

**INFRASTRUCTURE & GROWTH COUNCIL COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2015  
3:30 PM  
PLAZA ROOM B, MUNICIPAL PLAZA BUILDING**

<b>Members Present:</b>	Councilmember Rey Saldaña, Chair, <i>District 4</i> Councilmember Shirley Gonzales, <i>District 5</i> Councilmember Ron Nirenberg, <i>District 8</i> Councilmember Mike Gallagher, <i>District 10</i>
<b>Members Absent:</b>	Councilmember Cris Medina, <i>District 7</i>
<b>Staff Present:</b>	Peter Zaroni, <i>Deputy City Manager</i> ; Carlos Contreras, <i>Assistant City Manager</i> ; John M. Dugan, <i>Director, DPCD</i> ; Rod Sanchez, <i>Director, Development Services</i> ; Shanon Miller, <i>Director, Historic Preservation</i> ; Terry Bellamy, <i>Assistant Director, TCI</i> ; Michael Shannon, <i>Assistant Director, Development Services</i> ; Terry Bellamy, <i>Assistant Director, TCI</i> ; Christie Chapman, <i>Assistant to Director, TCI</i> ; Tony Felts, <i>Senior Planner, DSD</i> ; Jacob Wong, <i>Executive Management Assistant</i> ; Paul Jimenez, <i>District 10</i> ; Mario Hune, <i>District 10</i> ; Errol Reid, <i>Office of the City Manager</i> ; Alexander J. Pytel, <i>Office of the City Clerk</i>
<b>Others Present:</b>	Councilmember Roberto Treviño, <i>District 1</i> ; Councilmember Alan E. Warrick II, <i>District 2</i> ; David Jareczki, <i>Building Standards Board</i> ; Clayton Perry, <i>Building Standards Board</i> ; Evelyn Brown, <i>Building Standards Board</i>

Item 2 was addressed at this time.

**Item 2. Approval of the Minutes for the May 20, 2015 Infrastructure and Growth Council Committee Meeting.**

Councilmember Gallagher moved to approve the minutes of the May 20, 2015 Infrastructure and Growth Council Committee Meeting. Councilmember Nirenberg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

**Briefing and Possible Action on:**

**Item 3. Briefing on the progress of the SA Tomorrow planning effort.**

Mr. John Dugan reported on the SA Tomorrow planning efforts and noted that the purpose of the plan was to help with strategic decisions in planning for the future growth of the City. He stated that policy analysis was currently underway with the goal of identifying policies that are most relevant to today's growth and what procedures would work best for the City's future. He highlighted major issues including corridor expansion and air quality as areas of focus for SA Tomorrow. He noted that final draft plans would be prepared through April 2016 for Planning Commission and City Council review. He detailed the working groups involved in planning process and noted that public feedback would be considered in the Existing Conditions Report.

Mr. Terry Bellamy presented an overview of the Multimodal Transportation Plan which included collaboration with VIA and the Texas Department of Transportation. He mentioned the designation of pedestrian zones to help ensure the safety of pedestrian and bicycle traffic as part of the Transportation Plan. He stated that the purpose of the plan was to identify core segments throughout the City and consider public safety, economic development, mobility enhancement, multimodal potential, and geographic diversity at these core segments. He noted that the various cores would be examined for connectivity to address the expected growth of the City by 2025. He detailed different scenarios and traffic models to help integrate future traffic into the transportation network.

Mr. Bellamy stated that over 5,000 face-to-face interactions have taken place as a result of the community outreach efforts and noted that staff was reaching out at different events, high schools, and rallies. He explained that each interaction is an opportunity to receive community feedback and noted that community meetings would continue to take place in order to address community questions and inform residents. He added that there has been significant positive feedback from the community.

Mr. Dugan reported that the overall goal of the Sustainability Plan was to enhance communities and examine the overall quality and resilience of the community. He noted that the resilience of the community illustrates how well the community responds to unexpected disasters and challenges. He further stated that the Sustainability Plan aims to balance the impact of expected growth against environmental, economic, and social resources as well as establish best practices for sustaining said resources for the future.

