



**UDC OHP Amendments
Task Force Meeting
September 26, 2019**

Attendance

Barbara Witte-Howell
Vince Michael
Patti Ziontz
Sarah Gould
Paul Kinnison
Luis Miguel Martinez
Sam Aguirre
Ashley Farrimond
Brad Carson
Irby Hightower
Monica Savino
Gemma Kennedy
Jeff Fetzer
John Bustamante

City Staff

D1 -- Sydell Brooks
D7 – Fred Ramirez
Lauren Sage
Shanon Miller
Cory Edwards
Tony Felts
Alma Lozano
Jenny Hay

Meeting Notes

OHP staff shares notes on proposed HDRC changes

Discussion

- Question about increasing number of HDRC members
- Everyone gets to appoint a second member
- The new panel should handle the violations and should be able serve on DRC
- Can alternates serve on HDRC?
- Concerns about DRC members know the project and being at both HDRC and DRC
- Support for having two commissions fully trained
- Question about residential v commercial violations?
- Going to test out putting violations on one agenda
- Support for having alternates, but alternates could watch HDRC meetings
- Discussion about benefits of two HDRC; there are people that are passionate about residential; maybe adding smaller scale projects to their scope



- Name of the “violation board” → Compliance Board

Administrative Items

Discussion

- Increase admin items
- Discussed creating standards for new admin items
- Questions about how notices would work
- Showed new explorer map
- Question about taking judgements out of guidelines/standards for these “new eligible request types”
- Question and concerns with additions, new constructions of ADUS, and final approval for non-residential projects consistent with conceptual
- Note that we separate design from use
- Note that anything that would be approved on this list would normally be on consent
- Discussion on how to treat Tax Certification and Verification. Could Tax Certification be administrative and verification go to HDRC; or Certify could happen after work is approved (not done)
- Note that any questions/concerns/open stipulations
- Notes about more specific/quantitative stipulations so that it’s certain that stipulations were met

Fee structure

Discussion

- Is this for both conceptual and final?
- Lessor fee for returning? Or re-review?
- Signage?
- Only commercial
- But signage is across the board
- Where does this money go?
- Concerns about defining non-profit and if we should charge them an application fee
- How long ago last rate? Inflation adjustment?
- Point about quicker turnaround time for OHP than zoning
- Residential would still not pay more
- Maybe for the fee, new construction, 4 units or more is charged

Final thoughts on HDRC process before moving on to Landmark Designation process

- Question about increasing 60 day take action
- Concerns about CTBH having more time; others agreed to wanting to have a rebuttal after applicant since sometimes CTBH is misquoted.



Landmark Designation Process

Discussion

- Question about petition required for reconsideration. Probably not but the threshold would include provision of new information.
- Notice required for both

Internal/Policy Changes

- Question about how to report violation

Other subcommittees

- Question about a timeline for the infill problem: Worksheets, then infill guidelines, and update to guidelines



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

UDC Task Force Recommendations – September Check-in
Process Changes and Potential UDC Amendments

OVERVIEW

- Streamline review process and optimize public participation
- Improve consistency, predictably, and effectiveness of review
- Shorten length of public meetings, reduce commissioner burnout
- Align with 2020 UDC Update Cycle or other process (CCR, policy change)

Steps Taken

- Worked with task force to recommend policy changes
- Public input will also inform the recommendations prior to any proposed amendments
- Subcommittees formed to review the following issues:
 1. HDRC and administrative review process
 2. Non-owner landmark designation process
 3. Neighborhood-level infill design standards
 4. Downtown and RIO
 5. Other clarifying amendments and minor process improvements

Immediate Changes (Staff / HDRC Policy)

- Roll out of online public Explorer Map (pending and past case records; improved public notice)
- Limit applicant speaking times to 20 minutes
- Consolidation of Historic Tax Verification into a single agenda item

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

The following are potential process changes and improvements for discussion:

HDRC and Administrative Review Process

- Increase HDRC membership
- Host one additional meeting per month to address violations
- Increase citizen membership and reporting from Design Review Committees
- Expand Administrative Review authority (staff approval)
 - Approximately 25% additional requests would be handled by staff
 - Completeness review period
 - Potential adopted standards to inform staff review
- Revise conceptual vs. final approval thresholds and provide staff approval for consistent projects
- Align HDRC fees with project size / complexity

Non-owner Landmark Designation Process

- Expand application requirement to include a petition:
 - Petition
 - For properties without a recent assessment (within last 5 years)
 - Requires signatures of SA residents – 15 to 20?
 - Requires notification of NA and Council Office
 - Requires research and statement of significance (see Boston’s checklist example)
- A different process would apply to previously-reviewed or inventoried sites that were found by OHP staff to be not eligible for historic designation
 - “Appeal”
 - For properties that have been determined ineligible within the last 5 years (through assessment, survey, or demo review)
 - Requires fee - \$150? (in line with Designation Verification)
 - Requires research and statement of significance (see Boston’s checklist example) and additional information not cited in staff’s initial review
- Consultation with HPO and HDRC worksession prior to public hearing

NEXT STEPS FOR OTHER ITEMS:

Neighborhood-level Infill Design Standards

- Worksheets in progress; contract with Alamo Architects
- Subcommittee will continue to meet
- Task force will ultimately recommend updates to Historic Design Guidelines for infill
- OHP and DSD will propose UDC Amendments to eliminate conflicts between HDRC and Zoning Commission

Downtown & RIO

- RFP in progress
 - *Evaluate the effectiveness of existing standards, identify areas of necessary improvement or clarification, and recommend new and / or consolidated language;*
 - *Improve the legibility and usability of existing guidelines and standards through illustrative graphics and diagrams which reinforce a form-based code;*
 - *Eliminate confusing, outdated, or conflicting language and articulate a clear path for successful projects;*
 - *Reinforce best practices for properties abutting the San Antonio River, San Pedro Creek, important urban corridors, and existing residential communities;*
 - *Align applicable design standards and guidelines with SA Tomorrow Plans, affordable housing programs, and long-term downtown parking and transportation strategies;*
 - *Incentivize sustainable design, affordable housing, and adaptive reuse of vacant or underutilized buildings through development credits or administrative variances from certain standards such as building height restrictions;*
 - *Update LID standards and landscaping requirements to align with Climate Action and Adaptation strategies;*
 - *Expand review types that may be reviewed and approved (in keeping with design standards) administratively by City staff without a public hearing;*

- *Consider best practices and potential design requirements for projects reviewed under the City's affordable housing and incentives policies; and*
- *Strengthen review process and emphasize the role of the HDRC in decisions by the City related to project design and development.*