

City of San Antonio



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

Monday, March 20, 2023

1:00 PM

1901 S. Alamo

1:00 PM – Call to Order

SeproTec translator were present.

Roll Call – Present: Spielman, Bragman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez,
Ozuna, Oroian

Absent: None

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

*Public Hearing and Consideration of the following Plats, Variances, Special Exceptions, Appeals, as
identified below.*

Item #5

BOA-23-10300038: A request by Lauren Snider for an appeal of the Administrator's decision to deny a short-term rental permit renewal, located at 201 E Carson Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Joshua Orton AICP, Senior Planner, (210) 207-7945, Joshua.Orton@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 26 notices were mailed to property owners, 7 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and no response from Government Hill Alliance Neighborhood Association.

Lauren Snider, applicant, request an extension for a short-term rental permit to provide more time to complete renovations. Severe weather conditions caused the patio to cave in, and the pandemic delayed and increased cost in renovations in result to her current position.

No Public Comment

Mr. Manna made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300038** for approval as presented.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300038**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the appeal for the property situated at 201 E Carson Street, applicant being Lauren Snider, because the information provided by the applicant shows that city staff made an error in revoking short-term rental permit.

Second: Bragman

In favor: Ozuna

Opposed: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Oroian

Motion to grant the appeal fails.

Item #12

BOA-23-10300042: A request by Escondida at Sunset LLC for a half story variance from the maximum two and a half story height to allow three stories for six structures, located at 235 Escondida Way. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 10) (Jacob Exler, Planner (210) 207-5876, Jacob.Exler@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 31 notices were mailed to property owners, 8 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and Oak Park Northwood Neighborhood Association is in favor.

Tim Bluntfest, architect, states the hardship is that the home was designed under the guidelines of the previous code that would be approved under those circumstances. The two and half story has been eliminated to access of the rooftop of the home. Now there is a conflict with an outdoor roof deck.

Public Comment

Patty Wallis, spoke in support.

Erik Anderson at 7910 Thornhill St, a property owner within 200' is opposed.

Chair Oroian made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300042** for approval as presented.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300042**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a half story variance from the maximum two and a half story height to allow three stories for six structures as in the submitted plans and documents, situated at 235 Escondida Way, applicant being Escondida at Sunset LLC, 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 is not contrary to the public interest as it is only a slight variation from the two and a half story maximum.

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 it would require the applicant to alter the floor plans.

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

The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law. The increased building height would observe the spirit of the ordinance as it only exceeds the maximum two and a half stories by a half story.

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.*

The increased height will not injure the use of conforming properties or alter the essential character of the district as it will be in a cul-de-sac.

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 increased building height is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, such as the location.

Second: Kaplan

Chair Oroian lost audio connection at 2:40 PM and joins meeting at 2:43 PM.

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

The meeting went into recess at 2:45 PM and reconvened at 2:50 PM.

Item #6

BOA-23-10300008: A request by David Shlachter for 1) a variance from the fence materials to allow a corrugated metal fence in the side and rear yards and 2) a 2'-2" variance to the 6' height limitation, to allow an 8'-2" solid fence in the side and rear yards, located at 5627 Sherry Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 4) (Vincent Trevino, Senior Planner (210) 207-5501, Vincent.Trevino@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 46 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and no response from People Active in Community Effort Association or the Southwest Community Association.

David Shlachter, applicant, states there is an alarming amount of criminal activity in the area. After a few unsuccessful attempts to decrease the crime on property, he has a professional install a metal fence around the property. However, he was not aware that required a permit. He requests a permit to keep fence up due to its success in reducing the residential crime rate.

No Public Comment

Mr. Bragman made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300008** for approval as amended.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300008**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a variance from the fence materials to allow a corrugated metal fence in the side and rear yards with caps on the top and the bottom 2) a 2'-2" variance to the 6' height limitation to allow an 8'-2" solid fence in the side and rear yards, situated at 5627 Sherry Street, applicant being David Shlachter, 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 public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. The applicant is requesting an 8'-2" corrugated metal fence with caps on the top and the bottom along the side and rear yards. The corrugated metal fence and height is to ensure the property is secured due to previous break-ins into the property.

