

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, PANEL C
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
CITY HALL, L1FN CONFERENCE CENTER AUDITORIUM
MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2005**

MEMBERS PRESENT AT BRIEFING: Frank Madrigal, Vice-Chair, Suzanne Smith, regular member, David Chortek, regular member, Dave Neumann, alternate member and Linda Wise, alternate member

MEMBERS ABSENT FROM BRIEFING: None

MEMBERS PRESENT AT HEARING: Frank Madrigal, Vice-Chair, Suzanne Smith, regular member, David Chortek, regular member, Dave Neumann, alternate member and Linda Wise, alternate member

MEMBERS ABSENT FROM HEARING: None

STAFF PRESENT AT BRIEFING: Steve Long, Board Administrator, TJ Okwubanego, Asst. City Attorney, Danny Sipes, Development Code Specialist, Chau Nguyen, Traffic Engineer, Donnie Moore, Chief Planner and Trena Law, Board Secretary

STAFF PRESENT AT HEARING: Steve Long, Board Administrator, T.J. Okwubanego, Asst. City Attorney, Danny Sipes, Development Code Specialist, Chau Nguyen, Traffic Engineer, Donnie Moore, Chief Planner and Trena Law, Board Secretary

10:28 A.M. The Board of Adjustment staff conducted a briefing on the Board of Adjustment's **April 18, 2005** docket.

1:18 P.M.

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.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEM NO. 1

To approve the Board of Adjustment Panel C March 14, 2005 public hearing minutes.

MOTION: **Wise**

I move **approval** of the **Monday, March 14, 2005**, Board of Adjustment Public Hearing minutes.

SECONDED: **Neumann**

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (unanimously)

MISCELLANEOUS ITEM NO. 2

FILE NUMBER: N/A

REQUEST: Of the Board of Adjustment to consider amendments to Section 10 of the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure

GENERAL FACTS:

- On April 1, 2005, Panels A, B, and C of the Board of Adjustment held a special meeting where the Assistant City Attorney to the Board presented several legal points and parameters to the board members as points of information and for discussion purposes.
- The board members discussed the possibility of amending their “Working Rules of Procedure” whereby a provision would be added to Section 10. Public Hearings (see Attachment A). Members expressed what appeared to be consensual interest in considering the addition of a provision to this section that would provide specific measures and guidelines pertaining to documents that would be submitted to them at the briefing and/or public hearing (after monthly dockets had been mailed).
- The Board of Adjustment Chair directed staff to prepare language to be placed on the upcoming Panel A, B, and C’s April Miscellaneous Dockets whereby each panel could consider devising and adopting amendments to this section of the Working Rules of Procedure.
- The Assistant City Attorney prepared a draft amendment to the rules in response to the board’s request that would amend/add the “Public Hearing” section to the board’s rules, an amendment specifically pertaining to “documentary evidence” (see Attachment B).
- In terms of procedure, any amendment to the draft document prepared by the Assistant City Attorney would be so noted by staff at each panel meeting held in April, with an incorporation of all comments/amendments/recommendations made by each panel consolidated and presented for each panel’s final consideration in May of 2005.

***No action was taken on this item, however minor amendments were suggested to be incorporated into the final draft that will be considered for adoption by the board in May of 2005.**

FILE NUMBER: BDA 045-160

BUILDING OFFICIAL’S REPORT:

Application of Charles and Teresa Arrington for a special exception to the fence regulations at 310 South Acres Drive. This property is more fully described as Lot 2 in City Block D/7777 and is zoned R-10(A) which limits the height of a fence in the front yard to 4 feet. The applicant proposes to maintain a 6 foot 6 inch fence which would require a special exception of 2 feet 6 inches. Referred to the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 51A-3.102(d) (3) of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, which states the power of the Board to grant special exceptions.

LOCATION: 310 South Acres Drive

APPLICANT: Charles and Teresa Arrington

REQUEST:

A special exception to the fence height regulations of 2’ 6” is requested in conjunction with maintaining an open wrought iron fence and gate in the 30’ Acres Drive front yard setback on a site developed with a single family home.

STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FENCE HEIGHT REGULATIONS:

Section 51A-4.602 of the Dallas Development Code states that the board may grant a special exception to the height requirement for fences when in the opinion of the board, the special exception will not adversely affect neighboring property.

GENERAL FACTS:

- The Dallas Development Code states that a fence may not exceed 4’ above grade when located in the required front yard in all residential districts except multifamily districts.
- The elevation plan that has been submitted with the application indicates the following:
 - a 5’ 9” high open wrought iron fence
 - a 6’ 6” high arched open wrought iron gate
- The site plan that has been submitted with the application indicates the following:
 - the fence and gate located parallel to Acres Drive;
 - the fence approximately 100’ in length; and
 - the fence located on the site’s front property line or 23’ from the Acres Drive pavement line.
- The existing fence is located on a site where two single family homes have direct/direct frontage, one of which has an approximately 5’-high open chain link fence in the front yard setback.

- The Board Administrator conducted a field visit of the site and surrounding area and noted several open chain link fences in the area that appeared to be about 4' high. The administrator noted only one fence above four (4) feet high in the area. This fence, located immediately west of the site, is an approximately 5'- high open chain link fence.
- On March 18, 2005, the applicant withdrew his request for a reimbursement of the filing fee.
- The applicant had submitted one letter in support of his fence with his application submittal. This letter is included in the case report and is from the property owner located diagonally northwest of the subject site.
- The applicant submitted information beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A). This information included the following:
 - A reduced elevation of the fence/gate;
 - A letter that further details why the request should be granted;
 - A petition with 3 signatures from immediately adjacent neighbors who support the request; and
 - A map of where the support lies in relation to the subject site.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-10 (A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
North: R-10 (A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
South: R-10 (A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
East: A (A) (Agriculture)
West: R-10 (A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)

Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a single family home. The areas to the north, south, east, and west are developed with single family uses.

Zoning/BDA History:

There has not been any recent related board or zoning cases recorded either on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.

Timeline:

January 25, 2005: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.
 March 17, 2005: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel C.

March 17, 2005: The Board Administrator contacted the applicant and shared the following information:

- the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application;
- the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request;
- the importance of evidence submitted by the applicant with regard to the board's decision since the code states that the applicant has the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant favorable action by the board;
- the March 28th deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis and incorporate into the board's docket;
- that additional evidence submitted past this date should be brought to the public hearing, and may result in delay of action on the appeal or denial; and
- that the board will take action on the matter at the April public hearing after considering the information/evidence and testimony presented to them by the applicant and all other interested parties.

March 24, 2005 The applicant submitted information beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A).

March 28, 2005: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the April public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Development Services Department Current Planning Division Assistant Director, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Development Code Specialist, the Subdivision and Plats Chief Planner, the Development Services Department Transportation Engineer; and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

No review comment sheets with comments were submitted in conjunction with this application.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

- A scaled site plan has been submitted that documents the location of the existing fence relative to its proximity to the property line and pavement line. The site plan also clearly shows the length of the existing fence relative to the lot.
- A scaled elevation has been submitted that documents the height of the existing fence, posts, and gate. The elevation also clearly specifies that the fence is an "ornamental iron fence."
- The existing fence is in excellent condition and of durable material.
- The existing fence is located a relatively long distance away from the street pavement line: 23 feet.

- There are a number of open chain link fences in the front yard setbacks that were noted from Old Seagoville Road to Harvest Road, most of which appeared to be close to the 4'-height that is permitted by right. The open chain link fence immediately west of the subject site was noted to be about 5' in height.
- As of April 4th, no letters had been submitted to staff in opposition, and 3 letters had been submitted in support of the fence.
- Granting this special exception of 2' 6" with conditions imposed that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and submitted elevation would assure that the fence and gate are maintained as shown on the plan and elevation.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: April 18, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: No one

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: No one

MOTION: Neumann

I move that the Board of Adjustment **grant** application **BDA 045-160** 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 or appropriate PD as applicable, and are consistent with its general purpose and intent of the Code or PD. I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code.

- Compliance with the submitted site plan and elevation is required.

