City of Alamo Heights ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

June 20, 2017

The Architectural Review Board held a regularly scheduled meeting at the Council Chambers of the City of Alamo Heights, located at 6116 Broadway St, on Tuesday, June 20, 2017, at 5:30 p.m.

Members present and composing a quorum of the Board:

John Gaines, Chairman Mary Bartlett Diane Hays Mike McGlone Phil Solomon Jill Souter

Members absent:

Grant McFarland

Staff present:

Jason B Lutz, Director of Community Development Services Chief Buddy Kuhn, Fire Department Lety Hernandez, Planner Eli Briseno, Combination Inspector

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gaines at 5:35p.m.

Mr. Solomon moved to approve the minutes of May 16, 2017 as presented. Ms. Souter seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

None

FOR:

Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Souter

AGAINST:

Case No. 672 S – Request of Budget Signs, applicant, for permanent signage at 5231 Broadway, Suite 105 (Pureline Nutrition Store)

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Katy Weilder of Budget Signs, applicant, was present and clarified that the proposed would be internally illuminated.

Mr. McGlone questioned if there would be any signage applied to the storefront. Mr. Lutz informed that hours of operation and phone numbers were allowed. Ms. Souter questioned if staff was working with applicants regarding the limitation of signage. Mr. Lutz responded. Ms. Souter went on to ask the applicant if they were aware of the sign limitations and the applicant responded. Mr. McGlone suggested the applicant show the storefront as a whole and Ms. Bartlett went on to say that it should be okay for the board to act on the presented. An open discussion took place.

Mr. Solomon moved to approve the signage as presented. Ms. Bartlett seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR:

Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Souter

AGAINST:

None

Case No. 673 S – Request of United Sign Group, applicant, for permanent signage at 211 Routt (Villas at Alamo Heights)

Mr. Lutz presented the case. The applicant was not present. The board discussed the proposed and agreed to act on the case.

Mr. McGlone moved to approve the signage as presented. Ms. Souter seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR:

Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Souter

AGAINST:

None

Case No. 674 S – Request of City of Alamo Heights, owner, for permanent signage at 6116 Broadway St (City Hall Complex)

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Marian Mendoza, applicant, was present. The board discussed the proposed signage, lighting, font, size, and location. Mr. Solomon questioned if the amount of proposed signage was necessary and Ms. Mendoza responded. Ms. Souter added that it was too much signage. An open discussion followed.

Mr. McGlone moved to approve the signage as submitted. Ms. Bartlett seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR.

Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Souter

AGAINST:

None

Case No. 668 F (670F) – Request of Keith Norman, applicant, representing JAS Development Corp., owner, for the compatibility review of the proposed replacement structure located at 320 Alta Ave under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010) in order to construct a new single-family residence with detached accessory structure.

Mr. Lutz presented the case. Keith Norman, applicant, addressed the board.

Mr. McGlone asked for clarification regarding the proposed placement of the front of the main structure in relation to the surrounding properties. The applicant responded it would be the same as the previous home. He added that they would not be utilizing any bonuses.

Mr. Solomon asked if they had given any thought to a landscaping plan. Mr. Norman responded that they had not but would be the next step after the review process. Chairman Gaines questioned if the board and batten was consistent on all gables to which the applicant responded no.

Ms. Souter questioned staff regarding the height measurements and Mr. Lutz responded. Ms. Bartlett felt there was too much going on with the roof and Ms. Souter agreed. Mr. Norman responded that the proposed roof was a result of having to modify the plan to meet looming requirements. Mr. McGlone added that the proposed structure had a nice feel just had to be simpler. A suggestion was

made to add gable to the left at the side and rear (5/12) and remove gable at rear of the 2nd floor and remove the shed roof at front.

