

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OFFICIAL MINUTES**

DRAFT

March 6, 2017

Members Present:	Staff:
Jeff Finlay	Logan Sparrow, Principal Planner
Frank Quijano	Ted Murphree, City Attorney
Denise Ojeda	Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner
Maria Cruz	Shepard Beamon, Senior Planner
George Britton	Oscar Aguilar, Senior Planner
Henry Rodriguez	
John Kuderer	
Roger Martinez	
Jesse Zuniga	
Mary Rogers	
Richard Acosta	

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. and Texas Flags.

Ms. Rogers, called the meeting to order and called roll of the applicants for each case.

Arianne Villanueva, Worldwide Languages, Interpreter, was present.

Case Number: A-17-056

Applicant: Reynaldo C. Reyes

Owner: Reynaldo C. Reyes

Council District: 1

Location: 147 Laurelwood Drive

Legal Description: Lot 15, Block 6, NCB 9675

Zoning: "R-4 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

Case Manager: Margaret Pahl, AICP, Senior Planner

Request

A request for 1) a 6 foot variance from the 10 foot front setback to allow a carport to be 4 feet from the front property line; 2) a 2 foot variance from the 5 foot side setback **including a gutter** and to allow a carport 3 feet from the side property line and 3) a request for a 5% variance from the maximum 50% impervious coverage in the front yard to allow 55% of the front yard in concrete.

Margaret Pahl: Senior Planner presented the background information and staff's recommendation of the variance. She indicated 7 notices were mailed, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and no response from the North Central Neighborhood Association.

Reynaldo Reyes: applicant stated he needed the carport to protect all his vehicles from the weather, traffic and safety. Cars are being broken into and vehicles are being hit by people speeding thru the neighborhood.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-056 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Martinez**, "Regarding Appeal No. A-17-056, a request for 1) a 6 foot variance from the 10 foot front setback to allow a carport to be 4 feet from the front property line; 2) a 2 foot variance from the 5 foot side setback **including a gutter** to allow a carport 3 feet from the side property line and 3) a request for a 5% variance from the maximum 50% impervious coverage in the front yard to allow 55% of the front yard in concrete, subject property being Lot 15, Block 6, NCB 9675, situated at 147 Laurelwood Drive, applicant being Reynaldo Reyes.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request for the variance to the subject property as described above, 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 from the front and side setback are not contrary to the public interest as the carport does not impose any immediate fire threat to adjacent properties. The driveway curb cut width was permitted and inspected, consistent with the public interest.***
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. **The special condition present in this case is that the platted front setback, was removed to reduce the requested severity of the variance and the applicant has proceeded with City guidance to gain final approval.***
3. *By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done. **The carport is setback 15 feet from the edge of the street, meeting the intent of the ordinance.***
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the "R-4 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District.*
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 carport is located 3 feet from the side property line and 15 feet from the street edge.***

6. *The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property. The unique circumstance on the property is the confusing instructions communicated to the applicant by various city staff. The owner has made efforts to remedy the mistakes and proceeded through permit and other review processes to correct them.*” Mr. Zuniga seconded the motion.

AYES: Martinez, Zuniga, Finlay, Rodriguez, Britton, Cruz, Acosta, Ojeda, Quijano, Kuderer, Rogers

NAYS: None

VARIANCE IS GRANTED.

Case Number: A-17-060

Applicant: GD Bar Family LP

Owner: GD Bar Family LP

Council District: 10

Location: 11110 North IH-35

Legal Description: Lot 40, NCB 14946

Zoning: “C-3R IH-1 AHOD” General Commercial Restrictive

Alcohol Sales Northeast Gateway Corridor Airport Hazard

Overlay District

Case Manager: Margaret Pahl, AICP, Senior Planner

Request

A request for 1) a 35 foot variance from the 60 foot front building setback, as described in the Northeast Gateway Corridor District development standards, to allow a new building 25 feet from the front property line; and 2) a 15 foot variance from the 20 foot side setback, as described in the Northeast Gateway Corridor District development standards, to allow a building to be five (5) feet from the side property line.

Margaret Pahl: Senior Planner presented the background information and staff’s recommendation of the variance. She indicated 8 notices were mailed, 0 returned in favor, 1 returned in opposition, and no neighborhood association.

Tim Holland: representative stated they worked hard with staff for this request and asked for the Boards approval.

Trey Jacobsen, gave a presentation and spoke in opposition.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-060 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by Mr. Martinez to continue the item to April 3, 2017. Mr. Rodriguez seconded the motion.

AYES: Martinez, Rodriguez, Zuniga, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Acosta, Ojeda, Quijano, Kuderer, Rogers

NAYS: None

THE CONTINUANCE IS GRANTED.

