

City of San Antonio



Minutes
Board of Adjustment
Development and Business
Services Center
1901 S. Alamo

Monday, October 21, 2024

1:00 PM

1901 S. Alamo

The meeting was called to by order by Chair Oroian at 1:00 PM and roll was called by Monica Reyes-Urdiales noting the following members present:

Roll Call – Present: Brereton, Dean, Benavides (joined via WebEx at 1:02 PM), Ozuna, Vasquez, Cruz, Oroian, Stevens (via WebEx), Ybanez, Manna, Bragman, Kaplan (joined via WebEx at 3:39 PM), Riahi (joined via WebEx at 4:28 PM)

Absent: Gomez

Worldwide Interpreters present.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MAY BE CONSIDERED AT ANY TIME DURING THE REGULAR MEETING:

Item #1

BOA-24-10300187: A request by Mary Ann MacCartney for a Special Exception to allow one (1) additional Type 2 Short Term Rental permit on the block face, per UDC Section 35-374.01(c), located at 230 Lucas Street Unit 202. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Joseph Leos, Senior Planner (210) 207-0315, Joseph.Leos@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 31 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 0 in opposition. No response from the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association.

Mary Ann MacCartney, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kevin Nguyen – in opposition

Commissioner Cruz made a motion. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300187, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a special exception to allow for (1) Type 2 short term rental unit, situated at 230 Lucas Street Unit 202, applicant being Mary Ann MacCartney, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

A. The special exception will not materially endanger the public health or safety.

The Board finds that the request to operate an additional short term rental is unlikely to materially endanger the public health, safety, or welfare. There is nothing obvious that would distinguish a short term rental versus a long term rental at this facility.

B. The special exception does not create a public nuisance.

There does not appear to be a reason to believe a public nuisance would be created if an additional short term rental permit was approved.

C. The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use.

The neighboring properties consist of single-family and multi-family structures. This scenario does not cause reason to believe it will substantially injure neighboring property as a Type 2 Short Term Rental.

D. Adequate utilities, access roads, storm drainage, recreation, open space, and other necessary faculties have been or are being provided.

The subject property provides off-street parking and appears to have adequate utilities, access, and open space.

E. The applicant or owner for the special exception does not have any previously revoked short term rental licenses, confirmed citations, or adjudicated offenses convictions for violations of Chapter 16, Article XXII of the City Code within one year prior to the date of the application.

The applicant does not have any history of revocation, citations, or convictions for violations of Chapter 16.

F. The special exception will not alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property for which the special exception is sought.

The subject property is located in close proximity to other residential. With the property owner providing off-street parking and maintaining it from the neighboring property, the special exception does not appear to alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property is seeking the special exception.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brereton.

Favor: Cruz, Brereton, Stevens, Ybanez, Manna, Bragman, Benavides, Ozuna, Vasquez, Oroian
Opposed: Dean

MOTION PASSED

Item #2

BOA-24-10300191: A request by Sherlyn Norton for a Special Exception to allow one (1) additional Type 2 Short Term Rental permit on the block face, per UDC Section 35-374.01(c)., located at 16106 Noble Night Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 8) (Juan Alvarez, Planner (210) 207-7232, Juan.Alvarez2@SanAntonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 33 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 2 in opposition. No response from the Grandview Homeowners Association. No response from the Riot Commons Community Organizations.

Garrett Holden, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Voice mail

Melissa Wallis – in opposition

A motion was made by Commissioner Bragman. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300191, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a special exception to allow for (1) Type 2 short term rental unit, situated at 16106 Noble Night Street applicant being Sherlyn Norton, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

A. The special exception will not materially endanger the public health or safety.

The Board finds that the request to operate an additional short term rental is unlikely to materially endanger the public health, safety, or welfare. There is nothing obvious that would distinguish a short term rental versus a long term rental at this facility.

B. The special exception does not create a public nuisance.

There does not appear to be a reason to believe a public nuisance would be created if an additional short term rental permit was approved.

