



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
29 May 2020**

The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session on Friday, May 29, 2020, in the Board Room at the Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

- Chairman Fetzer called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

- The roll was called by the Executive Secretary.

Present: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Arreola, Carpenter, Bowman, and Fetzer.

Absent: Fernandez, Arreola, Martinez-Flores, Grube, and Laffoon.

CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Bud Church, Evelyn Franklin, Joseph Garcia, Li Franklin, Lulu Francois, Monica Savino, and Valerie Cortez- request 6 units on the 36 acres for the affordable homes in Dignowity Hill for 515 N Palmetto case.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Consideration of Consent Agenda items:**
 - AGENDA ITEM 1 WAS WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT
 - **Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Laffoon joined meeting at 2:25pm.**

INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION AGENDA ITEMS

- **Item # 2. HDRC NO. 2020-163**
ADDRESS: 202 N ST MARYS ST
Applicant: Anthony Byron/SMS-SAR Hospitality, LLC.

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting A Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval of the relocation of the Alamo Plaza bandstand to The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a 14-story hotel tower at 202 N St Mary's Street to feature both street and River Walk frontage.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct a 14-story hotel tower at 202 N St Mary's Street to feature both street and River Walk frontage.
- b. CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL – This request received conceptual approval on June 24, 2019, with the following stipulations:
 - i. That every attempt be made to incorporate the existing structure which is eligible for local landmark designation into the new construction. If, with HDRC concurrence, it is determined that the existing structure cannot be incorporated, then staff recommends that character defining elements be salvaged and reused within the project.
 - ii. That the structure be photographed and documented.
 - iii. That the applicant provide an analysis and detailed demolition plan of the existing Hugman features on the River Walk.
 - iv. Interventions to the site should be designed to minimize impacts to the existing historic features of the River Walk and new elements should be introduced within the spirit of Hugman's original plans such as terraced landscaping beds and stone retaining walls. (This stipulation has not been met)
 - v. That the applicant provide a solar study to confirm demonstrate that the proposed massing and height complies with the UDC's requirements for solar access to the San Antonio River.
 - vi. That the street level treatment of the tower be redesigned to better distinguish the base of the building and enhance the pedestrian experience. Loading areas should be removed or limited to the fullest extent possible.
 - vii. That the river-level treatment of the tower be redesigned to better respond to the pedestrian scale and natural setting of the river walk.
 - viii. That the building massing, base, middle, and cap, be designed to better meet the UDC requirement while maintaining traditional scale and architectural detailing.
 - ix. That a detailed lighting plan be submitted for review and approval when returning for final approval.
 - x. Archaeological investigations shall be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.
 - xi. That the applicant retain the sloping river bank to the greatest extent possible.
 - xii. That the applicant submit a reflection and glare study to determine the impact of potential reflections off of the south facing glass curtain wall system.
 - xiii. That the applicant reuse all Hugman era and existing River Walk wall materials in the proposed new construction and proposed landscaping and outdoor patio. (This stipulation has not been met.)
 - xiv. That a more detailed river level landscaping plan be developed and submitted that provides additional information for landscaping and materials.

The applicant has submitted updated application documents that staff finds have addressed all of the previous stipulations with the exception of those specific to the river level design, particularly the incorporation of terracing elements and stone façade elements, as noted in stipulation xiv.

- c. **EXISTING STRUCTURE** – The proposed development necessitates the demolition of the existing rectory building and gift shop which was constructed between 1966 and 1967. It was designed by architect Harvey P. Smith Jr. of Harvey P. Smith & Associates for the Archdiocese of San Antonio. Designed in the New Formalist Style, character-defining features of the building include repeating exposed-aggregate panels with half-moon cutouts at bottom along the north, west, and south sides and a toothed concrete third-floor canopy with quatrefoil cutouts. A historic assessment, which determined the existing structure to be eligible for historic designation, was provided to the HDRC for its review and recommendation. At the June 19, 2019, Historic and Design Review Commission hearing, the Commission determined that no additional steps, including potential designation, were needed regarding the existing structures with the exception of those noted in the above stipulations.
- d. **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed a pedestrian pathway parallel to the site on N St Mary's and has not impacted the existing pedestrian pathway at the River Walk. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- e. **ARCHITECTURAL FOCAL POINT** – According to the UDC Section 35-672(c)(1), properties that appear to be the terminus at the end of the street or at a prominent curve in the river shall incorporate into their design an architectural feature that will provide a focal point at the end of the view. At the corner of the structure where N St Mary's intersects the San Antonio River, the applicant has proposed corner glazing elements that transition to both the south façade's curtain wall system as well as the cementitious panel system on the west façade. Staff finds this to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC.
- f. **SOLAR ACCESS** – The UDC Section 35-673(a)(1) provides guidelines for solar access to the San Antonio River in regards to new construction. The applicant has provided a solar study noting compliance with the UDC.
- g. **CURB CUTS** – The current site currently features a curb cut at the southernmost portion of the site, adjacent to the bridge. The UDC Section 35-672(b)(1)(A) notes that curb cuts should be limited to two on parking areas or structure facing only one street and one for each additional street face. Staff finds that any curb cut here should be limited in width and should not result in a change of grade at the pedestrian level as to not interrupt pedestrian traffic on N St Mary's. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC regarding any curb cuts on N St Mary's.
- h. **SITE DESIGN** – According to the UDC Section 35-673, buildings should be sited to help define active spaces for area users, provide pedestrian connections between sites, help animate the street scene and define street edges. Primary entrances should be oriented toward the street and shall be distinguishable by an architectural feature. The proposed new construction features a primary elevation that fronts N St Mary's and one that fronts the river. The applicant has incorporated entrance and pedestrian oriented elements that address the human scale and pedestrian traffic on each façade that addresses the public right of way.
- i. **LANDSCAPE DESIGN** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(e) regarding landscape design, a variety in landscape design must be provided with no more than seventy-five (75) percent of the landscape materials, including plants being the same as those on adjacent properties. Additionally, according to the UDC Section 35-674(f), indigenous, non-invasive plant species and tropical plant species are permitted. The applicant has provided detailed landscaping plans for the river level. Consistent with previous recommendations and approved stipulations, staff finds that additional terracing elements

