

City of San Antonio



Board of Adjustment Minutes

Development and Business Services
Center
1901 South Alamo

October 5, 2020

1:00PM

Videoconference

Board of Adjustment Members

A majority of appointive Members shall constitute a quorum.

Roger F. Martinez, District 10, Chair
Donald Oroian, District 8, Vice Chair
Andrew Ozuna, Mayor, Pro-Tem

Anisa Schell, District 1 | Vacant, District 2
Andrew Menchaca, District 3 | George Britton, District 4 |
Maria Cruz, District 5 | Seth Teel, District 6
Phillip Manna, District 7 | Kimberly Bragman, District 9

Alternate Members

Cyra M. Trevino | Anne Englert | Arlene B. Fisher | Vacant
Seymour Battle III | Kevin W. Love | Jonathan Delmer

1:01 P.M. - Call to Order

- **Roll Call**
- **Present:** Schell, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Cruz, Battle, Manna, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez
- **Absent:** Britton, Teel

2 Translators from SeproTec were present to assist with translating.

**THE FOLLOWING ITEMS MAY BE CONSIDERED AT ANY TIME DURING THE
REGULAR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING:**

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

Item #1 **BOA-20-10300055**: A request by William Epp for a 10' variance from the 15' Type B bufferyard to allow the north and east side bufferyards to be 5' in width, located at 12590 West Avenue. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 9) (Dominic Silva, Senior Planner (210) 207-0120, Dominic.Silva@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 8 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition.

Caroline E. McDonald, 12590 West Avenue – Requesting variance for reduced buffer. Special exceptions were not caused by property owner.

The Board asked the applicant questions concerning the request. The Applicant responses were heard by the board as well as other testimonies offered, followed by a discussion among board members before the vote.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300055, as presented

Ms. Bragman made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300055 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300055, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 10' variance from the 15' Type B bufferyard to allow the north and east side bufferyards to be 5' in width, situated at 12590 West Avenue, applicant being Caroline E. McDonald, 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 variance is not contrary to the public interest as the applicant is proposing to construct a commercial structure currently underutilized lot. The surrounding area predominately consists of commercial uses.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
Staff finds that any special conditions that, if enforced, would result in an unnecessary hardship. The subject property is surrounded by odd shaped lots, so a literal enforcement of the ordinance would create difficulty in constructing a commercial structure with space for parking and traffic.
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 intent of the bufferyard requirements is to create buffers between adjacent property uses and protect the public health, safety, and welfare. In this case, the adjacent properties are commercially utilized, and due to the right-of-way acquisition, requires a variance in order to meet parking requirements.

4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the property for which the variance is sought is located.*
The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized by the 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 subject property is located in a predominately commercial and industrial area. The variance will not injure the adjacent properties nor alter the 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 that, due to the right-of-way acquisition, irregular lots adjacent to the subject property, and commercial uses of those lots, a variance is justified and are not due to financial circumstances or due to the general conditions of the district.”

Second: Mr. Ozuna

In Favor: Bragman, Ozuna, Schell, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Cruz, Battle, Manna, Oroian, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Item # 2 **BOA-20-10300081:** A request by Adam Sanchez for an appeal of the Historic Preservation Officer’s decision to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, located at 931 Hays Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Edward Hall, Senior Historic Preservation Specialist, (210) 207-4680, edward.hall@sanantonio.gov, Office of Historic Preservation; Azadeh Sagheb, Planner (210) 207-5407, Azadeh.Sagheb@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 32 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 4 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. 1 response in favor outside the 200’ and 2 in opposition outside the 200’. The Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association is in opposition.

Adam Sanchez & Christopher Gill, for property owner Mrs. Johnson, 931 Hays Street – Requesting appeal for the decision from OHP issue of certificate of appropriateness. The intention was to always follow the guidelines of OHP.

