

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
OFFICIAL MINUTES  
February 2, 2015**

Members Present:

Andrew Ozuna  
Mary Rogers  
Frank Quijano  
Alan Neff  
George Britton  
Gabriel Velasquez  
Maria Cruz  
John Kuderer  
Frank Martinez  
Gene Camargo  
Jeffrey Finlay

Staff:

Catherine Hernandez, Planning Manager  
Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner  
Logan Sparrow, Planner  
Paul Wendland, City Attorney

**Call to Order**

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

Mr. Ozuna, Chair, called the meeting to order and called roll of the applicants for each case.

**CASE NO. A-15-037**

Applicant – Shavano Rogers Ranch North No. 3, LTD  
Lot 999, Block 17, NCB 17701  
18029 Shavano Ranch Road

Zoned: “R-6 PUD ERZD MLOD AHOD” Residential Single-Family Planned Unit Development Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone Military Lighting Overlay Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting 1) a 3 foot variance from the maximum 8 foot monument sign height, as described in Section 28-240, to allow an 11 foot tall monument sign at the entrance to a residential subdivision; 2) a 15 foot variance from the minimum 15 foot setback from a public street to allow the monument sign on the property line; and 3) a 5 foot variance from the maximum 8 foot perimeter wall height, as described in Section 35-514 (d) to allow a decorative wall element no taller than 13 feet tall for a length of 22 feet.

Margaret Pahl, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of denial of the requested variances. She indicated 5 notices were mailed, none were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition.

James Griffin, representative, stated the variance is necessary due to the topography. He also stated the design of the road and the median makes it difficult to find the property line. He further stated they pushed the monument sign further back because of the strange location of the property line.

**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-15-037 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by **Mr. Camargo**. I would move that in Case No. **A-15-037**, on property located at **18029 Shavano Ranch Road**, legally described as **Lot 999, Block 17, NCB 17701**, be granted 1) a **3 foot variance from the maximum 8 foot monument sign height, as described in Section 28-240, to allow an 11 foot tall monument sign at the entrance to a residential subdivision** and 2) a **15 foot variance from the minimum 15 foot setback from a public street to allow the monument sign on the property line**. Specifically, we find that the variance is necessary because strict enforcement of this article prohibits any reasonable opportunity to provide **signage due to topography and distances that have been shown on the site plan on the public right of way**. Granting the variance does provide the applicant with **some relief from the existing situation on the ground mainly that being the existence of large heritage trees, topography, and distances from the public right of way**. Granting the variance will not have a substantially adverse impact upon neighboring properties **in that the immediate surrounding property is vacant and proposed to be improved by applicant, the developer in this particular case**. Granting the variance will not substantially conflict with the stated purposes of this article **in that as mentioned earlier due to the existing conditions on this mainly undeveloped area will provide the applicant with a reasonable ability to be able to advertise the location of the proposed development**. The motion was seconded by **Ms. Rogers**.

**AYES: Camargo, Rogers, Quijano, Neff, Velasquez, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Martinez, Ozuna**

**NAYS: None**

**THE VARIANCES WERE GRANTED.**

**MOTION**

A motion was made by **Mr. Camargo**. Re Appeal No. **A-15-037**, variance application for 1) a **3 foot variance from the maximum 8 foot monument sign height, as described in Section 28-240, to allow an 11 foot tall monument sign at the entrance to a residential subdivision**; 2) a **15 foot variance from the minimum 15 foot setback from a public street to allow the monument sign on the property line**; and 3) a **5 foot variance from the maximum 8 foot perimeter wall height, as described in Section 35-514 (d) to allow a decorative wall element no taller than 13 feet tall for a length of 22 feet**, subject property description **Lot 999, Block**

17, NCB 17701, situated at 18029 Shavano Ranch Road, applicant being Shavano Rogers Ranch North No. 3, LTD. Specifically, we find that such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the surrounding area is predominantly vacant at this point of time and the location and length of the wall falls well within a very wooded area that is in the process of being developed.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship **due to the large number of heritage trees surrounding this property which makes it somewhat difficult to identify the location from the public right of way.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **adequate signage for what appears to be a very large development will be necessary in order to provide identification to people traveling on the public right of way.** 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 **it is a wall with a variance due to the circumstances that exist on the property.** 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 adjacent conforming property is located a considerably distance from the south of the subject property and from Loop 1604.** 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 **again being the topography and the location of the signage in relationship to the public right of way.** The motion was seconded by Ms. Rogers.

