



Zoning Board of Adjustment
COMMISSION

Gerardo Arzate, Chairman
Tim Harry, Vice Chairman
Kyle Newton, Member
Kirk Strahan, Member
Kaylie Banda, Member
Paul Anthony Rios, Member
Mark Windham, Member
Craig Stoker, Member (Alternate)
Pricilla Contreras, Member (Alternate)

Zoning Board of Adjustments, Minutes
City Hall, 411 W 8th St.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – FIFTH FLOOR

August 16, 2023
8:30 A.M.

OPENING ITEMS

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance and Texas Pledge.

Honor the Texas Flag, I pledge allegiance to thee, Texas, one state under God, one and Indivisible.

CONSENT ITEMS

3. Motion to approve the Zoning Board of Adjustments minutes for August 16, 2023.

Public Hearing

4. CASE FILE NO. 2023-01-V

Consider approval of the request of Alfredo Caldera owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa zoning Ordinance to allow a structure (carport) to be built at thirteen feet (13') front yard setback instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback in a Single Family-Three (SF-3) Zoning District, Lot 6, Block 1, Rogers Addition. (1203 W. 26th St.)

5. CASE FILE NO. 2023-02-V

Consider approval of the request of Deborah Bishop owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa zoning Ordinance to allow a structure (carport) to be built at nine feet (9') front yard setback instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback in a Single Family-Estates (SF-E) Zoning District, Lot 30, Block 1, North County Club Estates. (3300 Lancewood Ln.)

6. CASE FILE NO. 2023-03-V

Open a public hearing to consider approval of the request of Bettie Hawkins owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-13 (b) of the City of Odessa Zoning Ordinances to allow a structure (carport) to be located within One and one half feet (1 ½') from main residence instead of a six feet (6') separation from the main structure in a General Residence (GR) Zoning District, Lot 8, Block 1, Judkins Annex. (214 Cummings Dr.)

7. CASE FILE NO. 2023-04-V

Open a public hearing to consider approval of the request of Tony E. & Debra E. Agüero, owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa zoning Ordinance to allow a structure (carport/auto cover) to be built fourteen feet (14') instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard building setback in a Single Family-two (SF-2) Zoning District, Lot 3, Block 72, Crescent Park Addition, 3rd Filing. (1702 Redbud Ave.)

8. ADJOURN

Be it said and remembered that at 8:30 a.m. on the 16th day of August 2023, there came on and was held a Zoning Board of Adjustments meeting in the Council Chambers, 5th Floor, 411 W. 8th St., Odessa, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gerardo Arzate, Chairman
Tim Harry, Vice Chairman
Kyle Newton
Pricilla Contreras
Craig Stoker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mark Windham
Paul Anthony Rios
Kirk Strahan
Kaylie Banda

OTHERS PRESENT: Maria Prieto, Planning Manager; James Reber, Planner; Cheynna Torres, Planning Tech, Gracie Rodriguez, Planning Tech, Joe Tucker, Assistant City Engineer; Fara Hernandez, CIP Coordinator; Dan Jones, Interim City Attorney

The minutes of the August 16, 2023, Zoning Board of Adjustments Commission meet were approved, motion for approval being made by Commissioner Craig Stoker, seconded by Tim Harry, Vice Chairman, with the vote being a unanimous “aye”.

Be it said and remembered that at 8:30 a.m. on the 16th day of August 2023, there came on and was held a Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting in the Council Chamber, 5th Floor, 411 W. 8th St., Odessa, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kirk Strahan
Brooke Harper
Tim Harry
Kyle Newton
Anthony Rios

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Craig Stoker (Alternate)

OTHERS PRESENT: Elizabeth Shaughnessy, Director of Development; Maria Prieto, Planning Manager; James Reber, Planner; Cheynna Torres and Gracie Rodriguez, Planning Tech.

Gerardo Arzate called the meeting to order, with Member Tim Harry giving the Invocation.

Elect Chairman and Vice Chairman

Motion to approve Zoning Board of Commission Chairman and Vice Chairman for 2023.

Motion for Gerardo Arzate, as Chairman, Commissioner Tim Harry, Second aye by Commissioner Craig Stoker.