Submitted Public Comment

Arvis Holland, President, Dignowity Hill Neighborhood Association – In opposition
Patti Zaiontz, President, The Conservation Society of San Antonio,
107 King William St. – In opposition
Kelby & Bradley Bellows, 411 Muncey St – In favor
Scott Albert, 922 N Pine St – In opposition
Monica Savino, 1120 E Crockett – In opposition
Carmen Lynn, 927 Hays St – In favor
Mike Selema, 1417 Crockett St. – In favor
Kelsey Shaffer, 922 Hays St – In favor
Mary Douglas, 918 Hays St – In favor
Dwayne White, 923 Hays St – In favor

The Board asked the applicant questions concerning the request. The Applicant responses were heard by the board as well as other testimonies offered, followed by a discussion among board members before the vote.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300081, as presented

Mr. Oroian made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300081 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA 20 10300081, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant an appeal of the Historic Preservation Officer’s decision to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 931 Hays St., applicant being Adam Sanchez.”

Second: Mr. Manna

In Favor: Menchaca, Battle

Opposed: Oroian, Manna, Schell, Trevino, Delmer, Cruz, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Motion Fails

Item #3

BOA-20-10300084: A request by David Ayers for a variance to allow 15'7" median blockface dimension from the minimum 21' code requirement, located at 220 and 226 East Carson Street and 222 Oleander Street. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 2) (Dominic Silva, Senior Planner (210) 207-0120, Dominic.Silva@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 42 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. 1 responses in opposition outside 200’. No response from the Government Hill Neighborhood Association.

David Ayers, 220 & 226 E. Carson St. & 222 Oleander St. – Developer for property. Requesting variance to reduce blockface for buffer between property.

Submitted Public Comments

Fabian Sanchez – In opposition

The Board asked the applicant questions concerning the request. The Applicant responses were heard by the board as well as other testimonies offered, followed by a discussion among board members before the vote.

Motion: Chair Oroian asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300084, as presented

Mr. Manna made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300084 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300084, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a variance to allow 15'7" median blockface dimension from the minimum 21' code requirement, situated at 220 and 226 East Carson Street and 222 Oleander Street, applicant being David Ayers, 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, given the lot constraints, granting the variances still provides adequate accessibility to light, air, and open space for both the subject property and the adjacent property.
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 due to significantly reducing the amount of developable space on the lots facing East Carson Street if following the median setback of the two lots to the east of the subject properties.
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 the intent of the code, rather than the strict letter of the law. The intent of the median setback of the Limited Intensity Infill Development Zone is to reduce altering the existing character of the district. The subject properties are utilized as a buffer between the commercially utilized IDZ properties to the west and the predominately single-family uses to the east within Government Hill. By granting the variances, the spirit of the ordinance will be done.
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the property for which the variance is sought is located.*
The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized by the 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 variances requested would not substantially injure or alter the use or character of adjacent conforming property or character of the district. Specifically, the variance would not place the structure out of character within the community as they serve as a buffer between the commercial IDZ lots to the west and the residential uses to the east.

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 unique circumstances existing on the property are neither due to the general conditions of the district, nor due to the owner, and is not financial in nature. Due to the median setback of the existing two lots on the blockface, the median setback is not conducive to small lot configurations the applicant has proposed.”

Second: Mr. Menchaca

In Favor: Manna, Menchaca, Schell, Trevino, Delmer, Cruz, Battle, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Chair Oroian called for the Board of Adjustment to take a recess at 2:59 p.m. The Board of Adjustment returned at 3:06 p.m.

Item #4

BOA-20-10300057: A request by Mirna Rizo for 1) a 15'5" variance from the 20' minimum rear setback to allow an attached addition to be 4'7" from the rear property line, and 2) a 1'4" variance from the required 5' side setback to allow the attached addition to be 3'8" away from the side property line, located at 315 Noria. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 5) (Azadeh Sagheb, Planner (210) 207-5407, Azadeh.Sagheb@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 52 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the San Juan Gardens/Collins Gardens Neighborhood Association.

Rolando Rizo, 315 Noria – Representing his Mother, Mirna Rizo. Requesting variance to continue with the construction of the addition to their home.

No Public Comment

The Board asked the applicant questions concerning the request. The Applicant responses were heard by the board as well as other testimonies offered, followed by a discussion among board members before the vote.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300057 as presented

Mr. Ozuna made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300057 for approval.

