

City of San Antonio



Board of Adjustment Minutes

Development and Business Services
Center
1901 South Alamo

June 15, 2020

1:00PM

Videoconference

Board of Adjustment Members

A majority of appointive Members shall constitute a quorum.

Roger F. Martinez, District 10, Chair
Dr. Lisa Zottarelli, District 1, Vice Chair
Donald Oroian, District 8, Pro-Tem

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 | Andrew Ozuna, Mayor

Alternate Members

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

1:03 P.M. - Call to Order

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

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-20-10300027**: A request by Maria E. Shoults for 1) a variance from the restriction of corrugated metal as a fencing material to allow for its use as a fencing material and 2) a special exception to allow a solid screen fence to be up to 7' tall in the front yard, located at 8390 North Verde Drive. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Kayla Leal, Senior Planner (210) 207-0197, kayla.leal@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 10 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 6 returned in opposition, 1 in favor, and 8 in opposition outside the 200 foot buffer. No response from the Verde Hills Neighborhood Association.

Maria E. Shoults, 8390 North Verde Drive – Request for variance to keep fence. She has had items stolen from her property; the fence provides protection and safety.

Submitted Public comment

William Rowe, 10250 Bandera Rd. – In opposition

Donald & Julia Kane, 3123 Sable Creek – In opposition

Milton Twiefel, 8310 N. Verde Dr. – In opposition

MHSC Properties, Ltd – P.O. Box 1718 – In opposition

Noe Lopez, Field Engineering, 8305 N Vedre Drive – In opposition

William & Eileen Camarillo – In opposition

Sarah & Colin Chude, 8324 S. Verde Dr. – In opposition

Daniel L. Earl, 10240 Belga Dr– In opposition

Leigh Earl, 10240 Belga Dr – In opposition

Tracy Cowden, 10190 Belga Dr. – In opposition

Edwin Harding, NV North Verde – In favor

Carina King, 7810 N Verde – In opposition

Jason Wester & Nina Salinas, 7970 S Verde – In opposition

William & Jessica Bjerk, 8120 N Verde – In opposition

Ernesto Valero, 7910 S Verde – In opposition

Carla & Chris Rodgers, 7965 S Verde – 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 Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300027, as presented

Mr. Manna made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300027 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300027, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a special exception to allow a solid screen fence to be up to 7’ tall in the front yard, situated at 8390 North Verde Drive, applicant being Maria Shoults 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 special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter.*
The additional fence height is intended to provide security and privacy of the applicant's property due to its location adjacent to Bandera Road. Allowing this special exception will be in harmony with the spirit of the chapter.
2. *The public welfare and convenience will be substantially served.*
In this case, these criteria are represented by maximum fence heights to protect residential property owners while still promoting a sense of community. A 7-foot tall corrugated metal fence in the front yard will provide protection to the entrance to the neighborhood and screening from the heavily traveled Bandera Road Corridor.
3. *The neighboring property will not be substantially injured by such proposed use.*
The corrugated metal front yard fencing is only placed along the western property line that directly abuts Bandera Road. There is no metal fencing along the eastern property line which abuts the neighboring property, so it is not likely there will be substantial injury by such proposed use.
4. *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 front yard fencing only extends a short distance past the front façade and serves as protection from Bandera Road. This will not alter the essential character of the district.
5. *The special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district or the regulations herein established for the specific district.*
The current zoning permits the current use of a single-family home. The requested special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district.”

Second: Mr. Ozuna

In Favor: None

Opposed: Manna, Ozuna, Zottarelli, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Cruz, Teel, Oroian, Bragman, Martinez

Motion Failed

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for the variance for item BOA-20-10300027, as presented

Mr. Manna made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300027 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300027, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a variance from the restriction of corrugated metal as a fencing material to allow for its use as a fencing material, situated at 8390

North Verde Drive, applicant being Maria Shoults, 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 fence is installed along a property line that faces Bandera Road, which is highly trafficked with vehicles traveling at a high speed.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
The special condition of this property is its location adjacent to an arterial road where a corrugated metal fence would be an appropriate location to serve as more protection. A literal enforcement of the ordinance in this case would result in unnecessary hardship.
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 material limitation is to preserve appropriate design consistent with the surrounding community, which is still maintained with the fence being placed along one side of the 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 corrugated metal fencing is adjacent to O.P. Schnabel Park and Bandera Road. This fence does not alter the essential character of the district because it is most clearly seen from Bandera Road.
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 variance is being sought due to its unique circumstance being located adjacent to Bandera Road which was not created by the owner and is not merely financial.”

Second: Ms. Trevino

In Favor: None

Opposed: Manna, Trevino, Zottarelli, Menchaca, Delmer, Cruz, Teel, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Motion Failed

Item # 2 **BOA-20-10300050:** A request by Cheryl Carney for a 2' special exception and variance to the Beacon Hill Neighborhood Conservation District standards to allow a fence to be 8' tall along the side property line, located at 1124 West Gramercy Place. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 1) (Kayla Leal, Senior Planner (210) 207-0197, kayla.leal@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 27 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition, 1 in opposition outside the 200 foot boundary. No response from the Beacon Hill Community Neighborhood Association.