SECONDED: Smith

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0 –

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0

FILE NUMBER: BDA 045-180

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT:

Application of Tim Starr, P.E., Project Manager, City of Dallas, for a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations at 5304 Alpha Road. This property is more fully described as Lot 1A in City Block A/7017 and is zoned CR which requires that no structure may be located in the required visibility corner clip. The applicant proposes to maintain a building within the visibility corner clip which would require a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations. Referred to the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 51A-3.102(d) (3) of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, which states the power of the Board to grant special exceptions.

LOCATION: 5304 Alpha Road

APPLICANT: Tim Starr, P.E., Project Manager, City of Dallas

REQUEST:

- A special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations is requested in conjunction with maintaining an existing building (Roche Bobois Furniture Store) that will become located in the 45' visibility triangle at the intersection of Alpha Road and Noel Road once/if City right of way acquisition and widening has been/is completed at this intersection.

STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO THE VISIBILITY OBSTRUCTION REGULATIONS:

The Board shall grant a special exception to the requirements of the visibility obstruction regulations when, in the opinion of the Board, the item will not constitute a traffic hazard.

GENERAL FACTS:

- According to DCAD records, the approximately 1-acre site is developed with a “free standing retail store” structure built in 1999 with 9,000 square feet of area.
- The Dallas Development Code states the following with regard to visibility triangles: A person shall not erect, place, or maintain a structure, berm, plant life or any other item on a lot if the item is:
 - In a visibility triangle as defined in the Code (45-foot visibility triangles at intersections and 20-foot visibility triangles at drive approaches); and
 - Between 2.5 – 8 feet in height measured from the top of the adjacent street curb (or the grade of the portion on the street adjacent to the visibility triangle).
- The applicant submitted information beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A). The information includes a document that outlines information about the appeal, and site plans that illustrate the location of the existing building in relation to existing and proposed street curbs.
- The information and plans submitted by the applicant document that the existing detached sign on the site located near the Noel Road/Alpha Road intersection will be removed and/or relocated prior to the intersection widening project.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: CR (Community retail)
North: NO(A) (Neighborhood office)
South: PD No. 215 (Planned Development District No. 215)
East: PD No. 215 (Planned Development District No. 215)
West: PD No. 322 (Planned Development District No. 322)

Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a retail use (Roche Bobois Furniture Store). The area to the north is undeveloped; the area to the east is developed with retail use; the

area to the south is developed with multifamily use; and the area to the west is developed with a mix of office, retail, parking garage, and hotel uses (The Galleria).

Zoning/BDA History:

There has not been any recent related board or zoning cases recorded either on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.

Timeline:

February 28, 2005: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

March 17, 2005: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel C.

March 17, 2005: The Board Administrator contacted the applicant and shared the following information:

- the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application;
- the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request;
- the importance of evidence submitted by the applicant with regard to the board's decision since the code states that the applicant has the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant favorable action by the board;
- the March 28th deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis and incorporate into the board's docket;
- that additional evidence submitted past this date should be brought to the public hearing, and may result in delay of action on the appeal or denial; and
- that the board will take action on the matter at the April public hearing after considering the information/evidence and testimony presented to them by the applicant and all other interested parties.

March 28, 2005: The applicant submitted additional information to staff (see Attachment A).

March 28, 2005: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the April public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Development Services Department Current Planning Division Assistant Director, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Development Code Specialist, the Subdivision and Plats Chief Planner, the

Development Services Department Transportation Engineer; and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

A review comment sheet was submitted by the Development Services Transportation Engineer in conjunction with this application. The engineer commented that he has no objections to this request stating that the 5' x 5' encroachment into the 45' visibility triangle would have minimal traffic impact on safety since the intersection is controlled by a traffic signal, and both Alpha and Noel Roads are roadways with medians.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

- If the request were granted, subject to compliance with the submitted site plan, the only element that would be “excepted” into the Alpha Road/Noel Road 45’ visibility triangle would be an approximately 5’ x 5’ (or 12 square foot area) of an existing structure.
- The Development Services Transportation Engineer has indicated that he has no objections to the request. The engineer has commented that the 5’ x 5’ encroachment into the 45’ visibility triangle would have minimal traffic impact on safety since the intersection is controlled by a traffic signal, and since both Alpha Road and Noel Road are roadways with medians.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: April 18, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: No one

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: No one

MOTION: Neumann

I move that the Board of Adjustment **grant** application **BDA 045-180** 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 or appropriate PD as applicable, and are consistent with its general purpose and intent of the Code or PD. I further move that the following condition be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code.

- Compliance with the submitted revised site plan as noted on page 5-7 of the hearing packet is required.
- Any detached premise sign located or to be located within the visibility clip hereby excepted must comply with Article VII of the Dallas City Code, as amended.

SECONDED: Smith

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0 –

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0

FILE NUMBER: BDA 045-179

BUILDING OFFICIAL’S REPORT:

Application of Alfredo Levy for a special exception to allow an additional dwelling unit at 9024 Broken Arrow Lane. This property is more fully described as Lot 3 in City Block C/5666 and is zoned R-16 (A) which limits the property to one dwelling unit per lot. The applicant proposes to construct an additional dwelling unit which would require a special exception. Referred to the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 51A-3.102(d) (3) of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, which states the power of the Board to grant special exceptions.

LOCATION: 9024 Broken Arrow Lane

APPLICANT: Alfredo Levy

REQUEST:

- A special exception to the single family use regulations is requested in conjunction with constructing an additional “dwelling unit” on a site proposed to be developed with a single family home. The proposed additional “dwelling unit” in this appeal is a 2-story garage/”cabana” structure.

STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO THE SINGLE FAMILY USE REGULATIONS TO AUTHORIZE AN ADDITIONAL DWELLING UNIT IN A SINGLE FAMILY ZONING DISTRICT:

The board may grant a special exception within the single family use regulations to authorize an additional dwelling unit in any single family zoning district when, in the opinion of the board, the additional dwelling unit will not: 1) be used as rental accommodations; or 2) adversely affect neighboring properties. In granting a special exception, the board shall require the applicant to deed restrict the subject property to prevent the use of the additional dwelling unit as rental accommodations.

GENERAL FACTS:

- “Single family” use is defined in the Dallas Development Code as “one dwelling unit located on a lot,” however, the code allows the Board of Adjustment to grant a special exception to this provision to allow an additional dwelling unit when, in their opinion, the additional dwelling unit will not:
 - 1) be used as rental accommodations; or
 - 2) adversely affect neighboring properties.
- The subject site is 31,196 square feet in area and developed with, according to DCAD records, the following:
 - a single family home that is in very good condition, built in 1946 with 3,999 square feet of living area; and
 - a 590 square foot attached garage.(A field visit shows that this house has been demolished).
- The site plan indicates that the additional “dwelling unit” structure has a building footprint of approximately 32’ 8” x 29’ or is about 957 square feet in area.