or planters integrated into the river level façade would be more appropriate at the river level to relate to the existing, historic condition, which includes various levels and locations of stone and vegetation. Additionally, consistent with stipulations of conceptual approval, staff finds that all existing stone materials should be reincorporated into the design at the river level. This includes stone that may not be original, or traced to Hugman’s original design.

- j. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – The UDC Section 35-673(n) addresses service areas and mechanical equipment and their impact on the public. Service areas and mechanical equipment should be visually unobtrusive and should be integrated with the design of the site and building. Noise generated from mechanical equipment shall not exceed city noise regulations. The applicant has noted that mechanical equipment will be screened by a mechanical penthouse.
- k. **BUILDING SCALE & MASSING (Street Level)**– According to the UDC Section 35-674(b) a building shall appear to have a “human scale”. To comply with this, a building must (1) express façade components in ways that will help to establish building scale, (2) align horizontal building elements with others in the blockface to establish building scale, (3) express the distinction between upper and lower levels, (4) in this instance, divide the façade of the building into modules that express traditional and (5) organize the mass of a building to provide solar access to the river. The applicant has proposed some human-scaled elements at the street level such as storefront and entrance canopies.
- l. **BUILDING SCALE & MASSING (River Level)** – The applicant has a pedestrian entrance at the river level as well as balconies that overlook the River Walk. While staff finds that the applicant has taken steps to introduce river-facing elements that reduce the scale, such as recessed balconies and a change in materials, additional design strategies should be explored that better respond to the pedestrian scale and natural setting of the river walk.
- m. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION** – According to the UDC Section 35-674, high rise buildings, more than one hundred (100) feet in height shall terminate with a distinctive top or cap. In addition to this, curtain wall systems shall be designed with modulating features such as projecting horizontal and/or vertical mullions, entrances shall be easy to find, be a special feature of the building and be appropriately scaled and the riverside façade of a building shall have simpler detailing and composition than the street façades. The applicant has proposed three distinct masses that are separated by horizontal breaks in building massing and has proposed that curtain wall systems be separated distinctly by mullion systems. The applicant has also provided distinction between the base, tower and tower cap.
- n. **FAÇADE COMPOSITION (North)** – The applicant has proposed for the north elevation, which is adjacent to other structures to feature a significantly less amount of fenestration. Since conceptual approval, the applicant has incorporated additional façade separation elements.
- o. **BUILDING HEIGHT** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(c) in regards to the height of new construction in RIO districts, there are no height restrictions for new construction in RIO 3 other than the solar access standards. The proposed building height is appropriate.
- p. **BUILDING HEIGHT** – Section 35-674(c)(3) states that building facades shall appear similar in height to those of other buildings found traditionally in the area. This section

also states that if fifty (50) percent of the building facades within a block face are predominantly lower than the maximum height allowed, the new building façade on the street-side shall align with the average height of those lower buildings within the block face, or with a particular building that falls within the fifty (50) percent range. The block on N St Mary's features multiple structures that feature heights comparable to that which has been proposed.

