

City of Alamo Heights
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
March 15, 2022

The Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting at the Council Chambers of the City of Alamo Heights located at 6116 Broadway St, San Antonio, Texas on Tuesday, March 15, 2022, at 5:30 p.m.

Members present and composing a quorum of the Board:

John Gaines
Larry Gottsman
Adam Kiehne
Karl Baker
Phil Solomon

Members absent:

Diane Hays
Grant McFarland
Lyndsay Thorn

Staff members present:

Phil Laney, Assistant City Manager
Lety Hernandez, Director of Development Services
Buddy Kuhn, City Manager

The meeting was called to order by John Gaines at 5:35 pm.

Mr Gottsman moved to approve the meeting minutes of January 18, 2022 and February 15, 2022 as presented. Mr Kiehne seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: John Gaines, Larry Gottsman, Adam Kiehne, Karl Baker, Phil Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 873 F – Request of Ronald Eckels of Don B. McDonald Architect, AIA, Ltd., applicant, representing Jyl and Randy Cain, owners, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 820 Cambridge Oval in order to construct a new single-family residence with detached garage under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Hernandez presented the case. Don McDonald was present and addressed the board. Mr McDonald spoke regarding the design and the plan to keep existing oak trees.

Ronald Eckels spoke in regards to the site and intent of design, and provided sketches.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment at 5:53 p.m.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:
Ms Hardy of 904 Cambridge

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 5:55 p.m.

Mr. Gottsman moved to approve the design as compatible. Mr. Kiehne seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: John Gaines, Larry Gottsman, Adam Kiehne, Karl Baker, Phil Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 874 F – Request of Gerardo Noriega of GNA Architecture, applicant, representing Jose Gonzalez II, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 301 Encino in order to demolish 63.1% of the existing street-facing façade, demolish 64.5% of all exterior walls, and 100% of the existing roof 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 Hernandez presented the case. Mr Noriega, representing Jose Gonzalez, was present and addressed the Board.

Mr. Noriega spoke regarding the plan to remove asbestos siding and replace it with stucco siding, and to install black steel windows.

The Board asked for clarification on the proposed entrance location. Mr Noriega responded that the entrance would be on the same side of the home but a different location.

Mr Solomon raised a concern about the height of structures and the way it would look from the street. Mr Noriega responded that they planned to keep existing landscaping, which would partially block the view of the home. Discussion followed regarding landscaping, the slope of the lot, and looming heights.

The Chairman opened the public hearing at 6:11 p.m.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:
Tom McGaughy of 310 Joliet (opposed)
Claire Alexander of 251 Encino (opposed)

Concerns were raised about the height of the proposed building and the appearance from the street. Ms. Hernandez responded with information on the recent code changes and looming height regulations.

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 6:34 p.m.

Mr. Gottsman moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the design as compatible. Mr. Kiehne seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: John Gaines, Larry Gottsman, Adam Kiehne, Karl Baker, Phil Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 876 F – Request of Lyndsay Thorn Architects, PLLC, applicant, representing Stacy and Jeff Foerster, owners, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 237 Argo in order to construct a 2-story detached garage under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Hernandez presented the case. Ms Garza was present representing the applicant and addressed the Board.

The Board asked for more information on the rail seen in the designs, and a discussion followed regarding the design, specifically the windows and trellis.

Mr Kiehne moved to approve the proposed design as compatible. Mr Gottsman seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: John Gaines, Larry Gottsman, Adam Kiehne, Karl Baker, Phil Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 875 F – Request of Kris Feldmann of Creo Architects, applicant, representing Trebes Sasser Jr. of Ridgemont Properties, owner, for the final design review of the proposed multi-family structure’s design located at 111, 119, 131 & 135 Katherine Ct under Chapter 2 Administration for Architectural Review.

Ms. Hernandez presented the case. Mr Sasser was present and addressed the Board. Mr Sasser spoke on the minor changes made to plans and the other Boards they had appeared before.

Kris Feldmann spoke regarding the overall height due to reinterpretation of Code requirements. He went on to speak regarding the site plans, elevations, and landscaping plans, and the revised plans to comply with the allowable number of units and parking spaces.

Mr Feldman spoke on the impervious cover numbers on the plan and proposed impervious cover beneath the carports to add more pervious area. Discussion followed concerning the number of units in the proposed design.

The Board inquired concerning the proposed placement of the dumpster and where garbage cans would be serviced from. Mr Feldman responded that the proposed location

would be in the alley to allow for emergency services access and avoid disturbing neighbors during pickup.

Mr Kiehne asked for clarification regarding the difference between structures based on the number of units and Mr Feldman responded.

Mr Feldman spoke regarding whole process of getting plans approved and the response from the community at large and the immediate neighbors.

The Board asked if there were any changes to the proposed design based on pushback from the community. Mr Sasser responded that changes had not been made based on the community, only from Katherine Ct.

Mr Baker commended the design. Chairman Gaines spoke regarding previously approve designs adding that they were more modern than the proposed.

The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

There was a brief discussion regarding the number of responses received. Ms Hernandez was able to bring up the count on the screen.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows:
Joan Wagonich Cunningham, 137 Katherine (opposed)
Mike McGuire of 150 Katherine Ct (opposed)
John Feitshans (via teleconference) (opposed)

Concerns were raised concerning the compatibility of the design and the size of the development. Mr Wagonich expressed concerns regarding the number of responses received. Ms Hernandez confirmed the count and apologized for the oversight. Concerns of those speaking regarding the case included the issues the proposed driveway would cause in the context of the neighborhood, the lack of compatibility, parking issues, and changes to the landscaping design. Ms Cunningham provided handouts to Boards members and staff illustrating the issues she would have with her driveway if the complex is built.

Mr Gottsman left the meeting and quorum at 7:35 p.m.

John Feitshans asked if the landscape designs had been altered with the rest of the plans. Mr Feldman responded that they had not changed.

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:41 p.m.

Mr Feldman stated that there had not been any change to the landscaping since the change to the number of units.

A brief discussion followed about the driveway width and the side setbacks.

Mr Baker moved to approve design as compatible, Mr Gaines seconded.
The motion failed with the following vote:
FOR: John Gaines, Karl Baker, Phil Solomon

AGAINST: Adam Kiehne

There being no further business, Mr Kiehne moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr Gaines seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 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.



John Gaines, Chairman
(Board Approval)



Date Signed & Filed



Daniel Thale-Galat,
Community Development Services