- The site plan indicates that the additional “dwelling unit” structure will be located 10’ from the nearest property line which in this case is the side property line on the north.
- The site plan indicates the following:
 - total house living area: 5,896 SF
 - total house unconditioned area: 953 SF
 - total house area: 6,849 SF
 - total garage conditioned area: 752 SF
 - total garage unconditioned area: 946 SF
 - total garage/guest area: 1,698 SF
 - total area under roof: 8,547 SF
 - total lot coverage: 4,610SF
 - total site area: 31,196SF
 - total lot coverage: 15%
- The submitted elevation indicates that the 2-story additional “dwelling unit” structure will be approximately 22’ in height.
- Floor plans indicate the following spaces within the proposed detached 2-story additional “dwelling unit” structure on the site:
 - a 2-car garage, bath, and storage rooms on 1st floor; and
 - a living room, bedroom, snack area/kitchen area, bath, and closet on the 2nd floor.
- The Dallas Development Code defines “dwelling unit” as “one or more rooms designed to accommodate one family and containing only one kitchen plus living, sanitary, and sleeping conditions.”
- The Dallas Development Code defines “family” as “individuals living together as a single housekeeping unit in which not more than four individuals are unrelated to the head of the household by blood, marriage, or adoption.”
- The Dallas Development Code defines “single family” use as “one dwelling unit located on a lot.”
- The Board of Adjustment has seen an increased number in special exceptions for additional dwelling units since November of 2004. This increase is most likely somewhat attributable to a memo that the Building Official wrote to city plan reviewers in September in 2004 (see Attachment A). This memo requested that plan reviewers carefully review applications for an addition or accessory structure on a lot zoned single family with regard for compliance with code-provisions related to the definitions of “dwelling unit,” “family,” and “single family.”
- Currently the City of Dallas is in the process of considering an amendment to the Development Code with regard to provisions related to single family accessory structures which are at times being interpreted as additional dwelling unit structures by Building Inspection due to a recent change in policy. Any official amendment to the Dallas Development Code would be made by the City Council.
- If this request is granted, a completed deed restriction stating that the additional dwelling unit on the site will not be used for rental accommodations must be submitted to the Board Administrator, approved by the City Attorney’s Office as to form, and filed in the deed records of the applicable county (in this case, Dallas County) before the applicable permits for this additional dwelling unit can be issued by the City.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

<u>Site:</u>	R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
<u>North:</u>	R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
<u>South:</u>	R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
<u>East:</u>	R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
<u>West:</u>	R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)

Land Use:

The subject site is being developed with a single family home. The areas to the north, east, south, and west are developed with single family uses.

Zoning/BDA History:

There has not been any recent related board or zoning cases recorded either on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.

Timeline:

February 25, 2005: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

March 17, 2005: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel C.

March 17, 2005: The Board Administrator left a message with the applicant and shared the following information:

- the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application;
- the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request;
- the importance of evidence submitted by the applicant with regard to the board's decision since the code states that the applicant has the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant favorable action by the board;
- the March 28th deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis and incorporate into the board's docket;
- that additional evidence submitted past this date should be brought to the public hearing, and may result in delay of action on the appeal or denial; and
- that the board will take action on the matter at the April public hearing after considering the information/evidence and

testimony presented to them by the applicant and all other interested parties.

March 28, 2005: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the April public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Development Services Department Current Planning Division Assistant Director, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Development Code Specialist, the Subdivision and Plats Chief Planner, the Development Services Department Transportation Engineer; and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

No review comment sheets with comments were submitted in conjunction with this application.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The proposed 2-story “dwelling unit” structure meets all setback, lot coverage, and height regulations.
- As of April 5, 2005, no letters in support or in opposition to this request had been submitted to staff.
- If the Board were to approve the request, subject to imposing a condition that the applicant comply with the submitted elevation and site plan, the proposed “dwelling unit” structure would be restricted to the specific location, size, and height shown on the plans, which in this case is a 2-story garage / “cabana” structure.
- The Dallas Development Code states that in granting this type of special exception, the board shall require the applicant to deed restrict the subject property to prevent the use of the additional dwelling unit as rental accommodations.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: April 18, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Alfredo Levy, 3551 Flair Drive, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: No one

MOTION: Wise

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 045-179** on application of Alfredo Levy, **grant** the request of this applicant to maintain an additional dwelling unit on the property, because our evaluation of the property and testimony shows that the additional dwelling unit will not be used as rental accommodations nor adversely affect neighboring properties. I further move that the following conditions be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

- Compliance with the submitted site plan and elevations is required;
- The property must be deed-restricted to prohibit the additional dwelling unit on the site from being used as rental accommodations; and

- A copy of the deed restrictions recorded in Dallas County must be submitted to the City Attorney's office.

SECONDED: Smith

AYES: 4 – Madrigal, Smith, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 1– Chortek

MOTION PASSED: 4 – 1

FILE NUMBER: BDA 045-183

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT:

Application of Jeremy Scharf for a variance to the front and side yard setback regulations at 6545 Layfayette Way. This property is more fully described as Lot 24 in City Block 10/7445 and is zoned R-16 (A) which requires a 35 foot front yard setback and a 10 foot side yard setback. The applicant proposes to construct a single family dwelling and provide a 28 foot front yard setback and a 0 foot side yard setback which would require a variance of 7 feet to the front yard regulations and a variance of 10 feet to the side yard regulations. Referred to the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, which states the power of the Board to grant variances.

LOCATION: 6545 Layfayette Way

APPLICANT: Jeremy Scharf

April 18, 2005 Public Hearing Notes:

- The following information was submitted at the public hearing:
 - Photos of the neighborhood from an opposing property owner.
- The board delayed action on this matter to allow the applicant and neighbors an opportunity to reach a resolution on the matters at hand.

REQUESTS:

- A variance to the front yard setback regulations of 7' and a variance of 10' to the side yard setback regulations are requested in conjunction with constructing a single family home on a site that is undeveloped.

STANDARD FOR A VARIANCE:

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, coverage, floor area ratios, height, minimum sidewalks, off-street parking or off-street loading, or landscape regulations that 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. The variance must be necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land which 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 in districts with the same zoning classification. A variance may 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 in districts with the same zoning classification.

GENERAL FACTS:

- A 35'-front yard setback is required in the R-16(A) zoning district.
- The submitted site plan indicates that entry steps of the proposed single family home are to be located 28' from the site's front property line.
- According to the submitted site plan, the area of the proposed single family structure (entry stairs) located in the 35' front yard setback is approximately 119 square feet (or 17' x 7') in area.
- A 10'-side yard setback is required in the R-16(A) zoning district.
- The submitted site plan indicates that a deck and stairs (from the deck to the back yard) are proposed to be located on the site's side property line on the western edge of the site.
- According to the submitted site plan, the area of the proposed single family structure located in the 10' side yard setback (deck and stairs) is approximately 230 square feet (or 23' x 10') in area.
- According to calculations taken from the submitted site plan, the building footprint of the single family home is approximately 80' x 40' or 3,200 square feet in area. (According to information submitted by the applicant, the proposed home would have 3,735 square feet of living area).
- An elevation has been submitted in conjunction with the application that indicates a 2-story house.
- The site is sloped, irregular in shape (100' x 129' x 40' x 69' x 155'), and approximately 13,000 square feet in area.
- The applicant submitted information beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A). This information included the following:
 - 18 letters of support from immediate neighbors;
 - Information retrieved from the Dallas Central Appraisal District on random new homes in the immediate neighborhood; and
 - A map of the immediate area with the subject site and adjacent streets noted above from support letters and from DCAD highlighted for reference.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
North: R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
South: R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)
East: R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)

West: R-16 (A) (Single family district 16,000 square feet)

Land Use:

The subject site is undeveloped. The areas to the north, east, south and west are developed with single family uses.

Zoning/BDA History:

There has not been any recent related board or zoning cases recorded either on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.

Timeline:

March 4, 2005: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

March 17, 2005: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel C.

March 17, 2005: The Board Administrator contacted the applicant and shared the following information:

- the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application;
- the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request;
- the importance of evidence submitted by the applicant with regard to the board's decision since the code states that the applicant has the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant favorable action by the board;
- the March 28th deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis and incorporate into the board's docket;
- that additional evidence submitted past this date should be brought to the public hearing, and may result in delay of action on the appeal or denial; and
- that the board will take action on the matter at the April public hearing after considering the information/evidence and testimony presented to them by the applicant and all other interested parties.

March 25, 2005 The applicant submitted information beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A).