C. The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use.

The neighboring properties consist of single-family structures. This scenario does not cause reason to believe it will substantially injure neighboring property as a Type 2 Short Term Rental.

D. Adequate utilities, access roads, storm drainage, recreation, open space, and other necessary faculties have been or are being provided.

The subject property provides off-street parking and appears to have adequate utilities, access, and open space.

E. The applicant or owner for the special exception does not have any previously revoked short term rental licenses, confirmed citations, or adjudicated offenses convictions for violations of Chapter 16, Article XXII of the City Code within one year prior to the date of the application.

The applicant or owner does not have confirmed citations, or adjudicated offenses or convictions for this subject property as he only received a notice of violation for operating without a permit and submitted an STR application shortly afterwards for other properties.

F. The special exception will not alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property for which the special exception is sought.

The subject property is located in close proximity to other residential uses. With the property owner providing off-street parking and maintaining it from the neighboring property, the special exception does not appear to alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property is seeking the special exception.

The motion was seconded by Chair Oroian.

Favor: None

Opposed: Bragman, Oroian, Brereton, Stevens, Ybanez, Dean, Cruz, Manna, Benavides, Ozuna, Vasquez

MOTION FAILED

Item #3

(Continued from 10/7/2024) BOA-24-10300174: A request by One Stop Code Consulting, LLC for variance to allow four separate units on two abutting “RM-4” lots that are each less than one-third of an acre, located at 3050 and 3054 McArthur Avenue. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 4) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

A motion was made by Commissioner Ozuna to continue BOA-24-10300174 to the December 16th Board of Adjustment meeting.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brereton.

A verbal vote was taken, and all voted in affirmative.

MOTION PASSED

Item #4

(Continued from 10/7/2024) BOA-24-10300185: A request by Arturo Rivera for a variance to allow development of two structures on an “MF-33” lot that is one-third of an acre or less, located at 215 Lucas Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 38 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 2 in opposition. No response from the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association.

Arturo Rivera, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Oroian tabled Item #4 at 1:46 pm for the applicant to contact Kevin Nguyen of the Mahncke Park Neighborhood Association.

(Item brought back from Table at 2:17 pm) BOA-24-10300185

Commissioner Manna made a motion. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300185, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a variance to allow development of two structures on an “MF-33” lot that is one-third of an acre or less, situated at 215 Lucas Street, applicant being Arturo Rivera, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The request will not be contrary to the public interest, as adequate spacing exists on the lot to permit two separate structures which will not impact the community feel of the neighborhood.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

The special conditions found is the irregular lot shape as it relates to depth compared to similar nearby lots.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The two separate structures will be observing the spirit of the ordinance, as they will be abiding by all other setback requirements and not imposing on the public interest of the adjacent neighbors.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, the variance does not interfere with the development pattern of the neighborhood and will not injure the adjacent use of conforming properties or alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds the plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, such as the shape and size of the lot. The circumstances do not appear to be merely financial.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Benavides.

Favor: Manna, Benavides, Brereton, Stevens, Ybanez, Dean, Cruz, Bragman, Ozuna, Vasquez, Oroian

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

Item #5

BOA-24-10300130: A request by Aqua Verde Enterprises, Inc. for 1) a 4'-11" variance from the minimum 5' side setback requirement to allow a structure to have 1" side setbacks, and 2) a 4'-11" variance from the minimum 5' rear setback requirement to allow a structure to have a 1" rear setback, located at 419 South Hackberry Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 29 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 0 in opposition. No registered Neighborhood Association.

