BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OFFICIAL MINUTES
June 20, 2011

Members Present:

Michael Gallagher
Andrew Ozuna
Liz Victor
Edward Hardemon
Helen Dutmer
George Britton
Jesse Zuniga
Mary Rogers
Mike Villyard
Gene Camargo
Paul Klein

Staff:

Jacob Floyd, Senior Planner
Rudy Niño, Senior Planner
Andreina Dávila-Quintero, Planner
Paul Wendland, City Attorney

Call to Order

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

Mr. Gallagher, Chairman, called the meeting to order and called roll of the applicants for each case.

Mr. Klein made a motion to move Case No. A-11-038 to the end of the agenda. Mr. Zuniga seconded the motion with all members voting in the affirmative.

CASE NO. A-11-036

Applicant – Raymond M Gutierrez
Lot 17, Block 2, NCB 14182
1707 Searcy Drive
Zoned: "R-5 MLOD AHOD" Residential Single-Family Military Lighting Overlay Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting 1) a 2-foot variance from the 6-foot maximum fence height standard in side and rear yards, in order to allow an 8-foot fence in the side and rear yards and 2) a 5-foot variance from the 5-foot minimum side setback requirement of the R-5 district, in order to allow a structure on the northeast side property line.

Andreina Dávila-Quintero, Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of denial of the requested variances She indicated 32 notices were mailed, 2 were returned in favor and 3 were returned in opposition.

Raymond Gutierrez, applicant, stated there was an existing 6-foot fence on the property that had deteriorated which caused him to rebuild the fence. He also stated he decided to replace the fence with an additional 2 feet for security reasons and did not realize he needed a permit to replace the fence. He stated he could do without the setback variance for the dog kennels. He further stated he is withdrawing the setback variance.

Tanya Gutierrez, applicant, stated the fence is for safety concerns and to ensure privacy for her two children. She also stated the fence is not encroaching or encumbering into anyone's property.

The following citizens appeared to speak:

Linda Gutierrez, citizen, spoke in favor.

Erlinda Pollock, citizen, 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-11-036 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Klein.** Re Appeal **A-11-036**, variance application for **a 2-foot variance from the 6-foot maximum fence height standard in the rear yards, in order to allow an existing 8-foot fence in the rear yard to remain,** the subject property is described as **Lot 17, Block 2, NCB 14182**, the zoning is **"R-5 MLOD AHOD", Residential Single-Family Military Lighting Overlay Airport Hazard Overlay District,** the property address is **1707 Searcy Drive,** the applicant is **Raymond M. Gutierrez.** I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding this appeal for a 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 the **variance request for the rear yard fence increase in height is not contrary due to the owners needs for privacy with his family and young children and providing appropriate shielding from the adjoining lot on Talcott Drive.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the applicant has provided testimony today to indicate that the topography of the land is such that a fence of less than 8 feet does not provide adequate visual protection to himself and his family.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the owner will be required to pay the necessary fines that may accompany constructing the fence without the needed permit. Also the spirit of the ordinance is observed and the fact that the UDC does address needs that can be based on topography and also the privacy needs of the residence.** Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the property is currently zoned "R-5" and will remain so**. 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 in that **the applicant did provide a petition indicating**

acceptance of his fence by seventeen nearby property owners and it should also be noted that the property owner most affected by the wording of this variance was in approval of the variance request as stated. 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 in that **the applicant's need for privacy based on the topography of the land is the primary reason behind this variance request and recommendation.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Camargo.**

AYES: Klein, Ozuna, Camargo, Victor, Villyard, Hardemon, Rogers, Britton, Dutmer, Gallagher
NAY: Zuniga

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-11-039

Applicant – Alamo Sign Solutions, LLC
Lot 38, NCB 14946
11202 North IH 35
Zoned: "I-1 IH-1 AHOD" General Industrial Northeast Gateway Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a 212.35-square foot variance to the 150-square foot maximum area for single tenant signs in the "IH-1" Northeast Gateway Corridor, in order to allow a total sign area of 362.35 square feet.

Jacob Floyd, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of denial the requested variance. He indicated 20 notices were mailed, none were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition.