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

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would mean that the fence may only be installed at 6' in height and with approved fence materials. The site requires additional security leading to an unnecessary hardship should the variance be denied.

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

The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law. The fence will only be located along the side and rear yards and is being requested to provide security for 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.

The proposed 8'-2" corrugated fence with caps on the top and the bottom in the side and rear yards will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property, as the 8'-2" fence will provide security for the property and residents.

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, the 8'-2" corrugated fence will provide security for the property.

Second: Kaplan

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Item #7

BOA-23-10300020: A request by Ashley Williams for 1) a variance from the Fencing Design Standards as Described in the Beacon Hill Neighborhood Conservation District, to allow fencing or gate structures across the driveway in the front yard and 2) a 1'-6" variance from the minimum 15' clear vision requirement to allow a fence to be 13'-6" from the front driveway, located at 1016 W Lullwood Avenue. Staff recommends Denial for the Neighborhood Conservation District Variance. Staff recommends Approval for the Clear Vision Variance. (Council District 1) (Mark Chavez, Planner (210) 207-7395, Mark.Chavez@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 29 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and Beacon Hill Neighborhood Association are in opposition.

Ashley Williams, owner, requests to keep her fence as she was not aware of the property being a part of the Beacon Hill Neighborhood Association. She states the fence was permitted and was noticed as a violation a few months after her move. There is a high level of crime traffic, the fence does not block an open view, and it would cause more construction and waste than necessary. There is conflict with the NCD involving a lack of communication in assisting her with the fence violation. Applicant presents a petition with eleven in favor.

Public Comment

Voicemail:

Daniel Hudling, spoke in opposition.

Ms. Kaplan made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300020** to be continued to May 15, 2023.

Second: Spielman

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Item #8

BOA-23-10300035: A request by Minette Olson for a 2'-6" variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow an accessory structure to be 2'-6" from the side property lines, located at 148 Crofton Avenue. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 1) (Jacob Exler, Planner (210) 207-5876, Jacob.Exler@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 21 notices were mailed to property owners, 3 returned in favor, 2 returned in opposition, and no response from King William Neighborhood Association.

Minette Olson, applicant, requests garage and an apartment above it to park vehicles safely under garage to steer away from busy and active streets. She presented an email with one in favor.

Public Comment

Voicemail:

Terry Hunter, spoke in opposition.

Chair Oroian dropped signal in meeting at 3:47 PM and rejoined at 3:49 PM.

Chair Oroian made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300035** for approval as amended.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300035**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 2' variance from the minimum 5' side setback requirement to allow a structure with gutters to be 3' from the side property lines, situated at 148 Crofton Ave, applicant being Minette Olson, 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 is not contrary to the public interest as there will be room between the side setback and structure.

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 it would significantly impact the practicality of the proposed structure.

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

The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law. Reducing the side setback still leaves enough room to provide noise and fire protection to 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.

The reduced side setback will not injure neighboring properties as other similar side setbacks were observed for accessory structures in the 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.

Staff finds the plight of the owner of the property for which the reduced front setback variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, such as the location.

Second: Manna

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Item #9

BOA-23-10300036: A request by Fernando Agurcia for a 5' variance from the minimum 10' rear setback to allow a 5' rear setback, located at 118 Shenandoah Street. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 2) (Jacob Exler, Planner (210) 207-5876, Jacob.Exler@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 35 notices were mailed to property owners, 1 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and Denver Heights Neighborhood Association are in opposition.

Fernando Agurcia, applicant, request a setback due to the rapid change in the neighborhood. He wants to accommodate for residential living space.