Kort Breaux, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300130, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 4'-11" variance from the minimum 5' side setback requirement to allow a structure to have 1" side setbacks limited to the north side, and 2) a 4'-11" variance from the minimum 5' rear setback requirement to allow a structure to have a 1" rear setback as defined by plans submitted and approved by City Council on October 17, 2024, situated at 419 South Hackberry, applicant being Aqua Verde Enterprises, Inc, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The requested variance will not be contrary to the public interest as they will provide sufficient distance from neighboring lots and roadway.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the structure would need to be reconstructed to meet the required setback requirements.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variance provides a safe distance from the neighboring property, adheres to remaining setback requirements and will observe the spirit of the ordinance.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, staff finds that the variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties and will not directly alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the

owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The side and rear setback variances are due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner such as the location and size of the lot and surrounding area.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Favor: Manna, Bragman, Brereton, Stevens, Ybanez, Dean, Benavides, Ozuna, Vasquez, Oroian
Opposed: Cruz

MOTION PASSED

Commissioner Ybanez left the Board of Adjustment meeting at 2:44 pm

Item #6

BOA-24-10300142: A request by Oscar Munoz for 1) a 31% variance from the NDC-3 maximum 35% impervious cover to allow 66% impervious coverage in the front yard, 2) an NCD-3 variance to allow a front yard fence on the east side of property, and 3) a 60' variance from the minimum 65' driveway separation to allow a 5' driveway separation, located at 207 Stardust Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 16 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 0 in opposition. The Ingram Hills Neighborhood Association is in favor.

Cindy Munoz, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Ozuna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300142, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 1) 31% variance from the NDC-3 maximum 35% impervious cover to allow 66% impervious coverage in the front yard, 2) an NCD-3 variance to allow a front yard fence on the east side of property, and 3) a 55' variance from the minimum 65' driveway separation to allow a 10' driveway separation, situated at 207 Stardust Street, applicant being Oscar Munoz, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The requested variances will not be contrary to the public interest as they will provide sufficient permeable surface area and will not detract from established driveway and front yard fencing standards in the surrounding area.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the driveway and privacy fence would need to be reconstructed or removed to meet NCD-3 standards.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variances will not injure uniformed appearance in the area, adheres to remaining NCD-3 requirements and will observe the spirit of the ordinance.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, staff finds that the variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties and will not directly alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The variances are due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner, as the property will maintain 31% permeable surface area, provide privacy between neighboring lots, and will not injure the adjacent properties.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Manna.

Commissioner Manna requested to remove Item #2.

Commissioner Ozuna agreed to remove Item #2 from the motion.

After discussion, Chair Oroian requested to read Item #1 separately by removing both Item #2 and Item #3 from the motion which was accepted by both Commissioners Ozuna and Manna.

Chair Oroian made a request for a friendly amendment for Item #1 to “a 15% variance from the maximum 35% impervious cover to allow 50% impervious coverage in the front yard”.

Favor: Ozuna, Manna, Brereton, Stevens, Benavides, Dean, Cruz, Bragman, Vasquez, Oroian

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

Chair Oroian made a motion regarding BOA-24-10300142, item #2. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300142, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for an NCD-3 variance to allow a front yard fence on the east side of property with previous findings stated to remain the same.

Seconded by Commissioner Bragman

Favor: None

Opposed: Oroian, Bragman, Brereton, Stevens, Dean, Cruz, Manna, Benavides, Ozuna, Vasquez

MOTION FAILED

Chair Oroian made a motion regarding BOA-24-10300142, item #3.

Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300142, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 55' variance from the minimum 65' driveway separation to allow a 10' driveway separation with previous findings stated to remain the same.

Seconded by Commissioner Ozuna

Favor: Oroian, Ozuna, Brereton, Stevens, Dean, Cruz, Manna, Bragman, Benavides, Vasquez

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

The Board went into recess at 3:00 PM and reconvened at 3:06 PM.

Chair Oroian made a motion to reconsider BOA-24-10300142

Seconded by Commissioner Brereton

A verbal vote was taken, and all voted in affirmative.

