

**MINUTES FOR THE SEMINOLE COUNTY  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
MAY 22, 2006  
6:00 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Mike Hattaway, Chairman; Dan Bushrui, Alan Rozon, Tom O'Daniel and Wes Pennington

**Staff Present:** Kathy Fall, Principal Planner; Ian Sikonia, Planner; Kathleen Furey - Tran, Assistant County Attorney; Patty Johnson, Senior Staff Assistant

Mr. Hattaway, Chairman; called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. Mr. Hattaway then explained the method by which the meeting would be conducted, rules for voting and appealing decisions.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

1. **NORTH ROAD (LOT 4G)** – Bert Burch, applicant; Request for a lot size variance from 1 acre to 0.855 acre for a proposed home in the A-1 (Agriculture District); Located on the southeast corner of the intersection of North Orange Avenue and North Road; (BV2006-064).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

2. **4500 ORANGE BOULEVARD** – Michael Good, applicant; Request for a front yard setback variance from 50 feet to 25 feet for a proposed office/warehouse in the M-1 (Industrial District); Located on the north side Orange Boulevard approximately ¼ mile from the intersection of Kastner Place and Orange Boulevard; (BV2006-066).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve Consent Agenda Items 1 & 2.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**Kathy Fall stated that Items 3-16 were Public Hearing Items and staff did not have the authority to recommend approval to the Board of Adjustment.**

3. **640 CALIENTE WAY** – Jesus Duran, applicant; Request for (1) a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 6 feet; and (2) a side yard (south) setback variance from 7.5 feet to 3 feet for an existing shed in the R-1 (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located on the west side of Caliente Way approximately 600 feet north of the intersection of Hillview Drive and Caliente Way; (BV2006-053).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant constructed a shed without a building permit; a notice of violation from the Seminole County Building Division was issued on March 2, 2006. He further stated that there was no record of any similar approved variances in the immediate area. He then stated that staff received one (1) letter opposing the approval of the variance from the neighbor to the rear of the property.

Jesus Duran stated that he bought the house 3 years ago and there were four (4) sheds already on the property. He then stated that he removed two sheds and he only had two remaining on the property. He further stated that the sheds had been on the property about 12 years. He lastly stated that he uses the sheds for storage.

Dale McElhiney stated that the sheds look nice and she was in favor of the sheds.

**Mr. O'Daniel made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Rozon seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

4. **1888 DERBYSHIRE ROAD** – Neal Winnie, Michelle Winnie, and William Cluff, applicants; Request for a rear yard setback variance 30 feet to 10 feet for an existing carport in the R-1AAA (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located on the south side of Derbyshire Road approximately 300 feet east of Wellington Terrace and Derbyshire Road; (BV2006-054).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant constructed an approximately 400 square foot aluminum carport in the rear of the property. He further stated that the applicant was cited on June 3, 2005 by the Seminole County Code Enforcement Department for the construction of the carport without a permit. He then stated that the applicant had submitted plans to the Building Division for the carport on October 10, 2005. He also stated that there was no record of any similar approved variances in the immediate area. He lastly stated that staff had received a petition with 55 signatures requesting the Board of Adjustment to deny the request.

Peter McGrath stated that he was an Attorney; helping Mr. Winnie with his variance application. He then passed out an information packet to the Board members and the County Attorney. He further stated that after sitting down with

Mr. Winnie and looking at his request it appeared to him that the carport was an accessory structure under Section 30.1345 in the Land Development Code. He then referred to the copy he had given to the Board of Section 30.1345 and stated that Mr. Winnie carport met all the criteria for an accessory structure. He also stated that it was not attached to the main structure, it was 10 feet away from the rear property line, which was the minimum requirements. He further stated that at the top of the list of concerns was if a variance request was necessary. He then stated that the Code Enforcement Officer indicated to Mr. Winnie that the structure was properly installed and that it seemed to meet all requirements except for the setback requirements. He then referred to the survey which was a part of the packet he passed out.

Mr. Rozon asked was the carport surveyed with the survey.

Peter McGrath stated no, the carport was added to the survey.

Peter McGrath then stated that if the 30 foot setback applied to the carport, it did not meet that setback. He then stated that the carport is set far back and the visibility of the carport is limited. He then stated that his concern was if the 30 feet setback requirement could be lawfully enforced against an accessory structure. He further stated that he would love to address the issue of why the Board had a petition with 55 signatures, this has to do with another legal matter between the Winnie's and a dispute involving the Wellington Terrace Home Owner's Association, he then stated if the Board wanted to hear some back ground on that case he would be happy to provide it.

