

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
JUNE 18, 2014**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Training Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Cone, Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

**PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**  
**ABSENT: Salas, Shafer**

- Chairman’s Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Case No. 2014-204  | Multiple locations – Installation of bike racks |
| 2. Case No. 2014-187  | 202 Thorain                                     |
| 3. Case No. 2014-159  | 205 E. Houston                                  |
| 4. Case No. 2014-205  | 207 4 <sup>th</sup> Street                      |
| 5. Case No. 2014-178  | 212 N. Alamo                                    |
| 6. Case No. 2014-207  | 242 King William                                |
| 7. Case No. 2014-199  | 312 Peal Parkway                                |
| 8. Case No. 2014-191  | 400 N. Monumental                               |
| 9. Case No. 2014-196  | 443 Club Dr.                                    |
| 10. Case No. 2014-197 | 501 N. Leona                                    |
| 11. Case No. 2014-198 | 502 Brooklyn                                    |
| 12. Case No. 2014-202 | 515 Kendall                                     |
| 13. Case No. 2014-194 | 540 Kings Court                                 |
| 14. Case No. 2014-195 | 610 Nolan                                       |
| 15. Case No. 2014-143 | 622 S. Main                                     |
| 16. Case No. 2014-210 | 646 S. Main                                     |
| 17. Case No. 2014-144 | 700 N. St. Mary’s                               |
| 18. Case No. 2014-201 | 800 N. Cherry                                   |
| 19. Case No. 2014-185 | 907 Hays  |
| 20. Case No. 2014-200 | 2800 Broadway                                   |
| 21. Case No. 2014-193 | 6200 S. New Braunfels                           |
| 22. Case No. 2014-192 | 6911 Pickwell Park                              |

Items 5, 15, and 16 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve the remaining cases on the Consent Agenda based staff recommendations.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**  
**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**5. HDRC NO. 2014-178**

Applicant: John Harrison

Address: 212 N. Alamo

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Restore the first floor façade based on historic photographs. The new façade will consist of wood-framed storefront, granite veneer wainscot, and stucco siding and cornice;
2. Install striped canvas awnings based on historic photographs;
3. Construct an elevator shaft at the back corner of the building. The shaft will be clad in stucco and incorporate a new cornice that is aligned with the existing cornice;
4. Construct a two-story balcony in the rear of the building to provide access to units. The structure will consist of tube steel beams and columns and feature a striped canvas roof system; and
5. Reconfigure the rear elevation fenestrations to incorporate new wood-framed windows and doors.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 27, 2014. At that meeting, there was concern regarding a few items. It was noted that the addition of a new cornice line at the ground level should be avoided if possible. The applicant indicated that the cornice was necessary in order to account for the change in thickness due to the addition of the stucco veneer. The applicant also cited similar conditions at nearby historic buildings. The committee recommended that any required detail to account for the difference in thickness be as minimal as possible and only occur on the front façade where the stucco is being added. There was also concern regarding the reconfiguration of the rear fenestration pattern. The applicant indicated that the configuration of the proposed interior units necessitates the addition of new openings. This also requires the removal of the original masonry openings. Due to site constraints, these openings are difficult to view from the right-of-way. One committee member noted that the proposed interior plan might allow for the retention of the northernmost and southernmost openings and recommended, as a compromise, that the sill heights of those openings be lowered to accommodate the required doors. The committee was supportive of the elevator addition.
- b. The Henry Terrell Building was constructed circa 1908. The ground-level storefront has been altered significantly over time with the addition of aluminum windows, ceramic tile and glass block. The proposal to remove this storefront to expose the original masonry openings based on historic photographs is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.ii.
- c. The addition of a new cornice above the ground level does not have historic precedent at this location and will obscure a uniform brick band that is present on all four sides of the building. This is not consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i. The applicant should explore ways to limit the thickness of the new stucco veneer which necessitates the cornice detail. If this cannot be accomplished, the stucco veneer should be capped with a small sill or flashing detail limited to the front façade where the stucco is being added.
- d. The installation of canvas awnings is based on historic evidence and is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.A.iii.
- e. The proposed elevator shaft fills in a corner at the rear of the building and is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A and 2.B in terms of location, roof form, height and transition between old and new.
- f. The proposed rear balcony is simple in design and does not distract from the historic character of the building consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.iv.
- g. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., historic window and door openings should be preserved. Although the rear openings are not highly visible from the street, the removal of original openings for new openings is not consistent with the guidelines. Staff finds that the northernmost and southernmost openings could be adapted for the proposed entrances by lowering the height of the existing sills. This would be appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i. Staff further finds that any new or relocated openings should match the original openings in height, width and shape consistent with Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.ii.

