



BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

PANEL C MINUTES

AUGUST 17, 2026

RECEIVED

2026 SEP 16 AM 10:07

**CITY SECRETARY
DALLAS, TEXAS**

6ES Council Briefing

24957316190@dallascityhall.webex.com

Jared Slade, Temporary
Presiding Officer

PRESENT: [5]

Jared Slade, Temporary Presiding Officer	
Linda Garner	
Amelia Perez	
Rodney Milliken	
Roger Sashington (Virtual)	

ABSENT: [0]

Assistant City Attorney Theresa Carlyle called the briefing to order at **10:31 A.M.** with a quorum of the Board of Adjustment present.

Board Member Linda Garner nominated Board Member Jared Slade as Temporary Presiding Officer for Panel C; it was seconded by Board Member Rodney Milliken and voted unanimously.

Presiding Officer Jared Slade called the hearing to order at **1:02 P.M.** with a quorum of the Board of Adjustment present.

The Chairperson stated that no action of the Board of Adjustment shall set a precedent. Each case must be decided upon its own merits and circumstances, unless otherwise indicated, each use is presumed to be a legal use. Each appeal must necessarily stand upon the facts and testimony presented before the Board of Adjustment at this public hearing, as well as the Board's inspection of the property.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The Board of Adjustment provided public testimony opportunities for individuals to comment on matters that were scheduled on the posted meeting agenda.

- No Speakers

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Approval of the Board of Adjustment Panel C, June 15, 2026, Meeting Minutes, amending pg. 2.

A motion was made to approve Panel C, June 15, 2026, Meeting minutes as amended.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Amelia Perez				
Results:	5-0 unanimously				Motion to approve as amended
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Amelia Perez, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

UNCONTESTED CASES

1. 2146 CUSTER DRIVE BOA-26-000055 (KMH)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Luis Matarrita for **(1)** a variance to the front yard setback regulations at **2146 CUSTER DRIVE**. This property is more fully described as Block 6/5020, part of Lot 11, and is zoned R-7.5(A), which requires a front yard setback of 25-feet. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 13-foot-5-inch front yard setback along Gladewater Road, which will require **(1)** an 11-foot-7-inch variance to the front yard setback regulations.

LOCATION: 2146 CUSTER DRIVE

APPLICANT: Luis Matarrita

REQUEST:

(1) a variance to the front yard setback regulations

STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A VARIANCE:

Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) of the Dallas Development Code specifies that the board has the power to grant variances from the **front yard**, side yard, rear yard, lot width, lot depth, lot coverage, floor area for structures accessory to single-family uses, height, minimum sidewalks, off-street parking or off-street loading, or landscape regulations, provided that the variance is:

- (A) not contrary to the public interest when, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
- (B) necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and

- (C) not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

SECTION 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B): Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (i) The financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
- (ii) Compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
- (iii) Compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
- (iv) Compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
- (v) The municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Variance to the front-yard setback regulations:

Approval

Rationale: Based upon evidence presented and provided by the applicant, staff concluded that the site is:

- Not contrary to the public interest as no opposition was received from the date this report was created.
- The subject site is restrictive in buildable area but not shape and slope. Taking into consideration, the subject site is a corner lot with front-yard setbacks facing both Custer Drive and Gladewater Road, reducing the buildable area due to the continuity of the established setback along both street frontage
- Not self-created or personal hardship.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-7.5(A)
North: R-7.5(A)
East: R-7.5(A)
South: R-7.5(A)
West: R-7.5(A)

Land Use:

The subject site is undeveloped; the surrounding properties contain single-family residential uses.

BDA History:

No BDA history found on this property within the past five years.

GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The application of Luis Matarrita for the property located at 2146 Custer Drive focuses on one request relating to the front yard setback.
- The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 13-foot-5-inch front yard setback along Gladewater Road, which will require an 11-foot-7-inch variance to the front yard setback regulations.
- The lots along Gladewater Road face Gladewater Road; however, the subject property faces Custer Drive, to ensure continuity both street frontages require a front yard setback.
- The subject lot information
 - Lot size: 7,500 square feet
 - Lot dimensions: 150 feet by 50 feet
 - Buildable area without the requested variance: approximately 2,400 square feet
 - Buildable area with the requested variance: approximately 3,790 square feet
 - Proposed front-yard setback along Gladewater Road: 13 feet 5 inches
 - Required front-yard setback along Gladewater Road: 25 feet
 - Requested variance: 11 feet 7 inches
 - Proposed dwelling size identified on the site plan: 1,999.83 square feet
 - Proposed lot coverage: 26.7 percent
 - Maximum lot coverage permitted: 45 percent
- The lots along Gladewater Road establish the front-yard setback along Gladewater Road. However, because the subject property is a corner lot fronting both Gladewater Road and Custer Drive, the continuity provisions of the Dallas Development Code require front-yard setbacks along both street frontages. Unlike the surrounding interior lots, these dual front-yard setbacks significantly reduce the buildable area of the property and limit the location and size of a single-family residence.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
 1. That granting the variance to the front yard setback regulations will not be contrary to the public interest when, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
 2. The variance is necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
 3. The variance would not be granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

SECTION 51 A-3.102(d)(10)(B)

Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance

standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (i) the financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
 - (ii) compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
 - (iii) compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
 - (iv) compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
 - (v) the municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.
- Granting the variance to the front yard setback regulations, with the condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations, would require the proposal to be constructed as shown on the submitted documents.
 - 200 foot radius link: [BOA-26-000055 at 2146 Custer](#)

Timeline:

- July 1, 2026: The applicant submitted an “Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment” and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.
- June 30, 2026: The Board of Adjustment Secretary assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel **C**.
- July 13, 2026: The Planning and Development Senior Planner emailed the applicant the following information:
- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the **July 24, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and **August 7, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the board’s docket materials.
 - the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request; and
 - the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to documentary evidence.
- July 28, 2026: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and other requests scheduled for the **August** public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner/Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Senior Planner, Project Coordinator, Board Secretary, Conservation District Chief Planner, Chief Arborists, Zoning Senior Planner, and Transportation Engineer.

Speakers:

For: No Speakers

Against: No Speakers

Motion

I move that the Board of Adjustment **GRANT** the following application listed on the uncontested docket because it appears, from our evaluation of the property and all relevant evidence that the application satisfies all the requirements of the Dallas Development Code and is consistent with the general purpose and intent of the Code, as applicable, to wit:

BOA-26-000055 – Application of Luis Matarrita, for a variance to the front-yard setback regulations contained in the Dallas Development Code, is granted, subject to the following condition:

Compliance with the most recent version of all submitted plans are required.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Amelia Perez				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to grant
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Amelia Perez, Rodney Milliken and Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

HOLDOVER CASES

2. 5418 MELROSE AVENUE

BOA-26-000038 (KMH)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Jorge Maliachi for **(1)** a variance to the front yard setback regulations, **(2)** a variance to the side yard setback regulations, **(3)** a variance to the side yard setback regulations, and **(4)** a variance to the maximum lot coverage regulations at **5418 MELROSE AVENUE**. This property is more fully described as Block C/1978, Lots 8, 9, and 10, and is zoned R-7.5(A), which requires a front yard setback of 25-feet, a side yard setback of 5-feet, and limits the lot coverage to 45 percent for residential structures. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 7-foot 2-inch front yard setback, which will require **(1)** a 17-foot 10-inch variance to the front yard setback regulations, to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 3-foot 5-inch side yard setback at the west side of the property, which will require **(2)** a 1-foot 7-inch variance to the side yard setback regulations, to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 3-foot 6-inch side yard setback at the east side of the property, which will require **(3)** a 1-foot 6-inch variance to the side yard setback regulations, and to construct and or maintain a single-family residential structure with 53 percent lot coverage (2,302 square feet), which will require **(4)** an 8 percent (368.35 square foot) variance to the maximum lot coverage regulations.

LOCATION: 5418 Melrose Avenue

APPLICANT: Jorge Maliachi

REQUEST:

- (1) a variance to the front yard setback regulations
- (2) a variance to the side yard setback regulations
- (3) a variance to the side yard setback regulations
- (4) a variance to the maximum lot coverage regulations

STANDARDS OF REVIEW FOR A VARIANCE:

Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) of the Dallas Development Code specifies that the board has the power to grant variances from the **front-yard**, **side-yard**, rear-yard, lot-width, lot-depth, **lot-coverage**, floor area for structures accessory to single-family uses, height, minimum sidewalks, off-street parking or off-street loading, or landscape regulations provided that the variance is:

- (A) **not contrary to the public interest** when owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
- (B) **necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land** that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
- (C) **not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship**, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

Section 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B):

Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (i) the financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
- (ii) compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
- (iii) compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
- (iv) compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
- (v) the municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (4):

Variance (4):

Denial (4)

Rationale: Based upon evidence presented and provided by the applicant, staff concluded that the site is:

- A. Four letters of opposition received ; and contrary to the public interest as a result.
- B. The subject site is restrictive in area as it is well below the minimum lot size for the zoning district. The minimum lot size for R-7.5(A) is 7,500 square feet, the subject site has a lot size of 4,546.84 square feet; therefore, it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with development upon other parcels of land in the same zoning district.
- C. Not self-created nor is it a personal hardship.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-7.5(A)
North: TH-3(A)
East: R-7.5(A)
South: R-7.5(A) and PD-462
West: R-7.5(A) and PD-462

Land Use:

The subject site and surrounding properties are developed with single-family, townhouse uses.

BDA History:

No BDA history has been found within the last five years.

GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The application of Jorge Maliachi for the property located at 5418 Melrose Avenue focuses on four requests relating to the front and side yard setback regulations as well as the lot coverage regulations.
- The first request, the applicant is proposing to construct and maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 7-foot 2-inch front yard setback, which will require a 17-foot 10-inch variance to the front yard setback regulations.
- The second request focuses on the side yard. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 3-foot 5-inch side yard setback along the west side of the property, which will require a 1-foot 7-inch variance.
- Additionally, the applicant is also proposing to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 3-foot 6-inch side yard setback along the east side of the property, which will require a 1-foot 6-inch variance to the side yard setback regulations.
- Lastly, the applicant is proposing to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure with 53 percent lot coverage (2,302 square feet), which will require an 8 percent (368.35 square foot) variance to the maximum lot coverage regulations.
- It is imperative to note that while the lot size is well below the minimum lot size for lots within the R-7.5(A) zoning district, the property is currently developed with a single-family home.
- The current single-family home will be demolished and rebuilt.

- Per the applicant, the subject site presents a unique physical hardship not created by the property owners. The lot is substandard in size, being both narrow in width and short in depth compared to other lots in the surrounding area.
- 200' radius video:
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
 - 1) That granting the variances to the front-yard setback, side yard setback regulations and lot coverage regulations will not be contrary to the public interest when owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
 - 2) The variances are necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
 - 3) The variances would not be granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

Section 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B):

Dallas Development Code §51A-3.102(d)(10)(b), allows for the BDA to use their discretion and consider Element 2 of the Variance standard to be met, if:

- (i) the financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
 - (ii) compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
 - (iii) compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
 - (iv) compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
 - (v) the municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.
- Granting the variances to the front-yard and side yard setback regulations as well as the lot coverage regulations with a condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations, would require the proposal to be constructed as shown on the submitted documents.
 - 200' Radius Video: [BOA-26-000038 at 5418 Melrose Ave.](#)

Timeline:

May 5, 2026:	The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.
--------------	--

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 17, 2026

May 7, 2026: The Board of Adjustment Secretary assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel **C**.

May 18, 2026: The Planning and Development Senior Planner emailed the applicant the following information:

- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the **May 22, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and **June 5, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the board's docket materials.
- the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request; and
- the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to documentary evidence.

May 28, 2026: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and other requests scheduled for the **June** public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner/Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Senior Planner, Project Coordinator, Board Secretary, Conservation District Chief Planner, Chief Arborists, Zoning Senior Planner, and Transportation Engineer.

Speakers:

For: Jorge Maliachi, 6119 Greenville Ave, # 427. Dallas TX 75206
Alex Vidal, 6119 Greenville Ave, # 427, Dallas TX 75206

Against: Ken Skaggs, 2035 Cullen Ave., Dallas TX 75206

Motion # 1

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000038, on application of Jorge Maliachi, **GRANT** the 17-foot 10-inch variance to the front-yard setback regulations requested by this applicant because our evaluation of the property and testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

Compliance with the most recent version of all submitted plans are required.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Jared Slade				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to grant
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Amelia Perez, Linda Garner, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

Motion # 2

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000038, on application of Jorge Maliachi, **GRANT** the 1-foot 7-inch variance to the side-yard setback regulations at the west side of the property as requested by this applicant because our evaluation of the property and testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