Motion for Tim Harry, as Vice Chairman, Commissioner Craig Stoker, Second Aye by Commissioner Kyle Newton.

DOCKET NO. 2023-01-V(approved)

Consider approval of the request of Alfredo Caldera owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa zoning Ordinance to allow a structure (carport) to be built at thirteen feet (13') front yard setback instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback in a Single Family-Three (SF-3) Zoning District, Lot 6, Block 1, Rogers Addition. (1203 W. 26th St.)

Ms. Prieto gave the following presentation: 28 sent notices, 2 approve 0 objections.

The property involved in this request is located at 1203 W. 26th St. This site is currently zoned Single Family-Three (SF-3) and is occupied by a single-family resident. The property is surrounded by residential development to the north, east, south, and west.

The applicant is Alfredo Caldera, Owner, and the purpose of the request is for a variance to allow a structure (carport) to be built thirteen feet (13') instead of twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback. In order to allow the structure twelve (12') forward on the twenty-five (25') front yard setback, the applicant is requesting a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa Zoning Ordinance, which states:

Sec. 14-7-5 Front Yard

In the following zoning district, the minimum required front yard shall be in accordance with the following schedule and no building or structure shall hereinafter be located, erected, or altered so as to have a smaller front yard than hereinafter required, and no front yard existing at the time of passage of this ordinance shall be reduced below the minimum set forth in the following schedule except hereinafter provided:

Schedule Minimum Required Front Yard

Single Family-Three (SF-3)	25 ft. (See Page 14 Attachment 5)
----------------------------	-----------------------------------

The following criteria as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 14-15-1 (d) (3)) are to be used by the Board of Adjustment in evaluating variance requests. The burden of proof in meeting each of these criteria is upon the applicant. Authorize in specific cases a variance if the Board shall find that:

- (a) The variance request is not contrary to the public interest.
- (b) Special conditions exist for the applicant that do not generally exist for others.
- (c) A literal enforcement of the ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship.
- (d) The spirit of the zoning ordinance is observed, and substantial justice is done.

Staff analysis of this request is the applicant's request to reduce the front yard to thirteen feet (13') instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback will not create any hazards or hardships to surrounding properties to light, air, or open space. Low traffic volume in this residential street should not be a hindered. With this in mind, the planning staff has no objections to this request as presented.

Chairman, Gerardo Arzate, asked for questions or motion from commissioners.

Tim Harry asked the following question. What were the objections for this case. Ms. Prieto indicated we did not have any objections by mail, with two approvals. Chairman Arzate asked if any of the homeowners attend and would like to speak. Homeowner indicated they do not wish to speak or give comments.

Then Chairman, Gerardo Arzate, opened the floor to the public to speak for or against the variance case. Seeing that no one came to the podium, closed the public portion of this meeting, and turned to Commission for approval or denial. Vice Chairman, Tim Harry, moved to approve the item as presented, Craig Stoker Commissioner, Seconded the motion, with the vote being a unanimous “aye”.

DOCKET NO. 2023-02-V(approved)

Consider approval of the request of Deborah Bishop owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa zoning Ordinance to allow a structure (carport) to be built at nine feet (9’) front yard setback instead of the required twenty-five feet (25’) front yard setback in a Single Family-Estates (SF-E) Zoning District, Lot 30, Block 1, North County Club Estates. (3300 Lancewood Ln.)

Vice chairman asked, on the public hearing docket shows 14-7-5, and looking here is 14-7-6.

Ms. Prieto corrected as 14-7-5, error on the agenda.

Ms. Prieto gave the following presentation: 14 sent notices, 1 approve 0 objections.

The property involved in this request is located at 3300 Lancewood Ln. This site is currently zoned Single-Family Estates (SFE) and is occupied by a single-family residence. The property is surrounded by residential development to the north, east and south and university land to the west.