MOTION PASSED

A motion was made by Commissioner Brereton. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300142, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 1) 15% variance from the NDC-3 maximum 35% impervious cover to allow 50% impervious coverage in the front yard, and 2) a 55' variance from the minimum 65' driveway separation to allow a 10' driveway separation, situated at 207 Stardust Street, applicant being Oscar Munoz, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The requested variances will not be contrary to the public interest as they will provide sufficient permeable surface area and will not detract from established driveway.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the driveway would need to be reconstructed to meet NCD-3 standards.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variances will not injure the uniform appearance in the area, adheres to remaining NCD-3 requirements and will observe the spirit of the ordinance.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, staff finds that the variances will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties and will not directly alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The variances are due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner, as the property will maintain 50% permeable surface area and they will not injure adjacent properties.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Manna.

A verbal vote was taken, and all voted in affirmative.

MOTION PASSED

Item #7

BOA-24-10300158: A request by Elbert A Fuqua for 1) a 2' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow residential development to be 3' from the southern side setback, 2) a 1' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 4' side setback, and 3) a half story variance from the maximum 2.5 stories to allow two detached structures to be 3 stories, located at 203 and 205 Toledo Street. Staff recommends Approval for the Side Setback Variances. Staff recommends Denial for the Half Story Variance. (Council District 2) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 20 Notices were mailed to property owners, 3 in favor, 0 in opposition. The Denver Heights Neighborhood Association is in opposition.

Elbert Fuqua, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

A motion was made by commissioner Manna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300158, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 2' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow residential development to be 3' from the southern side setback, and 2) a 1' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 4' side setback, situated at 203 and 205 Toledo Street, applicant being Elbert A Fuqua, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The variances will not be contrary to the public interest as they will provide sufficient distance from each dwelling unit and neighboring properties.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the proposed structures would have to be reconfigured to abide by the "AE-2" setback regulations that restrict residential development on a limited size lot.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variances to allow for both a 3' and 4' side setback for two proposed dwellings provide a safe distance from the neighboring property and will observe the spirit of the ordinance.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, staff finds that the requested 3' and 4' side setback variances will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties within the surrounding area.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The setback variances are due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner such as the location of the lot and surrounding area.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Favor: Manna, Bragman, Brereton, Stevens, Dean, Cruz, Benavides, Ozuna, Vasquez, Oroian

Opposed: None

Abstained: Kaplan

MOTION PASSED

A motion was made by Commissioner Bragman. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300158, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a half story variance from the maximum 2.5 stories to allow two detached structures to be 3 stories, situated at 203 and 205 Toledo Street, applicant being Elbert A Fuqua, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The variance will not be contrary to the public interest as it will provide sufficient height for each dwelling unit.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the proposed structures would have to be reconfigured to abide by the “AE-2” regulations that restrict residential development on a limited size lot.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variances to allow for a 3-story development for two proposed dwellings provide a safe height from the neighboring property and will observe the spirit of the ordinance.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, staff finds that the requested half story variances will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties within the surrounding area.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The half story variance is due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner such as the location of the lot and surrounding area.

Seconded by Commissioner Ozuna.

Favor: Stevens, Dean, Ozuna

Opposed: Brereton, Cruz, Manna, Bragman, Benavides, Vasquez, Oroian

Abstained: Kaplan

MOTION FAILED

Item #8

BOA-24-10300179: A request by Archbishop John Gabriel for 1) a 9’ 11” variance from the minimum 10’ front setback to allow a 1” front carport setback, 2) a 4’ 6” variance from the minimum 5’ side setback to allow a 6” side carport setback, and 3) a 3’ variance from the minimum 5’ side setback to allow a 2’ side setback for an accessory structure, located at 3442 W Woodlawn Avenue. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Colton Unden, Planner, 210-207-0120, Colton.Unden2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 23 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 2 in opposition. No response from the University Park Neighborhood Association.