No Public Comment

Mr. Manna made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300036** for approval as presented.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300036**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant request for a 5' variance from the minimum 10' rear setback requirement to allow a 5' rear setback, situated at 118 Shenandoah St, applicant being Fernando Agurcia, 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.

There will be adequate space between the structure and neighboring houses and so it is not contrary to the public interest.

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 there would not be enough space to construct the dwelling.

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

The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law. The reduced rear setback requirement is in the spirit of the ordinance as there will be adequate space between the dwelling and adjacent 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.

The reduced rear setback requirement will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent 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 plight of the owner of the property for which the reduced landscape variances are sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, such as the location of the property.

Second: Bragman

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Item #10

BOA-23-10300039: A request by Martha Mulder for a 3' special exception from the maximum 3' front fence height to allow a 6' solid screen fence along the front yard, located at 1707 Town Oak Drive. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 9) (Jacob Exler, Planner (210) 207-5876, Jacob.Exler@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 21 notices were mailed to property owners, 7 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and there is no registered neighborhood association.

Martha Mulder, applicant, request that she put up a solid fence for the benefit of her privacy and insurance, and the safety of people who attempt to enter the pool. She states that she wants to make it clear her pool is not a neighborhood pool.

No Public Comment

Mr. Manna made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300039** for approval as amended.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300039**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 3' special exception from the maximum 3' front fence height to allow a 6' solid screen fence along the front yard up to the drive way, situated at 1707 Town Oak Dr, applicant being Martha Mulder, 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 UDC states the Board of Adjustment can grant a special exception for a fence height modification. Since there are other similar fences in the area, it is in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter.

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

In this case, the fence height criteria protect residential property owners while still promoting a sense of community. The privacy fence will contribute to the welfare and convenience of the property owner and neighbors by protecting people from getting into the pool.

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

Privacy fences above the 3' maximum permitted were observed in the vicinity of the subject site; therefore, the additional height would not substantially injure other properties in the neighborhood.

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 height in fence along the front property line up to the driveway will not alter the essential character of the district as other homes with pools have similar fences.

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

The current zoning permits the use of a single-family home. The requested special exception will not weaken the purpose of the district as it merely relates to fence height for protection the pool.

Second: Bragman

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Ms. Cruz exits the meeting at 4:56 PM.

Item #11

BOA-23-10300040: A request by Filimon Hernandez for a 9'-11" variance from the minimum 10' front setback to allow a carport to be 1" from the property line, located at 8930 Fabens. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 6) (Jacob Exler, Planner (210) 207-5876, Jacob.Exler@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 35 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and there is no registered neighborhood association.

Filimon Hernandez, applicant, presented petition with four signatures in favor. He states he would

like to install a carport to support the size and frame of his vehicle and protect his vehicle from severe weather conditions. The accessory structure is already built and needs to be permitted.

No Public Comment

Chair Oroian made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300040** for approval as amended.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300040**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 6' variance from the 10' front setback requirement to allow a carport to be 4' from the front property line, situated at 8930 Fabens, applicant being Filimon Hernandez, 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 proposed carport is far from the street and so is not contrary to the public interest.

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 applicant could not build a carport conforming to the code.

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

The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law. Reducing the front setback would not injure neighboring properties as there are other carports in the area.

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.*

The reduced front setback would not injure neighboring properties as other properties in the areas have similar carports and it would not obstruct the neighbors' views.

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 reduced front setback variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, such as the location.

Second: Manna

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: Zuniga

Chair Manna made a Motion for BOA-23-10300040 to be reconsidered.

Second: Oroian

All affirmative.

Mr. Manna made a Motion for BOA-23-10300040 to be continued to April 3, 2023.

Second: Bragman

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: Zuniga

Motion Granted.

Item #13

BOA-23-10300043: A request by Greenboro Homes Inc for a variance to allow four separate structures on an "RM-4" that is less than one-third of an acre, located at 631 Carolina Street. Staff recommends Approval (Council District 2) (Joseph Leos, Planner (210) 207-3074, Joseph.Leos@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)
Staff stated 29 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and Denver Heights Neighborhood Association are in opposition.