Compliance with the most recent version of all submitted plans are required.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Jared Slade				
Results:	3-2				Motion to grant fails
		Ayes:	-	3	Jared Slade, Linda Garner,& Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	2	Amelia Perez and Rodney Milliken

Motion # 3

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000038, on application of Jorge Maliachi, **DENY** the variance to the side-yard setback regulations at the west side of the property as requested by this applicant **without prejudice**, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would NOT result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Andrew Finney				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to deny without prejudice
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Amelia Perez, Linda Garner, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

Motion # 4

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000038, on application of Jorge Maliachi, **DENY** the variance to the side-yard setback regulations to the east side of the property as requested by this applicant **without prejudice**, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would NOT result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

Maker:	Amelia Perez				
Second:	Linda Garner				

Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to deny without prejudice
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Amelia Perez, Linda Garner, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

Motion # 5

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000038, on application of Jorge Maliachi, **DENY** the variance to the maximum lot coverage regulations requested by this applicant **without prejudice**, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would NOT result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

Maker:	Amelia Perez				
Second:	Linda Garner				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to deny without prejudice
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Amelia Perez, Linda Garner, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

INDIVIDUAL CASES

3. 5014 ABRAHAMS ROAD

BOA-26-000049(KMH)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Ryan Huston for **(1)** a variance to the floor area for structures accessory to single family use regulations at **5014 ABRAMS ROAD**. This property is more fully described as Block 6/5419, Lot 19, and is zoned R-7.5(A), which states that an accessory structure may not exceed 25 percent of the floor area of the main structure. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential accessory structure with 769.55 square feet of floor area (41.8% of the 1,840 square foot floor area of the main structure), which will require **(1)** a 309.55 square foot (17 percent) variance to the floor area for structures accessory to single family use regulations.

LOCATION: 5014 Abrams Road

APPLICANT: Ryan Houston

REQUEST:

(1) A variance to the floor area for structures accessory to single-family use regulations

STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A VARIANCE:

Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) of the Dallas Development Code specifies that the board has the power to grant variances from the front yard, side yard, rear yard, lot width, lot depth, lot coverage, **floor area for structures accessory** to single-family uses, height, minimum sidewalks, off-street parking or off-street loading, or landscape regulations, provided that the variance is:

- (D) not contrary to the public interest when, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
- (E) necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
- (F) not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

SECTION 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B): Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (vi) The financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
- (vii) Compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
- (viii) Compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
- (ix) Compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
- (x) The municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Variance Request (1):

Denial

Rationale: Based upon evidence presented and provided by the applicant, staff concluded that the site is:

1. Not contrary to the public interest.
2. The proposed variance is not necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning.
3. The proposed development appears to be a self-created or personal hardship, and would permit a personal privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by the code of ordinances to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-7.5(A)
North: R-7.5(A)
East: R-7.5(A)
South: R-7.5(A)
West: R-7.5(A)

Land Use:

The subject site is developed and surrounded by similar single family uses.

BDA History:

Zero cases within the past five years.

GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The application of Ryan Houston for the property located at 5014 Abrams Road focuses on one request relating to the floor area of an accessory structure exceeding 25 percent of the main structure.
- The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential accessory structure with 769.55 square feet of floor area (41.8% of the 1,840 square foot floor area of the main structure), which will require a 309.55 square foot (17 percent) variance to the floor area for structures accessory to single-family use regulations.
- Lot is not considered to be restricted in area, shape, or slope and can be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
 4. That granting the variance to the floor area for structures accessory to single family use regulations will not be contrary to the public interest when, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
 5. The variance is necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
 6. The variance would not be granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

SECTION 51 A-3.102(d)(10)(B)

Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (vi) the financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
 - (vii) compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
 - (viii) compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
 - (ix) compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
 - (x) the municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.
- Granting the variance to the floor area for structures accessory to single-family use regulations, with the condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations, would require the proposal to be constructed as shown on the submitted documents.
 - 200 radius link: [BOA-26-000049 at 5014 Abrams](#)

Timeline:

- July 2, 2026: The applicant submitted an “Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment” and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.
- June 30, 2026: The Board of Adjustment Secretary assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel C.
- July 13, 2026: The Planning and Development Senior Planner emailed the applicant the following information:
- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the **July 24, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and **August 7, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the board’s docket materials.
 - the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request; and
 - the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to documentary evidence.
- July 28, 2026: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and other requests scheduled for the **August** public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner/Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Senior Planner, Project Coordinator, Board Secretary, Conservation District Chief Planner, Chief Arborists, Zoning Senior Planner, and Transportation Engineer.