Archbishop John Gabriel, applicants, presented the item and was available for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In Person

Jose Gallegos – in favor

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300179, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 9' 11" variance from the minimum 10' front setback to allow a 1" front carport setback, and 2) a 4' 6" variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 6" side carport setback, situated at 3442 West Woodlawn Avenue, applicant being Archbishop John Gabriel, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The carport setbacks side setback variances are not contrary to the public interest as sufficient space will exist between neighboring properties and structures, and the development is not uncharacteristic for the neighborhood in which this property is located.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the carport setback ordinances would result in unnecessary hardship as the applicant would need to demolish or largely remove large portions of the carport.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variances appear to be in the spirit of the ordinance as sufficient space will exist for purposes of fire safety and water runoff concerns.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds that the variances would not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent properties as the variances do not appear to directly impact any neighboring properties with water runoff or fire safety issues.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds the unique circumstances existing on the property is the smaller lot and size of the home relative to the lot, leaving less room for a carport.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ozuna.

Favor: Manna, Ozuna, Brereton, Stevens, Dean, Cruz, Bragman, Benavides, Vasquez, Kaplan, Oroian

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

BOA-24-10300179, Item #3 FAILED due to lack of motion.

Item #9

BOA-24-10300186: A request by Cairo Developments LLC to allow separate structures on an "RM-4" that is less than one-third of an acre, located at 1410 Montana Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Colton Unden, Planner, 210-207-0120, Colton.Unden2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

A motion was made by Commissioner Ozuna to continue BOA-24-10300174 to the November 4th Board of Adjustment meeting.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brereton.

A verbal vote was taken, and all voted in affirmative.

MOTION PASSED

Commissioner Ozuna left the Board of Adjustment meeting at 4:17 PM.

Item #10

BOA-24-10300188: A request by Praxedes Gasper for 1) a 3'-2" side setback variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a structure to be 1'-10" from the west side property line, 2) a 9'-11" variance from the minimum 10' front setback to allow a structure to be 1" from the front property line, 3) a variance from the prohibited fence materials to allow a corrugated metal fence on the west side of yard, and 4) a 5' variance from the minimum 15' clear vision to allow a 10' driveway clear vision, located at 143 Lansing Lane. Staff recommends Approval for the Clear

Vision Variance. Staff recommends Denial for the Side Setback, Front Setback and Fence Material Variances. (Council District 5) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 33 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 1 in opposition. No response from El Charro Neighborhood Association.

Praxedes Gasper, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bragman. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300188, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 3'-2" side setback variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a structure to be 1'-10" from the west side property line, and 2) a 5' variance from the minimum 15' clear vision to allow a 10' driveway clear vision, situated at 143 Lansing Lane, applicant being Praxedes Gasper, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The requested variances will not be contrary to the public interest as they will provide adequate spacing between properties and the right of way and not impose on the adjacent properties in the surrounding area.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the attached carport, and side privacy fence would need to be reconstructed or removed to meet UDC standards.

3. *By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.*

The requested variances will observe the spirit of the ordinance as the carport is an appropriate distance from neighboring properties and right of way, the side fence provides privacy from neighboring lots and the driveway clear vision maintains a safe distance from and onto the local residential road.

4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.*

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, staff finds that the variances will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties and will not directly alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The variances are due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner, as the side setback variance and driveway clear vision variance are sought due to unique circumstances existing on the property such as limited lot size and the established distance of front yard fencing and gates in the community.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cruz. She requested to amend Item #1 to reference gutters that were included in the application.

Commissioner Bragman agreed with the amendment.

Favor: Bragman, Cruz, Stevens, Dean, Benavides

Opposed: Brereton, Manna, Vasquez, Kaplan, Oroian

Abstained: Riahi

MOTION FAILED

BOA-24-10300188, Items #2 and #3 FAILED due to lack of motion.

Item #11

BOA-24-10300189: A request by Miguel Rivera for 1) a 4' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 1' side setback for a porch, 2) a 6'-6" variance from the minimum 10' front setback to allow a 3'-6" front setback, 3) a 4'-11" variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 1" side setback for an accessory structure, 4) a 4' variance from the minimum 15' clear vision to allow a 11' driveway clear vision, and 5) a 1' special exception from the maximum 6' rear fence height to allow a 7' fence height in the rear yard, located at 146 Los Arboles. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 5) (Colton Unden, Planner, 210-207-0120, Colton.Unden2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 30 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 0 in opposition. No response from the St. Leo's Neighborhood Association.