- q. **MATERIALS** – In regards to materials and finishes, the UDC Section 35-674(d)(1) states that indigenous and traditional building materials should be used for primary wall surfaces. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of walls (excluding window fenestrations) shall be composed of the following: Modular masonry materials including brick, stone, and rusticated masonry block, tile, terra-cotta, structural clay tile and cast stone. Concrete masonry units (CMU) are not allowed. However according to 35-674(d)(2)(B), glass curtain wall panels are allowed in RIO-3 as a secondary material as long as the river and street levels comply with 35-674(d)(1). The applicant has proposed materials that include glass curtain wall systems, stone veneer, GFRC panels and metal panels. Staff finds the proposed materials to be generally appropriate. At the river level, staff finds that the primary façade should feature stone with a rough finish to promote and relate to the pedestrian scale, per the UDC. Additionally, the UDC Section 35-674(e)(4), the river side façade of a building shall have simpler Detailing and composition that the street face, and are to appear less formal than the street facades. Staff finds that the proposed river side canopy should be modified to feature natural materials to accommodate the existing, natural environment of the river level.
- r. **WINDOWS** – The UDC Section 35-674(e)(2) provides information in regards to proper window fenestration and installation. For window openings that are not included within a curtain wall system, an inset of at least two to three inches within each wall is required. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC. Additionally, staff finds that dark colored frames should be used.
- s. **CANOPIES** – The applicant has proposed canopies at the street and river levels. Staff finds the proposed street level canopy to be appropriate and consistent with the UDC; however, per the UDC Section 35-674(d), materials that blend with the natural setting of the river are to be used. Staff finds that the canopy at the river level should feature natural materials and appearances.
- t. **LIGHTING DESIGN** – Lighting design for any project located in a RIO district is an important aspect of not only that particular project's design, but also the adjacent buildings as well as the River Walk. According to the UDC Section 35-673(j), site lighting should be considered an integral element of the landscape design of a property. The applicant has submitted a lighting plan noting lighting at the River Walk level.
- u. **OUTDOOR FURNITURE** – The applicant has proposed outdoor seating areas on the site. When returning to the Commission for final approval, the applicant should submit product and material information for review and approval by the HDRC. At no time shall outdoor furniture impede upon or block with public walkway at the River level.
- v. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project area is within the River Improvement Overlay District and San Antonio Downtown National Register of Historic Places District. The property is also adjacent to the historic alignment of the San Antonio River, an area known to contain significant historic and prehistoric archaeological deposits. A review of historic archival documents identifies structures within, or in close proximity to, the project area

as early as 1873. Thus, the property may contain sites, some of which may be significant. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through v with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant fully meet previous river level stipulations from conceptual approval. These stipulations included the river-level treatment of the tower and its redesign to better respond to the pedestrian scale and natural setting of the river walk. Staff recommends that terracing elements and façade elements such as stone, should be incorporated to strengthen the pedestrian scale. Additionally, a salvage and reuse plan for existing stone elements must be provided as part of the final landscaping plan; staff recommends that all existing stone on site be used in the final landscaping.
- ii. That any curb cut on N St Mary’s should be limited in width to no more than twenty-five (25) feet in width and should not result in a change of grade at the pedestrian level as to not interrupt pedestrian traffic on N St Mary’s.
- iii. That the applicant incorporate stone with a rough finish at the river level to promote and relate to the pedestrian scale, per the UDC, and that the proposed river level canopy feature natural, indigenous materials that complement the natural aspects of the River Walk.
- iv. Archaeology – Archaeological investigations shall be required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation archaeologists for review and approval prior to beginning the archaeological investigation. The project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society San Antonio support case with staff stipulations.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 1 with staff stipulations that include a salvage and reuse plan for existing stone elements as part of final landscaping; and approve item 2 and 4 as submitted.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon,
Nays: None.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item # 3. HDRC NO. 2020-166**
ADDRESS: 150 CROFTON
APPLICANT: TERRY HUNTER/HUNTER TERRY & STEPHANIE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new front yard perimeter fence, pedestrian gate, and driveway gate.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 150 Crofton was constructed circa 1910 in the Folk Victorian style and first appears on the Sanborn maps in 1912. It is a 1-story, single-family residence featuring a rectangular plan, a composition shingle hip and valley roof, wood cladding, and wood windows. The property is contributing to the King William Historic District.
- b. **FRONT YARD FENCE INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot-high black metal front yard fence featuring a pedestrian gate and a vehicle gate at the front of the driveway. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements stipulates that applicants should avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements additionally states that the appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall 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. Properties within the King William Historic District often feature front yard fences. The applicant has provided three examples of front yard fences at nearby properties on Crofton. Due to the precedent of front yard fences on the street and within the King William Historic District and due to the reversibility of fence installation, staff finds the proposal generally appropriate.
- c. **FRONT YARD FENCE DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed to install a black metal front yard fence similar to the existing metal front yard fence at 617 E Guenther. The applicant has requested to ground the metal fence in a concrete fence base. Guideline 2.B.i for Site Elements states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. Black wrought iron fencing is the most appropriate style for a Folk Victorian home. However, the proposed concrete fence base is generally featured at properties with large side and front yards and more prominent house setbacks. Staff finds the fencing material appropriate, but the proposed concrete fence base is inappropriate.
- d. **FRONT YARD FENCE HEIGHT** – The applicant has proposed to install a 4-foot-high front yard fence. Guideline 2.B.iii for Site Elements states that the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to four feet. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. **FRONT YARD FENCE CONFIGURATION** – The applicant has proposed to install the front yard fence that will begin where the existing privacy fence line terminates. On the west side of the property, the existing rear privacy fence terminates at the plane of the bay window. On the east side of the property, the rear privacy fence terminates behind the wall plane of the front façade. Guideline 2.C.i for Site Elements stipulates that privacy fences should be set back from the front façade of the building, rather than aligning with the front façade of the structure to reduce their visual prominence. As the rear privacy fence is existing, staff finds the configuration of the proposed front yard fence to be appropriate.
- f. **PEDESTRIAN GATE INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to install a pedestrian gate across the front yard walkway. Pedestrian gates should be located at the intersection of the property’s walkway and the public sidewalk. Pedestrian gates should relate to the design of the fence while maintaining the 4-foot height limit. Staff finds the proposal appropriate.
- g. **VEHICLE GATE INSTALLATION** – The applicant has proposed to install two vehicle gates, one vehicle gate at the front of the driveway and a second vehicle gate behind the front façade plane. Vehicle gates should be set behind the front façade plane of the house and not span across