Case Number: A-17-061

Applicant: Ismael L. Castro

Owner: Ismael L. Castro

Council District: 6

Location: 8903 Rich Trace Street

Legal Description: Lot 27, Block 1, NCB 17643

Zoning: "R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

Case Manager: Shepard Beamon, Senior Planner

Request

A request for a 15 foot variance from the 20 foot platted front setback, as described in Section 35-516 (o), to allow a carport to be five (5) feet from the front property line.

Shepard Beamon: Senior Planner presented the background information and staff's recommendation of the variance. He indicated 31 notices were mailed, 1 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and no response from the Tara Neighborhood Association.

Ismael L. Castro: applicant (requested Translation Services) explained the need for protection from rain and hail.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-061 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by Mr. Kuderer. "Regarding Appeal No. A-17-061, a request for a 15 foot variance from the 20 foot platted front setback to allow a carport 5 feet from the front property line, subject property being Lot 27, Block 1, NCB 17643, situated at 8903 Rich Trace Street, applicant being Ismael L. Castro.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request for the variance to the subject property as described above, 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 from the front setback is not contrary to the public interest as the carport does not impose any immediate fire threat to adjacent properties, or increase water runoff. Further, the carport does not interfere with Clear Vision requirements, as the property is located within a cul-de-sac.*
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. The special condition present in this case is the 20 foot platted front setback, which restricts any development in the front of the home. A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in the removal of the 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 will be respected in that the carport does not harm any adjacent properties as the carport respects the established side setbacks and does not interfere with the Clear Vision requirements. Denial of the request would not result in substantial justice for the property owner.*
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the “R-6 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District.*
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 carport contributes to increased protection of the owner’s vehicles. The location of the carport also allows for maintenance without trespass and will not increase water run-off on the adjacent properties. The carport does not detract from the character of surrounding neighborhood as there are other carports within the subdivision with similar design.*
6. *The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property. Due to the platted setback and the configuration of the lot, additional parking with covered protection would not be permissible on any other portions of the property, which is no fault of the owner.”*
The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodriguez.

AYES: Kuderer, Rodriguez, Martinez, Zuniga, Finlay, Cruz, Britton, Acosta, Ojeda, Quijano, Rogers

NAYES: None

THE VARIANCE IS GRANTED

Case Number: A-17-063

Applicant: Amalia Gill

Owner: Amalia Gill

Council District: 4

Location: 3131 Goose Creek

Legal Description: Lot 37, Block 5, NCB 14218

Zoning: “R-6 MAOZ-2 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Military

Airport Overlay Zone Airport Hazard Overlay District

Case Manager: Shepard Beamon, Senior Planner

Request

A request for a 19 foot variance from the 30 foot platted front setback, as described in Section 35-516 (o), to allow a carport to be 11 feet from the front property line.

Shepard Beamon: Planner presented the background information and staff's recommendation of the variances. She indicated 36 notices were mailed, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and no neighborhood association.

Ricardo Gil: representative stated he wanted to build the carport for his mother. He decided to inquire about the process and wishes to comply with all city codes.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-063 closed.

A motion was made by **Mr. Martinez**. "Regarding Appeal No. A-17-063, a request for a 19 foot variance from the 30 foot platted front setback to allow a carport 11 feet from the front property line, subject property being Lot 37, Block 5, NCB 14218, situated at 3131 Goose Creek, applicant being Amalia Gill.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request for the variance to the subject property as described above, 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 is not contrary to the public interest as the carport will not encroach into the public right-of-way and will not interfere with the Clear Vision requirements.*
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. The hardship being the intense heat and hail. The special condition present in this case is the 30 foot platted front setback, which restricts any development in the front of the home. A literal enforcement of the ordinance would not allow the applicant to construct a carport.*
3. *By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done. The carport's design will meet the 10 foot front setback established in the Unified Development code. The spirit of the ordinance will be respected in that the carport does not harm any adjacent properties.*
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the "R-6 MAOZ-2 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Military Airport Overlay Zone Airport Hazard Overlay District.*
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. There are several homes within the subdivision that have constructed carports that*

encroach into the platted setback. The requested carport will be within character of the surrounding 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. Similar to several homes in the neighborhood, an attached garage has been converted into livable space for the primary dwelling, thus providing no covered parking for the owner. The platted setback significantly limits the depth allowance of any addition to the front of the home.*” The motion was seconded by **Ms. Cruz.**

AYES: Martinez, Cruz, Quijano, Ojeda, Finlay, Acosta, Zuniga, Rodriguez, Britton, Kuderer, Rogers

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE IS GRANTED.