March 28, 2005: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the April public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Development Services Department Current Planning Division Assistant Director, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Development Code Specialist, the Subdivision and Plats Chief Planner, the

Development Services Department Transportation Engineer; and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.
No review comment sheets with comments were submitted in conjunction with this application.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

- The site is sloped, irregularly-shaped, and approximately 13,000 square feet in area. This total lot size is less than the typically-sized lot in the R-16(A) zoning district at 16,000 square feet.
- If the Board were to grant the front yard variance request, subject to the submitted site plan, the site could be developed with a 2-story single family structure that (according to the applicant) will have about 3,800 square feet of living area where the only encroachment into the front yard setback would be an approximately 119 square foot (or 17' x 7') area for entry steps.
- If the Board were to grant the side yard variance request, subject to the submitted site plan, the site could be developed with a 2-story single family structure that (according to the applicant) will have about 3,800 square feet of living area where the only encroachment into the side yard setback would be an approximately 230 square foot (or 23' x 10') area for a deck and steps.
- The applicant has submitted information from DCAD that shows 8 other homes in the area (and zoning district) that have living areas that range from 5,182 square feet to 10,002 square feet. These "living areas" contrast with the 3,735 square feet of living area that the proposed home on the subject site will have.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: April 18, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Jeremy Scharf, 12660 Hillcrest Road #7201, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Maridel Hoagland, 6553 Lafayette Way, Dallas, TX
John Hoagland, 6553 Lafayette Way, Dallas, TX
Sam King, 6561 Lafayette Way, Dallas, TX
Liberty Ford, 6247 Lafayette Way, Dallas, TX

MOTION: **Smith**

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 045-183**, hold this matter under advisement until **May 16, 2005**.

SECONDED: **Wise**

AYES: 4 – Madrigal, Smith, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 1– Chortek

MOTION PASSED: 4 – 1

FILE NUMBER: BDA 034-177

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT:

Application of Randall Goss, represented by Ray Martinez, Ford and Harrison, for a variance to the front yard setback regulations at 9863 Rockbrook Drive. This property is more fully described as Lot 32 in City Block 5543 and is zoned R-1ac (A) which requires a 40 foot front yard setback. The applicant proposes to maintain and construct structures on the site and provide a 17 foot front yard setback which would require a variance of 23 feet. Referred to Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 51A-3.102 (d) (10) of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, which states the power of the Board to grant variances.

LOCATION: 9863 Rockbrook Drive

APPLICANT: Randall Goss
Represented by Raymond Martinez, Ford and Harrison

April 18, 2005 Public Hearing Notes:

- The following information was submitted at the public hearing:
 - A letter that explained why the request should be denied and photos of the site from an attorney of an opposing property owner.

SUMMARY:

- Variances to the front yard setback regulations of up to 23' are requested in conjunction with maintaining air conditioning units and an addition on a single family home that are located in the 40'-Meadowood Road front yard setback.
- The applicant is providing a 17'-front yard setback for the air conditioning units, and a 21.4'-front yard setback for the single family home addition, both of which are located in the 40'-Meadowood Road front yard setback.
- This case was first presented to the Board in June of 2004. The City Attorney's Office has recommended that this case be held under advisement since this time due to non-action by the Texas Supreme Court on a case (City of Dallas, Texas, et al. v. Doug Vanesko, et al.) that has similar issues to the applicant's requests for variances on the site (permit issued in error by a city employee).
- In November of 2004, the Board was informed that the status of the "Vanesko case" in the Texas Supreme Court was as follows:
 - 1) Appellants' (the Board, City, & Building Official) had submitted a brief on the merits of the appeal;
 - 2) Appellees' brief was due November 8, 2004 by 3pm;
 - 3) Appellants' reply brief was due by November 23, 2004;
 - 4) Only then was the Court expected to review all the material and decide whether it will hear the appeal. The City Attorney's Office expected but would not guarantee that the decision on whether to hear the appeal would be made by either December 2004 or January 2005.

- On January 18, 2005, the Assistant City Attorney involved with the “Vanesko case” mentioned above submitted a memo to the Board of Adjustment (see Attachment B). The memo stated that the Texas Supreme Court had granted the Petition for Review submitted by the City, the Board, and the Building Official. The memo stated that the Court would hear oral argument in the City of Dallas, Texas, et al. v. Doug Vanesko, et al. appeal on February 15th, and that he did not expect the Court to issue an opinion until several months after oral argument.
- The only additional information that materialized from what was submitted in November of 2004 and February of 2005 was evidence from counsel to property owners who oppose the request (see Attachment C).
- On February, 3, 2005, the applicant’s representative requested that the Board Administrator re-distribute his 23-section notebook of material on the matter (originally submitted in November of 2004) back to Board members at the February 14th briefing.
- On February 14, 2005, the Board of Adjustment heard testimony from the applicant and interested parties, and delayed action on this matter until March 14, 2005. The board encouraged the applicant and the neighbors who opposed the request to meet and determine if any resolution could be reached on the matters at hand.
- On February 18, 2005, the Board Administrator left a message with the applicant’s representative informing him of the February 25th deadline to submit any additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis and to incorporate into the board’s docket.
- As of March 7, 2005, no additional information had been submitted to staff from either the applicant or the neighboring property owners.
- On March 14, 2005, the Board of Adjustment Panel C conducted a public hearing on the requests and delayed action until April 20, 2005.
- The following information was submitted at the March 14th public hearing (see Attachment D):
 - A March 9, 2005 letter from the applicant’s attorney to the attorney of an opposing property owner to the variance request documenting his and the applicant’s intent to meet, and the applicant’s understanding that the opposing property owner would not accept an offer from the applicant other that did not include demolition of the addition;
 - A March 14, 2005 letter from the attorney of an opposing property owner that formulated a proposal or “compromise solution” that involved all three property owners adjacent to the applicant’s Meadowood frontage to apply for and consent abandonment by the City of Dallas of that approximately 200 foot stretch of Meadowood to adjacent property owners; and made additional points regarding both the variances requested in case BDA 034-177 and the fence height special exception in case BDA 034-178.
 - Photos of the neighborhood from the attorney of an opposing property owner.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, subject to the submitted site/landscape plan and elevations.

The reason for the staff recommendation is the property hardship due to the two required 40’ front yard setbacks.

ADDITIONAL FACTS (reported on June 21, 2004):

- Staff recommended approval of both variance requests, subject to the submitted proposed landscape plan. Staff made this recommendation for the following reasons:
 - The site differs from other parcels of land given that it has two front yard setbacks which reduces the applicant's buildable area by an additional 30' along the northern boundary of Meadowood Road as compared to a 10' setback that would be required if the Meadowood Road side of the site were a "side yard";
 - The site is restricted in its size at 0.87 acres in area in an R-1ac (A) zoning district where most of the lots in the zoning district (as shown in the applicant's submitted "Exhibit G") are either an acre in area or exceed an acre in area;
 - Requiring compliance with the submitted proposed landscape plan as a condition to the variances would act to buffer the structures that encroach in the front yard setback from the street; and at the same time would preserve the existing rural and green environment Meadowood Road;
 - The proposed landscape plan will ensure that granting the variance will not be contrary to interest since it will match the prevalent pattern of heavily landscaped homes that front onto in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- The site is flat, somewhat irregular in shape (about 154' on the northeast, 205' on the southeast, 227' on the southwest, and 215' on the northwest), and approximately 0.879 acres in area.
- According to DCAD records, the site is developed a single family home built in 1985 with 9,200 square feet of living area; a 400 square foot "porte cache"; a 1,190 square foot attached garage; and two cabanas: one 1,230 square feet in area, and the other 624 square feet.
- The subject site has two 40' front yard setbacks: one along Rockbrook Drive and another on Meadowood Road.
- Neither the existing home nor the proposed a/c units encroaches/will encroach into the site's *Rockbrook Drive* 40' front yard setback.
- The applicant has provided a series of documents (a letter, plans, copies of permits, photos, support letters, case history information, and maps) that further explains the request and why it should be granted (see Attachment A). Part of the applicant's information includes his account as to how the addition in the front yard setback is a result of an issued building permit and numerous inspections made by city staff.
- Staff's research regarding the permit and inspections issue showed the following:
 - In the past there was a policy in existence whereby an applicant could waive the site plan review for minor constructions by submitting an affidavit swearing to meet all regulations.
 - In the year 2000 this policy was changed and all applicants were required to get an approval of site plans before a construction permit was issued.
 - The 2002 site plans for this property are stamped as follows: "subject to field inspector's approval." This stamp in conjunction with a signed waiver traditionally means that the site plan review was waived.
 - Staff has been unable to locate a signed waiver of site plan review but at the same time staff was unable to locate a receipt for the payment of the site plan review fee.