1. Staff recommends approval of reconfiguring the storefront based on finding b with the stipulation that the cornice is removed from the design in favor of a small sill or flashing detail limited to the front facade based on finding c.
2. Staff recommends approval of the fabric awnings based on finding d.
3. Staff recommends approval of the elevator shaft addition based on finding e.
4. Staff recommends approval of the rear balcony based on finding f.
5. Staff recommends approval with the stipulations:
  - That the northernmost and southernmost openings are maintained in place and that only the still height is lowered to accommodate the addition of doors based on finding g; and
  - That new masonry openings for the remaining units match the original arched openings in height, width and shape based on finding g.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to refer to an onsite DRC meeting.

**AYES: Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Cone**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**15. HDRC NO. 2014-143**

Applicant: Bury, Inc.

Address: 622 S. Main

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Create a bike and pedestrian path along the east side of S Flores Street between Arsenal Street and E Cesar Chavez Blvd. The bike and pedestrian corridor consists of the following: a 9.5-foot landscape buffer between the face of the existing curb on S Flores to the western edge of the existing stone wall (the existing concrete sidewalk will be removed), a 6-inch permeable buffer located on the eastern edge of the existing stone wall, an 8-foot, two-lane concrete bike path, a 5.5-foot bioswale landscape strip, and a 5-foot concrete pedestrian walkway. The overall resulting corridor will measure approximately 30-feet wide and will constitute addition right-of-way dedication. Street trees and low vegetation will be planted along the corridor in both the landscape buffer area and bioswale. The existing chain link fence in front of the Commander's House property will be removed. Bike lanes along Arsenal Street and Old Guilbeau will be marked with striping. Bike lanes across driveways will be marked with green pavement paint. Other amenities, such as pedestrian lighting, are proposed along the corridor.
2. Create a new entry at Whitley Blvd to serve as the main entry for both the HEB Arsenal Campus and Commander's House. The existing drive will be widened to 44 feet. A traffic signal and pedestrian crosswalk will be added at this intersection. Approximately 65 linear feet of the existing stone wall will be removed to accommodate the driveway; the stones will be relocated and repurposed along the northern edge of the Commander's House property. Three existing mature palm trees will be relocated along Taylor Circle to accommodate the widening driveway. A 30" heritage sycamore located near the drive will be retained.
3. Stabilize, repair and restore the remaining portions of the stone wall based on historic photographs, including the replication of missing stone columns.
4. Repave and expand portions of Taylor Circle in front of the Commander's house. The existing asphalt will be replaced with new asphalt topping. Scored concrete paving will be used at the crossing points along the linear path between the front entry gates and main structure. A new concrete drive is proposed to connect Taylor Circle to the existing surface parking area located behind the Commander's House. A concrete walkway is proposed between the Commander's house, the bike/pedestrian corridor and a future grocery store site at the corner of S Flores and E Cesar Chavez Blvd. Additional seating has been proposed along this walkway.

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to:

Develop to guarded entries to the HEB Arsenal campus at Whitley Blvd and Dwyer Ave. Each entry will feature a new guardhouse sheltered by an overhead trellis structure. Other site improvements at these locations include landscaping and a low wall to screen parking areas, new pedestrian lighting, bollards and gates to match the existing fencing.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The curb cuts and driveways associated with these two entries were previously given conceptual approval by the HDRC on May 7, 2014.
- b. The proposed improvements are located within existing parking areas. The requested entries and new construction to not remove green space within the Arsenal campus nor alter any historic spatial relationships between historic resources at the site. The improvements are designed in a manner that is distinguishable as new construction and could be removed in the future without impact the nearby historic resources. This is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.
- c. The proposed new structures are scaled appropriately within the overall site and to not exceed the height or scale of any adjacent historic buildings consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i.
- d. The proposed pedestrian lighting and bollards are generally consistent with the Guidelines for site elements 6.D. The applicant will preserve and reuse historic lighting fixtures on the property and introduce new pedestrian lights and poles that are compatible with historic precedent.
- e. The introduction of landscape buffers and screening for parking areas adjacent to the entries is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A.
- f. The proposed improvements will create entry points to the campus that are generally consistent with the provisions of UDC Section 35-5-672 in terms of automobile access.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through f.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve as submitted based on findings a through f.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**RECUSED: Guarino**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**23. HDRC NO. 2014-113**

Applicant: Syngman Stevens

Address: 619 Nolan

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to demolish the structure at 619 Nolan. The applicant has provided estimates from contractors for roof repairs/replacement and general exterior and interior repairs to make the structure habitable. The estimates total around \$132,000. The assessed value of the structure according to the Bexar County Appraisal District is \$52,300.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. This request was referred by the HDRC to the Designation and Demolition Committee on June 4, 2014.

June 18, 2014

7

- b. The DDC performed a site visit to the property on June 11, 2014. Overall, the committee found that the structure was extremely deteriorated and has lost its significance. The committee recommended that, if demolition was approved, then the materials be salvaged.
- c. The home at 619 Nolan first appears on the 1904 Sanborn map.
- d. Staff performed a site visit to the property at 619 Nolan with the owner on April 2, 2014. At that time, staff found that the home is in a deteriorated condition.
- e. This property is within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. It was identified in the survey of that district as contributing based on its scale and materials.
- f. The 600 block of Nolan is largely intact, with one vacant parcel on the south side of the block. This portion of Nolan serves as a gateway in to the Dignowity Hill Historic District and should be protected.
- g. The home was built in the Craftsman style with simplified details. It has been modified from its original appearance, including the enclosure of the front porch.
- h. The applicant has provided several estimates from contractors for foundation repair, replacement of damaged/missing floor boards and sheet rock, window repair, siding repair, painting, plumbing and electrical work, and roof replacement. This work is estimated to cost approximately \$130,000. According to the Bexar County Appraisal, this property's assessed value is \$52,300. While rehabilitating this structure would be costly, staff does not find that an economic hardship has been proven.
- i. While the home has been modified and is in a deteriorated state, demolition of a contributing resource in a historic district should always be a last resort where a loss of significance has occurred due to excessive deterioration or where repairs to the structure are found to be infeasible, resulting in an unreasonable economic hardship as outlined in UDC Section 35-614.
- j. According to the UDC Section 35-614.c, if the applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, he may provide evidence to indicate that the property has lost its historic significance. The DDC finds that a loss of significance has occurred and recommends that, if demolition is approved, the materials be salvaged. That applicant is required to provide a salvage strategy for reuse of building materials deemed valuable by the historic preservation officer for other preservation and restoration activities in accordance with UDC Section 35-614(d)2.
- k. In accordance with UDC Section 35-614, demolitions of contributing structures are to be reviewed and approved simultaneously with the proposed replacement plans for the property. It is unclear what the future intended use of the property is. Replacement plans have not been submitted by the applicant. A demolition permit may not be issued until replacement plans are submitted for review by the HDRC.

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings j and k. The requirements of UDC Section 35-614 for demolition of a contributing structure have not been met. The applicant must provide replacement plan for review by the HDRC as well as a plan for salvaging of materials. If, after considering the evidence at the public hearing, HDRC approves demolition, no permit for demolition will be issued until there are approved replacement plans and proof of financial means to complete the project.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to reset to July 2, 2014 so that the owner may return with salvage and replacement plans.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**25. HDRC NO. 2014-068**

Applicant: Linda Castro

Address: 221 Club Dr.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Demolish the rear garage as 221 Club Drive; and
2. Install landscaping and pergola at rear of house. The pergola will be freestanding wood construction measuring approximately 9' by 10' and 12' tall.