Miguel Rivera, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

A motion was made by Chair Oroian. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300189, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 1' special exception from the maximum 6' rear fence height to allow a 7' fence height in the rear yard, situated at 146 Los Arboles, applicant being Miguel Rivera, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

A. The special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter.

If granted, staff finds the request would be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the ordinance, as the request is limited to the rear yard and exceeds the maximum height requirements for a fence by 1-foot.

B. The public welfare and convenience will be substantially served.

The fence does appear to serve the public welfare and convenience, as the additional fence height will add additional security to the subject property.

C. The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use.

The fence special exception appears to create enhanced security and privacy for the subject and adjacent properties being within 1-foot of the Unified Development Code fence guidelines.

D. The special exception will not alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property for which the special exception is sought.

The additional fence height does not appear to alter the essential character of the district and location for which the special exception is sought.

E. The special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district, or the regulations herein established for the specific district.

The requested special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district as it is within 1-foot of the permitted height and will increase security of the subject property.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cruz.

Favor: Oroian, Cruz, Brereton, Stevens, Dean, Manna, Bragman, Benavides, Vasquez, Kaplan, Riahi

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

A motion was made by Chair Oroian. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300189, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 4' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 1' side setback for a porch, 2) a 6'-6" variance from the minimum 10' front setback to allow a 3'-6" front setback, 3) a 4'-11" variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a 1" side setback for an accessory structure, and 4) a 4' variance from the minimum 15' clear vision to allow a 11' driveway clear vision, situated at 146 Los Arboles, applicant being Miguel Rivera, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The variances are not contrary to the public interest as sufficient space will exist between neighboring properties for the purposes of fire safety and water runoff. Additionally, the gate and fencing are on an established fence line and sufficient space will be present for the purposes of safely traversing to and from the local road and driveway.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the setback and driveway clear vision ordinances would result in unnecessary hardship as the applicant would need to demolish significant additions to the home as well to the accessory structure. In the driveway clear vision, the applicant would need to relocate the fencing and gate away from an established line, also an unnecessary hardship.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variances appear to be in the spirit of the ordinance as sufficient space will exist between neighboring properties for the purposes of fire safety and water runoff. Furthermore, it is not uncharacteristic for the neighborhood in which the property is located.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds that the variance would not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent properties as sufficient space will exist between neighboring properties for the purposes of fire safety and water runoff.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds the unique circumstances existing on the property is the location of the driveway entry and parking in the rear, which leaved only the front and sides as areas for additions to the property.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Manna.

Favor: Oroian, Manna, Brereton, Stevens, Dean, Cruz, Bragman, Benavides, Vasquez, Kaplan, Riahi

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

Commissioner Stevens left the Board of Adjustment meeting at 5:03 PM.

Item #12

BOA-24-10300190: A request by Neal Neathery for a 4' variance from the minimum 20' rear setback to allow an addition to be 16' from the rear property line, located at 26311 Marsh Pond. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District N/A) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 17 Notices were mailed to property owners, 2 in favor, 0 in opposition. No registered Neighborhood Association within 200'.

Neal Neathery, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBILC COMMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Bragman. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300190, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 4' variance from the minimum 20' rear setback to allow an addition to be 16' from the rear property line, situated at 26311 Marsh Pond, applicant being Neal Neathery, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The variance does not appear to be contrary to the public interest due to the property being located outside of city limits and abutting a vacant lot.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

Staff finds an unnecessary hardship as the applicant would be required to reconfigure the plans to adhere to the rear setback requirements.

3 By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The request will observe the spirit of the ordinance because the proposed structure will still maintain a reasonable distance between the structure, and the neighboring property and adhere to all other setback requirements.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

Staff did not find evidence that the requested rear setback variance would alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The rear setback variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property such as the proposed structure needing more space due to the lot configuration. The variance request is not merely financial.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Manna.