the front of the driveway. A front vehicle gate may be considered if the site features an atypical condition including (a) a wraparound porch, (b) a narrow driveway less than 10 feet wide which prevents vehicle access beyond the front façade wall plane, and/or (c) front driveways abutting rear yards or commercial properties. The applicant has provided documentation that the driveway is less than 10 feet wide, however the width of the driveway does not prevent vehicles from driving beyond the front façade wall plane to the rear of the property. While a second vehicle gate behind the front façade plane is appropriate, a front driveway vehicle gate is not appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Item 1, staff recommends approval of the front yard fence installation based on findings a through e with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant does not install a concrete fence base.
- ii. That the applicant submits an updated site plan to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
- iii. That the applicant submits final material specifications to staff for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Item 2, staff recommends approval of the pedestrian gate based on finding f.

Item 3, staff does not recommend approval of the front driveway gate based on finding g.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Beverly Schwartzman, King William, an Ellen Law are opposed the fence placement because it conflicts HVAC Issues.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve item 1 with stipulations 2 and 3; and, approve item 2 and 3 as submitted.
Commissioner Velasquez seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Bowman, and Fetzer.
Nays: Carpenter and Laffoon.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 6 AYES AND 2 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item #4. HDRC NO. 2020-183**
ADDRESS: 1804 S ST MARYS ST
APPLICANT: David Quinn/Shade TX Sombrilla

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install one fire retardant fabric awning, approximately 27-feet by 3-feet, with a 3-foot projection at the commercial block addressed 1804 S St Marys.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 1804 S St Marys is a 2-story commercial block constructed circa 1920. The structure features a brick façade, traditional storefront fenestration, and evidence of tie rods for a first for metal awning. The structure is an individually listed local landmark.
- b. AWNING – The applicant has request to install an awning above the first floor storefront. The awning is proposed to be constructed of weather resistant fabric with a 3 foot projection.

According to the Historic Design Guidelines, canopy and awning elements should be limited to buildings that historically had them, and missing features should be restored with evidence of an original configuration. Per Google Street View, a metal canopy sign with ties existed on this structure through 2011 and was subsequently removed. The canopy design and material is consistent with historic precedents. Staff finds that the applicant should replicate the prior metal canopy as closely as possible to be consistent with the Guidelines. Staff does not find the fabric awning appropriate given clear evidence of a more appropriate condition.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend the fabric awning as proposed based on finding b. Staff finds that the applicant should install a metal canopy with ties that closely resembles the previous canopy as evidenced in Google Street View photos from as recent as 2011.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society of San Antonio opposed to placement of awning .

Motion: Commissioner Fish for to deny application.
Commissioner Gibbs seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nays: None.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores and Grube.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item # 5. HDRC NO. 2020-197**
ADDRESS: 515 N PALMETTO
APPLICANT: Ricardo McCullough

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for the construction of six, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 515 N Palmetto, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant has noted that each structure is to feature a footprint of approximately 840 square feet.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting conceptual approval of a site plan for the construction of six, 2-story residential structures on the vacant lot at 515 N Palmetto, located within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The applicant has noted that each structure is to feature a footprint of approximately 840 square feet.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.
- c. **CONTEXT & DEVELOPMENT PATTERN** – As noted in finding a, the existing site is currently void of any structures and is bounded by N Palmetto to the east and Florence/Dawson Alley to the west (rear). The lot is approximately 120 feet wide and 130 feet deep for a total size of 15,600 square feet. The applicant intends to sub divide the property into three lots.
- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – This request was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on April 22, 2020. At that meeting, the committee noted that front yard parking pads

- should be removed, commented on driveway configuration and noted that three new structures rather than six would be most appropriate for the district.
- e. **SETBACKS & ORIENTATION** – Regarding setbacks, the applicant has proposed setbacks for the structures fronting N Palmetto feature setbacks that are less than those found historically on the block. This is not consistent with the Guidelines. According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings are to align with front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. Staff finds that the applicant should incorporate setbacks for each structure that are equal to or greater than those found historically on the block. Regarding orientation, the applicant has proposed an orientation that is appropriate for structure oriented towards both N Palmetto, and the alley to the immediate west.
 - f. **SCALE & MASS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i., a height and massing similar to historic structures in the vicinity of the proposed new construction should be used. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one-story. This block of N Palmetto features five historic structures, only one of which features more than one story in height. While the proposed height of the new construction may be consistent with the Guidelines given the existence of a two-story historic structure on the block, staff is concerned regarding the proposed proportions of the new construction, which would feature two stories in height, plus roof massing, but only twenty-two (22) feet in width. Generally, staff finds that massing that is consistent with the massing of historic structures in the district should be proposed.
 - g. **SCALE & MASS** – As noted in finding e, staff finds the proposed width to height ratio of the proposed new construction to be atypical with examples found historically within the district. In regards to the structures addressing the rear alley, historically, rear accessory structures that feature alley access in historic district feature a scale that is subordinate to that of the primary historic structure. Staff finds the massing of the three structures addressing the alley to be inappropriate and inconsistent with the Guidelines. Structures with reduced massing, as well as varied architectural elements would be more appropriate.
 - h. **MASSING TRANSITIONS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.ii., applicants should utilize stepdowns in building height, wall-plane offsets, and other variations in building massing to provide a visual transition when the height of new construction exceeds that of adjacent historic buildings by more than one-half story. Staff finds that no transitions in building massing have been incorporated into the design.
 - i. **ENTRANCES** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.B.i., primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. The applicant’s proposed entrance orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.
 - j. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii., applicants should align foundation and floor-to-floor heights within one foot of floor-to-floor heights on adjacent historic structures. At this time the applicant has not provided information regarding foundation heights. Staff finds that the applicant should utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines.
 - k. **ROOF FORMS** – The applicant has proposed for each structure to feature both front and side gabled roofs. While these forms are found historically within the Dignowity Hill Historic District, staff finds that the proposed proportions and lack of a uniform gable height for both are inconsistent with historic examples found in the district. Staff finds that ridge lines of both the front and side gabled roofs should be uniform, as found on the historic structure at the corner of N Palmetto and Dawson.
 - l. **WINDOW & DOOR OPENINGS** – Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.C.i., window and door openings with similar proportions of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades should be incorporated into new construction. Per the elevation that the applicant has

