|  | ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, PANEL A TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017 AGENDA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRIEFING | LIFN CONFERENCE CENTER AUDITORIUM 1500 MARILLA STREET DALLAS CITY HALL | 11:00 A.M. |
| PUBLIC HEARING | L1FN CONFERENCE CENTER AUDITORIUM 1500 MARILLA STREET DALLAS CITY HALL | 1:00 P.M. |
|  | Donna Moorman, Chief Planner Steve Long, Board Administrator |  |
|  | MISCELLANEOUS ITEM |  |
|  | Approval of the February 21, 2017 Panel A Public Hearing Minutes | M1 |
| HOLDOVER CASES |  |  |
| BDA167-013(SL) | 5314 Yolanda Lane <br> REQUEST: - Application of Nathaniel Mangum for special exceptions to the fence standards and visual obstruction regulations | 1 |
| BDA167-020(SL) | 100 Crescent Court <br> REQUEST: Application of Robert Reeves, represented by Robert Reeves and Associates, Inc., for a special exception to the landscape regulations | 2 |

## REGULAR CASES

BDA167-029(SL)

13439 Preston Road
REQUEST: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations


13131 Preston Road
REQUEST: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations

13131 Preston Road
REQUEST: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations

## EXECUTIVE SESSION NOTICE

The Commission/Board may hold a closed executive session regarding any item on this agenda when:

1. seeking the advice of its attorney about pending or contemplated litigation, settlement offers, or any matter in which the duty of the attorney to the Commission/Board under the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of Texas clearly conflicts with the Texas Open Meetings Act. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.071]
2. deliberating the purchase, exchange, lease, or value of real property if deliberation in an open meeting would have a detrimental effect on the position of the city in negotiations with a third person. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.072]
3. deliberating a negotiated contract for a prospective gift or donation to the city if deliberation in an open meeting would have a detrimental effect on the position of the city in negotiations with a third person. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.073]
4. deliberating the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline, or dismissal of a public officer or employee; or to hear a compliant or charge against an officer or employee unless the officer or employee who is the subject of the deliberation or hearing requests a public hearing. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.074]
5. deliberating the deployment, or specific occasions for implementation, of security personnel or devices.. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.076]
6. discussing or deliberating commercial or financial information that the city has received from a business prospect that the city seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the city and with which the city is conducting economic development negotiations; or deliberating the offer of a financial or other incentive to a business prospect. [Tex. Govt. Code §551.086]
(Rev. 6-24-02)

FILE NUMBER: BDA167-013(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Nathaniel Mangum for special exceptions to the fence standards and visual obstruction regulations at 5314 Yolanda Lane. This property is more fully described as Lot 7, Block E/5518, and is zoned R$1 \mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{A})$, which limits the height of a fence in the front yard to 4 feet and requires a 20 foot visibility triangle at driveway approaches. The applicant proposes to construct and maintain a 7 foot 2 inch high fence in a required front yard, which will require a 3 foot 2 inch special exception to the fence standards, and to locate and maintain items in required visibility triangles, which will require special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations.

## LOCATION: 5314 Yolanda Lane

## APPLICANT: Nathaniel Mangum

## REQUESTS:

The following requests have been made on a site that is developed with a single family home:

1. A request for a special exception to the fence standards of up to 3 ' 2 " is made to maintain a fence (a 5' 7" high open metal picket fence with 5' 7" high posts, and two arched open metal picket gates ranging in height from 5' 7" to $7^{\prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$ ) higher than $4^{\prime}$ in height in the site's required front yard.
2. Requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations are made to maintain portions of the aforementioned open metal picket fence in four 20 ' visibility triangles at the two driveways into the site.

## STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FENCE STANDARDS:

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

## STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO THE VISUAL OBSTRUCTION REGULATIONS:

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

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION (fence standards):

No staff recommendation is made on this or any request for a special exception to the fence standards since the basis for this type of appeal is when in the opinion of the board, the special exception will not adversely affect neighboring property.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION (visual obstruction special exceptions):

Denial
Rationale:

- Staff concurred with the Sustainable Development Department Assistant Director of Engineering who recommends that these requests be denied.
- Staff concluded that requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations should be denied because the applicant had not substantiated how the existing 5' 7" high open metal picket fence with 5' 7" high posts in four 20 ' visibility triangles at the two driveways into the site from the street do not constitute a traffic hazard.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

> | Site: | $\begin{array}{l}\text { R-1ac(A) (Single family district } 1 \text { acre) }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| North: | R-1ac(A) (Single family district 1 acre) |
| South: | $\begin{array}{l}\text { R-1ac(A) (Single family district } 1 \text { acre) } \\ \text { East: }\end{array}$ |
| R-1ac(A) (Single family district 1 acre) |  |
| West: | R-1ac(A) (Single family district 1 acre) |

## 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.

## GENERAL FACTSISTAFF ANALYSIS (fence standards):

- This request for a special exception to the fence standards focuses on maintaining a 5' 7" high open metal picket fence with 5' 7" high posts, and two arched open metal picket gates ranging in height from 5' 7" to 7' $\mathbf{2 "}^{\prime \prime}$ on a site developed with a single family home.
- The subject site is zoned $\mathrm{R}-1 \mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{A})$. While $\mathrm{R}-1 \mathrm{ac}(\mathrm{A})$ zoning requires a 40 ' front yard setback, the subject site has a 65' required front yard because of a platted building line.
- The Dallas Development Code states that in all residential districts except multifamily districts, a fence may not exceed 4' above grade when located in the required front yard.
- The applicant has submitted a site plan and an elevation of the proposal/existing fence in the front yard setback with notations indicating that the proposal reaches a maximum height of $7^{\prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$.
- The following additional information was gleaned from the submitted site plan:
- The proposal is represented as being approximately $200^{\prime}$ in length parallel to the street and approximately 65 ' perpendicular to the street on the east and west sides of the site in the required front yard.
- The fence proposal is represented as being located approximately on the front property line or approximately 15 ' from the pavement line.
- One single family lot fronts the existing fence, a lot that has no fence in the front yard setback.
- The Board Administrator conducted a field visit of the site and surrounding area approximately 300 feet east and west of the site and noted no other fences that appeared to be above 4' in height and located in a front yard setback.
- As of March 10, 2017, no letters have been submitted in support of the request, and 11 letters have been submitted in opposition.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing that the special exception to the fence standards of 3 ' 2 " will not adversely affect neighboring property.
- Granting this special exception of $3^{\prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$ with a condition imposed that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevation would require the proposal/existing fence exceeding $4^{\prime}$ in height in the front yard setback to be maintained in the location and of the heights and materials as shown on these documents.


## GENERAL FACTSISTAFF ANALYSIS (visual obstruction special exceptions):

- The requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations focus on maintaining portions of a $5^{\prime} 7^{\prime \prime}$ high open metal picket fence with $5^{\prime} 7^{\prime \prime}$ high posts in four 20 ' visibility triangles at the two driveways into the site.
- The Dallas Development Code states the following: 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 street intersections, and 20 foot visibility triangles at drive approaches and at alleys on properties zoned single family); and
- between two and a half and eight 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 a site plan and an elevation representing a 5' 7" high open metal picket fence in the four, $20^{\prime}$ visibility triangles at the two driveways into the site.
- The Sustainable Development Department Assistant Director of Engineering submitted a review comment sheet along with a photo (see Attachment A). The review comment sheet was marked "Recommends that this be denied" with the following additional comment: "The fence and gate create a public traffic hazard".
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing how granting the requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations to maintain portions of a 5' 7" high open metal picket fence located in four 20' visibility triangles at the two driveways into the site do not constitute a traffic hazard.
- Granting these requests with the condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevation would require the items in the visibility triangles to be limited to and maintained in the locations, height and materials as shown on these documents.


## Timeline:

November 22, 2016: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

January 6, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

January 6, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant the following information:

- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the February $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the February $10^{\text {th }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the Board's docket materials;
- the criteria/standards that the board will use in their decision to approve or deny the requests; and
- the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to documentary evidence.