Mr. Hattaway asked was it pertinent to the subject of the carport? Mr. Hattaway then stated that the Board of Adjustment was accustomed to having petitions and they weigh them in making their decision, but he didn't want Peter McGrath, to get away from the fact of the matter of the request that was before the Board.

Peter McGrath stated that it was pertinent and he would be brief. He continued by stating that on March 1, 2005, Mr. Winnie was contacted by the Wellington Terrace Homeowner's Association concerning improvements on his property. He further stated that the carport was one of the issues and he told Mr. Winnie he needed approval from his Homeowner's Association, because the carport is a structure that the Association has the right to approve or deny. He then stated that they put together a letter and sent it certified to the Homeowner's Association, which was received by the Association. He further referred to paragraph 2 in the letter stating, please consider this letter to be an application for the Association to approve the following improvements located on my clients' lot and residence located at 1888 Derbyshire Road, vinyl fence; and carport. He then asked the Board to go to the Declaration of Covenants Conditions and Restrictions the second to the last page Section 6 Architectural Control, stating ; in the event that the said Architectural Review Committee or its successors or assigns fail to approve or disapprove such design and location within fifteen (15) days after the same have been submitted to said Architectural Review

Committee, such approval will be required and this covenant will be deemed to have been fully complied with.

Mr. Bushrui stated that the Homeowner's Association rules have nothing to do with what the Board of Adjustment does.

Peter McGrath stated that the point he wanted to make was that he believes the Homeowner's Association is trying to use the Board of Adjustment as an instrument to enforce their own covenants.

Mr. Hattaway stated that the Board of Adjustment doesn't do that. He further stated that the Board of Adjustment advises the applicants out of courtesy, if they have a mandatory Homeowner's Association that they should apply to them also.

Peter McGrath stated that the 55 signatures is an organization that is upset because of their failure to act timely in connection with Mr. Winnie's request for approval under their own covenants.

Mr. Winnie stated that there are two (2) different sections of Wellington Terrace and they are before the Board of Adjustment because of an angry Homeowner's Association that have called the Building Department and sent someone out to my property. He further stated that when you pull out of the Subdivision the very first house that you see has a carport and, no one has asked them to remove that structure. He then stated that his carport is very expensive, it is tastefully done and it is not an eyesore. He lastly stated that he would not degrade his neighborhood and he would like the Board to allow him to keep the carport in its current location.

Mark Troum stated that he was one of the neighbors in Mr. Winnie's neighborhood, a member of the Homeowner's Association Board and also on the Architectural Review Board. He further stated that the Homeowner's Association Board and the Architectural Review Board required all request be submitted on their forms.

Mr. Hattaway stated that the Board of Adjustment was very experienced and they wanted to talk about the facts involved in the request before them, which would be if be liked or not liked the idea of the variance request.

Mark Troum then stated that the 55 different signatures that the Board has already received and his made 56 plus he stated he had another letter of opposition to present to the Board. He further stated that there was 83 lots in the entire neighborhood and 57 of the lots were in opposition of the request. He then stated that he looked at the picture of the other carport in the neighborhood and (1) it is behind the fence and (2) it is substantially smaller than the requested carport and (3) I pull out of the neighborhood every day and I have not noticed this alleged carport behind the fence. He then stated that the applicant carport can be seen, it is large and it was not approved. He further stated that carports

are not allowed in the neighborhood without approval. He then stated that it was not a matter of trying to reduce the value of Mr. Winnie home, it is just a matter of something that is not approved.

Steve Waleseh stated that he was one of the neighbors and he then apologized for not having the neighbors put their complete address on the petition. He further stated that he knew the neighbors were not happy with the carport, therefore he wanted to put together something for the Board of Adjustment to inform them of the neighborhood objection.

Peter McGrath stated that this is an Association controversy, with Association generated opposition. He further stated that the application for the carport is appropriate.

Mr. Winnie stated that he wanted to thank the Board of Adjustment for their time. He further stated that he would appreciate any thing the Board could do to help. He then stated that the carport could be moved 20 feet forward, but because it would be an eyesore he didn't want to do that to his neighbors.