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300057, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 15’5” variance from the 20’ minimum rear setback to allow an attached addition to be 4’7” from the rear property line, and 2) a 1’4” variance from the required 5’ side setback to allow the attached addition to be 3’8” away from the side property line, situated at 315 Noria, applicant being Mirna Rizo, 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 served by setbacks. In this instance, the attached addition maintains adequate space for maintenance and fire separation while maintaining accessibility to light, air, and open space.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
The unnecessary hardship relates to the fact that if the variance is not granted, the applicant will not be able to utilize the addition as it was intended, and it needs to be demolished.
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 the intent of the code, rather than the strict letter of the law. The intent of the setback limitation is to prevent fire spread, allow adequate space for maintenance, and encourage proper stormwater drainage. All intents of this law will be observed if approved.
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.*
The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning 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.*
This variance would not substantially injure or alter the use or character of adjacent conforming property or character of the district. The structure the variance is requested for is in harmony with 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, 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 attached addition maintains the character of the neighborhood with adequate space utilized for maintenance of the structure, stormwater drainage, and accessibility to light, air, and open space.”

Second: Ms. Cruz

In Favor: Ozuna, Cruz, Schell, Trevino, Delmer, Battle, Oroian, Bragman, Martinez

Opposed: Menchaca, Manna

Motion Granted

Item #5

BOA-20-10300085: A request by John Bustamante for a 2’ variance from the 5’ minimum side setback requirement to allow an accessory structure to be 3’ from the side property line, located at 106 Castillo Avenue. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 5) (Kayla Leal, Senior Planner (210) 207-0197, kayla.leal@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 29 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 2 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the Roosevelt Park Neighborhood Association.

John Bustamante, 106 Castillo Avenue – Requesting variance to allow a new accessory structure to replace the existing structure with more separation with neighboring property. .

Submitted Public comment

Krystin Ramirez, 120 Castillo – In favor

Alicia Guerrero, 116 Castillo – In favor

The Board asked the applicant questions concerning the request. The Applicant responses were heard by the board as well as other testimonies offered, followed by a discussion among board members before the vote.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300085, to be continued until the October 19, 2020 Board of Adjustment meeting.

Ms. Cruz made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300077 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300085, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 2’ variance from the 5’ minimum side setback requirement to allow an accessory structure to be 3’ from the side property line, situated at 106 Castillo Avenue, applicant being John Bustamante, 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 variance is not contrary to the public interest as the applicant is proposing to renovate an accessory structure and move it further from a structure on an abutting lot.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
The Board finds that any special conditions that, if enforced, would result in an unnecessary hardship. The applicant is proposing to move the existing structure upon renovation, but the minimum side setback of five (5) feet would result in a smaller footprint of the accessory 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. The intent of side setbacks is to provide separation between structures and protect the public health, safety, and welfare. In this case, the applicant will be moving a dilapidated accessory structure three (3) feet from the property line where it currently sits. This will allow for separation from the eaves of the abutting structure to the south, creating more separation and reducing fire risk from the abutting property.
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the property for which the variance is sought is located.*
The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized by the 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 request to reduce the side setback does not pose a risk of substantially injuring the use of adjacent properties and is not likely 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.*
The Board finds that the location of the accessory structure and proposed plans for the lot shall warrant the granting of this request. The applicant was informed of the limitations incurred by the ordinance and submitted the request for a variance prior to construction.”

Second: Mr. Manna

In Favor: Cruz, Manna, Schell, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Battle, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

- Item #6** **BOA-20-10300078:** A request by Brett Henneke for 1) a 1,816 square foot variance from the minimum lot size requirement of 4,000 square feet to allow the lot to be 2,184 square feet and 2) a 10' variance to the rear setback to be allow a 10' setback from the rear property line, and 3) a 10' variance from the required 20' garage entrance to allow a garage to be located 10' from the front property line, located at 211 North Polaris Street. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 2)(Kayla Leal, Senior Planner (210) 207-0197, kayla.leal@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 25 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 2 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the Jefferson Heights Neighborhood Association.

Brett Henneke, 815 Dawson St – Requesting variance to build new 2-story structure on property.

No Public comment

The Board asked the applicant questions concerning the request. The Applicant responses were heard by the board as well as other testimonies offered, followed by a discussion among board members before the vote.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300078, as presented

Mr. Oroian made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300078 for approval.