February 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for February public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development Department Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

February 10, 2017: The Sustainable Development Department Assistant Director Engineering submitted a review comment sheet along with a photo (see Attachment A). The review comment sheet was marked "Recommends that this be denied" with the following additional comment: "The fence and gate create a public traffic hazard".

February 21, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Panel A conducted a public hearing on this application. The Board delayed action on this application until their next public hearing to be held on March 21, 2017.

February 23, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant the board's action; the February $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the February $10^{\text {th }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the Board's docket materials. (Note that the applicant has not submitted any additional documents from what was presented before/at the February $21^{\text {st }}$ public hearing).

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: FEBRUARY 21, 2017

APPEARING IN FAVOR: $\quad$ Nathaniel Mangum, 5314 Yolanda Lane, Dallas, TX Lindsay Mangum, 5314 Yolanda Lane, Dallas, TX

APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: No one
MOTION: Nelson
I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. BDA 167-013 hold this matter under advisement until March 21, 2017.

## SECONDED: Sibley

AYES: 5 - Schulte, Gibson, Nelson, Dutia, Sibley
NAYS: 0 -
MOTION PASSED: 5 - 0 (unanimously)



Attach A

## REVIEW COMMENT SHEET <br> BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT <br> HEARING OF FEBRUARY 21, 2017 (A)

$\square$ Has no objectionsRDA 167-013(SL)
$\square$ Has no objections if certain conditions
 are met (see comments below or attached)
Recommends that this be denied
 (see comments below or attached)
No comments $\square$

COMMENTS: $\square$

$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\square$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$

$\qquad$


Please respond to each case and provide comments that justify or elaborate on your response. Dockets distributed to the Board will indicate those who have attended the review team meeting and who have responded in writing with comments.
*Holdover case
BDA 167-013

Note that the gate and fence cause the driver to block the entire roadway constituting a traffic hazard.

APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

$$
\text { Case No.: BDA } 167-013
$$

Data Relative to Subject Property:
Date: $\qquad$ $11-22-16$
Location address: $\qquad$ 5314 Yolanda lane
$\qquad$ 1.2 Zoning District: P-1an(A)
Lot No.: $\qquad$ 7 Block No.: $E / 55 / \mathcal{F}^{\circ}$ Acreage:
$\qquad$ 199.932
$\qquad$ 3) $\qquad$ Census Tract: $\qquad$ 76.05

Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) 4) $\qquad$ 5)


To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :
Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): $\qquad$ Nathanid
Mangum Nathaniel Mangum
. $53 / 4$ Yolanda $\operatorname{Ln}$. Dallas, $\$ x$ Telephone: $\qquad$
Applicant: $\qquad$
E-mail Address: $\qquad$ self same as above Telephone: $\qquad$
Represented by:
Mailing Address: $\qquad$ Zip Code: $\qquad$
E-mail Address: $\qquad$
Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance ${ }^{\circ}$, or Special Exception $L$, of 3 feet 2 inches
in front yard
and a special exception 01 a visallo.lity triangle at driveway.
Application is made to the Board of Adjustment, in accordance with the provisions of the Dallas
Development Code, to grant the described appeal for the following reason:
$\qquad$
neighborhood style, Houses on street and
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Note to Applicant: If the appeal requested in this application is granted by the Board of Adjustment, a permit must be applied for within 180 days of the date of the final action of the Board, unless the Board specifically grants a longer period.

Affidavit
Before me the undersigned on this day personally appeared Nathaniel Nangum
(Affiant/Applicant's name printed)
who on (his/her) oath certifies that the above statements are true and correct to his/her best knowledge and that he/she is the owner/or principal/or authorized representative of the subject property.
(Rev. 08-01-11)
Respectfully submitted:


Subscribed and sworn to before me this $\qquad$ day of


July 17, 2019 1-10
иешлечэ

sydewoy

Date of Hearing

ヨH1 人日 NヨYV1 NOILכV MEMORANDUM OF

## Building Officiali＇s Report

I hereby certify that


did submit a request ：for an speqcial exception to the fence heightragulations，and for a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations $\lambda$ ．
at 5314 Yolanda Lane
t！！
risidati unot