The applicant is Deborah Bishop, owner, and the purpose of the request is for a variance to allow a covered entry way to be built sixteen feet (16’) instead of the twenty-five feet (25’) front yard setback. In order to allow the structure nine feet (9’) forward on the twenty-five feet (25’) front yard setback the applicant is requesting a variance from Section 14-7-6 © of the City of Odessa Zoning Ordinance, which state:

Sec. 14-7-6 (c) Special Front Yard Regulations

Where a building line has been established by plat or ordinance and such line requires a front yard setback greater or lesser in depth than is prescribed by the ordinances for the district in which the building line is located, the required front yard shall comply with the minimum required front yard as established by Section 14-7-5.

Schedule minimum required front yards

Single Family Estate (SFE)

25 ft. (See Plat Exhibit)

The following criteria as outline in the Zoning Ordinance are to be used by the Board of Adjustment in evaluating variance requests. The burden of proof in meeting each of these criteria is upon the applicant.

- A. The variance request is not contrary to the public interest.
- B. Special conditions exist for the applicant that do not generally exist for others.
- C. A literal enforcement of the ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship.
- D. The spirit of the zoning ordinance is observed, and substantial justice is done.

Staff analysis of this request is the applicant's request of sixteen feet (16') front yard setback will not create any hazards or hardships to surrounding properties to light, air, or open space. With this in mind, the planning staff has no objections to this request as presented.

Ms. Prieto indicated that the comments for 14-7-6 is correct, not the 14-7-5 as stated in the beginning of the case.

Mr. Tim Harry asked if any of the notices mailed back had been of objections, to which M. Prieto reply with only approvals.

Chairman, Gerardo Arzate, asked for any additional questions, as to which reply with no. Would Ms. Deborah Bishop like to comment or approach the podium. As to which indicated opening a public hearing.

Deborah Bishop, homeowner, stated. As you could see in the picture, few steps to the front door six (6) to seven (7) feet, as approximately. Five Step down, leading to the driveway, and one step is not safe for me to walk up and down. We would like to move the front door out and at the front door, want to place covered walkway, seven (7) or eight (8) feet. If someone who comes to the house currently, has a metal door frame, you are able to reach through it and grab me. We have a lot of cats in the area, and ants as it would keep the cats away since they bring the birds to the front wall. Secure me and gives me more safety and brings value to my home. As well would make my front yard appearance a whole lot better.

At this time, Chairman, Gerardo Arzate, asked if anyone else in the audience would like to speak on behalf or against Ms. Bishop home variance.

Mr. and Ms. Dobbs (Lives next door, 3301 Lancewood Ln.) approached podium and disagreed with the applicant on covered walkway. Do not feel like it is right to place such item to our neighborhood and would like to voice our opinion. Would cause some issues in the event we would like to sale our home, as would depend on the material she plans on using to build her carport, fence. When we look out our front door, we would be seeing this carport.

M. Prieto established the property will not be building a front carport, would be an entry way, closed in.

Ms. Dobbs apologized and indicated she read the letter and got from it was a carport, not entry or any addition for house, from the drawing. Turned to ask Ms. Bishop if this will have gates?

Ms. Bishop answered Ms. Dobbs with yes, as you turn in the circle driveway there will be a metal decorative gate with a button to push. Approximately six (6) to seven (7) feet to the front door, will be covered of outside. Stucco and shingle roof. Plan to do landscape in front and no will not have post in the ground, not tacky looking. I would not deface my neighborhood by placing a carport.

Vice Chair asked for type of drawing or any indication on this covered area.

Ms. Dobbs replied with the drawing we received; I was unaware of what information it gave.

Ms. Prieto indicates a Walkway for her, a covered area to accommodate her needs, as she indicated for security reasons. This is another form she submitted, the drawing.

Ms. Bishop gives reason for creating this walkway, as would be to get rid of any slippery surfaces, there are 5 step and different sizes. We would like to make it one level and keep me from falling again.

T. Harry ask if this is for access or security?

Main reason is for security as Ms. Bishop states.

G. Arzate, Chairman, ask at this time to review the other photos to help get a clearer view, image of front of the house.

D. Bishop answers as I am home a lot alone, I would like for my safety. 90% alone, and you can stick your hand through the door and unlock through the outside. Two to three inches and grab me, rob me or worst.

Are you going to enclose up to the second story, G. Arzate ask.