**FINDINGS:**

**Findings related to request item 1:**

- a. The home at 221 Club Drive and its accessory garage first appear on the 1924-1952 Sanborn map. The original garage was located on the rear property line along an alley, in a similar location as the proposed garage.
- b. The original garage was demolished without approval. The Designations and Demolitions Committee is unable to conduct a site visit to determine whether the garage can be considered non-contributing to the district. The available photos of the garage do not provide enough information for staff to make a determination of non-contributing status.
- c. Generally, garages and outbuildings contribute to the overall character of integrity of historic properties and districts. Every effort should be made to preserve contributing garages and outbuildings in rather than demolish for new construction.
- d. The applicant must meet the requirements outlined in UDC Section 35-614. In accordance with that section, no certificate shall be issued for property located in a historic district and contributing to the district although not designated a landmark unless the applicant demonstrates clear and convincing evidence supporting an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant if the application for a certificate is disapproved. When an applicant fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship in such cases, the applicant may provide additional information regarding loss of significance as provided in subsection (c)(3) in order to receive a certificate for demolition of the property. If the application is approved, demolition fees outlined in UDC Section 35-614(e) shall apply.

**Findings related to request item 2:**

- e. The proposed landscaping scheme introduces areas of pervious gravel and walkways that are consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 3.B.i. and 3.B.ii.
  - f. The proposed pergola is set back to the rear of the property and is compatible with the character of the primary structure consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i. and 5.A.iii.
1. Staff does not recommends approval of demolition based on finding d. The requirements for demolition of a contributing structure as outlined in UDC Section 35-614 have not been met. The HDRC may approve demolition if the structure is determined to be non-contributing to the Monticello Park Historic District.
  2. If demolition is approved, then staff recommends approval of the proposed replacement landscaping scheme and pergola based on findings e and f.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to grant denial of applicants request for demolition based on findings d.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**26. HDRC NO. 2014-173**

Applicant: Mario Carrazco, KM Builders

Address: 246 E. Lullwood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace the existing asphalt shingle roof on the main house and garage at 246 E Lullwood with a standing seam metal roof with standard galvalume finish;
2. Construct a shed-roof carport on the northern (front) façade of the existing garage. The carport will have a footprint of approximately 20' x 22' and feature heavy timber construction with standing seam metal roof;
3. Construct a shed-roof canopy over the existing patio. The canopy will feature similar construction as the carport and cover an area of approximately 15' x 16'.
4. Construct a new, timber pergola in the southwest corner of the property. The pergola will have a footprint of approximately 19' x 10' and will be 10' tall at its highest point.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. Site-formed metal and metal panels were a widely used roofing material in San Antonio in the late 19th century following the arrival of the railroad. Desired for its low maintenance and durability, it was often applied directly over cedar shake or other existing roofing materials. It continued to be a common roofing material for homes through the early part of the 20th century until factory-produced asphalt shingle products became widely available. By the 1920's, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material due to its fire resistance, ability to be customized in regards to color and shape, and relatively low costs of manufacturing and transportation. Often marketed as being able to mimic the appearance of slate tile roofs, asphalt shingles were a popular roofing material for Tudor Revival Style homes throughout the 20th century.
- b. The house at 246 E Lullwood was constructed circa 1928 in the Tudor Revival Style. This block of Lullwood features a number of Tudor Revival Homes. According to Sanborn Maps, homes on this block were originally constructed with asphalt or cementitious tile roofs. There does not appear to be a historic precedent for metal roofs at this location, although standing seam metal has been introduced in a few locations over time.
- c. In general, the proliferation of the Tudor Revival Style in the United States represents a movement which rejects industrialization in favor of a more hand-crafted aesthetic. Tudor Revival homes, such as the one at 246 E Lullwood, often featured intricate detailing and local materials. Roofs were typically shingled (usually with wood, slate or composition shingles).
- d. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B.vi., metal roofs should only be installed on structures that historically had a metal roof or where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. Staff finds that a metal roof is not appropriate for this style of house.
- e. Overall, the proposed heavy timber construction of the new carport, canopy and pergola are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. in terms of character because it relates to existing elements found on the house, such as the porch columns. For all new construction, the applicant is responsible for meeting the minimum setback requirements. As submitted, the proposed improvements may require a variance from the Board of Adjustment.
- f. A shed roof addition to the front of the garage is not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.ii. and 2.A.iv. A freestanding carport structure that is detached from the garage would be more appropriate and would constitute a reversible condition.
- g. A shed roof canopy addition to the rear of the house is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.ii. and 2.A.iv. The rear of the house appears to have been previously altered and the addition of an attached canopy would not have a negative impact to the integrity of the house.