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to deny the request.**

**The motion died for a lack of a second.**

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request, stating its location is less intrusive to the neighborhood.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the request.**

**The motion failed with a vote of 2-2.**

**A motion was made to reconsider the request.**

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui reluctantly seconded the motion to move the meeting along**

**The motion passed by a (3-1) vote. Mr. Hattaway was in opposition.**

5. **628 ALPINE STREET** – Jorge Rodriguez, applicant; Request for a (1) side yard (south) setback variance from 10 feet to 0 feet; and (2) a side yard (east) setback variance from 10 feet to 0 feet for a proposed pool screen enclosure in the R-1AA (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located at the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Evergreen Avenue and Alpine Street; (BV2006-056).  
Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct a pool screen enclosure over an existing pool. He further stated that the property had received prior approvals from the Board of Adjustment for lot size, width at the building line and a side street setback variance for a proposed fence. He then stated that there were currently no building or code enforcement violations for the property.

Jorge Rodriguez stated that he was requesting a pool screen enclosure. He further stated that he was told by the Building Department that he would have to apply for a variance to put the enclosure in. He then stated that he owns the adjacent property and the neighbor behind him that would be most affected didn't have a problem with the screen enclosure. He lastly stated that it would be good for the neighborhood and allow him to have a bigger deck.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by (3-1) consent. Mr. Hattaway was in opposition.**

6. **908 LOGENBERRY TRAIL** – Eleanor Ellison, applicant; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 12 feet to 7.6 feet for a proposed sunroom in the R-1A (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located on the north side of Logenberry Trail approximately 250 feet west of the intersection of Huckleberry Lane and Logenberry Trail; (BV2006-057).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant received approval from the Board of Adjustment on February 27, 2006 for a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 12 feet for a proposed sunroom. He further stated that the applicant had received approval from the Tuskawilla Homeowners Association for the proposed sunroom addition on January 27, 2006. He lastly stated that when Mrs. Ellison submitted her application she didn't request enough of a setback to build the proposed sunroom, therefore she had to reapply.

Eleanor Ellison stated that she didn't measure correctly and she didn't ask for enough square footage to build the proposed sunroom. She further stated that she had the approval letter from the Homeowners Association.

Naval Modani stated that he lived behind the property and he didn't have any objection as a neighbor. He further stated that he was on the Homeowners Association Board and they didn't have any objections.

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

7. **290 MOFFATT LOOP** – Eleanor Ellison, applicant; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 20 feet to 12 feet for a proposed sunroom addition in the PUD (Planned Unit Development District); Located on the south side of Moffat Loop approximately 150 feet east of the intersection of Slash Pine Place and Moffat Loop; (BV2006-068).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the application and stated that the applicant proposed to construct a 182 square foot sunroom addition to the rear of the existing residence. He further stated that the Board of Adjustment granted a similar variance for a rear yard setback variance from 20 feet to 5 feet for a screen room addition at 302 Moffat Loop in 2004, which is three (3) properties to the east of the proposed property. He then stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations for the property. He lastly stated that staff received three (3) letters in support of the request.

Eleanor Ellison introduced the homeowner Mr. Rosino to the Board and stated they were requesting a variance from 20 feet to 12 feet for a proposed sunroom addition.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

8. **102 CHATSWORTH COURT** – Tony & Joyce Shultz, applicants; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 25 feet to 6 feet for a proposed covered screen room in the PUD (Planned Unit Development District); Located on the north side of Chatsworth Circle approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of Swansneck Place and Chatsworth Court; (BV2006-058).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct a 374 square feet screen room to the rear of the existing residence. He further stated that the neighbor to the north received approval for a similar variance in 1987 for a rear yard setback variance from 25 feet to 14 feet. He then stated that there were currently no building or code enforcement violations for the property. He lastly stated that the applicant had submitted two letters of approval from the neighbors to the north of the property.

Tony and Joyce Shultz, the applicants didn't have anything to add to staff's comments.

**Mr. O'Daniel made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

9. **7757 FOX KNOLL PLACE** – Wendy Tumlin, applicant; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 20 feet to 15 feet for a proposed screen enclosure addition in the PUD (Planned Unit Development District); Located on the north side of Fox Knoll Place approximately 600 feet east of Howell Branch Road and Fox Knoll Place; (BV2006-059).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant had submitted plans to the Building Department for the proposed screen enclosure addition. He further stated that the Board of Adjustment had granted similar rear yard setback variances on nearby properties. He then stated that there were currently no code enforcement or building violations on the property.