We would like to move to the front of the house, Ms. Bishop responds.

Ms. Prieto comments as the enclosed part would be part of setback, what she is applying for the nine (9) foot, awning. She could close the front and she would still be compliant with the ordinance.

Ms. Dobbs comments why can she not just follow code, as she has a long driveway, she has the room. She has a long driveway, why can she not just follow the requirements of twenty-five (25') feet.

Ms. Prieto answers Ms. Dobbs and indicates the side Setback is as well twenty-five (25') as well as nothing could be built here either. She is asking for nine (9') out of those twenty-five (25').

Ms. Dobbs ask how far from the street will it be?

Member Kyle Newton mentions about thirty (30') feet from street.

What we got from the letter, was it was going to be nine (9') feet from the street, Ms. Dobbs mentions.

Kyle Newton states, asking to cover walkway up to circle drive area, and based on sketch we would need about thirty (30') feet from street.

Ms. Prieto notes thirty feet is included with right of way.

Ms. Bishop comments, the circle drive where it comes around, covered walkway.

Member C. Stoker questions on the cover from the walkway

Member K. Newton says right, so as you leave your vehicle, you would come into this path covered walkway and enter the home.

Vice Chair Tim Harry ask if it will come up to the public Sidewalk?

Ms. Prieto answers not, just to beginning of driveway.

Ms. Bishop notes about three (3') to four (4') feet will be taken out, to be able to make a straight pathway. Whoever built this house must have loved concrete, steps and levels everywhere. With Ms. Maria, we had come up with an estimation of nine (9') feet, not going to be more than nine (9') foot, maybe even less.

Ms. Prieto mentions when D. Bishop presented this case to me, we came up with the nine feet. As you see in the photo, the curve concrete indicators, will only reach that as the driveway would begin.

Ms. Dobbs ask about the gates indicated in drawing. Are they going to be big gates?

Mr. Arzate corrects and states we have no indication for those gates or cannot give say about. All we are looking to either approve or deny is the awning (pathway). Structure side of it.

Mr. Dobbs ask if it just up to the sidewalk, out in the asphalt.

Ms. Bishop notes, I will not be going up the asphalt, only to my driveway. Thirty (30') feet from asphalt to the driveway.

Mr. Arzate ask Mr. and Ms. Dobbs if they still have objection?

To which they reply with no objection, which will ensure her safety.

Then Chairman, G. Arzate ask if anyone else would like to approach the podium for or against.

I am Tim Baum (3304 Lancewood Ln.) the convent for North Country Club Estates, plainly establish the setbacks. As well indicates garage doors to be facing the street, this property meets outside of the convent.

G. Arzate ask if we have a garage door built that is going in.

T. Baum makes comment in the past the previous owners placed and does not follow the convent of our Estates. As it is grandfathered now, as we cannot do for it.

Ms. Bishop mentions the previous owners had a shop, but I did not place that. Was there when I purchased the home.

T. Baum states no garage doors are to be facing the streets, as convent says for Country Club Estates. This is preexisting and I stand with the convent and restrict and request they stay that way, since they are existing for a reason, and is a twenty-five (25') foot setback.

T. Harry, Vice chair, ask we have a thirty (30') foot setback, and easement, is that correct. Staff M. Prieto answers yes.

T. Baum ask this is a permeant structure, not consistence with Covent.

M. Prieto states zoning requires a twenty-five (25') setback, as your zoning case requires twenty-five (25') foot. The Variance is also in the ordinance to allow request for citizens, as Ms. Bishop is requesting.

T. Baum I am understanding the variance, but I stand with the convent with where they stand, and since one was done already, I do not approve this case.

Mr. G. Arzate moved the request for a motion.

Member Craig Stoker motioned the request for variance to be Approved and member Tim Harry seconded the motion, with the vote being a unanimous "aye".

ORDER OF THE BOARD

Therefore, the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the City of Odessa acting on the basis of the required concurring vote of four (6) members of the Board hereby orders the variance sought by the applicant in this case be, in all things approved. In conditions of carport does no harm to any other residence and installation is met up to standards.