**AYES: Camargo, Rogers, Quijano, Neff, Velasquez, Britton, Finlay, Kuderer, Martinez, Ozuna, Cruz**

**NAYS: None**

**THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.**

---

**CASE NO. A-15-027**

Applicant – Jose Torres  
 Lot 49, Block 3, NCB 16662  
 9222 Rustlers Creek  
 Zoned: “R-5” Residential Single-Family District

The applicant is requesting a five foot variance from the required five foot side and rear yard setbacks, as described in Section 35-370, to allow an arbor and deck on the side and rear yard property line

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of denial of the requested variance. She indicated 21 notices were mailed, 2 were returned in favor and one was returned in opposition and no response from the Vance Jackson Neighborhood Association

Christina Guerra, representative, stated there is an elevation difference from the rear to the front of the house.

**The following citizens appeared to speak:**

Donald Oroian, citizen, spoke in opposition.

Hector Hernandez, 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-15-027 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by Mr. Velasquez. Re Appeal No. **A-15-027**, variance application for a **five foot variance from the required side yard setback, as described in Section 35-370, to allow an arbor on the side yard property line**, subject property description **Lot 49, Block 3, NCB 16662**, situated at **9222 Rustlers Creek**, applicant being **Jose Torres**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding Appeal No. **A-15-027**, 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 such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. In this case the property slopes to a neighbor who does not have any existing structure adjacent the property line and is in accord with the neighbors request and is willing to provide a 5-foot maintenance agreement that would be presented as a component to this request.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **it has been illustrated to us that the property has quite a bit of slope that in fact the deck begins within code and slopes to a point that is nominal amount outside of code.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **it has been demonstrated to us that this helps the property owner to enjoy the property more fully.** 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 **it is an existing single family dwelling and will remain a single family dwelling.** 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 **issues have been raised regarding water runoff and absorption into the soil. This is a wood deck and water will percolate through the wood which should allow water to continue into its natural form.** 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 **owner is working with the neighbor that is adjacent the deck and they have a solution to work together in a community that has examples of zero lot line.** The motion was seconded by Ms. Cruz.

**AYES: Velasquez, Cruz, Neff, Finlay, Camargo, Rogers, Ozuna, Britton, Kuderer**  
**NAYS: Quijano, Martinez**

**THE VARIANCE WAS GRANTED.**

**CASE NO. A-15-032**

Applicant – Ralph Banda  
Lot 10, Block 16, NCB 9236  
2330 Texas Avenue  
Zoning: “R-4 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a four foot variance from the five foot minimum side setback as described in Section 35-310 to allow a covered patio one foot from the property line.

Logan Sparrow, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of denial of the requested variances. He indicated 38 notices were mailed, 2 were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and response from the University Park Neighborhood Association.

Ralph Banda, applicant, stated he is willing to address the issue of the water runoff from the carport to divert the water into another direction away from the adjacent neighbor.

Veronica Banda, citizen, stated the contractor was supposed to obtain any and all permits associated with the construction of the patio. She also stated the water runoff from the roof when it rains falls straight into their property not into the neighbor.

**The following citizens appeared to speak:**

Theresa Ingle, 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-15-032 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by **Mr. Camargo**. Re Appeal No. **A-15-032**, variance on property located **2330 Texas Avenue**, legally described as **Lot 10, Block 16, NCB 9236**, be granted a **two foot variance that would allow a three foot setback on an open carport, open patio which is a common setback in this area**. Specifically, we find that such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **if in fact gutters, which are part of this motion, are applied to the structure**. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **due to the circumstances that exist on this property and being that it is an older neighborhood, where setbacks were allowed that of construction of a three foot setback, that that which we would be granting would be in line with other development in this subdivision**. The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice

is done in that **again the setback would not be out of place with the surrounding development.** 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 variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those permitted in the zoning classification which is a single-family residence in a residential zone.** 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 **as much as the applicant has stated that they will in fact gutter the property and divert the water on to his own 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 in that **the variance that is sought is not a unique circumstance because we have this come up too often where citizens hire contractors and assume that they are following the rules and regulations of the city and then come to find out that in fact it was not done. It is my hope that the property owner has some recourse with the contractor that they hired to correct the situation in compliance with that which the variance is. This is not a request for a variance, at least the motion does not allow the structure to remain where it is at but rather that the columns be placed three feet from the property line which is a common setback in this neighborhood.** The motion was seconded by Mr. Velasquez.

**AYES: Camargo, Velasquez, Neff, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Rogers, Ozuna**  
**NAYS: Quijano, Britton, Martinez**

**THE VARIANCE WAS NOT GRANTED.**

**Board members recessed for 10 minutes.**

**CASE NO. A-15-038**

Applicant – Dante Chiei  
Lot 18, Block 47, NCB 18429  
11802 Pomeroy Circle  
Zoning: “R-6 AHOD” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting a two foot variance from the six foot maximum fence height, as described in Section 35-514, to allow a predominately open fence to be eight feet tall in the rear yard.