Wendy Tumlin stated that she had lived in the house for 5 years. She further stated that last year she looked into adding a porch to the property but couldn't afford it. She then stated that she had already submitted a letter to her Homeowners Association and they didn't have any objections to the request. She also stated that she noticed about 7 other homes on her street that have screen enclosures. She lastly stated that the slab was added when the house was build and she wanted to enclose the slab with a covered screen room, insulted roof and ceiling fan.

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

10. **248 SUMMERWOOD TRAIL** – Superior Aluminum, applicant; Request for a side yard (south) setback variance from 10 feet to 4 feet for a replacement pool screen enclosure in the R-1AA (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located on the west side of Summerwood Trail approximately 800 feet east of the intersection of Cherrywood Drive and Summerwood Trail; (BV2006-061).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the application and stated that the applicant proposed to build a replacement screen enclosure which was originally constructed in 1976. He further stated that the replacement screen enclosure would be built on an existing concrete pool slab. He then stated that the



applicant had submitted plans for the screen enclosure to the Building Division on January 17, 2006. He lastly stated that there were currently no building or code enforcement violations on the property.

**THE APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT.**

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

11. **1340 CHARLOTTE STREET** – Russell & Beverly Curry, applicants; Request for a side street setback variance from 25 feet to 2.5 feet for an existing fence in the R-1AA (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located at the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Charlotte Street and Suniland Avenue; (BV2006-063).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to replace an existing fence. He further stated that the applicant had received approval on March 29, 2006 from the Building Division which doesn't encroach into the setback. He then stated that there were currently no building or code enforcement violations for the property. He lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Beverly Curry stated that she bought the property in 1992 and that there was currently a chain link fence up. She stated that the request for 2.5 feet was for the back corner of the property. She further stated that she had already replaced the fence to the point that the permit has allowed.

**Mr. O'Daniel made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

12. **709 BOYSENBERRY COURT** – Naval & Vijayalaxmi Modani, applicants; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 12 feet for a proposed sunroom addition in the R-1A (Single-Family Dwelling District); Located on the south side of Boysenberry Court approximately 200 feet west of the intersection of Huckleberry Lane and Boysenberry Court; (BV2006-065).

Ian Sikonia, Planner

Ian Sikonia introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant proposed to construct a sunroom to the rear of the existing residence. He further

stated that the applicant received approval from the Tuskawilla Point Homeowners Association for the proposed sunroom addition on March 22, 2006. He then stated that the property to the rear received approval from the Board of Adjustment for a rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 12 feet at the February 27, 2006 meeting and the neighbor behind him received approval tonight for a rear yard setback variance from 12 feet to 7.6 feet. He lastly stated that there were currently no building or code enforcement violations for the property.

Naval Modani stated that Ian Sikonia did a good job of explaining his request. He further stated that his sunroom would be similar to the sunroom that received approval earlier in the meeting.

Eleanor Ellison stated that she represented the Company that would build the applicant's sunroom. She further stated that she was in favor of the request.

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Rozon seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

13. **4207 ROCKY RIDGE PLACE** – Melissa Williams, applicant; Request for a (1) rear yard setback variance from 10 feet to 3 feet 3 inches; and a (2) side yard (east) setback variance from 7 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 3 inches for an existing dog pen in the R-1A (Single Family Dwelling District); Located on the south side of Rocky Ridge Place approximately 0.17 mile from the intersection of Cross Bow Lane and Rocky Ridge Place; (BV2006-052).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

Kathy Fall introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant constructed a 100 square feet dog pen that has a shingled roof and is 7 feet high which requires it to have a permit and meet the setbacks for an accessory building. She further stated that the applicant received a code enforcement violation on March 28, 2006 for the unpermitted construction of a dog pen. She lastly stated that there was no record of prior variances granted for the property.

Melissa Williams stated that she didn't know that they needed a permit or a variance for the dog pen. She then stated that if she knew it they would have done everything in the right process. She further stated that they had a large dog that has to be in a pen. She also stated that they had a large dog before and they had problems with him getting out of the yard, so they attached a running cable on him and it killed him. She lastly stated that they thought the best solution for the new dog was the dog pen.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

14. **7215 SYLVAN COURT** – Gregory & Dale McElhiney, applicants; Request for a (1) rear yard setback variance from 30 feet to 15 feet; and a (2) side yard (south) setback variance from 7 feet 6 inches to 3 feet for an existing shed in the R-1A (Single Family Dwelling District); Located on the east side of Sylvan Court, approximately 500 feet northeast of the intersection of Crest Street and Sylvan Court; (BV2006-055).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

Kathy Fall introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicant constructed a 216 square feet shed without a permit and not within the setbacks. She further stated the property's rear yard abuts a canal and the setback is measured from the mean high water line. She then stated that the applicant received a code enforcement violation on March 6, 2006 for the unpermitted construction of a shed. She lastly stated that the applicant received 12 signatures of approval and 2 letters of opposition from the same neighbor.