Cheryl Carney, 1124 W Gramercy Place – Requesting variance to allow for an 8' fence for her security and privacy; she has suffered many years of harassment.

Submitted Public Comment

Jack Finger P.O. Box 12048 – 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 Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300050, as presented

Dr. Zottarelli made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300050 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300050, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a special exception to allow a privacy fence to be up to 8' tall along the eastern side property line, situated at 1124 West Gramercy Place, applicant being Cheryl Carney 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 special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the chapter.*
The UDC states the Board of Adjustment can grant a special exception for a fence height modification up to eight feet. The additional fence height is intended to provide privacy of the applicant's property. This request would be in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the ordinance.
2. *The public welfare and convenience will be substantially served.*
In this case, these criteria are represented by maximum fence heights to protect residential property owners while still promoting a sense of community. The applicant states the slight elevation of the property results in less privacy. An 8-foot tall wooden fence along the side property line will provide additional privacy for the applicant's property. This is not contrary to the public interest.

The fence will create enhanced security and privacy for the subject property and is highly unlikely to injure adjacent properties. The material and style of the fence is similar to other fences and will not be noticeable from the right-of-way. Further, the fencing does not violate Clear Vision standards.

4. *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 fencing does not detract from the character of the neighborhood. The fencing is in line with other preexisting fencing material and height within the immediate vicinity.

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

The current zoning permits the current use of a single-family home. The requested special exception will not weaken the general purpose of the district.”

Second: Ms. Cruz

Voting for BOA-20-1030050 Variance and Special Exception were combined into one vote.

In Favor: Zottarelli, Cruz, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Teel, Manna, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Item #3

BOA-20-1030052: A request by Eduardo Di Loreto for 1) a variance from the minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet to allow a lot to be 4,486 square feet, 2) a special exception to allow a solid screen fence to be up to 6' tall along the side property line within the front yard, and 3) a variance from the Clear Vision standards to allow a fence to be within the Clear Vision field, located at 509 Dowdy Street. Staff recommends Denial with Alternate Recommendation. (Council District 5) (Azadeh Sagheb, Planner (210) 207-5407, Azadeh.Sagheb@sanantonio.gov, Development Services

Staff stated 28 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the Lone Star Neighborhood Association.

Eduardo Parra, 509 Dowdy Street – Spoke of request of variance for lot size, and special exception to allow solid material for fence. Owner has complied with the clear vision standards, and moved part of the fence back to match up with the neighbor's.

No Public Comments

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-20-10300052, as presented

Dr. Zottarelli made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300052 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300052, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant 1) a variance from the minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet to allow a lot to be 4,486 square feet, situated at 509 Dowdy, applicant being Eduardo Di Loreto, 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 represented by lot size that maintain neighborhood character and smaller lot size are not contrary to the public interest.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
A literal enforcement of the ordinance related to the lot size would result in unnecessary hardship by going through the rezoning process and delay in platting process.
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 code is to establish cohesive development that preserves the public interest. The request to reduce the lot size observe the intent of the code as the property complies with other 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 request will not injure adjacent properties as this is just an issue of the current lot size.

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 is due to financial and limited budget that owner could spend to build a smaller dwelling. These are not the fault of the property owner and are not the result of the general conditions in the community.”

Second: Ms. Cruz

In Favor: Zottarelli, Cruz, Trevino, Menchaca, Delmer, Teel, Manna, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for clear vision standard variance item BOA-20-10300052, as presented

Dr. Zottarelli made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300052 for approval

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300052, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a variance from the Clear Vision standards to allow a fence to be within the Clear Vision field, situated at 509 Dowdy, applicant being Eduardo Di Loreto, 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 represented to maintain neighborhood character and clear vision field area that enhances pedestrian safety. The fence location within the Clear Vision is not contrary to the public interest.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
A literal enforcement of the ordinance related to the lot size would result in unnecessary hardship. The requirement to reduce the fence height would have placed the home safety and privacy at risk, resulting in an unnecessary hardship.
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 code is to establish cohesive development that preserves the public interest. The clear vision field observe the intent of the code as the property complies with other 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 request will not injure adjacent properties as there is still adequate distance between the driveway fence and the street will not harm other motorists or pedestrians.

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 is not the fault of the property owner and are not the result of the general conditions in the community.”

Second: Ms. Cruz

In Favor: Zottarelli, Cruz, Delmer, Teel, Oroian, Bragman

Opposed: Trevino, Menchaca, Manna, Ozuna, Martinez

Motion Failed

Item #4

BOA-20-10300047: A request by Gloria Vasquez for a 29% variance from the 50% front yard impervious cover limitation to allow 79% of the front yard to be covered in impervious cover, located at 5554 Kensington Run. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 7) (Dominic Silva, Senior Planner (210) 207-0120, Dominic.Silva@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 35 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition.

Gloria Vasquez, 5554 Kensington Run – Requesting variance to keep the front yard impervious cover. The additional parking is needed for the 7 vehicles owned by the family. The parking provides safety for their children; there have been many accidents due to drivers turning the corner very quickly.

