

City of San Antonio



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

Monday, March 4, 2024

1:00 PM

1901 S. Alamo

1:00 PM – Call to Order

Worldwide Interpreter presented.

Roll Call – Present: Brereton, Kaplan, Dean, Manna, Bragman, Ozuna, Benavides, Bonillas (see page 2), Ybanez, Oroian, Cruz

Absent: None

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

Item #2

BOA-24-10300005: (Continuance) A request by Jonathan Clarke 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 825 E Park Ave. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 1) (Juan Alvarez, Planner (210) 207-7232, Juan.Alvarez2@SanAntonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 28 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor; 0 received in favor Tobin Hill Community Neighborhood Association is in opposition, no response from Sojo Crossing Homeowner Association.

Ryan Reed, attorney for the applicant, stated the intent was to offset costs for the applicant. There were issues with the settling of the foundation and potentially the warranty may have expired.

No Public Comment

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna to continue case **BOA-23-10300005** to March 18, 2024, and was seconded by Commissioner Cruz.

Favor: Brereton, Ybanez, Benavides, Cruz, Manna, Ozuna, Bonillas, Oroian

Opposed: Dean, Kaplan, Bragman

MOTION PASSES

Commissioner Bonillas joined the meeting at 1:10 pm

Chair Oroian exited at 1:30 pm for recusal purposes.

Item #1

BOA-24-10300025: A request by Alvin Peters for an appeal from an Administrator's decision on the interpretation of Section 35-310.06 (a)(1), located at 412 South Hackberry Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Mirko Maravi, Principal Planner (210) 207-0107, Mirko.Maravi@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 36 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, Denver Heights Neighborhood Association is in opposition.

Alvin Peters, applicant's representative, stated he submitted plans for review, and received a permit. Since permits were approved, construction began. He was contacted by COSA staff expressing the issue specifically in Section 35-310.06. He stated the city staff made an error. The option expressed was to extend the awning all the way back with the structures connecting at the base.

Crystal Gonzalez PE, CBO, Development Services Assistant Director, stated the applicant was offered the option to extend the awning/canopy structure from the front of the building all the way to the back to achieve a continuous roof line. The awing is about 5' deep, while structures are approximately 30' feet deep.

Melissa Ramirez, Development Services Assistant Director, stated this component of the UDC did not get a consensus. Through engagement with the neighborhood associations a single struct was supported for any RM-4 developments are a certain acreage for the lot. Development Services is upholding the regulations that were approved by City Council.

Alvin Peters, applicant's representative, stated that the ordinance is ambiguous and what has occurred is confusion and that was why he was given bogus advice.

Public Comment

In person

Denise McVey, spoke in opposition.

Rebuttal

Mr. Peters addressed the public comment and cannot provide any answers as it only refers to McVey's home. He did exchange information with Ms. McVey to answer questions and concerns. Mr. Peters is requesting a continuance in order to meet with Denver heights Neighborhood Association and reach a resolution.

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Kaplan to continue case **BOA-23-10300005** to March 18, 2024, and was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Favor: None.

Opposed: Brereton, Kapan, Ybanez, Dean, Cruz, Benavides, Manna, Bragman, Ozuna, Bonillas.

MOTION FAILS

Chair Oroian returned to the Board Room at 2:05 pm.

Item #3

BOA-24-10300011: A request by Juan Franco for a Special Exception to allow two (2) additional Type 2 Short Term Rental permits on the block face, per UDC Section 35-374.01(c), located at 2411 Pinn Road Units 205 & 206. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Juan Alvarez, Planner (210) 207-7232, Juan.Alvarez2@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 24 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, no registered Neighborhood Association.

Maria Rodriguez, applicant, stated she has 8 apartments and 3 are operated as STRs and is in compliance with HOT Taxes and did not have any code violations. The STR is near a military base and the location helps many military families coming for graduations.

Lauren Chavez, Principal Planner, confirmed there have not been any violations within the past 3 years.

Public Comment**Voicemail**

Angela Rodriguez, spoke in favor.

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Kaplan. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300011, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a special exception to allow for (2) Type 2 short term rental units, situated at 2411 Pinn Rd Unit 205 and Unit 206, applicant being Juan Franco, 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 two additional Short Term Rentals 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 commercial 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 facilities 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 and commercial properties. 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 Bragman.