DOCKET NO. 2023-03-V(approved)

Open a public hearing to consider approval of the request of Bettie Hawkins owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-13 (b) of the City of Odessa Zoning Ordinances to allow a structure (carport) to be located within One and one half feet (1 ½') from main residence instead of a six feet (6') separation from the main structure in a General Residence (GR) Zoning District, Lot 8, Block 1, Judkins Annex. (214 Cummings Dr.)

Ms. Prieto gave the following presentation: 17 sent notices, 0 approve 0 objections.

The property involved in this request is located at 214 Cummins Dr. This site is currently zoned General Residence (GR) and is occupied by a single-family residence. The property is surrounded by residential development to the north, east and south and west.

The applicant is Bettie Hawkins, owner, and the purpose of the request is for a variance to allow a structure (carport) to be located within One and one-half (1 ½') feet from the main residence instead of six feet (6') separation from the main structure. The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 14-7-13(b) of the City of Odessa Zoning Ordinance, which state:

Sec. 14-7-13 (b) Accessory Building and Structure Regulations

(b) Side Yard. There shall be a side yard for any attached accessory building equal to the minimum requirement for the main structure located in a residential area. For a detached accessory building located behind the front yard building setback, there shall be no side yard required, provided that all building code standards are met. Accessory building must maintain a six (6) feet separation from any other structure. If the six (6) feet separation is not maintained, the accessory building shall be considered to be an integral part of that structure and shall be required to observe the same side yard as the main structure. Adjacent to a side street, the accessory building shall observe either the platted setback line, the setback line established by the main structure, or the setback lines established by ordinance, whichever is most restrictive.

The following criteria as outline in the Zoning Ordinance are to be used by the Board of Adjustment in evaluating variance requests. The burden of proof in meeting each of these criteria is upon the applicant.

- A. The variance request is not contrary to the public interest.

- B. Special conditions exist for the applicant that do not generally exist for others.
- C. A literal enforcement of the ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship.
- D. The spirit of the zoning ordinance is observed, and substantial justice is done.

Staff analysis of this request is the applicant's request of One- and one-half feet (1 1/2') separation from main structure will not create any hazards or hardships to surrounding properties to light, air, or open space. With this in mind, the planning staff has no objections to this request as presented.

Ms. Prieto indicated that the carport is already existing. She hired a company to build the carport for her, as they completed, they placed in the wrong area. Building Inspections requirements were ignored by business. She did receive a building permit and called the Business back and they refused to. Then Kyle asked since its existing are we reviewing because it was incorrectly done and having to approve those mistakes. To which Ms. Prieto replied yes, she did everything correct and right.

Mr. Arzate, Chairman, asked Ms. Prieto if residence need to be present during cases, or representative. To which Maria replied yes, we send notices and gave her schedule. Chairman mentioned in the past for homeowner not attending these meeting, we have tabled them in the past. Ms. Prieto mentioned we could and give her a call for those.

Mr. Arzate states moving forward we will table, considering it was already there, we can continue. Vice Chairman, Tim Harry, asked she asked to be placed in a certain area and they set it wrong. Ms. Prieto states she asked them, and when she called them back to fix it, they were rude about it and did not want to go out. Member Kyle Newton states since it was not placed in the correct area, to close to the home, must request for a variance.

Chairman, Gerardo Arzate, asked for motion from commissioners.

Member Tim Harry motioned the request for variance to be Approved and member Craig Stoker seconded the motion, with the vote being a unanimous "aye".

DOCKET NO. 2023-04-V(approved)

Open a public hearing to consider approval of the request of Tony E. & Debra E. Agüero, owner, for a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa zoning Ordinance to allow a structure (carport/auto cover) to be built fourteen feet (14') instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard building setback in a Single Family-two (SF-2) Zoning District, Lot 3, Block 72, Crescent Park Addition, 3rd Filing. (1702 Redbud Ave.)

Ms. Prieto gave the following presentation: 17 sent notices, 4 approve 0 objections.

The property involved in this request is located at 1702 Redbud Ave. This site is currently zoned Single Family-two (SF-2) and is occupied by a single-family residence. The property is surrounded by residential development to the north, east and south and west.