James Alfaro, representative, stated they are proposing to replace an inoperable sign that is 2 feet high by 6 feet long. They are proposing to replace this sign with a 4 feet by 8 feet sign since the current sign does work and is an eyesore. He also stated the new proposed sign will have some beautification since the proposed sign is a newer technology and energy conscious sign. This will allow the applicant to present what it does as a business.

No citizens appeared to speak.

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-11-039 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Klein to continue this case until the next regularly scheduled meeting on July 11, 2011.** The motion was seconded by **Ms. Dutmer.**

AYES: Klein, Dutmer, Victor, Hardemon, Zuniga, Britton, Dutmer, Gallagher
NAY: Camargo, Villyard, Rogers

THE MOTION CARRIES.

Board members recessed for 10 minutes.

CASE NO. A-11-040

Applicant – Ramon Castro, Jr.
N 50 feet Lot 84, Block 2, NCB 1015
1509 North Colorado Street
Zoned: "I-1 AHOD" General Industrial Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting 1) a 30-foot variance to the 80-foot minimum lot street frontage requirement of the "I-1" district, in order to allow a 50-foot wide street frontage, 2) a 30-foot variance to the 80-foot minimum lot width requirement of the "I-1" district, in order to allow a 50-foot wide lot, and **3)** a 25-foot variance to the 30-foot minimum rear setback requirement of the "I-1" district when abutting a residential use, in order to allow a 5-foot rear setback.

Andreina Dávila-Quintero, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of approval of the requested variances. She indicated 16 notices were mailed, 2 were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and no response from the Gardendale Neighborhood Association.

Raymundo Rivera, representative, stated the plat on this property was recorded on Friday, June 17, 2011. He also stated the property will only be used as an office for the property owner's HVAC business. He will not have customers on the property.

The following citizens appeared to speak:

Alma Lobo, citizen, 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-11-040 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Ozuna.** Re Appeal **A-11-040**, variance application for **Ramon Castro, Jr.,** subject property address is **1509 North Colorado Street**, subject property description is **N 50 feet Lot 84, Block 2, NCB 1015**, again situated at **1509 North Colorado Street,** the applicant's request is for **1) a 30-foot variance to the 80-foot minimum lot street frontage requirement of the "I-1" district, 2) a 30-foot variance to the 80-foot minimum lot width requirement of the "I-1" district in order to allow a 50-foot wide lot, and 3) a 25-foot variance to the 30-foot minimum rear setback requirement of the "I-1" district when abutting a residential use in order to allow a 5-foot rear setback.** I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding appeal No **A-11-040**, application for a 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 the variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the variances requested will not create any adverse impact on the wellbeing of the general public. The requested variances, if approved, will allow the use and development of a vacant property in an industrial zoned area with lots of similar width dimensions and uses.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the subject property is a 50-foot by 56-foot parcel of land that was created when the north 50 feet of Lot 84 was subdivided without a plat in 1934. In 2001, the minimum lot width and frontage requirement of the "I-1" zoning district increased from 50 feet to 80 feet. Additionally, per Section 35-310.01 of the UDC, buildings shall have a front setback of 30 feet, and a rear setback of 30 feet when abutting a residential use or district. Due to the time when the property was created and the change in the minimum lot width and frontage requirements, the depth of the property (56 feet), and the residential use located to the west, the enforcement of the current "I-1" development standards resulted in unnecessary hardship on the currently vacant property.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the granting of the variance will allow for the subject property to be developed with a use similar to those permitted in the vicinity by the UDC, and thus substantial justice will be done. Failure to grant these variances would result in the property becoming undevelopable.** Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the requested variances will all the currently vacant property to be developed with an approximately 270-square foot structure that will be used as a repair and storage area for a mobile A/C and heating business. Pursuant to Table 311-2, Nonresidential Use Matrix of the UDC, Air Conditioning/Refrigeration – Service and repair is a use permitted by right in the "I-1" zoning district.** 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 in that **the variances requested will allow the development of a currently vacant property in an industrial area with similar uses, and will not injure the conforming uses of the adjacent properties. The residential use currently located to the west of the property is a nonconforming use that was established prior to the current zoning designation. The applicant is proposing to place the building a minimum of 5 feet from the west property line, which would allow for the provision of a buffer between the proposed use and the**

residential use. 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 in that **the requested variance are due to the unique conditions of the subject property that were created at the time that the original Lot 84 was subdivided and due to the nonconforming use to the west. These conditions were not created by the current owner, and are not merely financial or due to the general conditions of the "I-1" district.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Hardemon.**