Mr. Dugan explained that the Planning Process includes multiple phases. He stated that Phase I is a baseline assessment that began in February 2015 and is currently completed. He reported that Phase II identifies primary goals and possible strategies to achieve said goals with stakeholder and community input. He added that the Final Report would be integrated into Comprehensive Plan Policies. He noted that there were different ways for residents to become involved and highlighted the upcoming Sustainability Forum hosted by the City of San Antonio on June 23, 2015.

Councilmember Nirenberg noted the importance of community leadership groups in planning efforts. He stated that the City should establish regulatory framework for driverless vehicles as an important part of transportation planning effort. He mentioned that several states have already adopted said regulations.

Councilmember Gallagher asked for clarification on Vulnerability Assessments. Mr. Dugan responded that the Vulnerability Assessments were a measurement of the resiliency of the community. He stated that Vulnerability Assessments addresses the preparedness of the community to respond to unexpected disasters and also examines potential areas of vulnerability and focuses on creating solutions to strengthen the community. He cited flooding as a major area of vulnerability for the City and noted that stronger management of drainage and run-off was needed.

Councilmember Gonzales asked for clarification regarding the cost of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Dugan responded that \$700,000 was the current cost of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that cost of the Multimodal Transportation Plan was approximately \$2.75 million and \$200,000 for the Sustainability Plan. Councilmember Gonzales asked for detail regarding civic involvement in the planning process. Mr. Bellamy responded that 2,656 surveys have been taken and 956 signed up for email updates. He added that City Staff has visited approximately 90 locations throughout the City to engage the community.

No action was required for Item 3.

**Item 4. Briefing and possible action on a request from District 2 Councilmember Alan Warrick on potential amendments to the Unified Development Code relating to Historic District Designation and demolition penalties.**

Mrs. Shannon Miller spoke to the Council Consideration Request submitted by Councilmember Warrick and noted that it addressed how Historic Districts were designated and clarified the penalty incurred by the demolition of historic structures. She explained that the petition for Historic Designation is generated by proponents and there is a current minimum of 30% neighborhood approval to initiate the public hearing process. She indicated that the application was valid for two years and an abstention of a vote was not counted for or against the designation. She added that no new Historic Districts have successfully gone through the process since 2010.

Mrs. Miller stated that under the current process; anyone in a Historic District can submit an application and initiate a petition, as well propose the District Boundaries. She explained that this process was meant to ensure community input in the designation. She detailed the administrative process and noted that a Public Hearing would occur after the 30% threshold was met.

Mrs. Miller reported that the Council Consideration Request proposes three changes to the current process. She noted that the first proposed change requires 51% neighborhood approval before a Public Hearing can be called. She added that this ensures that a majority of the community is open to the Historic Designation. She stated that the second proposed change requires that the City of San Antonio generate the ballot and distribute to all the residents in the proposed district. She stated that the third proposed change was to reduce the length of time that an application is valid from two years to one year.

Mrs. Miller reported that the second part of the Council Consideration Request was related to the demolition process and noted that when a structure is proposed for demolition; the owner is required to demonstrate economic hardship and replacement plans before the demolition is initiated. She explained that the Building Standards Board can order demolition without a demonstration of economic hardship and replacement plans if the case is declared a Dangerous Premises Case by the Code Enforcement Division of Development Services Department. She noted that property owners were using this method of designation to circumvent the normal demolition requirements.

Mrs. Miller noted the five year hold on building permits for property that has been demolished as a public safety hazard and explained that the penalty was meant to discourage property owners from willingly neglecting their property in order to demolish it. She reported that this penalty also helps to ensure that there are plans for redevelopment of a property before demolition. She stated that recommendations include requiring property owners to receive at least two notices, two Municipal Court Dispositions, and documented consultation with the property owner.

Councilmember Warrick noted that the current structure of the process was confusing to many residents and stated that the 51% threshold would ensure that a majority of the community was open to Historic Designation as the first part of the process.

Councilmember Nirenberg asked for clarification regarding the current process and the proposed changes. Mrs. Miller responded that under the current process, the City does not initiate the forms;

the resident initiates the petition. She reported that the proposed changes would ensure that residents have the task of gathering community input. She added that under the proposed process the City would send out notification as well as a community petition for resident response. Councilmember Warrick added that an abstention on the community petition would be considered a positive response.