- submitted, staff finds the proposed windows to be inconsistent with the Guidelines, as there are windows located on both the first and second floors on the primary façade that feature sizes that are not found historically within the district.
- m. **PORCH MASSING** – The applicant has proposed a front porch that consists of a stoop and roof element that is attached to the front façade of the historic structure. Porches found historically within the district feature massing that is incorporated into the massing of the structure, rather than simply attaching to the front façade, particularly in the case of two story structures. Staff finds that the proposed porch massing should be incorporated into the massing of the structure, as found on the historic structure at the corner of N Palmetto and Dawson.
 - n. **LOT COVERAGE** – The applicant has proposed to subdivide the 15,600 square feet property into three equalsize 5,200 square feet lots. On each of the lots, the applicant has proposed to construct two structures featuring approximately 836 square feet each. Per the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i., applicants should limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. While the proposed lot coverage may be consistent with the Guidelines, six, primary residential structures are not found in this context historically within the district.
 - o. **MATERIALS** – At this time the applicant has not submitted information regarding materials. Staff finds that all siding should feature a four (4) inch exposure, a thickness of ¾”, mitered corners and a smooth finish. Columns should be six inches square, and window materials should meet staff’s standards for windows in new construction.
 - p. **WINDOW MATERIALS** – At this time, the applicant has not provided information regarding window materials. Staff finds that a wood, or aluminum clad wood window should be installed that is consistent with staff’s specifications for windows, which are noted in the applicable citations.
 - q. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – As noted in the previous findings, staff finds that many of the proposed architectural details, including porch massing, roof massing, and window proportions are inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff finds that these elements should be modified. Additionally, staff finds that six, repetitive designs are inappropriate for a historic district, and that each structure should feature unique massing and architectural details.
 - r. **SITE ELEMENTS** – The applicant has provided the location of walkways and driveways. Generally, the location of driveways and walkways is appropriate; however, staff finds that the proposed driveway lengths should be extended to the rear of each lot.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through q. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to receiving a recommendation for conceptual approval:

- i. That the applicant incorporate setbacks that are equal to or greater than those found historically on the block as noted in finding e.
- ii. That the applicant propose an overall building massing (width to height ratio) that is consistent with that of two story structures found historically within the district, as noted in finding f.
- iii. That the proposed structures on the rear alley be reduced in height and massing to be consistent with rear accessory structure found historically within the district (subordinate to the primary structure), as noted in finding g.
- iv. That the applicant utilize foundation heights that are consistent with the Guidelines, as noted in finding j.
- v. That the applicant incorporate roof forms that feature matching ridge lines as noted in finding k.
- vi. That the applicant incorporate appropriate window sizes and proportions as noted in finding l.
- vii. That the applicant incorporate appropriate porch massing as noted in finding m.

- viii. That the applicant proposed unique designs for each structure, rather than six, repetitive structures, as noted in finding q.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Conservation Society of San Antonio and Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association opposed to development.

Motion: Commissioner Carpenter moved to approve to table until next hearing.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nays: None.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item # 6. HDRC NO. 2020-185**
ADDRESS: 306 AUSTIN ST
APPLICANT: Paul Vidal/Custom Signs

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a new sign measuring approximately 40 square feet. The sign will be affixed over the original date and building name marker at the center of the parapet on the front façade.