Favor: Bragman, Manna, Brereton, Dean, Cruz, Benavides, Vasquez, Kaplan, Riahi, Oroian
Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

Item #13

BOA-24-10300193: A request by RPGA Design Group, Inc. for 1) a 4'-6" variance from the maximum 15'-6" driveway width to allow for 20' of driveway width, and 2) a half story variance from the maximum 2.5 stories to allow development for a 3-story structure, located at 109 Omaha Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 35 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 0 in opposition. No registered Neighborhood Association within 200'.

Michael Wilhelm, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBLIC COMMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300193, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 4'-6" variance from the maximum 15'-6" driveway width to allow for 20' of driveway width, situated at 109 Omaha Street, applicant being RPGA Design Group, Inc, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The requested driveway width variance will not be contrary to the public interest as it will meet all remaining UDC requirements and will not injure the neighboring properties.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as the proposed structure would have to be redesigned to abide by the "AE-2" regulations and restrict residential development on a limited size lot.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested variance will observe the spirit of the ordinance as the driveway width provides adequate space for access onto the property.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

If granted, the 20' driveway width will not injure the appropriate use of conforming properties or alter the essential character of the district.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The driveway width variance is due to unique circumstances that were not created by the property owner, such as the unique configuration and size of the lot.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Favor: Manna, Bragman, Brereton, Dean, Cruz, Benavides, Vasquez, Kaplan, Oroian

Opposed: None

Abstained: Riahi

MOTION PASSED

BOA-24-10300193, Item #2 half – story variance FAILED due to lack of motion.

The Board went into recess at 5:29 PM and reconvened at 5:34 PM.

Item #14

BOA-24-10300194: A request by Humberto Leal for 1) a 2’-6” variance from the minimum 5’ side setback to allow a 2’-6” side setback for an accessory structure on the west property line, 2) a 2’-10” variance from the minimum 5’ side setback to allow a 2’-2” side setback for an accessory structure on the east property line, and 3) a variance from the fence materials to allow for a corrugated metal fence on the property, located at 1707 West Mally Boulevard. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 4) (Colton Unden, Planner, 210-207-0120, Colton.Unden2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 24 Notices were mailed to property owners, 8 in favor, 0 in opposition. 3 returned in favor outside 200’. No registered Neighborhood Association.

Humberto Leal, applicant, and Raul Mendez, property owner, presented the item and was available for questions.

NO PUBILC COMMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300194, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 2’-6” variance from the minimum 5’ side setback to allow a 2’-6” side setback for an accessory structure on the west property line, 2) a 2’-10” variance from the minimum 5’ side setback to allow a 2’-2” side setback for an accessory structure on the east property line, and 3) a request for a variance from the fence materials to allow for a corrugated metal fence on the property, situated at 1707 West Mally Boulevard, applicant being Humberto Leal, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The requested variances are not contrary to the public interest as sufficient space will remain for the purposes of water runoff and fire safety along the accessory structures and the corrugated metal fencing will allow easier removal of graffiti and add security and privacy to the area.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship as limited room exists on the rear yard that contains a pool and several trees and the need for security for the corrugated metal fence material.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The requested accessory structure setback and fence material variances appear to be in the spirit of the ordinance as sufficient space will remain for the purposes of water runoff and fire safety along the accessory structures and the fence material will not adversely impact neighboring properties.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds that the variances will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent properties as sufficient space will remain for the purposes of water runoff and fire safety along the accessory structures and the fence material will not adversely impact neighboring properties.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds the unique circumstances existing on the property warranting the need to have reduced accessory structure setbacks are the preexisting structures and the development in the backyard along with the need for additional security through the fence material.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Friendly amendment requested by Chair Oroian to remove Item #1 from the motion which was accepted by the Commissioners Manna and Bragman.