Speakers:

For: Joe Terry, 5014 Abrams Rd, Dallas TX 75214
Jeff Koor, 2919 Thomas Ave., Dallas TX 75204

Against: No Speakers

Motion

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000049, on application of Ryan Huston **GRANT** the 309.55 square foot (17 percent) variance to the floor area for a structure accessory to the single family use regulations because our evaluation of the property and testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

Compliance with the most recent version of all submitted plans are required.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Jared Slade				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to grant
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Amelia Perez, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

4. 5005 DENTON DRIVE

BOA-26-000052 (KMH)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Jojo Anaya for **(1)** a variance to the front yard setback regulations at **5005 DENTON DRIVE**. This property is more fully described as Block J/2325, Lot 1, and is zoned PD-193 (R-7.5 Subdistrict), which requires a front yard setback of 25 feet. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 5-foot front yard setback along Maple Springs Boulevard, which will require **(1)** a 20-foot variance to the front yard setback regulations.

LOCATION: 5005 Denton Avenue

APPLICANT: Jojo Anaya

REQUEST:

(2) a variance to the front yard setback regulations

STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A VARIANCE:

Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) of the Dallas Development Code specifies that the board has the power to grant variances from the **front yard**, side yard, rear yard, lot width, lot depth, lot coverage, floor area for structures accessory to single-family uses, height, minimum sidewalks, off-street parking or off-street loading, or landscape regulations, provided that the variance is:

- (G) not contrary to the public interest when, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.

- (H) necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
- (I) not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

SECTION 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B): Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (xi) The financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
- (xii) Compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
- (xiii) Compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
- (xiv) Compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
- (xv) The municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Variance to the front-yard setback regulations:

Approval

Rationale: Based upon evidence presented and provided by the applicant, staff concluded that the site is:

- A. Not contrary to the public interest.
- B. It is necessary to permit development of this specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being a restrictive area, shape, or slope. The subject site is restrictive in shape and buildable area, but not slope. The property is an irregularly shaped corner lot that tapers significantly toward the intersection, creating a nonstandard building envelope that differs from the surrounding rectangular lots within the R-7.5 zoning district. Furthermore, the continuity provisions of the Dallas Development Code require front-yard setbacks along both street frontages, further limiting the buildable area of the site. As a result, the subject property cannot be reasonably developed in a manner commensurate with other parcels in the same zoning district without the requested variance.
- C. Not self-created or personal hardship.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: PD-193 (R-7.5) Subdistrict
North: PD-193 (R-7.5) Subdistrict

East: PD-193 (R-7.5) Subdistrict
South: PD-193 (R-7.5) Subdistrict
West: PD-193 (R-7.5) Subdistrict

Land Use:

The subject site is undeveloped; the surrounding properties contain single-family residential uses.

BDA History:

BDA201-111 – Panel C approved a 21-foot 6-inch variance to the front yard setback regulations.

GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The application of Jojo Anaya for the property located at 5005 Denton Drive focuses on one request relating to the front yard setback.
- The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential structure and provide a 5-foot front yard setback along Maple Springs Boulevard, which will require a 20-foot variance to the front yard setback regulations.
- Having two frontages, the site is subject to more restrictive setback requirements as compared to adjacent properties. The property also differs in shape, which creates unique development challenges not shared by others.
- *The subject site lot information:*
 - *Lot size: 7,953 square feet*
 - *Buildable are without variance: 2,865 square feet*
 - *Buildable area with variance: 5,157 square feet*
 - *Lot coverage: 39 percent proposed*
 - *Lot Coverage 45 percent max allowed*
- The subject site did not obtain a permit within 180 days of approval. Consequently, this request is being made. For reference Section 51A-4.703(d)(6) states: *The applicant shall file an application for a building permit or certificate of occupancy within 180 days from the date of the favorable action of the board, unless the applicant files for and is granted an extended time period prior to the expiration of the 180 days. The filing of a request for an extended time period does not toll the 180-day time period. If the applicant fails to file an application within the time period, the request is automatically denied without prejudice, and the applicant must begin the process to have his request heard again.*
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
 7. That granting the variance to the front yard setback regulations will not be contrary to the public interest when, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice done.
 8. The variance is necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope, that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning; and
 9. The variance would not be granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning.

