

City of Alamo Heights
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
April 21, 2020

The Architectural Review Board held a regular meeting via telephone conference on Tuesday, April 21, 2020, at 5:30p.m. due to pandemic, COVID-19, also known as coronavirus.

Members composing a quorum of the Board via roll call:

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

Members absent:

None

Staff members present:

Nina Shealey, Assistant City Manager
Lety Hernandez, Planner

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gaines at 5:32 p.m.

Mr. McFarland moved to approve the meeting minutes of December 03, 2019, December 17, 2019, and January 21, 2020 as presented. Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

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

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn
AGAINST: None

Case No. 793 S – Request of Sign-A-Rama, applicant, for permanent signage at 6403 Broadway (Atos Brazilian Jiu-Jitsu).

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

The board posed questions regarding the design and materials. The applicant responded.

After further discussion, Mr. McFarland moved to approved the signage as submitted. Ms. Hays seconded the motion.

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

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

AGAINST: None

Case No. 778 F – Request of Jorge Cavazos and Yvette Almendarez, owners, for the significance review of the existing main structure in order to demolish 100% of the existing residence located at 223 Allen and compatibility review of the proposed design in order to construct a new single-family residence with the detached accessory structure under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey announced that the case was postponed until further notice. No action was taken.

Case No. 792 F – Request of Frank and Erica Ramos, applicant, representing Nancy Carson Baldrige, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure in order to demolish 100% of the existing main structure and accessory structures located at 301 College under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. Mr. and Mrs. Ramos addressed the board. A discussion of the state of the existing structure followed and the owners spoke regarding the demolition and clarified regarding future design. The board asked that the tree survey be updated and present the information for accuracy.

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

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

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

AGAINST: None

Case No. 794 F – Request of Aaron Recko, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure located at 133 Montclair and compatibility review of the proposed design in order to demolish 100% of the existing residence 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. Mr. Recko addressed the board.

The board discussed the window placement and the proposed design of the roof, specifically the hip at the rear. They also expressed concerns regarding the proposed detached accessory structure and its intended use.

The board expressed concerns regarding the window finestra and the lack of consistency in addition to the proposed roof design. It was suggested to revise the roof to avoid looming into the back area. Mr. McGlone suggested that a Dutch gable would address both.

Chairman Gaines commended on the design and added that he felt it was pleasant and complimented the surrounding. He added that he agreed and that the changes would add more symmetry. An open discussion followed and the owner asked for a more definitive direction to have the architect revise the design.

Mr. McGlone questioned staff regarding the flatwork and impervious coverage on the lot. He also questioned the circular driveway and if it was grandfathered if he was changing everything else. Staff responded.

Those speaking regarding the case were as follows:
Mary Judson, 129 Montclair (in favor)

Mr. McGlone moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the design as compatible with the following stipulations: 1) eliminate the rear roof hip at the main structure and convert to Dutch gable and 2) that the window style be consistent over the entire house. Mr. Thorn seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:
FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, McGlone, Solomon, Thorn
AGAINST: McFarland
ABSTAINED: Hays

Mr. Thorn announced he would reclude himself from the next item due to interest in the case.

Case No. 795 F – Request of Lyndsay Thorn, Architect, representing Santiago and Olga Lizeth Morin, owners for the significance review of the existing main structure located at 236 Tuxedo and compatibility review of the proposed design in order to demolish 79% of all exterior facing walls, demolish 71% of the street facing façade, demolish 100% of the existing roof, and construct a new single-family residence under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. Marcus Guerra, representative, addressed the board.

The board discussed the design and expressed concerns regarding the cast stone entry on the front façade. They felt that it needed to be larger for a more balanced look. There was discussion regarding the stone design around the front entrance. The board felt that it needed to be wider and taller to be better proportioned. An open discussion followed.

Mr. McGlone moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the design as compatible with the following stipulations: 1) increase the width and height of the case stone entry around the entry for more balance. Mr. Solomon seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:
FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, Hays, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon
AGAINST: None

Mr. Thorn announced his return to the quorum at 7:13p.m.

Case No. 796 F – Request of Jack Uptmore of Uptmore LLC, owner, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 202 Inslee in order to construct a new single-family residence with detached accessory under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. Mr. Uptmore addressed the board.

There was a discussion regarding the windows and concern with the window placement, sizes, and lack of consistency. The board added that the goal should be to have proportion on top and bottom.

The board questioned if they were proposing any landscaping due to the long façade. Mr. Uptmore informed that they would be installing a 6ft high fence in the future. Mr. McGlone suggested larger windows since the fence would provide privacy. Chairman Gaines agreed. The owner responded to their concerns. Chairman Gaines stated that the window consistency is pleasing and appropriate in older residences and felt that it was appropriate to discuss. An open discussion followed.

Mr. Thorn moved to recommended approval of the design as compatible with the following stipulations regarding the proposed east elevation: 1) rotate the bedroom window to a vertical aspect and 2) have at least one vertical window on the first floor to be consistent with those on the front façade. Mr. Solomon seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote via roll call:
FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, McGlone, McFarland, Solomon, Thorn
AGAINST: Hays

A discussion followed regarding signage and enforcement. The board expressed concerns regarding business owners putting up signage up even after signs are denied. Ms. Shealey responded.

There being no further business, Mr. Thorn moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Hays seconded the motion and unanimous vote via roll call. The meeting was adjourned at 8:49p.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)

07/21/2020

Date Signed & Filed



Eoly Hernandez, Planner
Community Development Services