Favor: Brereton, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian, Kaplan, Ybanez, Cruz, Benavides, Manna, Bonillas.
Opposed: Dean.

MOTION PASSES

Item #4

BOA-24-10300017: A request by 9425 South Presa Street for 1) a 25' height variance from the 50' sign height maximum to allow a sign to be 75' in height, and 2) a 594'-6" square feet variance from

the 375 square feet maximum to allow a sign to be 969'-6" square feet, located at 9425 South Presa Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 3) (Richard Bautista-Vazquez, Planner (210)-207-0215, richard.bautista-vazquez@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department).

Kristie Flores, Planning Manager Land Development & Zoning, clarified on the posting language. The language should have stated staff recommends denial which is consistent with all the information in the packet.

Staff stated 19 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, no response provided by Villa Coronado Neighborhood Association.

Brad Peck, applicant's Project Manager, stated he wanted the sign to be visible so that customers are aware of the location with ample drive time. He is working to ensure all safety measures are met.

Edward Rodriguez, Development Services Senior Sign Inspector, clarified on the 3 rectangles for measurement placed on 969'.

Public Comment

Voicemail

Villa Coronado Neighborhood Association, voice their position as neutral.

Rebuttal

Dereck Thompson, owner, stated he was made aware staff was going to recommend denial minutes prior to the meeting. He further stated the sign is below grade level. Had they known denial was the recommendation, a very different presentation would have been prepared.

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Kaplan to continue case **BOA-24-10300017** and to March 18, 2024 and was seconded by Commissioner Benavides.

Favor: Brereton, Kaplan, Ybanez, Dean, Ozuna, Benavides, Bragman, Bonillas Cruz, Oroian,
Opposed: Manna.

MOTION PASSES

Item #5

BOA-24-10300015: A request by E Z SHOP 7-11 INC for 1) a 15' variance from the minimum 15' buffer yard and composition to allow a 0' buffer yard and composition along a 193' portion of the southern property line, 2) a request for an 8' variance from the minimum 10' buffer yard to allow a 2' buffer yard structure encroachment along eastern property line, 3) a request for a 15' variance from the minimum 30' buffer yard to allow a 15' buffer along northern property line, and 4) a request for a 30' variance from the minimum 30' buffer composition to allow a 0' buffer composition along northern property line, located at 8823 South IH 35 . Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 4) (Richard Bautista-Vazquez, Planner (210)-207-0215, richard.bautista-vazquez@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 23 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, no registered Neighborhood Association.

David Ranjbar and Randy Chavez, the applicant's representatives, stated there was a design meeting with city staff. Property buffers were addressed on the east and I-35 South access road. This was somewhat approved with conditions to include buffers on Sommerset Road and along I-35. Calculations were met.

No Public Comment

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna to continue case **BOA-24-10300015** to March 18, 2024 and was seconded by Commissioner Cruz.

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

MOTION PASSES

Commission went into recess at 2:59 pm and reconvened at 3:12 pm

Motion

Chair Oroian, moves to reconsider **BOA-24-10300015** and was seconded by Commissioner Ozuna. Clarification was found on the buffering and the north lot.

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

MOTION PASSES

Mirko Maravi, Principal Planner, stated a plat was updated with a measurement of 363'. It does appear that it ends a significant way from the C-2, and closer to the preliminary plat that was originally shown. This would not require a buffer for Item 3 and 4.

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Ozuna. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300015, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a request for 1) a 15' variance from the minimum 15' buffer yard and composition to allow a 0' buffer yard and composition to allow a 0' buffer yard and composition along a 193' portion of the southern property line, and 2) an 8' variance from the minimum 10' buffer yard to allow a 2' buffer yard structure encroachment along eastern property line, situated at 8823 South IH 35, applicant being E Z SHOP 7-11 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.*

In this case, the public interest is represented by buffer yard requirements to provide landscaped separation between adjacent uses and arterial roadways. The elimination of the buffer yard is not contrary to public interest as it does not negatively impact any surrounding properties or the public.

