

City of Alamo Heights
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
October 21, 2025

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, October 21, 2025, at 5:30 p.m.

Members present and composing a quorum of the Board:

John Gaines, Chairman
Ashley Armes
Larry Gottsman
Adam Kiehne
Clay Hagendorf, Alternate

Members absent:

Grant McFarland
Phil Solomon
Lyndsay Thorn
Mac White, Alternate

Staff members present:

Phil Laney, Assistant City Manager
Lety Hernandez, Director of Community Development Services
Tyler Brewer, Senior Planner
Garrett Pringle, Permit Technician

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

Ms. Hernandez introduced Garrett Pringle, Permit Technician, to the board and the board welcomed him.

Mr. Gottsman moved to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2025 meeting. Ms. Armes seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 1005S

Request of Executive Signs Enterprises, Inc., applicant, representing Envo Properties, LLC, owner, permanent signage at 5308 Broadway St (SipIT).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. He spoke regarding the number of signs and specifications adding that, as proposed, the size of the signage exceeded the maximum size allowable. Donnie Davis, business owner, was present and addressed the board.

The board questioned if they had the ability to change the proposed colors and Mr. Davis responded that they could only change to black and white. Open discussion followed regarding the size and surrounding tenant signs. Mr. Gottsman suggested the "Siplt" portion of sign to be in white. He expressed concerns regarding the vinyl signage on the front door and discussion followed. Ms. Hernandez stated that the board's practice was to limit additional text on the front door to a logo and hours of operation.

Mr. Gottsman moved to approve the signage with the elimination of the additional text shown below the business name and logo. Mr. Kiehne seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 1006S

Request of Industry Signs, LLC, applicant, representing Exchange 09, LLC, owner, for permanent signage at 5021 Broadway (*Mind Body & Soul*).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. The business owner was present and addressed the board. He did not state his name.

Mr. Gottsman asked for clarification regarding the proposed colors and asked staff for clarification regarding neon signs, specifically if they were allowed by code. Staff informed that neon signs were allowed so long as they did not pulsate, flash, or had any other function that would create a moving sign. Discussion followed regarding the proposed and suggested applicants provide a night view for future requests.

Mr. Kiehne moved to approve as presented. Ms. Armes seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 996F

Request of Manuel Luevanos, applicant, representing Qube Property Development, LLC., owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 503 Circle St in order to demolish 100% of the existing structures and construct a duplex under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Mr. Brewer presented the case and informed that the case was previously tabled from the August meeting pending revisions. Both original and revised renderings were provided for board review. Antonio Quadrini, owner, and Jaime Miramontes, designer, were present and addressed the board.

The board commended on the revisions and open discussion followed regarding the design.

Chairman Gaines opened the public hearing at 6pm. No one requested to speak so the public hearing was closed.

At that time, Mr. Hagendorf moved to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of the revised design as compatible. Mr. Gottsman seconded the amended motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 999F

Request of Bobo Custom Builders, applicant, on behalf of David and Rachel Rogoff, owners, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 216 Inslee Ave in order to demolish approximately 47.7% of the existing street façade facing north, and construct additions to the existing single-family residence under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. Cody Engel and Jason Peters, applicants, were present and addressed the board. Discussion followed regarding the proposed improvements and design.

Chairman Gaines opened the public hearing at 6:09pm. No one requested to speak so the public hearing was closed.

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

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 1000F

Request of Brian Voges – Voges Design, LLC, applicant, on behalf of LADSA, LLC, owner, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 280 Retama Pl in order to construct a new single-family residence and detached garage under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. Brian Voges, applicant, was present and addressed the board. Discussion followed regarding the proposed design.

Chairman Gaines opened the public hearing at 6:15pm. Those speaking with interest in the case were as follows:

Deborah Brodigan, 276 Retama Pl (Neutral)

No one else requested to speak and Chairman Gaines closed the public hearing at 6:19pm.

Concerns of those speaking included drainage due to the amount of excavation.

The applicant spoke to the concerns of the neighbor and stated that no retaining wall would be installed on the west side to allow drainage.

Mr. Hagendorf asked for clarification regarding the retaining wall on the east side of the property and the driveway. The applicant responded.

Mr. Gottsman moved to approved the proposed design as compatible. Mr. Hagendorf seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 1001F

Request of Bardfield Properties, LP, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 727 Patterson Ave in order to demolish 100% of the existing structure and construct a new single-family residence and a detached two-story garage under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. Dan Reed, applicant, was present and addressed the board.

The board asked for clarification regarding concerns with the existing property and open discussion followed.

Chairman Gaines opened the public hearing at 6:27pm. No one requested to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Kiehne moved to declare the existing main structure as not compatible and recommended approval of the proposed design as compatible.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

Case No. 1002F

Request of Aaron Recko, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 123 Inslee Ave in order to demolish 100% of the existing structure and construct a new single-family residence under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. Aaron Recko, owner, was present and addressed the board.

Mr. Gottsman commended on the proposed design but that it was out of scale compared to adjoining properties. Ms. Armes agreed. Open discussion followed regarding the square footage. Mr. Recko informed that they were unable to relocate square footage to the rear to open up the front because the family preferred to have move back yard.

The board questioned regarding Lot Coverage and Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) and staff clarified that, according to the application, it appeared to be. Discussion followed regarding the proposed exterior finish

materials, window styles, and floorplan. As proposed the total square footage was between 3,000 to 4,000sq ft. The applicant added that they had attempted to include design elements of the area.

Mr. Gottsman left quorum and meeting at 6:40pm.

Chairman Gaines opened the public hearing at 6:42pm. Those speaking with interest in the case were as follows:

Carrie Miller, Did Not State Address

No one else requested to speak and Chairman Gaines closed the public hearing at 6:44pm.

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

The motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: Armes

Case No. 1003F

Request of Puerto BB, LLC, applicant, on behalf of Robert Price IV, owner, for the compatibility review of the proposed design located at 417 Patterson Ave in order to construct a new single-family residence and detached garage under Demolition Review Ordinance No. 1860 (April 12, 2010).

Mr. Brewer presented the case. Jahan Ahmadi, applicant, was present and addressed the board. Discussion followed regarding the proposed design.

Chairman Gaines opened the public hearing at 7:05pm. Those speaking with interest in the case were as follows:

Richard Holt, 421 Patterson Ave (Opposed)

Virginia Lyons, 405 Patterson Ave (Opposed)

Andrew Morrison, 410 Patterson Ave (Opposed)

No one else requested to speak and Chairman Gaines closed the public hearing at 7:13pm.

Concerns of those speaking included the design not consistent with the area, removal of trees and preference that they remain, and lack of privacy due to proposed design.

The applicant spoke to the concerns of the neighbors. He added that consideration was given to deed restrict vehicular access to the alley, only.

The board felt that the proposed design was not final and stressed the importance of providing final details. Open discussion followed.

Mr. Hagendorf moved to table the case and Mr. Kiehne seconded the motion. Staff requested amendment to include date of the next meeting. Mr. Hagendorf amended the motion to table the case for the November 18, 2025. Mr. Kiehne seconded the motion.

The amended motion was approved with the following vote:

FOR: Gaines, Armes, Gottsman, Hagendorf, Kiehne

AGAINST: None

There being no further business, Mr. Kiehne moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Armes seconded the motion followed by unanimous consent from the board. The meeting was adjourned at 7:26pm.

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)

11/18/25

Date Signed & Filed



Lety Hernandez, Director
Community Development Services