FINDINGS:

- a. The multitenant commercial structure located at 306 Austin St. is a designated historic landmark, with the common name of Wolfmueller Building. The building is 2 stories and features a symmetrical front façade with storefront windows on the first floor, five windows on the second floor, and a raised parapet. Primary façade materials are cast stone and brick with decorative patterning at the cornice level. The building was designated on October 27, 1988 as part of a comprehensive ordinance that landmarked nearly 1,100 structures. The applicant is requesting approval to install a new sign to measure approximately 40 square feet, to hang over the original date and name marker on the front parapet.
- b. **NUMBER AND SQUARE FOOTAGE** – According to guideline 1.A.i, each building is allowed one major and two minor signs with a total square footage not to exceed 50 feet. The applicant’s proposal of a sign totaling approximately 40 square feet is generally consistent with the square footage requirement. Staff finds that additional signage on the building may exceed the number requirement. Staff requires that the applicant verify that no additional signage remains prior to its installation if approved.
- c. **DESIGN** – The applicant has proposed to install a single-sided sign to identify the tenant. The sign will be affixed over the original date and building name marker on the central parapet on the front façade. Based on the drawings submitted, the sign will hang over the parapet and will not be affixed to the front brick. The sign will feature white letters on a black background. Guideline 1.D.iii states that colors on signs should be limited to three, and that white text on a dark background will increase legibility. Guideline 3.A.iii stipulates that projecting signs should only be used on building forms that historically had them, particularly commercial storefronts. Staff finds the design of the sign consistent with the Guidelines and appropriate for the structure.

- d. MATERIAL – The applicant has proposed to utilize reverse channel lettering illuminated with indirect LED lighting. According to guideline 3.C.iv, reverse channel letters may be permitted. Staff finds the proposal generally consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. LOCATION – The applicant has proposed to install the sign over the existing date and building marker on the front parapet. Guideline 3.A.iii stipulates that projecting signs should only be used on building forms that historically had them, particularly commercial storefronts. Staff finds the location of the sign inconsistent with the Guidelines and recommends that the applicant propose a projecting blade sign, under canopy sign, or wall sign that does not conceal any historic features.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding d. Staff recommends that the applicant proposes a location and design that does not conceal the original parapet with building name and date as noted in finding d. Temporary signage may be approved in accordance with the UDC until permanent signage is approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved for denial of application.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, and Laffoon.
Nays: Fetzer.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES AND 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

• **Item #7. HDRC NO. 2020-190**

ADDRESS: 301 BURLESON ST
APPLICANT: thomas friedman/FRIEDMAN THOMAS J

REQUEST:

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

1. Construct a wood patio in the side yard with detachable shade tarp.
2. Install a front yard rock garden including concrete pavers and artificial turf.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 301 Burleson was constructed circa 1905 in the Folk Victorian style, first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map, and contributes to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The one-story single-family structure features hipped roofs with a front-facing gable and partially enclosed wraparound porch with standing seam metal roofing material, wood sash windows, and stucco siding. The corner property features an atypical side yard with parking in rear accessed on cross street N Cherry.
- b. COMPLIANCE – On a site visit conducted on April 16, 2020, staff found that the property at 301 Burleson was subjected front yard shade structure and landscape modifications prior to approval. The applicant was cooperative to the Stop Work Order and submitted an application to be heard at the next Historic and Design Review Commission hearing.
- c. SHADE STRUCTURE – The applicant has proposed to install a detached wood deck with 12’ tall driftwood posts that a shade tarp can be attached to. The proposed structure features stained 1” x 6” decking, 2” x 2” framing, 2” x 4” posts, set on cinderblocks, located in the side yard

adjacent to and visible from the front right-of-way on Burleson. Staff finds that the proposed shade structure in its currently is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii and v. as it does not relate to the architectural style of the building and obscures building features such as the front porch and fenestration. Staff finds that the structure may be appropriate as a completely detached rear yard feature as defined by being set behind the front-most sidefacing window, and that any point of attachment of the shade tarp to the historic structure should be minimal and reversible. If the shade structure is to be set further in the rear of the side yard, the applicant may request installing a privacy fence or taller plant elements to distinguish between front and rear yards.

- d. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard rock garden including large rock beds, concrete pavers, artificial turf, and a small wood and cinder block bridge. Staff finds that the proposed landscape features are a major departure from the Guidelines for Site Elements 7.A. and B. Each of the site elements are recommended against for front yards but may be eligible for administrative approval if they can be installed in the rear yard without visibility from the front right-of-way.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval of the shade structure and landscaping based on findings b through d. The applicant may work with staff for administrative approval to install the features set further in the rear of the side yard; the front yard should otherwise be restored to natural lawn or appropriate xeric-plantings.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association supports staff recommendations.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved for denial of application.
Commissioner Fernandez seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nay: None.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT.

• **Item # 8. HDRC NO. 2020-175**

ADDRESS: 311 REFUGIO ST

APPLICANT: BRIAN VOGES/VOGES DESIGN, LLC

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct two 2-story duplex homes at 311 Refugio.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 311 Refugio is currently vacant, but originally featured two single-family structures constructed circa 1910. They first appear on the Sanborn Map in 1912. The current vacant lot front Refugio to the south and Lavaca to the north. The block consists of 1-story and 2-story single-family and multi-family residences and infill construction. The property is contributing to the Lavaca Historic District.
- b. **CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL** – Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness or final approval..