- Therefore, staff is unable to conclude whether a site plan review was done or was waived by the applicant.
- In either case the on site building inspector should have caught the encroachment issue at the foundation inspection stage and the structure should never have been allowed to reach the current stage of building.

June 21, 2004 Public Hearing Notes:

- In addition to verbal testimony, the applicant’s representative submitted a notebook of information to the board that included sections entitled “Power Point,” “Exhibits,” and “Green Tags” (see Attachment A).
- Given the applicant’s contention that the structure on the site located in the front yard setback is a result of a permit erroneously issued by a city employee, an Assistant City Attorney submitted verbal testimony to the Board recommending that the Board delay action on this case until September of 2004 in hopes that the Texas Supreme Court will have taken action on the City’s petition for review in City of Dallas, et al v. Doug Venesko, et al. (This court matter involves a Board of Adjustment case heard in 1999 where the applicant sought relief to the height regulations through a variance request to address his home that was constructed as a result of an erroneously issued building permit. The board denied the applicant’s request and the applicant, in turn, appealed the board decision to court where the court overturned the board’s denial decision).
- The applicant and his representative established with the Building Inspection Development Code Specialist that the owner would be able to move into his home prior to the board’s consideration on this matter if indeed, action on the variance request were to be delayed until September of 2004. The applicant (and his representative) promised that there would be no further finish-out work for the part of the home that is located within the 40’ front yard setback, and that temporary air conditioning units would be placed outside the setback (rather than construct proposed permanent air conditioning units in the Meadowood Road front yard setback).
- The applicant and his representative stated that any building permits issued on the site not affected by the 40’ front yard setback between the June hearing and the September hearing would not be introduced as evidence as to why a variance should be granted on the site if action on the request were to be delayed until September of 2004.
- The applicant, his representative, and the opposition who provided testimony at the hearing indicated their support in delaying action on this matter until September of 2004.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-1 ac (A)
North: R-1 ac (A)
South: R-1 ac (A)
East: R-1 ac (A)
West: R-1 ac (A)

Land Use:

The site is developed with a single family home. The area to the north is undeveloped; and the areas to the east, south, and west are developed with single-family homes.

Zoning/BDA History:

1. BDA034-178, 9863 Rockbrook Drive (the subject site) On June 21, 2004, the Board of Adjustment Panel C will consider a request for a special exception of 4 feet requested in conjunction with maintaining an existing fence/wall along Rockbrook Drive and constructing a new fence along Rockbrook Drive and Meadowood Road.
2. BDA023-138, 9863 Rockbrook Drive (the subject site) On April 19, 2004, the Board of Adjustment Panel C denied a request for a variance to the front yard setback regulations of 23 feet without prejudice. The staff had recommended that the board grant the request, subject to compliance with the submitted site plan. The case report states that variances to the front yard setback regulations were requested to maintain an approximately 700 square foot portion of a two-story single family home, and to add an a/c unit both either located or to be located in the Meadowood Road front yard setback.
3. BDA88-063, 9844 Rockbrook Drive (the lot at the southeast corner of Rockbrook Drive and Meadowood Road) On May 10, 1988, the Board of Adjustment followed the staff recommendation and granted the appeals as requested for a variance to the front yard setback regulations of 30' and a "variance" to the fence regulations of 4 feet. The case report indicates that the front yard variance was requested for to maintain a swimming pool in the Meadowood Drive front yard setback, and an 8' high chain link fence.
4. BDA95-063, 9815 Rockbrook Drive (the lot located four lots south of the subject site) On May 23, 1995, the Board of Adjustment followed the staff recommendation and denied a request for a variance to the height regulations of 3', granted a special exception to the single family regulations, and denied a request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of 7 feet. The case report indicated that the height variance was requested in conjunction with a home that would reach 53' in height, a special exception to the single family regulations for a home with an

additional kitchen in a cabana, and a fence special exception to erect a 10' high open metal fence with 11' high masonry columns.

Timeline:

- April 30, 2004: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report (see Attachment A).
- May 14, 2004 The case was assigned to Board of Adjustment Panel C given the site's history with this panel and in order to comply with the Board's Rules of Procedure that state that "if a subsequent case is filed concerning the same request, that case must be returned to the panel hearing the previously filed case."
- May 14, 2004 The Board Administrator left a message with the applicant's representative requesting a return call to share information about the request.
- May 17, 2004: The applicant's representative met with the Board Administrator where the following information was discussed:
- the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application;
 - the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request;
 - the importance of evidence submitted by the applicant with regard to the board's decision since the code states that the applicant has the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant favorable action by the board;
 - the May 26th deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their recommendation; and
 - that the board will take action on the matter at the June 21st public hearing after considering the staff recommendation that will be made at the June 2nd staff review team meeting, and all other information/evidence and testimony presented to them by the applicant and all other interested parties.
- May 25, 2004 The applicant submitted a series of documents (a letter, plans, copies of permits, photos, support letters, case history information, and maps) that further explained the request and why it should be granted (see Attachment A).
- June 2, 2004 The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the June public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Board of

Adjustment Staff Development Code Specialist, the Development Services Transportation Engineer, the Chief Arborist, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board of Adjustment.

- June 9, 2004 The applicant submitted a revised site plan, a proposed landscape plan, and revised proposed fence elevations (see Attachment A).
- June 21, 2004 Panel C conducted a public hearing on the matters (see the "June 21, 2004 Public Hearing Notes" section of this case report for further details).
- August 27, 2004 The applicant submitted the following to staff (see Attachment A):
- A copy of a receipt and a letter the applicant describes it as "a receipt for a site plan review administered at the time the plans were approved for the addition that the subject of the discussion in this matters."
 - A copy of a permit for the addition with the letter stating that "the site plan review is clearly indicative that the City of Dallas approved the addition before construction had started and is consistent with the green tags that were issued on the property and other approvals given to the applicant and/or his agents regarding construction."
- August 30, 2004 The applicant submitted a letter to staff (see Attachment A) documenting his position on delaying action on this matter with the understanding the City Attorney's office will instruct the Board of Adjustment for an additional delay.
- August 30, 2004 The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the September public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Staff Development Code Specialist, the Development Services Transportation Engineer, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board of Adjustment.

BASIS FOR A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE: 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, coverage, floor area ratios, height, minimum sidewalks, off-street parking or off-street loading, or landscape regulations that 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. The variance must be necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land which 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 in districts with the same zoning classification. A variance may 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 in districts with the same zoning classification.

CASE ANALYSIS:

Purpose/Intent of the front yard setback regulation: The front yard setback regulations for single family districts were intended to create a better urban design and allow for openness and a consistent pattern of development along the streets.

Approval of the requests will result in allowing existing home to remain on the site in its current configuration and to add an a/c unit in the front yard setback on the site. The proposed landscape plan will hide the encroachment behind a live screen similar to the neighboring properties along the street and will therefore maintain the country look of the neighborhood.

Denial of the requests will result in both the existing addition being torn down and the a/c units being relocated outside the front yard setback; or the applicant redesigning and reconstructing the addition outside the front yard setback; or the house not having an addition.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: June 21, 2004

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Donald E. Godwin, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX
Randall Goss, 10210 N. Central Expwy., Suite 500
Dallas, TX
Ray Martinez, 1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

APPEARING FOR THE CITY: Chris Bowers, 1500 Marilla, 7DN, Dallas, TX

MOTION: Isenberg

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, hold this matter under advisement until **September 20, 2004**.

SECONDED: Neumann

AYES: 5 – Smith, Hines, Bach, Isenberg, Neumann

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: September 20, 2004

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

MOTION: Smith

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, hold this matter under advisement until **November 15, 2004**.

SECONDED: Bach

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Isenberg, Bach, Wise

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: November 15, 2004

2:08 P.M. Went into Executive Session

2:39 P.M. Executive Session Ends

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX
Randall Goss, 9863 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
William Solemeue, 4400 Williamsburg Rd., Dallas, TX
Hudson Lockett, 5737 Velasco, Dallas, TX
Nickey Oates, 4335 Lorraine, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX
Frank Trabold, 9908 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Jim Moore, 9938 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Will Rose, 4608 Meadowood, Dallas, TX
Marilyn Fulbright, 9945 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Bob Hamer, 4418 Beechwood Ln, Dallas, TX

MOTION: Smith

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, hold this matter under advisement until **February 14, 2005**.