Ms. Hays moved to recommend approval of the design as compatible with a simplified roof at the rear elevation. Chairman Gaines amended to include the gable. Ms. Souter expressed concerns of the board not being able to review and approve the elevations once revised. Ms. Bartlett seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR:

Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon

AGAINST:

Souter

Case No. 571 F – Request of James West, RA, of GFF Architects, applicant, representing AH MF Land, LP, owner, for the final design review of the proposed mixed-use development at the properties located at 5500 & 5514 Broadway and 200, 202, & 206 Ellwood under Chapter 2 Administration for Architectural Review.

Mr. Lutz presented the case and provided background regarding the project and outcome of other board actions. John Burnham, representative, was present and addressed the board. He introduced others in attendance.

Mr. Solomon questioned the boulder wall along frontage at Austin Hwy and how it evolved to that material. Ms. Bartlett asked for clarification regarding the proposed parking and the ratios. The applicant responded.

Mr. McGlone asked the applicant to explain broadly any changes that had occurred in the last two (2) years since originally approved. Mr. Burnham responded and spoke regarding architectural elements. Mr. Burnham provided an elevation that included the original architectural elements. An open discussion followed.

Mr. McGlone questioned regarding the proposed parking on Fennimore. Mr. Burnham responded that the parking belonged to the City, was included within the scope of the project, and clarified that the parking is not part of the parking calculations. Mr. McGlone expressed concerns regarding the head in parking on a two-way street. Mr. Burnham responded. A discussion followed regarding the area and proposed parking. Fire Chief Kuhn addressed the board and spoke regarding the parking and fire code requirements.

The board viewed the comparison of the original and revised elevations. Ms. Souter stated that she was not fond of heights but preferred the elevation with the architectural element because it broke up the roofline. Mr. Burnham responded that they did have the funding and could build the architectural element. A discussion followed. Ms. Souter added that she would have an issue with the feature if it was abutting a neighborhood but feature was out in the commercial district and it broke up the mass. Mr. Solomon agreed.

A discussion took place regarding the number and types of units.

Mr. Solomon asked for reassurance regarding surface water drainage. Gary Smith responded. Mr. McGlone posed additional questions regarding drainage. Mr. Smith responded.

Ms. Souter asked if Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT) had reviewed the proposed and if they had any red flags. Mr. Smith informed that they had been working with TXDOT and they had no concerns regarding the proposed plan. They went on to discuss the sidewalks.

Mr. McGlone spoke regarding the "public side" of the project and asked for clarification. Mr. Burnham responded and spoke regarding the Specific Use Permit (SUP).

Ms. Souter spoke regarding correspondence received in opposition. Mr. Smith spoke regarding the parking around Fennimore and the drainage that was approved by FEMA.

Mr. Solomon spoke regarding the landscaping and asked for clarification regarding the proposed street trees along Broadway. Mr. McGlone added that the plans illustrated Red Oak species. Mr. Burnham went on to speak regarding a forty-year (40) maintenance agreement to maintain the park area.

A twenty-two (22) month construction timeframe is anticipated. There was a discussion about lighting and construction materials coming onto and off site. The contractor plans to keep Ellwood open during the duration of the project. A discussion regarding the proposed exterior finish materials and colors followed.

Those present and speaking regarding the case were as follows: Mary Reynolds, 201 Ellwood, Unit 112

Mr. McGlone moved to recommend approval of the final plans as submitted with the encouragement of the applicant to present to the City Council the original central tower feature and follow-up for confirmation the building colors with a site mockup as suggested by the applicant. Mr. McGlone amended the motion to suggest endorsement by the board the consideration of the original design for the central tower. Ms. Souter seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR:

Bartlett, Hays, McGlone, Solomon, Souter

AGAINST:

None

Ms. Souter asked regarding the redaction of the property owners' names from the response cards.

There being no further business, Ms. Souter moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Solomon and unanimous vote to support the motion. The meeting adjourned at 7:44p.m.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING ARE 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)

111011

Lety Hernandez, Planner

Community Development Services