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

The special condition found on the subject property is the limitation of the variance request on the southern property line, and a limited structure encroachment on the eastern property line. A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in the applicant incorporating the minimum buffer yard requirement, which would result in an unnecessary hardship, as the applicant would need to reconfigure the development 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. In this case, the elimination of the buffer yards and composition will adhere to the spirit of the ordinance, the request is limited, and the established adjacent use would normally not require a bufferyard.

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 subject property will have reduced and eliminated buffer yards along the southern and eastern perimeter of the property. The appearance of the streetscape will not be altered, if approved.

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 utilizing the irregular shape of the property.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kaplan.

Favor: Brereton, Ozuna, Dean, Oroian, Kaplan, Bragman, Ybanez, Cruz, Benavides, Manna, Bonillas.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSES

Item #6

BOA-24-10300010: A request by Maria Martinez for a 4'-11' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a carport to be 1" from the side setback, located at 250 Micklejohn Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 1) (Melanie Clark, Planner, (210) 207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 30 notices were mailed to property owners, 4 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, no response from West End Hope in Action Neighborhood Association; 3 in favor outside 200'.

Maria Martinez, the applicant, stated she was seeking the variance for the carport.

No Public Comment

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Brereton. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300010, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 4' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a carport to be 1' from the side setback, situated at 250 Micklejohn Street, applicant being Maria Martinez 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 1' from the side property line is not contrary to the public interest as the size of the pre-existing structure is no longer conducive for use and the newly attached carport would provide a safe alternative for off street parking.

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 property size does not provide adequate space for a functioning carport thus increasing use of street parking within the neighborhood.

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

Reducing the side setback requirement would not injure neighboring properties, as the newly constructed carport's pitched roof is designed to prevent water runoff onto neighboring property, allow the removal of the pre-existing carport for tandem parking to reduce street parking.

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 new carport would allow the property owner a safe alternative to the pre-existing carport while reducing congestion within the neighborhood.

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 setback variance is sought due to unique circumstances existing on the property as there is not sufficient room to expand for an additional parking.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kaplan.

Favor: Brereton, Dean, Bragman, Ozuna, Oroian, Ybanez, Cruz, Benavides, Manna, Bonillas.

Opposed: Kaplan.

MOTION PASSES

Item #7

BOA-24-10300013: A request by Maria Del Rosario for 1) a Window Configuration Variance from the NCD-8 Window Configuration Standards, and 2) a 3' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a side setback to be 2' to include a 1' overhang, located at 1713 Texas Avenue. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Richard Bautista-Vazquez, Planner (210)-207-0215, richard.bautista-vazquez@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 23 notices were mailed to property owners, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, Woodlawn Lake Neighborhood Association.

Maria Acosta Ramirez, the applicant, stated she was seeking a variance and was not aware she needs to speak with her Neighborhood Association.

No Public Comment

Jake Morales, spoke in opposition.

Motion

A motion was made by Chair Oroian. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300013, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 3' variance from the minimum 5' side setback to allow a side setback to be 2' to include a 1' overhang, situated at 1713 Texas Avenue, applicant being Maria Del Rosario, 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.*

In this case the distance between both properties is reasonable and may not cause water runoff issues. The window design does not go against the public interest as the new design is subtle.

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

The proposed reduced setback space is sufficient to neighboring property.

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

The addition that is currently in place is in line with the existing structure. If granted the structure will be 2' with 1' of overhang from the neighboring property which is unlikely to injure the appropriate use of the adjacent property. Additionally, the current window design is unlikely to injure the surrounding 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 distance of the addition is in line of the existing structure, this does not alter the essential character of the district.

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 found unique circumstances on the subject property that would warrant the need for a reduced side setback such as the addition being inline of the existing structure. Additionally, the current window design is appropriate due to its location near other structures that have non-conforming windows.

Chair Oroian, clarified the motion is limited to the westside of the structure.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Commissioner Brereton made a friendly amendment to eliminate the second sentence under #2 which was accepted by Chair Oroian and Commissioner Bragman.

Favor: Brereton, Dean, Bragman, Ozuna, Kaplan, Oroian, Ybanez, Cruz, Benavides, Bonillas.
Opposed: Manna.