SECTION 51 A-3.102(d)(10)(B)

Dallas Development Code § 51A-3.102(d)(10)(B), allows for the board to use their discretion and consider the following as grounds to determine whether the portion of the variance standard of compliance with the ordinance as applied to a structure would result in unnecessary hardship:

- (xi) the financial cost of compliance is greater than 50 percent of the appraised value of the structure as shown on the most recent appraisal roll certified to the assessor for the municipality under Section 26.01 of the Texas Tax Code.
- (xii) compliance would result in a loss to the lot on which the structure is located of at least 25 percent of the area on which development is authorized to physically occur.
- (xiii) compliance would result in the structure not being in compliance with a requirement of a municipal ordinance, building code, or other requirement.
- (xiv) compliance would result in the unreasonable encroachment on an adjacent property or easement; or
- (xv) the municipality considers the structure to be a nonconforming structure.
- Granting the variance to the front yard setback regulations, with the condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations, would require the proposal to be constructed as shown on the submitted documents.
- 200 foot radius link: [BOA-26-000052 at 5005 Denton](#)

Timeline:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| July 2, 2026: | The applicant submitted an “Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment” and related documents which have been included as part of this case report. |
| June 30, 2026: | The Board of Adjustment Secretary assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel C . |
| July 13, 2026: | The Planning and Development Senior Planner emailed the applicant the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the July 24, 2026, deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and August 7, 2026, deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the board’s docket materials.• the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request; and• the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to documentary evidence. |
| July 28, 2026: | The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and other requests scheduled for the August public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner/Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Senior Planner, |

Project Coordinator, Board Secretary, Conservation District Chief Planner,
Chief Arborists, Zoning Senior Planner, and Transportation Engineer.

Speakers:

For: Jokabet Anaya, 5225 Maple Ave. # 5109, Dallas TX 75235

Against: Logan Monaco(V), 5011 Maple Springs Blvd, Dallas TX 75235
Marcia Millard, 5123 Maple Springs Blvd, Dallas TX 75235
Carlos Gomez, 5111 Denton Dr., Dallas TX 75235
Robert Putman, 5128 Maple Springs Blvd., Dallas TX 75235
Theresa Badylak (Did not speak)

Motion

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000052, on application of Jojo Anaya, **GRANT** the 20-foot variance to the front-yard setback regulations requested by this applicant because our evaluation of the property and testimony shows that the physical character of this property is such that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, would result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant.

I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

Compliance with the most recent version of all submitted plans are required.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Jared Slade				
Results:	4-1				Motion to grant
		Ayes:	-	4	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Amelia Perez & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	1	Rodney Milliken

5. 3741 SEGUIN DRIVE
BOA-26-000059 (BT)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Jojo Anaya for **(1)** a special exception to the fence height regulations, and for **(2)** a special exception to the 45-foot visibility obstruction regulations at street intersections at **3741 SEGUIN DRIVE**. This property is more fully described as block 11/6178, Lot 8, and is zoned R-7.5(A), which limits the fence height in the front yard to 4-feet, and requires a 45-foot visibility triangle at the street intersections. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a 6-foot-high fence in a required front-yard along Juniper Drive, which will require **(1)** a 2-foot special exception to the fence height regulations, and to construct and/or maintain a single-family residential fence structure in a required 45-foot visibility obstruction triangle at the street intersection of Seguin Drive and Juniper Drive, which will require **(2)** a special exception to the 45-foot visibility obstruction regulations at street intersections.

LOCATION: 3741 Seguin Drive

APPLICANT: Jojo Anaya

REQUEST:

1. a special exception to the fence height regulations along Juniper Drive, and
2. a special exception to the 45-foot visibility obstruction regulations at the street intersection of Seguin Drive and Juniper Drive.

STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FENCE HEIGHT REGULATIONS:

Section 51A-4.602(a)(11) of the Dallas Development Code states that the board may grant a special exception to the fence regulations when in the opinion of the board, the special exception will not adversely affect neighboring property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO VISUAL OBSTRUCTION REGULATIONS:

Section 51A-4.602(d)(3) of the Dallas Development Code states that the board may grant a special exception to the visual obstruction regulations when in the opinion of the board, the special exception will not constitute a traffic hazard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Special Exceptions (2):

No staff recommendation is made on this request.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-7.5(A)
North: R-7.5(A), R-10(A) & CR
East: R-7.5(A)
South: R-7.5(A)
West: R-7.5(A) & CR

Land Use:

The subject site and surrounding properties is developed primarily with single-family uses. To the north and west commercial development within CR zoning district.

BDA History:

No BDA history has been found within the last five years.

GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The application of Jojo Anaya for the property located at 3741 Seguin Drive focuses on two requests relating to the fence height regulations, and visual obstruction regulations at the street intersection of Seguin Drive and Juniper Drive.
- The first request is for a special exception to the fence height regulation. The applicant is proposing to construct and maintain a 6-foot-high fence in a required front-yard along Juniper Drive, which will require a 2-foot special exception to the fence height regulations.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 17, 2026

- The second request is for a special exception to the 45-foot visibility obstruction triangle at the street intersection of Seguin Drive and Juniper Drive. The applicant is proposing to maintain a 6-foot-high board on board cedar fence in a required 45-foot visibility obstruction triangle.
- Staff estimated fence encroaching a maximum of 2-feet 6-inches into visual obstruction.
- Per staff site visit, the fencing is proposed.
- David Nevarez from Planning and Development Transportation provided the following comments on 07/30/2026:
 - “Has no objections.”
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing that the special exception to the fence standard regulations relating to height will not adversely affect the neighboring properties.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing that the special exception to the visual obstruction regulations will not constitute a traffic hazard.
- Granting the special exceptions to the fence height, and visual obstruction regulations with a condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations, would require the proposal to be constructed as shown on the submitted documents.
- 200' Radius Video: [BOA-26-000059 at 3741 Seguin Dr](#)

Timeline:

- July 2, 2026: The applicant submitted an “Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment” and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.
- July 8, 2026: The Board of Adjustment Administrator assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel **A**.
- July 13, 2026: The Planning and Development Senior Project Coordinator on behalf of the Senior Planner emailed the applicant the following information:
- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the **1:00 pm, July 24, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and **1:00 pm, August 5, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the board’s docket materials.
- July 28, 2026: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and other requests scheduled for the **August** public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner/Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Senior Planner, Project Coordinator, Board Secretary, Conservation District Chief Planner, Chief Arborists, Zoning Senior Planner, and Transportation Engineer.

Speakers:

For: Jokabet Anaya, 5225 Maple Ave # 5109, Dallas TX 75235

Against: No Speakers

Motion # 1

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000059, on application of Jojo Anaya, **GRANT** the request of this applicant to construct and/or maintain a 6-foot high fence as a special exception to the height requirement for fences contained in the Dallas Development Code, as amended, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that this special exception will not adversely affect neighboring property.

I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

Compliance with the most recent version of the submitted site plan and elevations are required.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Jared Slade				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to grant
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Amelia Perez, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

Motion # 2

I move that the Board of Adjustment, in Appeal No. BOA-26-000059, on application of Jojo Anaya, **GRANT** the request to maintain items in the 45-foot visibility triangle at the intersection of Seguin Drive and Juniper Drive as a special exception to the visual obstruction regulation contained in the Dallas Development Code, as amended, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that this special exception will not constitute a traffic hazard.

I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code, as amended:

Compliance with the most recent version of the submitted site plan and elevations, in regards to the portion in violation of the visual obstruction triangle, are required.

Maker:	Jared Slade				
Second:	Linda Garner				
Results:	4-1				Motion to grant
		Ayes:	-	4	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Rodney Milliken & Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	1	Amelia Perez

6. 5443 RIDGEDALE AVENUE
BOA-26-000048 (KMH)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Kevin Lawson to appeal the decision of the administrative official in the denial of CON-DIST-WR-26-000196 at **5443 RIDGEDALE AVENUE**. This property is more fully described as Block J/2178, Lot 19, and is zoned CD-9, which requires compliance with conservation district architectural standards. The applicant proposes to appeal the

decision of an administrative official in the denial of a Conservation District Work Certificate No. CON-DIST-WR-26-000196.