Jim Lenard, applicant, states he wants to build single family detached homes on subject property to meet the requirements of affordable housing. The owner's requirements do not meet the city's requirements due to the buyer not having the proposed income of the city, but instead meets the affordable housing criteria. There was a conflict with previous plans and the updated UDC. He requests to keep plans the way they are.

Public Comment

Cassandra Ramirez, spoke in support.

Ms. Kaplan made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300043** for approval as presented.

Regarding Case No. **BOA-23-10300043**, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant request for a request for a variance to allow four separate structures on an "RM-4" that is less than one-third of an acre, situated at 631 Carolina Street, applicant being Greensboro Homes, 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 public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In this case, the public interest is defined by density requirements to prevent overcrowding on smaller lots. Staff finds this request is not contrary to the public interest as the applicant is abiding by all other setback requirements, which will not infringe on surrounding property owners.

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

The special condition on this property is that the lot is less than one-third of an acre, which previously did not require development to be within a single structure. A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in the applicant alter their plans to abide by the recently changed UDC requirement. The applicant had recently gone through an approved rezoning last year, but with the recent change, caused them to halt construction for this variance.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done. The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law.

Staff finds the spirit will be observed, as the applicant is abiding by all other building requirements and has not begun construction. Additionally, this will allow for infill development of a vacant lot.

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 “RM-4” zoned lot will be allowed to contain four separate structures on a lot that is less than one-third of an acre. The granting of this variance will not injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming properties, as this type of development is not out of character with the surrounding zoning districts. The lots abutting the subject property are zoned “RM-4” and “C-2”, which does not seem to 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 lot being less than one-third of acre. Additionally, the new UDC requirement was not implemented when the applicants rezoning was approved. The circumstances do not appear to be merely financial.

Second: Manna

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Item #14

BOA-23-10300044: A request by Phoenix Vintage Opportunity Fund, LLC for 1) a 2,750 square feet variance from the minimum 6,000 square feet lot size requirement to allow a lot to be 3,250 square feet, and 2) a 5' variance from the minimum 20' rear setback requirement to allow a structure to be 15' from the rear property line, located at 315 Tilden Street. Staff recommends Denial for the Minimum Lot Size Variance. Staff recommends Approval for the Rear Setback Variance. (Council District 2) (Joseph Leos, Planner (210) 207-3074, Joseph.Leos@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Item #15

BOA-23-10300045: A request by Mario Esparza for a 1'-10" variance from the minimum 5' side setback requirement to allow an addition to be 3'-2" from the side setback property line, located at 1509 Burnet Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Joseph Leos, Planner (210) 207-3074, Joseph.Leos@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Item #16

BOA-23-10300048: A request by Ortiz McKnight, PLLC for a 30' variance from the maximum 90' front setback requirement for properties with 100' or more of frontage, to allow a 120' front setback, located at Generally located in the 27000 Block of US Highway 281 North. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 9) (Joseph Leos, Planner (210) 207-3074, Joseph.Leos@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Chair Oroian made a **Motion** for **BOA-23-10300044**, **BOA-23-10300045**, and **BOA-23-10300048** to be continued to April 3, 2023.

Second: Manna

In favor: Spielman, Menchaca, Cruz, Zuniga, Manna, Kaplan, Vasquez, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian

Opposed: None

Motion Granted.

Item #17 Approval of the minutes from Zoning Board of Adjustments meeting on March 6, 2023

All voted in affirmative.

Motion Granted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:43 P.M.

APPROVED BY: _____ OR _____
Chairman Vice-Chair

Chairman

Vice-Chair

DATE: 4-3-2023

ATTESTED BY: Melvin J. [Signature]
Executive Secret

Executive Secret

DATE: April 9, 2023