding placement due to its proximity to the parking area. An open discussion followed.

Case No. 827 F – Request of David R. Youngquist of Cobblestone Investments, applicant, representing Rachel Kenney, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure located at 218 Normandy in order to demolish 100% of the existing single-family residence and accessory structure(s) under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The applicant was present and addressed the board. He spoke regarding the project and that they would return for the compatibility review.

Chairman Gaines opened for public comment but no one was present to speak regarding the case.

Mr. Thorn moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the demolition as requested. Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 829 F – Request of Peter DeWitt, AIA, applicant, representing Elizabeth and John Diggs, owners, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 406 Kokomo in order to construct an addition to the rear and side of the existing single-family residence with attached garage under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The applicant was present and addressed the board. He spoke regarding the design and that the exterior finish materials would be the same as the existing.

The board asked for clarification regarding the roof over the north side addition and the applicant responded. The board commended on the presentation and proposed design.

Chairman Gaines opened for public comment but no one was present to speak regarding the case.

Mr. Thorn moved to recommend approval of the design as compatible. Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 831 F – Request of Faustino Mancha Jr of Fauman Construction, applicant, representing Cipriano Espino, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure located at 103 Elmview E in order to demolish 100% of the existing single-family residence and accessory structure(s) under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The applicant was present and addressed the board stating that plans were in process and would submit for review in the future. Chairman Gaines opened for public comment but no one was present to speak regarding the case.

Mr. Thorn moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the demolition as requested. Ms. Bartlett seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 833 F – Request of Jim and Sharon Spivey, owners, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 320 Primrose in order to demolish 66% of the existing roof and 53% of the street facing façade in order to remodel and add to the front and rear of the existing single-family residence with attached accessory structure under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. Mrs. Spivey, owner, and Krystal Weidner, AIA, were present and addressed the board. Ms. Weidner spoke regarding the proposed project.

The board questioned regarding the proposed exterior finish materials and expressed concerns regarding the half-columns at the front porch. A discussion followed regarding the proposed cottage style porch on the current design adding that the proposed entry porch would be out of character with the rest of the home.

Chairman Gaines addressed the owner regarding the comments by the board and the owner responded. The board agreed that the porch is an extension of the character of the house stressing its importance. An open discussion followed the porch and proposed roof plan. Mrs. Spivey spoke regarding existing drainage and went on to say that she did not want to make revisions that would affect the current patterns. The board clarified regarding previous comments and felt would improve drainage. Additional suggestions were made including consistency with columns all around the house. A discussion followed regarding the design and possible changes that would allow for more consensus that would allow the owner to be comfortable with changes. The board went on to speak regarding the detailing to the columns.

Chairman Gaines opened for public comment but no one was present to speak regarding the case.

Mr. McGlone moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the demolition as requested and proposed design as compatible with the following suggestions: 1) front porch both roof slop & design of vertical elements consisting of columns, railings, etc. be re-examined and looked at in consistency with the midcentury modern style of the existing house. Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 826 F – Request Blair Jones of Blair Jones Co., owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 241 Fair Oaks E in order to demolish 100% of the existing structures and construct a new single-family residence with detached accessory structure under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The owner was available and addressed the board.

Chairman Gaines opened for public comments and the following spoke regarding the case:

John Ferguson, 231 Fair Oaks E

Susan Ferguson, 231 Fair Oaks E

Concerns of those speaking regarding the case were the scale of the replacement structure and the quality of the demolition due to pests.

Mr. Solomon moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the demolition as requested and the proposed design as compatible with the exception that the window treatments all be consistent and that trim on the long vertical window in front be removed and be consistent with the other windows. Mr. Thorn seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

ABSTAINED: McGlone

Case No. 834 F – Request of Doreen S. Patino, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 165 Claywell in order to demolish 100% of the existing residence and accessory structure(s) and construct a new single-family residence with detached accessory structure under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The owner and Corbin Lomas, AIA, were present and addressed the board.

The board asked for clarification regarding materials and design. The board expressed concerns regarding the design and detail along with the different roof pitches and style. The board informed they liked the design but felt would improve with slight revisions.

Chairman Gaines opened for public comment but no one was present to speak regarding the case.

Mr. Thorn moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the demolition as requested and proposed design as compatible with revision to front dormer treated in manner more in scale with property. He amended the motion to have the project return before the board with compatible of dormer design for further review. Mr. Solomon seconded the motion.

Mr. McGlone suggested making a motion that would allow the applicant to move on trusting that the applicant would consider the board's suggestion. Mr. Lindner spoke regarding the motion and action. The motion failed due to the unanimous consent of the board.

Ms. Patino addressed the board and expressed concerns regarding tabling the case making comparison to the previous case.

Chairman Gaines asked for clarification regarding the motion and Mr. Lindner, City Attorney, responded.

Mr. Thorn moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the demolition as presented and proposed design as compatible with design consideration and attention to be made to the dormer at the front of the residence. Mr. McGlone seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 835 F – Request of Logan Green of Green Innovations Homes, applicant, representing James Rothfelder, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 136 Claywell in order to demolish 49.72% of the existing street-facing elevation, demolish 66.12% of the existing roof, and 57.21% of all exterior walls in order to remodel and add to the existing single-family residence with attached accessory structure under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The applicant was present and addressed the board.

An open discussion followed regarding the proposed design and articulation of front façade. The board discussed the proposed design and height of the entryway and questioned the

height limitation stated by the applicant. Staff responded that the entryway, as designed, did not qualify as a porch and subject to height limitations to avoid a certain look and also not usable as a porch due to the proposed depth.

Chairman Gaines opened for public comment but no one was present to speak regarding the case.

Mr. McGlone moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the proposed design as compatible with articulation by offsetting the wall at the bathroom to meet zoning requirements. Mr. Thorn seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: None

Case No. 832 F – Request of Joseph Valdez of Valdez Designs, applicant, representing James W. and Jessica Collings, owners, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 730 Corona in order to construct a new single-family residence with detached accessory structures under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case and provided information regarding the recently approved variances by the Board of Adjustment. Phu Tran, representative of Valdez Designs, was available and addressed the board.

Bill Oliver, attorney for the McNab's who reside at 706 Corona, was present and spoke regarding the case.

Mr. McGlone moved to table the consideration of the project until resolution of a number of issues brought up by the neighbor can be addressed from the perspective of variances and reports. Mr. Thorn seconded.

Mr. Lindner, City Attorney, spoke regarding the proposed and Mr. McGlone responded. An open discussion followed.

Mr. Tran addressed the board and spoke regarding concerns from the neighbors.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn

AGAINST: Gaines

Ms. Shealey spoke regarding review of the current Residential Design Standards (RDS) and committee to participate in the process that is scheduled for the beginning of April. No action was taken.

There being no further business, Mr. Solomon moved to adjourn the meeting seconded by Ms. Bartlett. The meeting was adjourned at 10:06p.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.



John Gaines, Chairman
(Board Approval)

4/20/21

Date Signed & Filed



Lety Hernandez, Planner
Community Development Services