- c. **CASE HISTORY** – The applicant’s case was previously heard by the HDRC on July 17, 2019. The applicant received conceptual approval with staff stipulations to construct four, 2-story single-family residential structures on the lot at 311 Refugio with frontage on both Refugio and Lavaca streets. The applicant updated the proposal and returned to the HDRC on February 19, 2020. After receiving feedback from the Commissioners, the applicant withdrew the proposal and has submitted a new application with updates that reflect Commissioner comments for consideration.
- d. **DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE** – The applicant attended a Design Review Committee for the updated application on May 12, 2020. The discussion focused on setbacks, massing, noting the heights of neighboring structures on future submission, modifying the front porch design, and providing precedents for the front fixed window.
- e. **SETBACK & ORIENTATION (REFUGIO)** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings should align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has proposed to construct two 2-story, duplexes residences at 311 Refugio. The residences will be detached, with one duplex entrance facing Refugio and the other duplex entrance facing Lavaca. The applicant has noted that the proposed setback from Refugio will be 14 feet. Adjacent structures feature setbacks that range from approximately 10 to 20 feet. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction stipulate that primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street and that front facades should be aligned with the front facades of adjacent buildings. Historically, homes have had frontage on both Refugio and Lavaca Streets. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.
- f. **SETBACK & ORIENTATION (LAVACA)** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, the front facades of new buildings should align with the front facades of adjacent buildings where a consistent setback has been established along the street frontage. Additionally, the orientation of new construction should be consistent with the historic examples found on the block. The applicant has noted that the proposed setback from Lavaca will be 25 feet, which is generally consistent with adjacent structures. Current renderings show the front façade of the new construction in front of the neighboring historic structures. Staff finds that the applicant should provide a setback diagram noting the proposed setback is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. **ENTRANCES** – According to Guideline 1.B.i for New Construction, primary building entrances should be oriented towards the primary street. Staff finds the proposal for primary entrances on both Lavaca and Refugio Streets appropriate.
- h. **SCALE & MASSING** – According to Guideline 2.A.i for New Construction, new structures should feature a height and massing that is similar to historic structures in the vicinity. In residential districts, the height and scale of new construction should not exceed that of the majority of historic buildings by more than one story. The blocks of Refugio and Lavaca feature one-story and two-story historic structures. Staff finds that the proposed scale and massing of the two structures appear generally appropriate.
- i. **FOUNDATION & FLOOR HEIGHTS** – Guideline 2.A.iii for New Construction stipulates that foundation and floor heights should be aligned within one (1) foot of the neighboring structure’s foundation and floor heights. At this time, the applicant has not provided a diagram showing the foundation and floor heights of neighboring structures. The applicant is responsible for complying with the Guidelines.
- j. **ROOF FORM** – The applicant has proposed cross gable roof forms on each of the duplexes. According to Guideline 2.B.i for New Construction, new construction should feature roof forms that are consistent with those predominantly found on the block. The blocks of Refugio and Lavaca feature structures with front-facing gable roofs, hipped roofs, and shed porch roofs. Staff finds the proposal consistent with the Guidelines.

- k. LOT COVERAGE – Guideline 2.D.i for New Construction stipulates that building to lot ratio for new construction should be consistent with adjacent historic buildings. Limit the building footprint for new construction to no more than 50 percent of the total lot area, unless adjacent historic buildings establish a precedent with a greater building to lot ratio. The applicant has expressed that the proposed lot coverage will be 38 percent. Staff recommends that the applicant provide the total square footage for the lot and submit materials indicating the percentage of lot coverage proposed.
- l. MATERIALS AND TEXTURES – The applicant has proposed to clad the proposed structures in stucco over metal laith and vertical siding. The rendering appears to show a proposed metal roof. Guideline 3.A.i for New Construction stipulates that new construction should use materials that complement the type, color, and texture of materials traditionally found in the district. Materials should not be so dissimilar as to distract from the historic interpretation of the district. For example, corrugated metal siding would not be appropriate for a new structure in a district comprised of homes with wood siding. Consider using traditional materials, such as wood siding, in a new way to provide visual interest in new construction while still ensuring compatibility. Staff recommends that the applicant provide detailed material specifications.
- m. WINDOW MATERIALS – At this time, the applicant has proposed to install Lincoln windows, but has not specified the materiality. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles and proportions that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. An alternative window material may be proposed, provided that the window features meeting rails that are no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and an architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or be concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- n. RELATIONSHIP OF SOLIDS TO VOIDS – The applicant has proposed to install 3-pane casement windows and a three-over-four fixed bay of windows on the front of each structure. The proposed window proportions do not appear to be in keeping with those historically found in the district. Guideline 2.C.i for New Construction states that window and door openings should be incorporated into new construction with a similar proportion of wall to window space as typical with nearby historic facades. Windows, doors, porches, entryways, dormers, bays, and pediments shall be considered similar if they are no larger than 25% in size and vary no more than 10% in height-to-width ratio from adjacent historic facades. Staff finds the proposed windows inconsistent with the Guidelines.
- o. ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS –Guideline 4.A.i for New Construction states that new buildings should be designed to reflect their time while respecting the historic context. While new construction should not attempt to mirror or replicate historic features, new structures should not be so dissimilar as to distract from or diminish the historic interpretation of the district. Staff finds that the proposed new construction should incorporate architectural details that are respectful of the historic context and are consistent with the Guidelines.
- p. DRIVEWAYS – Guideline 5.B.i for Site Elements notes that new driveways should be similar to those found b historically within the district in regard to their materials, width, and design. Additionally, the Guidelines note that driveways should not exceed ten (10) feet in width. The applicant has proposed to install one ribbon driveway for each structure that is 7 feet, 6 inches wide and that terminates in a parking pad at the rear of the structure. Staff finds the proposed ribbon driveway consistent with the Guidelines but recommends exploring alternatives for the full concrete rear parking pad.