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300078, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) a 1,816 square foot variance from the minimum lot size requirement of 4,000 square feet to allow the lot to be 2,184 square feet and 2) a 10' variance to the rear setback to be allow a 10' setback from the rear property line, and 3) a 10' variance from the required 20' garage entrance to allow a garage to be located 10' from the front property line, situated at 211 North Polaris Street, applicant being Brett Henneke, 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 variance is not contrary to the public interest as the applicant is requesting the variance due to the size constraints of the lot. The applicant is proposing to construct a single-family dwelling on a currently vacant lot.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
The Board finds that any special conditions that, if enforced, would result in an unnecessary hardship. The subject property has a square footage less than the minimum requirement and has a shallow lot depth, so a literal enforcement of the ordinance would cause issues to obtain residential building permits to construct on the property.

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 intent of the minimum lot dimensions and setbacks is to create uniformity and protect the public health, safety, and welfare. The applicant will maintain the side setbacks and is proposing a 10' rear setback, which will allow enough separation from abutting properties.*
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the property for which the variance is sought is located. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized by the 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 request to reduce the front garage setback, the rear setback, and the lot size do not pose a risk of substantially injuring the use of adjacent properties and is not likely 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. The Board finds that the unique size and configuration of the lot shall warrant the granting of this request. The applicant was informed of the limitations incurred by the ordinance and submitted the request for a variance prior to construction."*

Second: Mr. Manna

In Favor: Oroian, Manna, Schell, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Cruz, Battle, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Item #7

BOA-20-10300082: A request by Ella Bree Homes for 1) an 843 square foot variance from the required 4,000 square foot lot size to allow a lot size to be 3,157 square feet and 2) a 10' variance from the required 20' minimum rear setback to allow a structure to be built 10' away from the rear property line, located at 102 Grenet Street. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 5) (Dominic Silva, Senior Planner (210) 207-0120, Dominic.Silva@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 29 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 1 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the Historic Westside Neighborhood Association.

Beto Sepulveda, 102 Grenet Street – Requesting variance to construct a home on the vacant lot. The rear setback would allow the home to be 10 feet from the property line.

Submitted Public comment

Jorge Lopez, 2522 S. Laredo – In favor

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300082, as presented

Ms. Cruz made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300082 for approval.

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300082, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for 1) an 843 square foot variance from the required 4,000 square foot lot size to allow a lot size to be 3,157 square feet and 2) a 10’ variance from the required 20’ minimum rear setback to allow a structure to be built 10’ away from the rear property line, situated at 102 Grenet Street, applicant being Ella Bree 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, given the lot constraints, granting the variances still provides adequate accessibility to light, air, and open space. Further, fire rated material will be required due to the proximity to adjacent structures.
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 due to significantly reducing the amount of developable space on each lot. The small lot configurations are the result of antiquated, substandard lot development and will require variances if developing on the lot as intended.
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 the intent of the code, rather than the strict letter of the law. The intent of the setback limitation is to prevent fire spread, allow adequate space for maintenance, and encourage proper storm water drainage. All intents of this law will be observed if approved.
4. *The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the property for which the variance is sought is located.*
The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized by the 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 variances requested would not substantially injure or alter the use or character of adjacent conforming property or character of the district. Specifically, the variance would not place the structure out of character within the community. Further, the residential structure is following a district norm of reduced setbacks for all houses built within 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.*

The unique circumstances existing on the property are neither due to the general conditions of the district, nor due to the owner, and is not financial in nature. The character of reduced lot sizes within the district is uniform, leaving little room for proper building setbacks. This is created by the proliferation of older, outdated substandard lots currently zoned “R-4.”

Second: Mr. Manna

In Favor: Cruz, Manna, Schell, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Battle, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Item #8 Consideration and approval of the September 21, 2020 Board of Adjustment Minutes.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for approval of the September 21, 2020 minutes as presented.

Mr. Manna made a **motion** for approval of September 21, 2020 minutes.

Second: Mr. Oroian

In Favor: Manna, Oroian, Schell, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Cruz, Battle, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None


Minutes Approved

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

APPROVED BY: _____ OR  _____
Chairman Vice-Chair

DATE: 12-16-2020

ATTESTED BY:  _____ DATE: 12/16/2020
Executive Secretary