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-20-10300047 as presented

Mr. Manna made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300047 for approval.

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300047, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 29% variance from the 50% front yard impervious cover limitation to allow 79% of the front yard to be covered in impervious cover, situated at 5554 Kensington Run, applicant being Gloria Vasquez, 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 impervious coverage limitation preserves storm water management by reducing runoff and increasing storm water travel times. Further, the regulations are provided to prevent front yards from being covered by impervious surfaces, which can detract from the character of the community. The Board finds the request is not contrary to the public interest.
2. *Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.*
Literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in increased street parking, thereby creating unnecessary hardship.
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 impervious coverage limitation requirements is to prevent water flooding and to preserve the character of the community. All intents of the code shall 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.*
The requested variance will not substantially injure adjacent conforming properties as the amount of impervious coverage is in line with other properties within 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 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 plight of the owner extends from increased on-street parking, leaving to owner to increase impervious coverage in order to utilize off-street parking as intended.”

Second: Mr. Oroian

In Favor: None

Opposed: Manna, Oroian, Zottarelli, Trevino, Menchaca, Cruz, Teel, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Motion Failed

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion to **reconsider** for item BOA-20-10300047

Mr. Ozuna made a **motion** to reconsider BOA-20-10300047.

Second: Mr. Teel

In Favor: Zottarelli, Cruz, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: Trevino, Menchaca, Teel, Manna, Oroian, Bragman

Motion to reconsider Fails

Mr. Delmer left the Board of Adjustment meeting at 3:12 PM.

Mr. Martinez called for the Board of Adjustment to take a recess at 3:34 PM. The Board of Adjustment resumed at 3:48 PM.

Item #5

BOA-20-10300048: A request by Hector Aguilar for a 3' variance from the required 5' side setback to allow a carport to be 2' away from the side property line, located at 162 Idell Avenue. Staff recommends Approval. (Council District 3) (Dominic Silva, Senior Planner (210) 207-0120, Dominic.Silva@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 30 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 0 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. No response from the Highland Hills Neighborhood Association.

Hector Aguilar, 162 Idell Avenue – Requesting variance to have the 2 feet on the side to fit his truck. The carport provides protection during bad weather.

Submitted Public comment

Arturo Velasquel, 159 Idell – In favor

Blanca L. Amaro, 154 Idell – In favor

Diane Covey Stallings, 150 Idell – In favor

Robert White, 155 Idell – 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-20-10300048, as presented

Mr. Oroian made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300048 for approval.

“Regarding Case No. BOA-20-10300048, I move that the Board of Adjustment grant a request for a 3’ variance from the required 5’ side setback to allow a carport to be 2’ away from the side property line, situated at 162 Idell Avenue, applicant being Hector Aguilar, 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 carport 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 Board finds the community is characterized by attached carports within the side setbacks. Literal enforcement of the setback limitation would result in unnecessary hardship by prohibiting the owner to utilize the carport as it was 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 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 follows a community norm of reduced side setbacks 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 carport is built in character of the neighborhood with adequate space utilized for maintenance of the structure, storm water drainage, and accessibility to light, air, and open space.”

Second: Mr. Manna

In Favor: Oroian, Manna, Zottarelli, Trevino, Menchaca, Cruz, Teel, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Item #6

BOA-20-10300032: A request by Silvia Torres Castaneda for 1) a 6’ variance from the required 10’ front setback for a carport to be 4’ away from the front property line, and 2) a 3’7” variance from 5’ required side setback for a carport to be 1’5” away from the side property line, located at 1002 S Pine Street. Staff recommends Denial. (Council District 2) (Azadeh Sagheb, Planner (210) 207-5407, Azadeh.Sagheb@sanantonio.gov, Development Services Department)

Staff stated 36 notices were mailed to property owners within 200 feet, 1 returned in favor, and 0 returned in opposition. The Denver Heights Neighborhood Association is in favor.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for item BOA-20-10300032 to be continued until the Board of Adjustment meeting on July 6, 2020.

Ms. Cruz made a **motion** for BOA-20-10300032 to be continued until the Board of Adjustment meeting on July 6, 2020.

Second: Mr. Menchaca

In Favor: Cruz, Menchaca, Zottarelli, Trevino, Teel, Manna, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Opposed: None

Motion Granted

Item #7

Consideration and approval of the June 1, 2020 Board of Adjustment Minutes.

Motion: Chair Martinez asked for a motion for approval of the June 1, 2020 minutes as presented.

Mr. Manna made a **motion** for approval of June 1, 2020 minutes.

Second: Ms. Cruz

In Favor: Manna, Cruz, Zottarelli, Trevino, Menchaca, Teel, Oroian, Bragman, Ozuna, Martinez

Minutes Approved

Staff mentioned the rest of the summer Board of Adjustment meetings will be held by videoconference.

Adjournment

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

Board of Adjustment

June 15, 2020

APPROVED BY: Roy F. Watkins OR _____
Chairman Vice-Chair

DATE: _____

ATTESTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
Executive Secretary