Councilmember Gallagher expressed his concern with abstentions being considered positive responses. Councilmember Warrick noted that 51% disapproval would be required to stop the process, requiring a negative vote from residents. He clarified that abstentions would be considered positive only in reaching the initial 51% threshold to initiate the Historic Designation Process.

Councilmember Gonzales asked for confirmation regarding community notification. Mrs. Miller confirmed that notification and vote slips are sent only to the property owners; not renters in the area.

Councilmember Nirenberg moved to forward said item to the full City Council for consideration. Councilmember Gonzales seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by those present.

**Item 5. Briefing and possible action on a request from District 1 Councilmember Roberto Treviño to review and amend Chapter 6 Demolition Procedures.**

Mr. Rod Sanchez reported that the Council Consideration Request sponsored by Councilmember Treviño was designed to improve processes for reviewing dangerous structures and the demolition process. He stated that the proposed changes had previously been presented to the Governance Committee. He outlined the current procedure and noted that the proposed changes include enabling the Director of Development Services to examine structures on a case by case basis with special attention paid to visible hardships, low income, Veterans, and generational homeowners. He highlighted another proposed change to modify the composition of the Building Standards Board to ensure that three At-Large Members as well as the Mayor's Appointment satisfy the following criteria: 1) One single family and multi-family rental property manager, 2) One commercial property rental manager, and 3) One historic preservation professional. He added that each seven member panel of the Board would be required to have an Army Technician, engineer, general contractor, social worker, health care professional, retired person, and Veteran of the U.S. Military and that appointments to the Board would still be made by the City Council. He explained that in the event a historic structure goes before the Board; all Board members would be required to review the case.

Mrs. Miller stated that one of the recommended changes entailed that when a historic building goes before the Building Standards Board; that one of the members that has experience working with historic property is present when that case is decided. She added that a second proposed change adds language to the process which requires the City and Development Services Department to work together with the property owner to pursue all possible alternatives to demolition before going to the full Board. She noted that this new process would require at least two Municipal Court Dispositions to demonstrate efforts to resolve the case. She highlighted the need for clarification to the policy that allows the Building Standards Board to order a partial demolition without sacrificing the integrity of the building. She explained that buildings which receive additions over time are sometimes not in compliance with Building Standards and need to be removed. She reported that another proposed change allowed the City to utilize abatement funds to stabilize historic properties that might otherwise be demolished and negatively impact the value of historic communities. She noted two proposed dates for the changes to take effect; January 1, 2016 for Board Member Requirements and September 1, 2015 for all other proposed changes.

Councilmember Treviño noted the impact that the demolition procedure has on a home and the quality of life. He stated that it was important to continue working together with the community and staff in addressing the multitude of issues arising from demolition procedures.

Councilmember Nirenberg stated the need to flesh out the concerns arising from the discussion.

Councilmember Gallagher noted that the issues needed to be addressed and stated that it was important to examine the issues in the context of the Building Standards Board and gather greater input from staff.

Councilmember Gallagher moved to send said item to the Building Standards Board for further review. Councilmember Gonzales seconded the motion. The motion failed by the following vote:

**AYES:** Gallagher and Gonzales

**NAYS:** Saldaña and Nirenberg

**ABSENT:** Medina

Councilmember Nirenberg moved to forward said item to the full City Council for consideration. Councilmember Gonzales seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following vote:

**AYES:** Saldaña, Nirenberg, and Gonzales

**NAY:** Gallagher

**ABSENT:** Medina

### **Item 1. Citizens to be Heard**

Item 1 was addressed at this time.

Mr. David Jareczki spoke of the role, history, and composition of the Building Standards Board. He highlighted the needs of the Board to more adequately respond to citizen concerns and stated that the current process was effective and did not require much change. He noted that specific eligibility criteria for Board Members would minimize the amount of candidates.

Mr. Clayton Perry spoke of the proposed changes and stated that they were not warranted. He noted the increased difficulty of retaining Board Member attendance with specific eligibility criteria.

### **Adjourn**

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

*Respectfully Submitted,*

---

*Rey Saldaña, Chairman*

---

*Alexander J. Pytel,  
Office of the City Clerk*