AYES: Ozuna, Hardemon, Villyard, Dutmer, Camargo, Victor, Rogers, Britton, Zuniga, Klein, Gallagher
NAY: None

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-11-042

Applicant – Bulverde Parkway Plaza, Ltd.
Lot 8, NCB 34955
18221 Bulverde Road
Zoned: "O-1 PC-1 ERZS" Office Bulverde Road Preservation Corridor Edwards Recharge Zone District and "O-1 ERZD" Office Edwards Recharge Zone District

The applicant is requesting **1)** a 125-foot variance to the 35-foot maximum front setback requirement of the "O-1" district, in order to allow a 160-foot front setback and **2)** a variance to the requirement of the "O-1" district that parking lots be located to the rear of the principal building, in order to allow a parking lot to be located to the front of the principal building.

Andreina Dávila-Quintero, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of approval of the requested variances. She indicated 27 notices were mailed, one was returned in favor and 3 were returned in opposition.

Gene Dawson, Jr., representative, stated the preservation corridor is trying to maintain some of the world characteristics of what is mainly undeveloped property along Bulverde Road. He also stated if they comply underlying with "O-1" zoning requirements in the rear, the parking would have to go back where the trees and not on the vacant land. This would cause for some of the trees to be removed. The building would also have to be pushed back forward away from the existing structure that is going to maintained and made part of the medical office. He further stated the reason for the variance is to meet the intent of the preservation corridor and save as many trees as possible.

The following citizens appeared to speak:

Colletta Galloway, citizen, spoke in opposition.

Mr. Ozuna made a motion to continue case A-11-042 until after the next case. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dutmer with all board members voting in the affirmative.

CASE NO. A-11-044

Applicant – Dwight Lieb
Lots 27, 29, and the West 3 feet of Lot 28, Block 3, NCB 10184
102 Addax Drive & 107 Mink Drive
Zoned: "C-2 AHOD" Commercial Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a 6-foot variance to the 6-foot maximum fence height standard for parking lots, in order to allow a 12-foot tall fence on the east property lines.

Jacob Floyd, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of denial of the requested variances. He indicated 22 notices were mailed, one was returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and no response from the Dellview Area Neighborhood Association

Corina Green, representative, stated the owner purchased the two parcels and the alley to replat them into one lot to create additional parking for his business. She also stated the additional height would be for security reasons. She further stated the owner would beautify the additional height of fence with water wall features.

Dwight Lieb, applicant, stated he has been a commercial owner for over 45 years. He also stated the 12-foot water wall would beautify the property and attract customers. He further stated this would benefit the restaurant and the entire neighborhood.

The followings citizens appeared to speak:

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-11-044 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Camargo.** I would move that in Case No **A-11-044**, on property located at Addax & 107 Mink Drive, also legally described as **Lots 27, 29, and the West 3 feet of Lot 28, Block 3, NCB 10184,** be granted a **6-foot variance to the 6-foot maximum fence height standard for parking lots, in order to allow 12-foot tall fence along the east property lines.** Specifically we find that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the many notices that were mailed to the property owners within 200 feet none were returned in opposition.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **on this property a literal enforcement of the regulations would not benefit the neighborhood and the surrounding area. Therefore it is felt that the requested variance is justified.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **by allowing this variance and the proposed construction proposed by the applicant would enhance the surrounding area as opposed to that which otherwise would be erected for a parking lot.** Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than

those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the property is zoned "C-2" Commercial as well as the property for which this property abuts and therefore it is totally within the use regulations of that zoning classification.** 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 in that the **it has been indicated by the applicant and his representative that the proposed construction of this decorative wall will not only affect and enhance the parking lot, which is allowed in the zoned that it is in, and it will also enhance the property to the east which would be most affected by the construction of this wall.** 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 in that **the unique circumstances really aren't as such but that the unique circumstances in this case is that this parking lot is allowed with or without the fence. There is not a fence requirement and therefore the proposal by the applicant certainly benefits the entire neighborhood as it opposed to leaving it as such and not allowing such a wall to be constructed.** The motion was seconded by **Ms. Victor.**