The Board of Adjustment convened for a 15 minute break at 2:40pm

The Board of Adjustment reconvened at 2:55pm

Case Number: A-17-064

Applicant: Maria Carrillo

Owner: Maria Carrillo

Council District: 4

Location: 9702 Dugas Drive

Legal Description: Lot 5, Block 77, NCB 15859

Zoning: “R-6 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard

Overlay District

Case Manager: Oscar Aguilera, Planner

Request

A request for a 20 foot variance from the 20 foot platted front setback, as described in UDC 35-516, to allow a carport on the front property line.

Shepard Beamon: Senior Planner presented the background information and staff’s recommendation of the variance. He indicated 33 notices were mailed, 0 returned in favor, 0 returned in opposition, and no response from the Heritage Neighborhood Association.

Arturo Banda: representative (requested translation services) stated his vehicle did not fit in his garage and has trouble with water runoff, in addition needs protection from the weather.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-064 closed.

A motion was made by **Mr. Finlay**. “Regarding Appeal No. A-17-064, a request for a 20 foot variance from the 20 foot platted front setback to allow a carport on the front property line, subject property being Lot 5, Block 77, NCB 15859, situated at 9702 Dugas Drive, applicant being Maria Carrillo.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant’s request for the variance to the subject property as described above, 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 is not contrary to the public interest as it does not increase the risk for fire spread and deflects water runoff onto the subject property only.***
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. **The carport serves as additional protection from inclement weather and provides a safe route for the family from the driveway to the home. Literal enforcement of this setback would prohibit the carport entirely and would ultimately result in an unnecessary hardship.***
3. *By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done. **The carport respects the established side setback and does not interfere with the Clear Vision requirements.***
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in the “R-6 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District.*
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 carport does not produce water runoff on the adjacent property, as it meets the five foot side setback. Further, the owner can maintain the structure without trespassing on the neighboring property on the side.***
6. *The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property. **The unique circumstance in this case is the platted front setback, which prohibits the owner from constructing any vehicle coverage in the front driveway. There is also no other location on the property for additional parking.”** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Rodriguez**.*

AYES: Finlay, Rodriguez, Kuderer, Acosta, Cruz, Britton, Rogers

NAYS: Zuniga, Martinez, Ojeda, Quijano

VARIANCE FAILED.

Case Number: A-17-065

Applicant: Donald Fredette

Owner: Donald Fredette

Council District: 2

Location: 5126 Galahad Drive

Legal Description: Lot 47, Block 1, NCB 13683

Zoning: "NP-10 AHOD" Neighborhood Preservation Airport Hazard Overlay District

Case Manager: Shepard Beamon, Senior Planner

Request

A request for a 29 foot variance from the 30 foot platted front setback, as described in Section 35-516 (o), to allow a carport to be one (1) foot from the front property line.

Shepard Beamon: Senior Planner, presented background information, and staff's recommendation of the variance. He indicated 30 notices were mailed, 1 returned in favor and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the Camelot Neighborhood Association.

Donald and Caroline Fredette: applicants stated they hired a contractor who they believed pulled all proper permits. They need the protection from the weather and for the safety of Mr. Fredette.

James Noggle: spoke in opposition

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-065 closed.

A motion was made by **Mr. Martinez**. "Regarding Appeal No. A-17-065, a request for a **20** foot variance from the platted 30 foot front setback to allow a carport **ten feet** from the front property line, **being 10ft from the front property line**, subject property being Lot 47, Block 1, NCB 13683, situated at 5126 Galahad, applicant being Donald Fredette.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request for the variance to the subject property **as modified** described above, 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. A **ten** foot setback would allow for room to comply with the UDC and maintain the structure and would not produce water runoff on the adjacent property.*
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. The 30 foot platted setback does not allow for additional parking on the subject property. Granting the variance will give the owner the needed coverage for the family's vehicles.*

3. *By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done. The spirit of the ordinance will be respected in that the carport does not harm any adjacent properties. The carport respects the established side setback and does not interfere with the Clear Vision requirements.*
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in the “NP-10 AHOD” Neighborhood Preservation Airport Hazard Overlay District.*
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 carport is in character with the district as there are several similar carports along the same street. As the structure is composed of metal, it will not pose any immediate threat of water runoff or fire spread on 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. The 30 foot platted setback creates conditions that restrict the owner of constructing any structure that will protect the owner’s personal property. This is not the fault of the owner and **would allow the carport to conform to the UDC.**”* The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodriguez.

AYES: Martinez, Rodriguez, Kuderer, Cruz, Quijano, Zuniga, Finlay, Acosta, Ojeda, Britton, Rogers

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE IS GRANTED.

Case Number: A-17-059

Applicant: Isaac Maldonado

Owner: Isaac Maldonado

Council District: 3

Location: 115 Arrid Road

Legal Description: Lot 17, Block 18, NCB 10978

Zoning: “R-4” Residential Single-Family District

Case Manager: Margaret Pahl, AICP, Senior Planner

Request

A request for a four foot variance from the five foot side setback, as described in Table 35-310, to allow a carport one foot from the side property line.

