


City of Alamo Heights
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
October 20, 2020

The Architectural Review Board held a regular scheduled meeting at the Council Chambers of the City of Alamo Heights located at 6116 Broadway St, San Antonio, Texas and via Zoom and telephone conference on Tuesday, October 20, 2020, 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 (via teleconference)
Grant McFarland (via Zoom)
Mike McGlone (via Zoom)
~~Lyndsay Thorn~~ 

Members absent:

Diane Hays
Lyndsay Thorn

Staff members present:

Nina Shealey, Assistant City Manager
Lety Hernandez, Planner

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

Mr. Solomon moved to approve the August 18, 2020 and September 15, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Bartlett seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, McFarland, McGlone, ~~Thorn~~ 
AGAINST: None

Case No. 817 S – Request of Comet Signs, applicant, for permanent signage at 401 Austin Hwy (Broadway Bank) and Case No. 820 S – 402 Austin Hwy (Broadway Bank)

Ms. Shealey presented the cases together as they are related with the same business. She spoke regarding administrative approvals for certain signage illustrated in the packets adding that there were same size and location to the monument signs. She added that the setback is 8.5ft and the minimum required is 10ft but will be verified at installation.

Pete Sitterle, representing Comet Signs, was available via phone. The board questioned the signs and their locations and expressed concerns that the signage would not be visible from

the street. A suggestion was made to change the font size for visibility. The applicant stated that they were open to replacing the proposed text with a larger font size and added that the location illustrated was only a representation. He spoke regarding the setback to address the concerns of the board adding that relocation would cause removal of the directional signage.

After further discussion, Mr. Solomon moved to approve the signage for both cases as presented. Mr. McGlone seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 818 S – Request of Comet Signs, applicant, for permanent signage at 5410 Broadway (Care Now Urgent Care)

Ms. Shealey presented the case noting that the additional signage on the side of the building was not compliant with current ordinances. Pete Sitterle, representing Comet Signs, was available via phone and informed that they had eliminated the side signage to comply.

The board asked for clarification regarding the proposed signage in relation to the applicant. An open discussion followed.

Mr. Solomon moved to approve the Broadway facing signage with the stipulation that the side facing signage would be eliminated. Mr. McFarland seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 815 F – Request of Current Owner(s) for the significance review of the existing main structure located at 324 Cloverleaf in order to demolish 100% of the existing residence and accessory structure under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The Rosenbergs, owners, were present and addressed the board. They informed that they would be returning at a future date with new construction and went on to say that their project/plan would blend with the community.

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

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Barlett, McFarland, McGlone Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 813 F – Request of Hilary Scruggs-Beebe of Hilary Scruggs Designs LLC, representing J. Byron Burton III and Laura Nell Burton, owner(s) for the compatibility review of the proposed accessory structure located at 222 Claiborne in order to construct an addition under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Ms. Shealey presented the case and provided background regarding the Board of Adjustment review and approval. The applicant and owners were available via phone and addressed the board.

The board asked for clarification regarding if the garage was being enclosed or if they were only proposing to change the doors. Staff responded.

Mr. McFarland moved to recommend approval of the proposed design as compatible. Mr. Solomon seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Bartlett, McFarland, McGlone, Solomon

AGAINST: None

Case No. 814 F – Request of R. Clay Page, applicant, representing Scott Boynton, owner to expand the parking area to the rear of the existing commercial structure at the property located at 6421 Broadway under Chapter 2 Administration for Architectural Review.

Ms. Shealey presented the case. Scott Boynton and Clay Hagendorf were present and addressed the board. They informed that they were only installing the same amount of impervious coverage as they were removing and placing the new at the rear of the building. The board questioned the need for the additional new parking and the owner responded that they wanted it for future for more flexibility of the use.

Andrew Barboza, Engineer, spoke regarding drainage and how currently drains onto property and towards properties at the rear and eventually drains to the side streets.

The board questioned the condition of the retaining wall at the rear and Mr. Barboza informed that the wall is 4ft to 6ft high, is a cantilever design, and spoke on the way it functions. He added that they were unsure of when it was built.

A discussion followed regarding the resurfacing and the engineer deferred to Clay Page who was available by phone to address the board. He spoke regarding the improvements and the proposed drainage. The board went on to speak regarding the buffer and how it would affect the neighbors behind the property and were informed that a drainage flume would be installed and were keeping the existing drainage patterns while improving the proposed drainage onto the street.

Mr. Page spoke regarding the addition of the curb to prevent all water from going onto the neighboring properties and added that their goal was to use as much existing grade as possible and prevent having to build a wall. An open discussion followed regarding existing and proposed drainage and concerns regarding the proposed parking scheme.

Those available to speak with interest in the case were as follows:

Howard Anderson, 123 College (opposed)
Dave Follingstad, 116 College (opposed)
Benjamin Kaminsky, 127 College (opposed)
Catharine Kollars, 135 College (opposed)

Concerns of the citizen included the number of new parking spots, drainage, landscaping, the intentional routing of traffic onto residential streets, and trees.

The board spoke regarding reasonable and the lack of drainage plan. They felt that they needed more information and that they should provide a more detailed plan. The board questioned the improvements of the area in whole and staff responded.

After further discussion, Mr. Solomon moved to table the case for the November 17, 2020 meeting pending submittal of additional documents and detail regarding drainage and proposed patterns, integrity of the retaining wall, drainage flume, implications regarding a tree, location of the proposed dumpster and how it relates to Phase I project, and a design regarding the entire site. Mr. McGlone seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

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

Chairman Gaines spoke regarding previous projects and the need to find a good common ground for better of the community.

Case No. 816 F – Request of Sarah Flowers of LPA, applicant, representing the Alamo Heights School District, in order to construct netting and a detached accessory building at the property located at 250 Viesca under Chapter 2 Administration for Architectural Review.

Ms. Shealey presented the case. The applicant was available by phone and addressed the board. She spoke regarding the project. The board questioned the installation prior to review by the board and asked for clarification regarding the location. The applicant responded.


Mr. Solomon moved to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. McGlone seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

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

There being no further business, Mr. McFarland moved to adjourn the meeting seconded by Mr. McGlone. The meeting was adjourned at 7:16p.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)

11/17/20

Date Signed & Filed



Lety Hernandez, Planner
Community Development Services