AYES: Camargo, Victor, Villyard, Hardemon, Rogers, Dutmer, Britton, Gallagher, Ozuna
NAY: Klein, Zuniga

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-11-042

Applicant – Bulverde Parkway Plaza, Ltd.
Lot 8, NCB 34955
18221 Bulverde Road
Zoned: "O-1 PC-1 ERZD" Office Bulverde Road Preservation Corridor Edwards Recharge Zone District and "O-1 ERZD" Office Edwards Recharge Zone District

Gene Dawson, representative, stated he has spoken with the neighbors about the project and explained it to them. He also stated the neighbors are ready to move forward.

Colleta Galloway, citizen, stated after having a discussion with the engineer, the neighbors would like to state that they are in favor of the project. She also stated the neighbors had several issues with drainage and screening for some homes form the two-story building. She further stated the engineer plans to meet with the neighbors and work with them on resolving the issues.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Ms. Rogers.** Re Appeal Case No **A-11-042**, this is a variance application for **1) a 125-foot variance to the 35-foot maximum front setback requirement of the "O-1" district, in order to allow a 160-foot front setback; and 2) a variance to the requirement of the "O-1" district that parking lots be located to the rear of the principal**

building, in order to allow a parking lot to be located to the front of the principal building, subject property description being **Lot 8, NCB 34955,** located at **18221 Bulverde Road**, the being **Bulverde Parkway Plaza, Ltd.** I move that the Board of Adjustment grant this appeal for a variance to the subject property as previously described, 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 the variances will not be contrary to the public interest in that **they do not adversely impact the well-being of the general public. The variances are needed in order to comply with the regulations and intent of the "PC-1" Bulverde Preservation Corridor overlay district, which covers the eastern half of the subject property where the variances to the "O-1" base zoning district are being requested. Further, after meeting with the neighbors who had previously been opposed are now in favor of this project with additional meetings with the applicant.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the eastern half of the subject property has a base "O-1" and an overlay "PC-1" zoning district. These two districts conflict in the requirements for which the variances are being sought. The "O-1" base zoning district requires a maximum front setback of 35-feet; whereas the "PC-1" overlay zoning district requires a minimum front 35-feet. The enforcement of both regulations result sin buildings being placed at 35-feet from the front property line to comply with these requirements. Parking lots located in the "O-1" base zoning district are to be located behind the principal building; whereas parking lots in the "PC-1" overlay zoning district may be located to the front of the building provided they are screened from the Bulverde Road right-of-way. The enforcement of both districts causes undue hardship as complying with the standards of the "PC-1" overlay zoning district result in violation of the "O-1" base zoning district. Furthermore, there are existing significant and heritage trees on the property that limit the placement of new buildings and parking areas on the property. If the applicant is forced to locate the parking lot at the rear of the building, it would result in the removal of some of these heritage trees.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the "PC-1" Bulverde Road Preservation Corridor Overlay District was established to ensure future development is compatible with the existing residential neighborhoods, preserve the natural character of the area, and protect the corridor from visual blight. By granting the variances, the subject property will comply and meet the intent of this preservation corridor overlay district. Additionally, the granting of the variances will ensure that the existing significant and heritage trees on site are preserved, thus meeting the tree preservation requirements of the city.** Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the requested variances will not allow the operation of a use that is not permitted within the "O-1" base zoning district**. 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 in that the **requested variances will not injure the appropriate use of the adjacent conforming properties or alter the essential character of the district. The variances are needed in order to meet the intent and preserve the character of the "PC-1" Bulverde Road Preservation Corridor Overlay District.** The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial, and

are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located in that **the plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, such as the existing significant and heritage trees on site, and the base and overlay zoning districts on the property that conflict with one another. Neither of these conditions was created by the owner of the property, nor are they merely financial in nature.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Villyard.**