BDA167－013．Application of Nathaniel Mangum for a special exception to the fence heigt regulations and a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations at 5314 Yolands Lane．This property is more fully described as ㅏot 7，Block E／5518，and is zoned R－1ac（A） which limits the height of a fence in the front yard to 4 feet and requires a 20 foot visibility $\because$ triangle ${ }^{-}$at driveway approaches．The applicant pringoses to construct a 7 foot 2 inch high． fence in a required front yard，which will require a 3 foot 2 inch special exception to the fence regulation，and to construct and maintain a single family residential fence structure i required visibility obstruction triangle，which will require a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulation．

Sincerely，


NOIE: PROPERTM SUAJEET TO TRRHS, CONTANED MNS, ANSTRUWENT RECORDED IN
vol. 9 , PG. 245

Notes:
HOTE: EEARMMES, EASEMENTS AND EUILDMG INES ARE GY RECORDED PLAT UNESS OTHEREMSE WOTED.
FOOD HOFF: Aocording to the FA.RM. Mo. $4814360180 \mathrm{~J}_{6}$ thle property doea fle in Zons $X$ and does nof tis whith the 100 year floosf zone.




 protruitions on ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ en graund.

| Drawn By: ATt |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Soate: $1^{+\prime}=40^{\circ}$ |  |
| Dote: $10 / 711 / 10$ |  |
| GF No.: 14156 |  |
| No. |  |



GATE PHOTO


FENCE PHOTO


# Notification List of Property Owners BDA167-013 

12 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 5325 | KELSEY RD |
| 2 | 5337 | KELSEY RD |
| 3 | 5230 | YOLANDA LN |
| 4 | 5314 | YOLANDA LN |
| 5 | 5233 | KELSEY RD |
| 6 | 5311 | KELSEY RD |
| 7 | 5351 | KELSEY RD |
| 8 | 5331 | YOLANDA LN |
| 9 | 5315 | YOLANDA LN |
| 10 | 5233 | YOLANDA LN |
| 11 | 5214 | YOLANDA LN |
| 12 | 5330 | YOLANDA LN |

Owner
SPARKS MARC A
ALLEN MICHAEL M \&
HANIG JOSEPH A \& DEBRA L
MANGUM NATHANIEL
LERER RICHARD
TRUMPOWER IAN N \&
ELMQUIST DAVID W \& ALISON M
HAFERTEPE JOE \& MAUREEN
PLATINUM SERIES DEV LLC
ZEIKUS PRIYA SWAMY \& ERIC ANDREW
SACHS WILLIAM R \&
BYRNE TIMOTHY W \&

FILE NUMBER: BDA167-020(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Robert Reeves, represented by Robert Reeves and Associates, Inc., for a special exception to the landscape regulations at 100 Crescent Court. This property is more fully described as Lot 1A, Block 2/948, and is zoned PD-193 (HC), which requires mandatory landscaping. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a structure and provide an alternate landscape plan, which will require a special exception to the landscape regulations.

## LOCATION: 100 Crescent Court

## APPLICANT: Robert Reeves

Represented by Robert Reeves and Associates, Inc.

## REQUEST:

A special exception to the landscape regulations is made to amend certain features shown on an alternate landscape plan (including but not limited to constructing and maintaining two patio areas to the mixed use development) that was imposed as a condition in conjunction with a request for a special exception to the landscape regulations granted on the subject by Board of Adjustment Panel A on August 16, 2016: BDA156-076 on the site currently developed as an approximately 1,450,000 square foot mixed use development (The Crescent).

## STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO THE LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS IN OAK LAWN:

Section 51P-193-126(a)(4) of the Dallas City Code specifies that the board may grant a special exception to the landscaping requirements of this section if, in the opinion of the Board, the special exception will not compromise the spirit and intent of this section. When feasible, the Board shall require that the applicant submit and that the property comply with a landscape plan as a condition to granting the special exception.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval, subject to the following condition:

- Compliance with the submitted alternate landscape plan dated 02-27-2017 is required.