Logan Sparrow, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of approval of the requested variances. He indicated 3 notices were mailed, 3 were returned in favor and none were returned in opposition and no response from the Randolph Hills Neighborhood Association.

Michael Knable, representative, stated the fence would provide security for the property. He also stated there have been numerous occasions where theft occurred on his property and a large amount of property was stolen.

**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-15-038 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by **Mr. Velasquez**. Re Appeal No. **A-15-038**, variance application for a **two foot variance from the six foot maximum fence height, as described in Section 35-514, to allow a predominately open fence to be eight feet tall in the rear yard**, subject property description **Lot 18, Block 47, NCB 18429**, situated at **11802 Pomeroy Circle**, applicant being **Dante Chiei**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant's request regarding Appeal No. **A-15-038**, 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 such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. In this case the public interest is represented by fence height limitations to create a sense of community. Occasionally, though, fence height limitations leads to compromised security, as is the case here. The applicant states that nearly \$60,000 worth of property has been stolen from his home and he fears that a six foot tall fence is inadequate at keeping thieves out. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that a literal enforcement of the code would result in a fence no taller than six feet in the rear yard. The applicant feels that a six foot tall rear yard fence is inadequate at securing his property. The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that staff finds that substantial justice will be done. The requested variance will add to a sense of security that one should feel on their 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 those specifically permitted in the "R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay 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 is not likely to harm adjacent, conforming properties. The location of the subject property is very rural in nature, and homes are spread far apart from one another. Allowing the applicant to construct the eight foot tall fence is unlikely to harm adjacent properties. 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 present in this case are the abnormally high occurrences of theft. Through five separate incidents, the applicant has had nearly \$60,000**

worth of property stolen as previously stated. This is not the fault of the owner of the property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Quijano.

**AYES:** Velasquez, Quijano, Neff, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Martinez, Camargo, Rogers, Ozuna

**NAYS:** None

**THE MOTION PASSES**

Mr. Velasquez departed the boardroom at 3:35 pm for purpose of recusal.

**CASE NO. A-15-039**

Applicant – Diana Maria Bugarin  
Lot 6 & the W 36 feet of Lot 7, Block 94, NCB 8810  
1818 Alametos Street  
Zoning: “R-4” Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District

The applicant is requesting 1) a 3 foot variance from the minimum 20 foot rear yard setback to allow a structure with a 17 foot rear setback and 2) a 3 foot 8 inch variance from the minimum 5 foot side yard setback, both as described in Section 35-370 to allow a structure 1 foot 4 inches from the side property line.

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of approval of the rear variance and denial of the side variances. She indicated 38 notices were mailed, 2 were returned in favor and 2 were returned in opposition and no response from the Los Angeles Heights Neighborhood Association.

Diana Bugarin, applicant, stated the cover carport would protection for personal items. She also stated the existing fence was built inside the property line by the previous owner. She further stated

**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-15-039 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by Ms. Rogers to continue Case No A-15-039 to the next regularly scheduled Board of Adjustment meeting on March 2, 2015 so that a survey can be obtained. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martinez.

**AYES: Quijano, Neff, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Martinez, Camargo, Rogers, Ozuna**

**RECUSAL: Velasquez**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION PASSES.**

Mr. Velasquez returned to the board room at 3:50 p.m.

**CASE NO. A-15-033**

Applicant – Martha Jordan  
Lot 2C, NCB 10757  
1825 S. WW White Road  
Zoning: “C-2” Commercial District

The applicant is requesting the elimination of the required 15 and 30 foot bufferyards, as described in Section 35-510, to allow a development with no bufferyards.

Logan Sparrow, Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of denial of the requested variances. He indicated 15 notices were mailed, one was returned in favor and none were returned in opposition.

Kevin Love, representative, stated they are willing to give a five foot buffer setback with a privacy fence. He also further stated the residential zoning adjacent to the property is used for storage.

**The following citizens appeared to speak:**

Paul Silber, citizen, spoke in favor.