SECONDED: Neumann

AYES: 4 – Madrigal, Smith, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 4 –0 (unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: February 14, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX
Randall Goss, 10210 N. Central Expwy., Suite 500 Dallas, TX
Hudson Lockett, 5735 Velasco, Dallas, TX
Nickey Oates, 4335 Lorraine, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

3:32 P.M.: Went into Executive Session

4:00 P.M.: Executive Session Ends

MOTION#1: Wise

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, hold this matter under advisement until **June 13, 2005**.

SECONDED: Gomez

AYES: 2 – Wise, Gomez

NAYS: 3– Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann,

MOTION FAILED: 2 – 3

MOTION#2: Neumann

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, hold this matter under advisement until **March 14, 2005**.

SECONDED: Chortek

AYES: 3 – Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann

NAYS: 3– Wise, Gomez

MOTION PASSED: 3 – 2

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: March 14, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

1:45 P.M.: Went into Executive Session

2:21 P.M.: Executive Session Ends

4:15 P.M.: David Chortek excused from hearing

MOTION: Neumann

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, hold this matter under advisement until **April 18, 2005**.

SECONDED: Wise

AYES: 3 – Madrigal, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 1– Smith

MOTION PASSED: 3 – 1

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: April 18, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Ray Martinez, 1601 Elm St., Dallas, TX
Randall Goss, 9863 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX
Susan Spalter, 9922 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Charles Price, 9839 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX

Michael Jung, 7143 Fisher Road, Dallas, TX
Jim Moore, 9938 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Marilyn Fulbright, 9945 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Frank Trabold, 9908 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX

MOTION#1: Neumann

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-177**, on application of Randall Goss, having considered the following additional factors, to wit: Whether the permit was issued in error, whether construction has commenced or been completed; and whether the administrative official's error was the sole cause of the hardship, **grant** the variance of **23** feet to the front yard setback regulations, 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 result in unnecessary hardship to this applicant. I further move that the following conditions be imposed to further the purpose and intent of the Dallas Development Code:

- Compliance with the submitted site/landscape plan and elevation is required; and
- Relocation of the air conditioning units outside a required setback.

SECONDED: Chortek

AYES: 4 – Madrigal, Smith, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0 –

ABSTENTION: 1- Wise

MOTION PASSED: 4 – 1

FILE NUMBER: BDA 034-178

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT:

Application of Randall Goss, represented by Raymond Martinez, Ford and Harrison, for a special exception to the fence regulations at 9863 Rockbrook Drive. This property is more fully described as Lot 32 in City Block 5543 and is zoned R-1ac (A) which limits the height of a fence in the front yard to 4 feet. The applicant proposes to construct an 8 foot fence in the required front yard setback which would require a special exception of 4 feet. Referred to Board of Adjustment in accordance with Section 51A-3.102 (d) (3) of the Dallas Development Code, as amended, which states the power of the Board to grant special exceptions.

LOCATION: 9863 Rockbrook Drive

APPLICANT: Randall Goss
Represented by Raymond Martinez, Ford and Harrison

SUMMARY:

- Special exceptions to the fence height regulations of up to 4' are requested in conjunction with:

- constructing a 6'-high decorative wrought iron fence with 6'-6" high masonry columns, and 6'-high wrought iron entry gates in the required Rockbrook Drive and Meadowood Road front yard setbacks; and
- maintaining a portion of an existing 8' high masonry wall in the Rockbrook Drive front yard setback.
- This case is related to the BDA 034-177 in that it has the same applicant and is located on the same site. This fence height special exception request was first presented along with the variance matter in BDA 034-177 to the Board in June of 2004. The applicant asked that the two cases be heard and considered together. As a result, this appeal has been delayed in June, September and November of 2004, and February of 2005.
- The City Attorney's Office has recommended that this case (and BDA 034-177) be held under advisement since June of 2004 due to non-action by the Texas Supreme Court on a case (City of Dallas, Texas, et al. v. Doug Vanesko, et al.) that has similar issues to the applicant's requests for variances on the site (permit issued in error by a city employee).
- In November of 2004, the Board was informed that the status of the "Vanesko case" in the Texas Supreme Court was as follows:
 1. Appellants' (the Board, City, & Building Official) had submitted a brief on the merits of the appeal;
 2. Appellees' brief was due November 8, 2004 by 3pm;
 3. Appellants' reply brief was due by November 23, 2004;
 4. Only then was the Court expected to review all the material and decide whether it will hear the appeal. The City Attorney's Office expected but would not guarantee that the decision on whether to hear the appeal would be made by either December 2004 or January 2005.
- On January 18, 2005, the Assistant City Attorney involved with the "Vanesko case" mentioned above submitted a memo to the Board of Adjustment (see Attachment B). The memo stated that the Texas Supreme Court had granted the Petition for Review submitted by the City, the Board, and the Building Official. The memo stated that the Court would hear oral argument in the City of Dallas, Texas, et al. v. Doug Vanesko, et al. appeal on February 15th, and that he did not expect the Court to issue an opinion until several months after oral argument.
- The only additional information that materialized from what was submitted in November of 2004 and February of 2005 was evidence from counsel to property owners who oppose the request (see Attachment C).
- On February, 3, 2005, the applicant's representative requested that the Board Administrator re-distribute his 23-section notebook of material on the matter (originally submitted in November of 2004) back to Board members at the February 14th briefing.
- On February 14, 2005, the Board of Adjustment heard testimony from the applicant and interested parties, and delayed action on this matter until March 14, 2005. The board encouraged the applicant and the neighbors who opposed the request to meet and determine if any resolution could be reached on the matters at hand.
- On February 18, 2005, the Board Administrator left a message with the applicant's representative informing him of the February 25th deadline to submit any additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis and to incorporate into the board's docket.
- As of March 4, 2005, no additional information had been submitted to staff from either the applicant or the neighboring property owners.
- On March 14, 2005, the Board of Adjustment Panel C conducted a public hearing on the requests and delayed action until April 20, 2005.

- The following information was submitted at the March 14th public hearing (see Attachment D):
 - A March 9, 2005 letter from the applicant's attorney to the attorney of an opposing property owner to the variance request documenting his and the applicant's intent to meet, and the applicant's understanding that the opposing property owner would not accept an offer from the applicant other than that did not include demolition of the addition;
 - A March 14, 2005 letter from the attorney of an opposing property owner that formulated a proposal or "compromise solution" that involved all three property owners adjacent to the applicant's Meadowood frontage to apply for and consent abandonment by the City of Dallas of that approximately 200 foot stretch of Meadowood to adjacent property owners; and made additional points regarding both the variances requested in case BDA 034-177 and the fence height special exception in case BDA 034-178.
 - Photos of the neighborhood from the attorney of an opposing property owner.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, subject to compliance with the submitted "proposed landscape plan" and "proposed elevations".

Staff concluded that the proposed fence, gates, and columns would not adversely affect neighboring property because:

- The "proposed landscape plan" documents existing landscape materials to be retained and proposed materials to be added on the site which reduces the fence's impact on neighboring properties, and the proposed landscaping is shown to be compatible with the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood.