Rationale:

- The City of Dallas Chief Arborist supports the applicant's request in that the features shown on the submitted revised landscape plan meet the spirit and intent of the PD 193 landscape requirements.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Site: PD 193(HC) (Planned Development, Heavy Commercial)
North: PD 193(HC) (Planned Development, Heavy Commercial)
South: PD 193 (PDS 334) (Planned Development, Planned Development)
East: PD 193(PDS 64) (Planned Development, Planned Development)
West: PD 193(PDS 74) (Planned Development, Planned Development)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a mixed use development (The Crescent). The areas to the north, east, south, and west are developed with a mix of land uses.

## Zoning/BDA History:

1. BDA156-076, Property at 100 ,

Crescent Court (the subject site)

On August 16, 2016, the Board of Adjustment Panel A granted a request for special exception to the landscape regulations and imposed the following conditions: 1) compliance with the submitted alternate landscape plan is required; and 2) All landscape improvements in each landscape area on the property as shown on the submitted revised landscape plan must be completed within 18 months of Board action, and landscape improvements for areas $B$ and $D$ as shown on the submitted landscape plan must be completed before the final building inspections of each permit in areas B and D, respectively.
The case report stated the request was made to amend certain features shown on an alternate landscape plan that was imposed as a condition in conjunction with a request for a special exception to the landscape regulations granted on the subject by Board of Adjustment Panel A on March 17, 2015: BDA145-037. The subject site is currently developed as an approximately $1,450,000$ square foot mixed use development (The Crescent). Note that the Board of Adjustment Panel A granted the applicant's request to waive the two year time limitation to refile a new application on this site on November 15, 2016).
2. BDA145-037, Property at 100, Crescent Court (the subject site)
3. BDA 134-042, Property at 100, Crescent Court (the subject site)
4. BDA 81-239A, Property at 100, 200, 300, 400, and 500 Crescent Court (the subject site)
5. BDA 81-239, 239, Property at 2304 Cedar Springs Road (the subject site)

On March 17, 2015, the Board of Adjustment Panel A granted a request for special exception to the landscape regulations and imposed the submitted alternate landscape plan as a condition.
The case report stated the request was made to replace an existing drive-through bank facility with an approximately 3,000 square foot restaurant, and not fully providing required landscaping on a site is currently developed as an approximately 1,450,000 square foot mixed use development (The Crescent) (Note that the Board of Adjustment Panel A granted the applicant's request to waive the two year time limitation to refile a new application on this site on June 28, 2016).
On June 24, 2014, the Board of Adjustment Panel A granted a request for special exception to the landscape regulations and imposed the submitted revised landscape plan as a condition.
The case report stated the request was made to construct and maintain an approximately 1,400 square foot addition to an approximately $1,450,000$ square foot mixed use development (The Crescent), and not fully providing required landscaping. (Note that the Board of Adjustment Panel A granted the applicant's request to waive the two year time limitation to refile a new application on this site on January 20, 2015). On February 14, 1988, the Board of Adjustment granted a request for "a 599 parking space variance and eliminate the set-aside land provisions subject to a TMP program as per the memo from Ken Melston, Manager of Transportation Engineering Services.
On October 13, 1981, the Board of Adjustment granted a 599 parking space variance, subject to a parking study to be conducted approximately one year after initial completion of the project