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-15-033 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by **Mr. Camargo**. Re Appeal No. **A-15-033**, variance application for the **elimination of the required 15 and 30 foot bufferyards, as described in Section 35-510, to allow a development with no bufferyards**, subject property description **Lot 2C, NCB 10757**, situated at **1825 S. WW White Road**, applicant being **Martha Jordan**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant’s request regarding Appeal No. **A-15-033**, 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 such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. In this case the public interest is represented by bufferyards to separate uses and to add beauty to a community. The applicant has stated that they will likely be able to add a fence and some buffering if needed, possibly five feet, to the subject property. Staff finds that a reduced bufferyard along the R-5 Residential Single-Family property is in keeping with the public interest as it will separate uses, especially if the property is later developed for residential uses and will allow the developer to improve the site.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the site plan submitted by the applicant depicts a driveway to service both a new Subway restaurant at the front, and a self-storage facility at the rear of the property. This driveway is located where much of the bufferyards would have to be established. A literal enforcement of the code would make the development of this site significantly more challenging. Because the "R-5" Residential Single-Family zoning to the north is not used residentially, but rather for a hair salon, staff finds that a having the applicant construct both a 15 and a 30 foot bufferyard may result in an unnecessary hardship to the applicant.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **because the property to the north is also used for commercial purposes, not residential, staff finds that substantial justice will be done by granting a reduced bufferyard.** 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 those specifically permitted in the "C-2" Commercial 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 **an agreement between both parties.** 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 "I-2" Heavy Industrial zoning to the north, which is used as a contractor facility, triggers a 30 foot bufferyard. That depth would make the north 17% of the property undevelopable. The rear of the property requires a 15 foot bufferyard because of the "R-5" Residential Single-Family zoning to the north. The "R-5" zoning to the north houses a hair salon, considered a commercial use. Had that property been zoned commercially, then a bufferyard would not be required.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Quijano.**

**AYES: Martinez, Quijano, Neff, Velasquez, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Camargo, Rogers, Ozuna**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION PASSES**



**CASE NO. A-15-040**

Applicant – Mitchell Hill  
Lot 5A, NCB 6939  
819 E Magnolia Avenue  
Zoning: “R-4 H RIO-1 AHOD” Residential Single-Family River Road Historic

The applicant is requesting 1) a 10 foot variance from the minimum 20 foot rear yard setback to allow an addition 10 feet from the rear property line; 2) a 3 foot variance from the minimum 5 foot side setback, as specified in Table 35-310-1, to allow an attached carport 2 feet from the east side property line.

Margaret Pahl, Senior Planner, presented background and staff’s recommendation of approval of the requested rear yard variance and denial of the requested side yard variance. She indicated 27 notices were mailed, none were returned in favor and one was returned in opposition and no response from the River Road Neighborhood Association.

Mitchell Hill, applicant, stated they would like additional space for their family and would allow them to have a much bigger home. He also stated they are only requesting the variance for the rear and not the side variance.

**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-15-040 closed.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by **Mr. Velasquez**. Re Appeal No. **A-15-040**, variance application for a **10 foot variance from the minimum 20 foot rear yard setback to allow an addition 10 feet from the rear property line**, subject property description **Lot 5A, NCB 6939**, situated at **819 E Magnolia Avenue**, applicant being **Mitchell Hill**. I move that the Board of Adjustment grant the applicant’s request regarding Appeal No. **A-15-040**, 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 such variance will not be contrary to the public interest in that **the public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. In this case the public interest for the rear yard variance is represented by required setbacks to ensure access to air and light. The rear setback variance is at 10 feet, still providing a 10 foot setback from the rear property line. Given the constraints of the historic district, this variance would be consistent with the public interest.** Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship in that **the special condition limiting options on this property is the historic district and the commitment to respect it. The requested rear setback variance of 10 feet is consistent with the rear setback required**

**in a majority of residential districts (9 of 15), and a larger setback would result in an unnecessary hardship.** The spirit of the ordinance is observed and substantial justice is done in that **the spirit of the ordinance calls for setbacks to ensure access to air, light, and to provide for fire separation. The variance to allow a single story addition in the rear yard 10 feet from the property line will provide an adequate setback, given the constraints of the historic district guidelines.** 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 will still be a single family dwelling.** 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 rear yard variance to allow a minimum 10 foot rear setback is unlikely to injure the adjacent property. The applicant discussed the variance request and the neighbors jointly agreed that this distance was adequate. In addition, it allows the expansion to remain hidden from the public right of way.** 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 need for a reduced rear setback is not financial, but instead a cooperative approach to preserving the historic character of the neighborhood while allowing equal enjoyment of property rights.** The motion was seconded by Mr. Quijano.

**AYES: Velasquez, Quijano, Neff, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Martinez, Camargo, Rogers, Ozuna**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION PASSES**

Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the November 3, 2014 minutes. Ms. Rogers seconded the motion.

**AYES: Velasquez, Quijano, Neff, Britton, Cruz, Finlay, Kuderer, Martinez, Rogers, Ozuna**

**ABSTAIN: Camargo**

**NAYS: None**

**THE MOTION PASSES.**

The December 15, 2014 and January 12, 2015 minutes were approved with all members voting in the affirmative.