MOTION PASSES

Item #8

BOA-24-10300016: A request by A-1 Engineering, LLC for a 3'-6" special exception from the maximum 3' fence height to allow a 6'-6" privacy fence east of the front property line, located at 2907 Deer Ledge Drive. Staff Recommends Denial. (Council District 1) (Melanie Clark, Planner, (210-207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 27 notices were mailed to property owners, 2 returned in favor, 2 returned in opposition, no response from Carrington Place Neighborhood Association.

Moses Cruz, the applicant, stated he had the fence built for privacy. He expressed being concerned with his neighbors. The neighbors also built a fence crossing over to his property line. This was stated to be a civil matter.

No Public Comment

Voicemail

Deedra Savalge, spoke in support.

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Kaplan. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300016 I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 3'-6" special exception from the maximum 3' fence height to allow a 6'-6" privacy fence east of the front property line, situated at 2907 Deer Ledge Drive, applicant being A-1 Engineering, 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. This is limited to the decorative screen fence with some openings, not the wooden fence with no closer than 1' of the westside of the property line.

Specifically, we find that:

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

The 3'-6" fence height special exception, if granted, would be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the ordinance, as the fence is limited to the east side of the property, meets clear vision requirements while providing privacy to the property owner.

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

In this case, these criteria are represented by fence heights to protect property owners while still promoting a sense of community. The proposed fence appears to serve the public welfare and convenience, as the fence provides privacy to the property owner.

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

The fence variance will enhance privacy for the subject and adjacent properties.

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 limited to the east side of the front yard does not appear to alter the location for which the special exception is sought and does not appear to alter the essential character of the district.

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 lot is approximately 10,000 square feet.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bragman.

Favor: Brereton, Dean, Bragman, Ozuna, Kaplan, Oroian, Ybanez, Cruz, Manna, Benavides, Bonillas.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSES

Item #9

BOA-24-10300014: A request by Elizabeth Haynes for a 3'-9" variance from the minimum 5' rear accessory setback to allow a detached garage to be 1'-2" from rear property line, located at 207 Wyanoke Drive. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 10) (Melanie Clark, Planner, (210) 207-5550, melanie.clark@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 18 notices were mailed to property owners, 1 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, no registered Neighborhood Association within 200'.

Elizabeth Haynes, applicant's representative, requested an enclosed garage. HDRC, Architectural Review Board, and Bell Meade Homes Association have approved the garage.

No Public Comment

Motion

A motion was made by Commissioner Kaplan. Regarding Case No. BOA-24-10300014, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 3'-9" variance from the minimum 5' rear accessory setback to allow a detached garage to be 1'-2" from rear property line, situated at 207 Wyanoke Drive, applicant being Elizabeth Haynes 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.*

Due to the size and unique design of the property, a 3'-9" variance to allow a detach garage to be 1'-2" from the rear setback will not affect the general health, safety, and welfare of the neighbor or surrounding properties.

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

A literal enforcement of the ordinance would prevent the applicant from development of a functional garage on the property.

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

The granting of this variance will observe the spirit of the ordinance, as a Certificate of Appropriateness from The Office of Historic Preservation has been approved and the new accessory building will be abiding clear vision and 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.*

The rear setback variance will allow a tandem detached garage to be constructed within the boundaries and limitations of a historical property. This will not injure the appropriate use of adjacent properties and will not 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 limited space, slope, and constraints as an historical landmark. This circumstance does not appear to be merely financial.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Manna.

Favor: Brereton, Dean, Bragman, Ozuna, Kaplan, Oroian, Ybanez, Cruz, Manna, Benavides, Bonillas.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSES

Item #10

Approval of the minutes from the Board of Adjustment meeting on February 19, 2024.

A motion was made by Commissioner Manna and seconded Commissioner Kaplan for approval of the February 19, 2024, minutes.

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

MOTION PASSES

Director's Report – nothing to report.

Staff Announcements – District 2 Sammuel Stevens and District 6 Luis Gomez will be appointed on March 7, 2024.

Staff Announcements – Chair asked if a poll was going to be taken for the meeting on April 8, 2024 due to the Solar Eclipse.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.

APPROVED BY: _____ or _____
Chairman Vice-Chair

DATE: _____

ATTESTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
Executive Secretary