Dale McElhiney stated that they were in a flood zone area and because they had a septic system in their back yard with a mounded system they had limited space. She further stated that they have a drive thru garage on the left side of the property and that they use that side of the property to access the canal in order to get out into the lake. She then stated that as soon as they have a chance to finish the existing shed, they will paint it gray and it will look like their house. She also referred to the letter of opposition and stated that in the letter it stated that they had chemicals in the shed that could harm the water and fish if the water from the lake came up in the shed. She then said that comment was not true and that they had tools and lawn equipment in the shed and that the water had never gone into the shed.

Terrance Mahl stated that he lived directly across the street from the applicants. He further stated that you really can't see the shed from the street. He then stated that the applicants' house was one of the nicest houses on their street, and when they finish the shed it would look nice. He lastly stated that the shed is consistent with the rest of the neighborhood.

**Mr. Bushrui made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

15. **432 MAINSAIL COURT** – Karen & Elvis Figueroa, applicants; Request for a (1) rear yard setback variance from 10 feet to 1 foot for a pool; (2) rear yard setback variance from 5 feet to 0 feet; and a (3) side yard (west) setback variance from 7 feet to 0 feet for a proposed pool screen enclosure in the PUD (Planned Unit Development); Located on the north side of Mainsail Court, approximately 350 feet east of the intersection of Lakebreeze Circle and Mainsail Court; (BV2006-060).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

Kathy Fall introduced the location of the applicant and stated that the applicant proposed to construct a pool and screen enclosure that will abut the rear and side (west) yard property lines. She further stated that there were no variances approved in that development for structures to be located on the property line.

Karen Figueroa stated that they had a very small back yard that was 19 feet wide and almost 40 feet in length. She further stated that all the yards in her neighborhood were long and narrow. She then stated that they were planning a small lagoon style pool, it would not be as wide as a regular pool. She also stated that they had sliding glass doors and large glass windows in the rear of the house therefore they wanted to set the pool away from the house. She further stated that the Board of Adjustment had approved a rear yard setback variance from 5 feet to 0 feet for a proposed screen enclosure and a rear yard setback variance from 10 feet to 1 foot for a proposed pool at the February 27, 2006 meeting. She then stated that she had received approval from her Homeowners Association and her neighbors. She lastly stated to the Board that there were some concessions she could make to the request but she really wanted the Board to approve what she requested.

**Mr. O'Daniel made a motion to approve request for a (1) rear yard setback variance from 10 feet to 3 feet for a pool; (2) rear yard setback variance from 5 feet to 2 feet; and a (3) side yard (west) setback variance from 7 feet to 2 feet for a proposed screen enclosure.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

16. **1073 AMANDA KAY CIRCLE** – Scott & Julie Hagge, applicants; Request for a rear yard setback variance from 25 feet to 10 feet for a covered screen room in the R-AH (Affordable Housing Dwelling Subdivision); Located on the west side of Amanda Kay Circle approximately ¼ mile south west of the intersection of Orange Boulevard and Amanda Kay Circle; (BV2006-067).

Kathy Fall, Principal Planner

Kathy Fall introduced the location of the property and stated that the applicants proposed to construct a 249 square feet covered screen enclosure. She further stated that the property is located in Forest Cove which requires the rear yard

setbacks to be 25 feet for the external lots and 20 feet for the internal lots. She lastly stated that there were several variances granted in this development for rear yard setbacks for covered screen rooms to be located on the property line.

Scott Hagge stated that they were proposing to build a porch for their family. He further stated that they had their second child on the way and would like to have a screened porch for family gatherings and barbeques. He lastly stated that they would like to watch their daughters play on their playground.

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the request.**

**Mr. Bushrui seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (5-0).**

## **APPROVAL OF APRIL 2006 MEETING MINUTES**

**Mr. Rozon made a motion to approve the Amended April 24, 2006 minutes.**

**Mr. O'Daniel seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed by unanimous consent (4-0).**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Time of Adjournment was 8:50 P.M.**