Margaret Pahl: Senior Planner presented the background information and staff’s recommendation of the variance. She indicated 25 notices were mailed, 2 returned in favor, 1 returned in opposition and no neighborhood association.

Isaac Maldonado: applicant stated he replaced an old pre-existing carport not knowing he needed permits. Mr. Maldonado asked ask for approval and would modify if necessary.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-059 closed.

MOTION

A **motion** was made by **Ms. Ojeda**. “Regarding Appeal No. A-17-059, a request for 1) a 4 foot variance from the minimum 5 foot side setback to allow a carport one foot from the side property line, subject property being Lot 17, Block 18, NCB 10978, situated at 115 Arrid Road, applicant being Isaac Maldonado.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant’s request for the variance to the subject property as described above, 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 represented by the side setback requirements. The carport has been built to reduce water runoff on the adjacent property and provide enough room for maintenance.***
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. **If the carport were to be constructed to meet the side setback, there would be no feasible way to have covered protection for the owner’s vehicle. Further, there has been an existing carport in the same location for at least 60 years.***
3. *By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done. **The spirit of the ordinance intends to ensure there are safe distances between structures. The carport has been constructed with the posts two feet from the side property line, and a one foot overhang. In addition, the carport will require modification to fire-rate it, protecting adjacent property.***
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the “R-4” Residential Single-Family District.*
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. **There are several existing carports within the district and the request does not conflict with the character of the neighborhood. With appropriate fire-rating, the carport should fire hazard to the adjacent property.***
6. *The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property. **There is not enough distance between the home and the side property line to meet the side setback. This is no fault of the owner and not merely financial in nature.”** The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.*

AYES: Ojeda, Martinez, Kuderer, Finlay, Rodriguez, Britton, Cruz, Acosta, Zuniga, Quijano, Rogers

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE IS GRANTED

Case Number: A-17-066

Applicant: Daniel Steelman

Owner: Daniel Steelman

Council District: 6

Location: 1227 Weston

Legal Description: Lot 50, Block 2, NCB 17643

Zoning: "R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

Case Manager: Margaret Pahl, AICP, Senior Planner

Request

A request for a 20 foot variance from the 20 foot platted front setback, as described in Section 35-516 (o), to allow a carport to be on the front property line and 2) a four foot variance from the five foot side setback, as described in Table 35-310, to allow a carport one foot from the side property line.

Margaret Pahl: Senior Planner presented the background information and staff's recommendation of the variance. She indicated 36 notices were mailed, 0 returned in favor, 2 returned in opposition, and no response from the Tara Neighborhood Association.

Calina Steelman: applicant stated they hired a contractor who said he pulled permits and needs the carport for protection from the weather.

Everyone present for or against having been heard and the results of the written notices having been received, the Chair declared the public hearing of Case No. A-17-066 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Martinez**. "Regarding Appeal No. A-17-066, a request for 1) a 15 foot variance from the 20 foot platted front setback to allow a carport on the front property line, and 2) a 4 foot variance from the minimum 5 foot side setback to allow a carport 1 foot from the side property line, subject property being Lot 50, Block 2, NCB 17643, situated at 1227 Weston, applicant being Daniel Steelman.

I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request for the variance to the subject property as described above, 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 allow adequate space from the front setback is not contrary to the public interest as the carport does not impose any immediate fire threat to adjacent properties, or increase water*

runoff. The encroachment into the side setback is a result of the irregular pie shaped lot and is mitigated by gutters.

2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. The special condition present in this case is the 20 foot platted front setback, which restricts any development in the front of the home. A literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in the removal of the 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 will be respected in that the carport does not harm any adjacent properties and does not interfere with the Clear Vision requirements.*
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the “R-6 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District.*
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 carport contributes to increased protection of the owner’s vehicles. The location of the carport also allows for maintenance without trespass and will not increase water run-off on the adjacent properties. The carport does not detract from the character of surrounding neighborhood as there are other carports within the subdivision with similar design.*
6. *The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property. Due to the platted setback and the configuration of the lot, additional parking with covered protection would not be permissible on any other portions of the property, which is no fault of the owner.”*
The motion was seconded by Mr.Kuderer.

AYES: Martinez, Kuderer, Rodriguez, Ojeda, Britton, Acosta, Finlay, Cruz, Zuniga, Quijano, Rogers

NAYS: None

THE VARIANCE IS GRANTED

The February 6, 2017 Board of Adjustment Minutes were approved.

No Director’s Report

There being no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

APPROVED BY: _____ OR _____
Chairman Vice-Chair

DATE: _____

ATTESTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
Executive Secretary