ADDITIONAL FACTS (reported on June 21, 2004):

- The proposed fence characteristics in the *Rockbrook Drive* 40' front yard setback are as follows:
 - About 200' in length;
 - Designed to run generally parallel to the street but with a small curve in the center of the site with a few graduated setbacks;
 - Located approximately from 3' – 10' from the property line or about 20' – 27' from the pavement line;
 - Located where about two single-family homes have direct/indirect frontage to the proposed fence, neither of which appear to have a fence located in their required front yards higher than 4' in height.
- A landscape plan has been proposed to screen the fence. The characteristics of this plan along Rockbrook Drive are as follows:
 - Existing Magnolia trees,
 - 6'- 8' 0" ht. evergreen screen planting in front of fence (Nellie R. Stevens);
 - New evergreen shrub planting 4' – 5' 0" ht. in front of wrought iron fence to allow filtered view to front of house;
 - Groundcover & low shrubs in front of screen planting;
 - Seasonal color & shrubs to frame main entry;
 - 6' 0" ht. wrought iron fence behind evergreen screen hedge.
- The proposed fence characteristics in the *Meadowood Road* 40' front yard setback are as follows:
 - About 150' in length;
 - Designed to run parallel to the street;
 - Located approximately 10' from the property line or about 25' from the pavement line;

- Located where no single family home has direct frontage and about two single-family homes have indirect frontage to the proposed fence, none of which appear to have a fence located in their required front yards higher than 4' in height.
- The proposed landscape plan characteristics are along Meadowood Road are as follows:
 - add 6' – 8' 0" evergreen hedge along outside of wall along alley;
 - 6'- 0" masonry screen wall behind evergreen planting;
 - 6'- 8' 0" height evergreen screen planting along outside of fence (Nellie R. Stevens Holly);
 - 6' – 0" wrought iron fence behind screen planting;
 - 14' – 16' ht. evergreen trees behind fence to screen views of house (Savannah Holly);
 - Preserve existing Magnolia trees (evaluate on site);
 - 3' – 5' 0" shrub plantings @ corner of property;
 - Seasonal color or perennials.

June 21, 2004 Public Hearing Notes:

- Staff recommended approval of the request, subject to the submitted “proposed landscape plan” and “proposed elevations”. Staff made this recommendation since the “proposed landscape plan” documented existing landscape materials to be retained and proposed materials to be added on the site, which reduced the fence’s impact on neighboring properties, and the proposed landscaping shown was compatible with the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood.
- In addition to verbal testimony, the applicant’s representative submitted a notebook of information to the board that included sections entitled “Power Point,” “Exhibits,” and “Green Tags” (see Attachment A).
- Given the applicant’s contention that the structure on the site in the front yard setback (related to BDA034-177) is a result of a permit erroneously issued by a city employee, an Assistant City Attorney submitted verbal testimony to the board recommending that the Board delay action on this case until September of 2004 in hopes that the Texas Supreme Court will have taken action on the City’s petition for review in City of Dallas, et al v. Doug Venesko, et al.
- The applicant and his representative requested that the board delay action on the fence special exception until September of 2004 to coincide with their action where they delayed considering the variance request on the site.
- In addition to verbal testimony, the opposition to this request submitted photographs of what they contended to be a wood fence being constructed in the Meadowbrook Road front yard setback that was higher than 4 feet. (These photographs will be available for review upon request at the briefing and public hearing).. The applicant and his representative stated they would immediately investigate this matter with the contractor on the site, and assured the board that any fence that was being constructed on the site would either be in (or be brought into) compliance with the fence regulations until the board’s hearing in September of 2004.
- The applicant, his representative, and the opposition who provided testimony at the hearing indicated their support in delaying action on both the variance request related to BDA 034-177 and the fence special exception matter in this application until September of 2004.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Zoning:

Site: R-1ac (A)

North: R-1ac (A)
South: R-1ac (A)
East: R-1ac (A)
West: R-1ac (A)

Land Use:

The site is developed with a single family home. The area to the north is undeveloped; and the areas to the east, south, and west are developed with single-family homes.

Zoning/BDA History:

1. BDA034-177, 9863 Rockbrook Drive (the subject site) On June 21, 2004, the Board of Adjustment Panel C will consider a request for a variance to the front yard setback regulations of 23 feet to maintain an approximately 700 square foot portion of a two-story single family home, and to add an a/c unit both either located or to be located in the Meadowood Road front yard setback.
2. BDA023-138, 9863 Rockbrook Drive (the subject site) On April 19, 2004, the Board of Adjustment Panel C denied a request for a variance to the front yard setback regulations of 23 feet without prejudice. The staff had recommended that the board grant the request, subject to compliance with the submitted site plan. The case report states that variances to the front yard setback regulations were requested to maintain an approximately 700 square foot portion of a two-story single family home, and to add an a/c unit both either located or to be located in the Meadowood Road front yard setback.
3. BDA88-063, 9844 Rockbrook Drive (the lot at the southeast corner of Rockbrook Drive and Meadowood Road) On May 10, 1988, the Board of Adjustment followed the staff recommendation and granted the appeals as requested for a variance to the front yard setback regulations of 30' and a "variance" to the fence regulations of 4 feet. The case report indicates that the front yard variance was requested for to maintain a swimming pool in the Meadowood Drive front yard setback, and an 8' high chain link fence.
4. BDA95-063, 9815 Rockbrook Drive (the lot located four lots south of the subject site) On May 230, 1995, the Board of Adjustment followed the staff recommendation and denied a request for a variance to the height regulations of 3', granted a special exception to the single family regulations, and denied a request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of 7 feet. The case report indicated that the height variance was requested in

- conjunction with a home that would reach 53' in height, a special exception to the single family regulations for a home with an additional kitchen in a cabana, and a fence special exception to erect a 10' high open metal fence with 11' high masonry columns. On June 23, 1992, the Board of Adjustment followed the staff recommendation and granted a request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of 4' 4". The board imposed the following condition: That the gate and driveway meet all requirements of the visibility obstruction provided in the Dallas Development Code. The case report indicated that request was to maintain a wrought iron and chain link fence with "an average height of 7 feet with a maximum height of 8' 4").
5. BDA92-051, 9839 Rockbrook Drive (the lot located two lots southwest of the subject site)
 6. BDA012-139, 9908 Rockbrook Drive (the lot located at the northeast corner of Rockbrook Drive and Meadowood Road)
 7. BDA989-191, 9662 Rockbrook Drive (the lot located three lots northeast of the subject site)
- On February 26, 2002, the Board of Adjustment Panel A followed the staff recommendation and granted a request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of 2' 6" and imposed the following conditions: Compliance with the submitted site/fence elevation plan and landscape plan is required; and the existing landscaping (hedge) shall remain in place along the entire length of the 6' high vinyl coated (black) cyclone fence along Meadowood Road, or when needed must be replaced and retained with minimum 6' height at maturity such that the entire length of the fence will not be visible from Meadowood Road. The case report states that the special exception was requested in conjunction with erecting a "6' 0" high vinyl coated (black) cyclone fence" in the Meadowood Road front yard to replace a "6' 6" high existing galvanized cyclone fence." (The request did not include any proposed fence in the Rockbrook Drive front yard setback).
- On April 20, 1999, the Board of Adjustment Panel B followed the staff recommendation and denied a request for a special

exception to the fence height regulations of 6 feet. The case report indicated that request was to construct an 8' high open metal fence, 8', 8" high columns, and 10' high open metal entry gates.

Timeline:

- April 30, 2004: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report (see Attachment A).
- May 14, 2004 The case was assigned to Board of Adjustment Panel C given the site's history with this panel and in order to comply with the Board's Rules of Procedure that state that "if a subsequent case is filed concerning the same request, that case must be returned to the panel hearing the previously filed case."
- May 14, 2004 The Board Administrator left a message with the applicant's representative requesting a return call to share information about the request.
- May 17, 2004: The applicant's representative met with the Board Administrator where the following information was discussed:
- the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application;
 - the criteria/standard that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the request;
 - the importance of evidence submitted by the applicant with regard to the board's decision since the code states that the applicant has the burden of proof to establish the necessary facts to warrant favorable action by the board;
 - the May 26th deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their recommendation; and
 - that the board will take action on the matter at the June 21st public hearing after considering the staff recommendation that will be made at the June 2nd staff review team meeting, and all other information/evidence and testimony presented to them by the applicant and all other interested parties.
- May 20, 2004: The Board Administrator conducted a field visit of the site and surrounding area and noted the following fences above four (4) feet high in the immediate area (approximately 500 feet in each direction from the site along Rockbrook Drive and Meadowood Road) which appeared to be located in the front yard setback (Note that these locations and dimensions are approximations):
- Along Rockbrook Drive:
 - An approximately 6 high open wrought iron fence with 6.5' high brick columns and 10' high brick columns about 20' from the pavement line that is located two lots south of the site;
 - An approximately 6.5' high open metal fence behind significant landscaping that is located two lots southwest of the site (and a result of board action on BDA 92-051);

- Along Meadowood Road:
 - An approximately 6' high open fences behind significant landscaping that is located immediately east (and a result of board action on BDA012-139).