AYES: Rogers, Villyard, Dutmer, Camargo, Hardemon, Zuniga, Klein, Victor, Britton, Ozuna, Gallagher
NAY: None

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

CASE NO. A-11-038

Applicant – Haven for Hope
Lot 25, Block 4, NCB 2211
724 North San Marcos Street
Zoned: "MF-50 IDZ AHOD" Multi-Family Infill Development Zone Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a 1-foot variance from the maximum 6-foot side and rear yard fence height standard, in order to allow a 7-foot tall fence in the side and rear yards.

Andreina Dávila-Quintero, Senior Planner, presented background and staff's recommendation of approval of the requested variance. She indicated 29 notices were mailed, none were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and no response from the Gardendale Neighborhood Association.

Meagan Oswald, representative, stated the fence will be congruent with the existing 7-foot fence on the campus. She also stated this affordable housing complex will be to the Haven for Hope graduates and the general public providing they meet the income requirements. She further stated this would serve as security and privacy from the Haven for Hope residents.

No citizens appeared to speak.

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-11-038 closed.

MOTION

A motion was made by **Mr. Villyard.** Re Appeal Case No **A-11-038**, a variance application for a **1-foot variance from the maximum 6-foot side and rear yard fence height standard, in order to allow a 7-foot tall fence in the side and rear yards,** the property is owned by **Haven for Hope,** the location is at **724 North San Marcos Street**, legal description **Lot 25, Block 4, NCB 2211,** the zoning is **"MF-50 IDZ AHOD" Multi-Family Infill Development Zone**

Airport Hazard Overlay District. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant this application for a 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 the variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the requested variance will not adversely affect the well-being of the general public as it will not obstruct visibility or impede traffic. Furthermore, the proposed fence will serve as a security barrier and buffer between the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way and the future residents and staff of the Terrace at Haven for Hope apartment complex.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the proposed location of the fence where the variance is being sought will surround the resident's parking lot to be located on the west portion of the subject property that directly abuts the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way. Due to the continuing use of the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way, the additional fence height will provide security to the future residents from the railroad lines. Additionally, the applicant has stated that there are varying grades on the property that will be altered in order to provide accessibility to the residents of the building. The resulting finished grade within the development will be higher than the adjacent grade outside the perimeter fence at several locations that result in the need for a higher security fence.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the requested variance will be in keeping with the spirit of the ordinance as the proposed fence complies with the intent of the maximum fence height standards by continuing to allow openness, air flow, light penetration and neighborhood uniformity. The proposed fence will be in character with the existing fence of the Haven for Hope main facility located across the street to the east and south of the subject property.** Such variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the subject property is located in that **the requested variance will not authorize the operation of a use on the subject property other than specifically permitted in the "MF-50 IDZ" zoning district**. 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 in that the **requested variance will not adversely impact the neighboring properties. The subject property is bounded by Leal Street, Perez Street, North San Marcos Street, and the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way. In addition, the fence, as proposed will be in character with the existing fence of the Haven for Hope facility located to the east and south of the subject property.** 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 **as stated by the applicant, the request for the variance is to provide security for the future residents of the Terrace at Haven for Hope due to the unique location of the subject property and the surrounding uses. The existing conditions are not a result of the general conditions of the zoning district or an action done by the property owner, or due to financial hardship.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Zuniga.**

AYES: Villyard, Zuniga, Dutmer, Camargo, Hardemon, Rogers, Klein, Victor, Britton, Ozuna, Gallagher
NAY: None

THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.

Approval of the May 9, 2011 Minutes

The May 9, 2011 minutes were approved with all members voting in the affirmative

There being no further discussion, meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

APPROVED BY: _____ OR _____
Michael Gallagher, Chairman Andrew Ozuna, Vice-Chair

DATE: 7-11-11

ATTESTED BY: _____ DATE: _____
Executive Secretary