## GENERAL FACTSI STAFF ANALYSIS:

- This request for a special exception to the landscape regulations focuses on amending certain features shown on an alternate landscape plan (including but not limited to constructing and maintaining two patio areas within the mixed use development) that was imposed as a condition in conjunction with a request for a special exception to the landscape regulations granted on the subject by Board of Adjustment Panel A on August 16, 2016: BDA156-076 on the site currently developed as an approximately 1,450,000 square foot mixed use development (The Crescent).
- PD 193 states that the landscape, streetscape, screening, and fencing standards shall become applicable to uses (other than to single family and duplex uses in detached structures) on an individual lot when work is performed on the lot that increases the existing building height, floor area ratio, or nonpermeable coverage of the lot unless the work is to restore a building that has been damaged or destroyed by fire, explosion, flood, tornado, riot, act of the public enemy, or accident of any kind.
- On February $9^{\text {th }}$, the applicant submitted a letter to staff (see Attachment B) requesting a delay of this request until the Board of Adjustment Panel A March $21^{\text {st }}$ public hearing to allow additional time to create a revised alternate landscape plan that would represent a new patio for a restaurant use which may have an impact on trees proposed and conveyed on the revised alternate landscape plan that was submitted on February $1^{\text {st }}$.
- On February 10, 2017, the City of Dallas Chief Arborist submitted a memo with regard to this application (see Attachment C). This memo stated the following:
- The Chief Arborist supports the proposed revisions to the alternate landscape plan for 100 Crescent Court which was submitted for the February hearing. The revisions sustain a plan which does not violate the spirit and intent of the ordinance.
- However, based on the applicant's statement of February 9, there may yet be additional revisions to the alternate landscape plan based on proposed future additions on a building site which is undergoing a period of general modification. Any additional revisions to the landscape plan should be completed before permits are submitted for the future addition.
- The ordinance requires that any change to floor area, and net increase of impervious surfaces, will require future landscape compliance under this ordinance. The applicant has successfully attempted to report all new adjustments or errors to be updated on the revised alternate landscape plans to date. The arborist office only requests the most efficient means to have a complete landscape plan for the purpose of permitting.
- The Chief Arborist will support the applicant, staff, and the board to help achieve the appropriate outcome.
- On February 28, 2017, the applicant submitted additional documentation that included a revised alternate landscape plan (see Attachment D).
- On March 9, 2017, the City of Dallas Chief Arborist submitted a memo with regard to this application (see Attachment E). This memo stated the following:
- The Chief Arborist supports the additional proposed revisions (shown in Attachment D) to the alternate landscape plan for 100 Crescent Court which was submitted for the February hearing. The revisions sustain a plan which does not violate the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Three oak trees will be removed and four birch trees will be placed back on the property. The removal and modification is acceptable for the use on the property.
- The ordinance requires that any change to floor area, and net increase of impervious surfaces, will require future landscape compliance under this ordinance. The applicant has successfully attempted to report all new adjustments or errors to be updated on the revised alternate landscape plans to date. His diligence on following up on a transitioning property such as 100 Crescent Court is appreciated. .
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing that the special exception will not compromise the spirit and intent of Section 51P-193-126: "Landscape, streetscape, screening, and fencing standards".
- If the Board were to grant this request and impose the submitted alternate landscape plan dated 02-27-2017 as a condition, the site would be granted exception from full compliance to the landscape requirements of the Oak Lawn PD 193 landscape ordinance.


## Timeline:

December 15, 2016: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

January 6, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Secretary assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A. This assignment was made in order to comply with Section 9 (k) of the Board of Adjustment Working Rule of Procedure that states, "If a subsequent case is filed concerning the same request, that case must be returned to the panel hearing the previously filed case."

January 6, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the following information to the applicant:

- a copy of the application materials including the Building Official's report on the application;
- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the February $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the February $10^{\text {th }}$ 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."

February 1, 2017: The applicant submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A).

February 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for February public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development Department Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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

February 9, 2017: The applicant submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment B).

February 10, 2017: The City of Dallas Chief Arborist submitted a memo regarding this application (see Attachment C).

February 23, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant the board's action; the February $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the February $10^{\text {th }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence to be incorporated into the Board's docket materials.

February 28, 2017: The applicant submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment D).

March 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the March public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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

March 9, 2017: The City of Dallas Chief Arborist submitted a memo regarding this application (see Attachment E).

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION: FEBRUARY 21, 2017
APPEARING IN FAVOR: Robert Reeves, 900 Jackson St., \#160, Dallas, TX
APPEARING IN OPPOSITION: No one
MOTION: Dutia
I move that the Board of Adjustment in Appeal No. BDA 167-020 hold this matter under advisement until March 21, 2017.