1. Staff does not recommend approval based on finding h. Staff recommends that an in-kind replacement of asphalt shingles be installed. If metal is desired by the applicant for its lifespan, then staff recommends a metal product that mimics the appearance of traditional shingles based on finding c.

2. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the carport be freestanding and not attached to the garage based on finding f.

3. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding e and g.

4. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding e.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Zuniga to approve items 2, 3 and 4 approved with the stipulation that the carport be freestanding and not attached to the garage based on findings f.

Item 1 was not approved and referred to the DRC.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**27. HDRC NO. 2014-208**

Applicant: Michael Andrew Perez

Address: 330 Mission Street

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

Install a 4-foot wrought iron fence enclosing the front yard of the property at 330 Mission Street. The fence will be painted black.

**FINDINGS:**

a. The house at 330 Mission Street sits on a prominent corner.

b. Other nearby properties feature either 3-foot wood picket fences or 4-foot chain link fences. The majority of properties on this block of Mission Street do not feature front yard fences.

c. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences should not be installed where they did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. The appropriateness of a front yard fence is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts that have not historically had them. Front yard fences are common in portions of the King William Historic Districts. However, they do not appear to be common at this block of Mission Street. A front yard fence at this location would not be consistent with the Guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to deny based on finding c.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**28. HDRC NO. 2014-189**

Applicant: Phillip Hunt

Address: 515 Cedar

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

Reconstruct the front porch of the home. Currently the home has a low concrete front porch with wood columns and steps up to the front door. The existing porch is not original to the home. The applicant proposes to construct a wood front porch at the height of the front door with a simple picketed railing, square section wood columns, and central front steps.

**FINDINGS:**

- a. The home at 515 Cedar first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map. According to this map, the home originally had a full width front porch, but both the home and the porch are listed as being 1 ½ stories high. At some point, the upper half-story of the porch was enclosed and possibly raised, creating a second story. The front porch was replaced with a concrete slab and what are likely non-original columns. Asbestos siding was also installed over the original wood. Staff commends the applicant for make efforts to return the porch to a more appropriate condition.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 7.B.v, elements like porches should be reconstructed based on evidence of the original. In the absence of such evidence, reconstructed porches should be consistent with the style of the home. The basic dimensions and height of the proposed porch are appropriate.
- c. While the proposed porch is simple in design, the details such as the railing, columns and skirting should be appropriate to the style of the home.
- d. The proposed vertical skirting is not consistent with historic precedent. The use of lattice or horizontal skirting would be more appropriate.
- e. The porch railing should be appropriately designed, with 2"x4" top and bottom rails and square pickets, spaced approximately 1-1/2" apart. There should be a space between the bottom rail and the porch floor, consistent with traditional design precedents. A drawing of an appropriately detailed railing is included in the attached exhibits.
- f. The house at 515 Cedar has some elements of the Classical Revival style including block modillions and cornice returns. The existing columns which were removed without approval featured classical detailing. The proposed square columns are more common to the Craftsman Style which does not appear to have precedent on this structure. Staff finds that round columns with classical detailing would be more appropriate at this location.

Staff recommends approval based on findings a-c with the following stipulations:

1. That horizontal or lattice skirting be used based on finding d;
2. That the porch railing be revised to be consisting with finding e;
3. That the columns be round columns with classical detailing based on finding f.

**COMMISSION ACTION:**

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through f.

**AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Zuniga, Feldman, Connor, Rodriguez**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION CARRIED.**

**29. HDRC NO. 2014-206**

Applicant: Mark Tolley

Address: 222 E. Mitchell

Reset to July 2, 2014 per the applicant.

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

APPROVED



Tim Cone  
Chair