Favor: Manna, Bragman, Dean, Cruz, Benavides, Vasquez, Oroian, Riahi

Opposed: Brereton, Kaplan

MOTION FAILED

Commissioner Dean made a motion to continue Item #1 to the November 4th Board of Adjustment meeting.

The motion was seconded by Chair Oroian.

Favor: Dean, Oroian, Cruz, Manna, Bragman, Benavides, Vasquez, Riahi

Opposed: Brereton, Kaplan

MOTION PASSED

Item #15

BOA-24-10300195: A request by MRG Texas Holdings LLC for a window configuration variance from the NCD-7 window configuration standards, located at 300 John Adams Drive. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Colton Uden, Planner, 210-207-0120, Colton.Uden2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 24 Notices were mailed to property owners, 0 in favor, 0 in opposition. No response from the Jefferson Neighborhood Association.

Ray Gonzales, Representative for MRG Holdings LLC, presented the item and was available for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Voice mail

Ted Guerra – in opposition

Applicant requested a continuance to the November 4th Board of Adjustment meeting.

Commissioner Brereton made a motion to continue. Seconded by Commissioner Dean.

A verbal vote was taken, and all voted in affirmative.

MOTION PASSED

Commissioner Vasquez left the Board of Adjustment meeting at 6:27 PM.

Item #16

BOA-24-10300196: A request by Carol Rodriguez for a 4' Fence Height Special Exception from the maximum 3' height to allow a 7' predominately solid front yard fence on the west side of the property, located at 3614 Lisa Drive. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Melanie Clark, Planner, 210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department).

Staff stated 28 Notices were mailed to property owners, 1 in favor, 0 in opposition. Sunshine Estates Neighborhood Association is in favor.

Carol Rodriguez, applicant, presented the item and was available for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Voice mails

Grace Villarreal – in favor

Paul Hernandez – in opposition

Lisa Robley – in opposition

A motion was made by Commissioner Bragman. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300196, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 4'-6" Fence Height Special Exemption from the maximum 3' height to allow a 4'-6" predominately solid front yard fence on the west side of the property, situated at 3614 Lisa Drive, applicant being Carol Rodriguez, because the testimony presented to us, and the facts that we have determined, show that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Unified Development Code, as amended, would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Specifically, we find that:

A. The special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter.

The fence height does not exceed 4'-6" in height and provides security for neighboring properties; the request would be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the ordinance.

B. The public welfare and convenience will be substantially served.

In this case, an increased fence height will serve the public welfare by providing the needed security and safety for the property and substantial justice will be served.

C. The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use.

The special exception will not injure the neighboring properties as the fence height will not impede traffic or clear vision requirements as it is located a safe distance from the front setback and creates enhanced security and privacy.

D. The special exception will not alter the essential character of the district and location in which the property for which the special exception is sought.

The additional fence height in the front yard will not alter the location for which the special exception is sought, as the fence height would provide the necessary privacy from public view and access.

E. The special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district, or the regulations herein established for the specific district.

The requested special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district as the placement of the fence is adequately back from the front setback and clear vision area.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Manna.

Favor: Bragman, Manna, Brereton, Dean, Cruz, Benavides, Kaplan, Riahi, Oroian

Opposed: None

MOTION PASSED

Item #17

(WITHDRAWN) BOA-24-10300204: A request by Pabel Garcia for a 7'-2" variance from the minimum 12'-6" (reduced from 20' with a 15' alley) rear setback requirement to allow a structure with a 5'-4" rear setback, located at 427 Byrnes Drive. (Council District 2) (Colton Unden, Planner, 210-207-0120, Colton.Unden2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Item #18

Approval of the minutes from the Board of Adjustment meetings on October 7, 2024.

A motion was made by Commissioner Brereton for approval of the October 7, 2024, minutes.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cruz.

A verbal vote was taken, and all voted in affirmative.

MOTION PASSED

Director's Report - None

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:53 PM.

APPROVED BY: _____ or _____
Chairman Vice-Chair

DATE: _____

ATTESTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
Executive Secretary