LOCATION: 5443 Ridgedale Avenue

APPLICANT: Kevin Lawson

REQUEST:

- (1) A request to appeal the decision of the administrative official in the denial of CON-DIST-WR-26-000196.

STANDARD FOR APPEAL FROM DECISION OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL:

Dallas Development Code Sections 51A-3.102(d)(1) and 51A-4.703(a)(2) state that any aggrieved person may appeal a decision of an administrative official when that decision concerns issues within the jurisdiction of the Board of Adjustment.

Section 51A-3.102 of the Dallas Development code states the Board of Adjustment has the following powers and duties: to hear and decide, appeals from decisions of administrative officials made in the enforcement of a zoning ordinance of the city; and may “reverse an order, requirement, decision, or determination of an administrative official involving the interpretation or enforcement of the zoning ordinance. For purposes of this section, “administrative official” means that person within a city department having the final decision-making authority within the department relative to the zoning enforcement issue.

Additionally, **Section 51A-4.703** states that “the board shall decide an appeal of a decision of an administrative official at the next meeting for which notice can be provided following the hearing and not later than the 60th day after the appeal date is filed. The board shall have all the powers of the administrative official on the action appealed from. The board may in whole or in part affirm, reverse, or amend the decision of the official. The board may impose reasonable conditions in its order to be complied with by the applicant in order to further the purpose and intent of this chapter.

The Board of Adjustment may hear and decide an appeal that alleges error in a decision made by an administrative official. Tex. Local Gov't Code Section 211.009(a)(1).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

<u>Site:</u>	R-7.5(A)
<u>North:</u>	R-7.5(A)
<u>East:</u>	R-7.5(A)
<u>South:</u>	R-7.5(A)
<u>West:</u>	R-7.5(A)

Land Use:

The subject site is developed and surrounded by similar single family uses.

BDA History:

Zero cases within the past five years.

GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The applicant was sent a denial letter dated June 1, 2026 stating the application to paint the previously unpainted brick was denied. The letter informed the applicant their right to appeal the decision to the Board of Adjustment.
- Lastly, the denial letter stated the applicant had twenty days from the date of the denial to file their appeal request. The appeal was filed on June 17, 2026.
- The board shall have all the powers of the administrative official on the action appealed. The board may in whole or in part affirm, reverse, or amend the decision of the official.

Timeline:

- July 2, 2026: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.
- June 30, 2026: The Board of Adjustment Secretary assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel **C**.
- July 13, 2026: The Planning and Development Senior Planner emailed the applicant the following information:
- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the **July 24, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and **August 7, 2026**, deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the board's docket materials.
 - the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request; and
 - the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to documentary evidence.
- July 28, 2026: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and other requests scheduled for the **August** public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner/Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Senior Planner, Project Coordinator, Board Secretary, Conservation District Chief Planner, Chief Arborists, Zoning Senior Planner, and Transportation Engineer.

Speakers:

For: Kevin Lawson, 5443 Ridgedale Ave., Dallas TX 75206
Christina Salas (id not speak)
Shahin Savallu, 5526 Forest Ln., Dallas TX 75230

Against: No Speakers

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 17, 2026

Presiding officer Jared Slade suspended the rules to accept more than 5 pages of documentary evidence presented by the applicant, seconded by Board member Amelia Perez.

Motion

Having fully reviewed the decision of the administrative official of the City of Dallas in Appeal No. BOA-26-000048, on application of Kevin Lawson, and having evaluated the evidence pertaining to the property and heard all testimony and facts supporting the application, I move that the Board of Adjustment **affirm** the decision of the administrative official and **DENY** the relief requested by the applicant.

Maker:	Linda Garner				
Second:	Amelia Perez				
Results:	5-0 Unanimously				Motion to affirm the OA decision
		Ayes:	-	5	Jared Slade, Linda Garner, Amelia Perez, Rodney Milliken and Roger Sashington
		Against:	-	0	

ADJOURNMENT

After all business of the Board of Adjustment had been considered, Presiding Officer Jared Slade moved to adjourn the meeting at **4:32 P.M.**



Required Signature:

Mary Williams - Board Secretary
Planning and Development.



Date



Required Signature:

Dr. Kameka Miller-Hoskins – Chief Administrator
Planning & Development



Date



Required Signature:

Cheri Gambow – Temporary Presiding Officer
Board of Adjustment



Date