The applicant is Tony E. & Debra E. Agüero, owner, and the purpose of the request is for a variance to allow a structure (carport/ auto cover) to be located fourteen feet (14') instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback. In order to allow the structure eleven feet (11') forward on the twenty-five (25') front yard setback the applicants are requesting a variance from Section 14-7-5 of the City of Odessa Zoning Ordinance, which state:

Sec. 14-7-5 Front Yard

In the following zoning district, the minimum required front yard shall be in accordance with the following schedule and no building or structure shall hereinafter be located erected or altered so as to have a smaller front yard than hereinafter required, and no front yard existing at the time of passage of this ordinance shall be reduced below the minimum set forth in the following schedule except hereinafter provided:

Schedule minimum required front yard

Single Family-Three (SF-3)	25 ft. (See Page 14 attachment 5)
----------------------------	-----------------------------------

The following criteria as outline in the Zoning Ordinance are to be used by the Board of Adjustment in evaluating variance requests. The burden of proof in meeting each of these criteria is upon the applicant.

- A. The variance request is not contrary to the public interest.
- B. Special conditions exist for the applicant that do not generally exist for others.
- C. A literal enforcement of the ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship.
- D. The spirit of the zoning ordinance is observed, and substantial justice is done.

The carport has already been built without a permit and there is no documentation or inspections that provide proof of being built to development standards. Staff analysis of this request is the applicant's request to reduce the front yard to eleven feet (11') instead of the required twenty-five feet (25') front yard setback will not create any hazards or hardships to surrounding properties to light, air, or open space.

Should the Board choose to approve this request, the Planning staff would recommend adoption following conditions:

- 1. The carport shall not be enclosed in the future.
- 2. No other structures or additions may be placed within the 25' front yard setback.

3. No other structures or additions shall be placed on the property without first contacting the Building Inspections Dept. and obtaining a building permit.

Chairman, Gerardo Arzate, asked for questions or motion from commissioners.

Tim Harry asked the following question. So, they did not get a permit to build the carport. Ms. Prieto replies with no. As Mr. Harry ask do we retrofit with inspections, where is the process at currently. Ms. Prieto indicated they have not done any inspections, nor have they had elevation. Mr. Harry ask are they going to have to take it down and rebuild with perspective requirements. Ms. Prieto mentions it is up to the board with the outcome, could either do building inspections for permits, leave as it or removal. What have we done in the past, Mr. Harry ask. Ms. Prieto states what have done in the past to go through building inspections and get inspected, as well they will need footing. Could approve the carport if like with conditions.

Chairman Arzate now opened the public portion of the meeting, to speak for or against. Homeowner, Ms. Debra Aguero approaches podium, this is my carport, we got this done since the weather in the city. I know people would tell me if I was worried about my cars, why didn't I get a house with a garage. I have always noted this is all we could afford at the time, with five kids, this house was within our budget and condition was no garage (turned into Dining room, we did not do). We were unaware of requirements for building a carport, we got opinions for other neighbors, and all of them indicated they never applied for permits, to which we thought we were not required. We do have several homes with carports, all the way up to university, as the snow, high heat.

Then Chairman Arzate closed the public hearing and turns to commission for motion. Vice Chairman Tim Harry approves with the following condition.

1. Get inspection as should follow code, since the building of it was not.
2. Get footing and follow through process.

Member Craig Stoker Second the motion with an unanimously "Aye"

Mr. Arzate indicates Fellow board members agree all homeowners are requirement to attend. Is it a requirement.

Ms. Prieto replays yes, it is a requirement, and we send notices to homeowners, place on the newspaper as a public notice and give them a schedule of the dates. In the future we will make it a requirement to call as well.

Yes, so at least one homeowner or representee gets notified. We will in the future table since we will have questions and need to ask directly and not wait for the response as Mr. Arzate notes for all Board Meetings. Member Tim Harry moves to approve the motion and second by Kyle newton, with an unanimous vote "aye"

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:41 a.m.

Cheylna Torres, Planning Tech, placed the minutes in the Minute Book on August 16, 2023.

Gerardo Arzate, Vice Chairman