- q. FRONT WALKWAYS – The Guidelines for Site Elements note that front yard sidewalk should appear similar to those found historically within the district in regard to their materials, width, alignment and configuration. Staff finds the proposed walkways consistent with the Guidelines.
- r. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT – Per Guideline 6.B.ii for New Construction, all mechanical equipment should be screened from view at the public right-of-way.
- s. LANDSCAPING PLAN – At this time, the applicant has not provided a landscaping plan. The applicant should install landscape elements that are consistent with those found historically in the district.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on findings a through s. Staff recommends that the applicant address the following items prior to receiving a recommendation for conceptual approval:

- i. That the applicant submits material specifications to staff for review and approval based on findings l through n.
- ii. That the applicant submits window specifications to staff for review and approval. Wood or aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended and should feature an inset of two (2) inches within facades and should feature profiles that are found historically within the immediate vicinity. Meeting rails must be no taller than 1.25” and stiles no wider than 2.25”. White manufacturer’s color is not allowed, and color selection must be presented to staff. There should be a minimum of two inches in depth between the front face of the window trim and the front face of the top window sash. This must be accomplished by recessing the window sufficiently within the opening or with the installation of additional window trim to add thickness. Window trim must feature traditional dimensions and architecturally appropriate sill detail. Window track components must be painted to match the window trim or concealed by a wood window screen set within the opening.
- iii. That the applicant proposes window sizes, patterns, proportions, and trim and sill detailing that are consistent with the Guidelines and historic precedents in the district as noted in findings m and n.
- iv. That the applicant explores alternatives to the full concrete rear parking pad.
- v. That the applicant provides the percentage of lot coverage for the proposed structures.
- vi. That the applicant provides a setback diagram showing that the proposed structure will not be located in front of the front façade planes of adjacent historic structures.
- vii. That the applicant submits elevation drawings for each elevation to staff for review and approval.
- viii. That the applicant submits a landscaping plan to staff for review and approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Cherise-Rohr- Allerigini- supports proposed development; and, Conservation Society supports staff recommendations for denial of conceptual approval.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved to approve with staff stipulations.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nay: None.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: **MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT**

- **Item # 9. HDRC NO. 2020-209**

ADDRESS: 202 THORAIN BLVD
APPLICANT: Christina Palafox/KERSEY DIANA C &

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install front yard fencing. The fence will be constructed of cedar posts and galvanized steel, double loop wire and will measure a maximum of four feet in height.

FINDINGS:

- a. The primary structure located at 2020 Thorain is a 1-story residential structure constructed circa 1940 in the Minimal Traditional style. The home features an asymmetrical front porch, scalloped siding in the gables, and a front bay window. The structure is located at the intersection of Thorain Blvd and Howard Ave and is contributing to the Olmos Park Terrace Historic District.
- b. FRONT YARD FENCE INSTALLATION – The applicant has proposed to install a front yard fencing constructed of cedar posts and galvanized steel, double loop wire. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements stipulates that applicants should avoid installing a fence or wall in a location where one did not historically exist, particularly within the front yard. Guideline 2.B.ii for Site Elements additionally states that the appropriateness of a front yard fence or wall is dependent on conditions within a specific historic district. New front yard fences should not be introduced within historic districts or along blocks that have not historically had them. Olmos Park Terrace did not historically feature front yard fencing, and the presence of fencing in the district today is rare. Based on a windshield survey of Thorain, one low stone wall and two instances of inconsistent wood picket fencing is present in front yards. Due to the lack of precedence of front yard fencing in the district, staff does not find the proposal to be consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. FRONT YARD FENCE DESIGN – The applicant has proposed to install fencing constructed of cedar vertical posts and galvanized steel, double loop wire. The fencing will closely match the design of an existing rear fence. The applicant has indicated that the plants and vegetation in the front yard will, over time, conceal the fence from public view. Guideline 2.B.i for Site Elements states that new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of scale, transparency, and character. Design of fence should respond to the design and materials of the house or main structure. While the fence design is present in the rear yard, as noted in finding b, staff does not find the location of the fence appropriate.
- d. FRONT YARD FENCE HEIGHT – The applicant has proposed to install a fence that measures no taller than four feet in height. Guideline 2.B.iii for Site Elements states that the height of new fences and walls within the front yard should be limited to four feet. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines, but does not find the location appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff does not recommend approval based on finding c. Minor modifications to the garage door widths and/or their spacing may be considered for administrative approval if the two single-width configuration remains.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Norma Martinez Flores oppose to fence, and Betty Eckert concurs with staff stipulations to deny application.

Motion: Commissioner Fish moved for denial of application.
Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion.

Vote: Ayes: Fernandez, Fish, Gibbs, Velasquez, Carpenter, Bowman, Fetzer, and Laffoon.
Nay: None.
Absent: Arreola, Martinez-Flores, and Grube.

Action: MOTION PASSED with 8 AYES, and 0 NAYS. 3 ABSENT

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:57 PM.

APPROVED

Jeffrey Fetzer
Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey Fetzer', written in a cursive style.

5/29/20