May 25, 2004 The applicant submitted a series of documents (a letter, elevations, photos, support letters, case history information, and maps) that further explained the request and why it should be granted (see Attachment A).

June 2, 2004 The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the June public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Staff Development Code Specialist, the Development Services Transportation Engineer, the Chief Arborist, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board of Adjustment.

June 4, 2004 The Board of Adjustment Chief Planner met with the applicant's representative where an agreement was made that if revised site and elevation plans were submitted, staff would support the fence special exception request.

June 9, 2004 The applicant submitted a revised site plan, a proposed landscape plan, and revised proposed fence elevations (see Attachment A).

June 21, 2004 Panel C conducted a public hearing on the matters (see the "June 21, 2004 Pubic Hearing Notes" section of this case report for further details).

August 27, 2004 The applicant submitted the following to staff (see Attachment A):

- A copy of a receipt and a letter the applicant describes it as "a receipt for a site plan review administered at the time the plans were approved for the addition that the subject of the discussion in this matters."
- A copy of a permit for the addition with the letter stating that "the site plan review is clearly indicative that the City of Dallas approved the addition before construction had started and is consistent with the green tags that were issued on the property and other approvals given to the applicant and/or his agents regarding construction."

August 30, 2004 The applicant submitted a letter to staff (see Attachment A) documenting his position on delaying action on this matter with the understanding the City Attorney's office will instruct the Board of Adjustment for an additional delay.

August 30, 2004 The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the September public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Board of Adjustment Staff Development Code Specialist, the Development Services Transportation Engineer, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board of Adjustment.

BASIS FOR REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FENCE HEIGHT REGULATIONS: Section 51A-4.602 states that the board may grant a special exception to the height requirement for fences when in the opinion of the board, the special exception will not adversely affect neighboring property.

CASE ANALYSIS:

Purpose/Intent of the maximum 4' fence height regulations in single family zoning districts: The maximum fence height regulation of 4' in single family districts was intended to ensure a certain level of openness and continuity along the streets in single family neighborhoods.

Approval of the request will result in allowing a fence 2 feet higher than the allowed 4 feet. If the staff suggested conditions were to be imposed, the materials, location, and design of the fence above 4' in height would be restricted to specifically what is shown on the submitted fence elevations and landscape plan. In addition, the specific landscape materials would be required to be installed and maintained as long as there was a fence in the front yard higher than 4 feet. This condition would ensure that the fence would not be visible from the street and the existing country feel along streets in the neighborhood would be preserved.

Denial of the request will result in either the plans for the fence to be cancelled; the fence to be located in its proposed location but redesigned to reach a height not greater than 4 feet; or the fence to be erected at its proposed height but relocated at or behind the 40' front yard setback lines.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: June 21, 2004

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Donald E. Godwin, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX
Randall Goss, 10210 N. Central Expwy., Suite 500
Dallas, TX
Ray Martinez, 1201 Main St., Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

APPEARING FOR THE CITY: Chris Bowers, 1500 Marilla, 7DN, Dallas, TX

MOTION: Bach

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, hold this matter under advisement until **September 20, 2004**.

SECONDED: Wise

AYES: 5 – Smith, Hines, Bach, Isenberg, Neumann

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: September 20, 2004

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

MOTION: **Smith**

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, hold this matter under advisement until **November 15, 2004**.

SECONDED: **Bach**

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Isenberg, Bach, Wise

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: November 15, 2004

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

MOTION: **Smith**

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, hold this matter under advisement until **February 14, 2005**.

SECONDED: **Neumann**

AYES: 4 – Madrigal, Smith, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 4 –0 (unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: February 14, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

Randall Goss, 10210 N. Central Expwy., Suite 500
Dallas, TX

Harold Leidner, 1601 Surveyor Blvd, Carrollton, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX

MOTION#1: **Chortek**

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, hold this matter under advisement until **March 14, 2005**.

SECONDED: **Neumann**

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann, Wise, Gomez

NAYS: 0 –

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (Unanimously)

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: March 14, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

Randall Goss, 10210 N. Central Expwy., Suite 500
Dallas, TX

Hudson Lockett, 5735 Velasco, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX
Frank Trabold, 9908 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Charles Price, 9839 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Jim Moore, 9938 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Susan Spalter, 9922 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Will Rose, 4608 Meadowood, Dallas, TX
Mark Godrin, 4520 Meadowood, Dallas, TX
William Gillies, 9851 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Cynthia Schneider, MD, 9930 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX

1:45 P.M.: Went into Executive Session

2:21 P.M.: Executive Session Ends

MOTION#1: **Smith**

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, **deny** the special exception requested by this applicant **without prejudice**, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that granting the application would adversely affect neighboring property.

SECONDED: **Wise**

AYES: 2 – Smith, Wise

NAYS: 3– Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann

MOTION FAILED: 2 – 3

MOTION#2: **Neumann**

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, on application of Randall Goss, **grant** the request of this applicant to maintain an 8 foot fence on the property as a special exception to the height requirement for fences contained in the Dallas Development Code, 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 submitted “Proposed Landscape Plan” and “Proposed Elevations” is required.

SECONDED: **Chortek**

AYES: 3 – Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann

NAYS: 2– Smith, Wise

MOTION FAILED: 3 – 2 (**Therefore deemed denied with prejudice**)

MOTION #3: **Smith**

I move to re-open the above referenced case.

SECONDED: **Wise**

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0–

MOTION PASSED: 5 –0

MOTION #4: Smith

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, **deny** the special exception requested by this applicant **without prejudice**, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that granting the application would adversely affect neighboring property.

There was no second to this Motion

MOTION #5: Neumann

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, hold this matter under advisement until **April 18, 2005**.

SECONDED: Chortek

AYES: 3 – Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann

NAYS: 2 – Wise, Smith

MOTION PASSED: 3 – 2

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: April 18, 2005

APPEARING IN FAVOR: Raymond Martinez, 1201 Elm St., Suite 1700, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: Randall Goss, 10210 N. Central Expwy., Suite 500
Jonathan Vinson, 901 Main Street, Dallas, TX
Will Rose, 4608 Meadowood, Dallas, TX
Marilyn Fulbright, 9945 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX
Jim Moore, 9938 Rockbrook, Dallas, TX

MOTION#1: Chortek

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, on application of Randall Goss, **grant** the request of this applicant to maintain two columns 8 feet high and a 6 foot 6 inch fence on the property as a special exception to the height requirement for fences contained in the Dallas Development Code, 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 submitted site plan and elevations is required.

SECONDED: Neumann

AYES: 3 – Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann

NAYS: 2 – Smith, Wise

MOTION FAILED: 3-2 (Therefore deemed denied with prejudice)

MOTION#2: Wise

I move to re-open the above referenced case.

SECONDED: Neumann

AYES: 4 – Madrigal, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 1 – Smith

MOTION PASSED: 4 – 1

MOTION#3: Wise

I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. **BDA 034-178**, on application of Randall Goss, **deny** the special exception requested by this applicant **without prejudice**, because our evaluation of the property and the testimony shows that granting the application would adversely affect neighboring property.

SECONDED: Neumann

AYES: 5 – Madrigal, Smith, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0 –

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0

MOTION: Smith

I move to adjourn this meeting.

SECONDED: Neumann

AYES: 5 –Madrigal, Smith, Chortek, Neumann, Wise

NAYS: 0 - None

MOTION PASSED: 5 – 0 (Unanimously)

5:12 P. M. - Board Meeting adjourned for **April 18, 2005.**

CHAIRPERSON

BOARD ADMINISTRATOR

BOARD SECRETARY

Note: For detailed information on testimony, refer to the tape retained on file in the Department of Planning and Development.