SECONDED: Nelson
AYES: 5 - Schulte, Gibson, Nelson, Dutia, Sibley NAYS: 0 -
MOTION PASSED: 5 - 0 (unanimously)



# ROBERT REEVES <br> \& Associates, Inc. <br> PLANNING AND ZONING CONSULTANTS 

February 1, 2017

Steve Long, Board of Adjustment Administrator
Department of Sustainable Development \& Construction
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 5BN
Dallas, Texas 75201
RE: BDA 167-020
The Crescent
Dear Mr. Long:
On August 16, 2016, the Board of Adjustment, Panel A approved an alternate landscape plan for The Crescent, BDA 156-076(SL). Enclosed is an updated amended landscape plan, which we are requesting board approval.

As you know, a couple of months ago we completed our landscape enhancement program and called for a final inspection by the City Arborist. However, after a site inspection, the Arborist determined that 22 proposed trees were missing, which were shown on the approved landscape plan. Obviously, this revelation was a complete surprise to us.

These missing trees were new trees proposed by the landscape architect and were mistakenly included in the landscape plan approved by the board last August. It was determined that these trees could not or should not be planted for several reasons. Many trees were proposed in areas with underground utility vaults or similar constraints. Other trees were proposed to be planted under the canopy of existing mature street trees and would not thrive or could damage the roots of the existing trees. Lastly, it was determined that planting several proposed River Birch trees at the intersection of Cedar Springs and Maple was excessive and would actually have a negative visual impact.

In addition, Sixty Vines restaurant is currently remodeling the former Palomino restaurant space and would like to construct an outside pavilion, which will cover a portion of the current outside deck. Since there may be a slight increase in the nonpermeable surface ( $450 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.), the proposed building site has been added to the revised landscape plan.

The following is a summary of the changes:
No existing trees are affective and there have been 128 new trees planted on the site

## Board Approved Landscape Plan Revised Landscape Plan

| Street Trees: | 133 | 132 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Interior Trees: | $\underline{163}$ | $\frac{148}{280}$ |
| Total Site Trees; |  |  |
| General Planting Area: | 80,000 sq. ft. | $\mathbf{7 5 , 5 5 0}$ sq. ft. |

Mr. Long, we respectively request approval of the revised landscape plan.
Sincerely:

Robert Reeves



# ROBERT REEVES 

\& Associates, Inc.<br>PLANNING AND ZONING CONSULTANTS

February 9, 2017

Steve Long, Board of Adjustment Administrator
Department of Sustainable Development \& Construction
City of Dallas
1500 Maxilla Street, Room 5BN
Dallas, Texas 75201
RE: BDA 167-020, The Crescent
Request for a Delay

## Dear Mr. Long:

As you know the revised landscape plan for The Crescent will be considered by the Board of Adjustment, Panel A on February 21, 2017. Last Tuesday evening, we presented our proposed landscape revisions to the Oak Lawn Committee including the proposed Sixty Vines restaurant outside pavilion, which will be located on a portion of the existing deck used by the former Palomino Restaurant.

This morning I learned that a new Sandwich Shop restaurant would like to locate on the south side of Office Tower Two. The restaurant would like to have a new patio for outside dining, which will be located next to the loading dock area shown in red on the attached landscape plan. The patio will have an impact on the general planting area and may have an impact on the three new trees planted in this area.

Therefore, we need additional time to provide the staff with information on the patio, resubmit a revised landscape plan, and go back before the Oak Lawn Committee on March 7, 2017. Consequently, we respectfully request that the board delay this case until March 21, 2017.

Sincerely:


Robert Reeves

## Memorandum

Date February 10,2017
To Steve Long, Board Administrator
Subject BDA \#167-020; 100 Crescent Court
The chief arborist does support the proposed revisions to the alternate landscape plan for 100 Crescent Court which was submitted for the February hearing. It is my belief the revisions sustain a plan which does not violate the spirit and intent of the ordinance. However, based on Mr. Reeves' statement of February 9, there may yet be additional revisions to the alternate landscape plan based on proposed future additions on a building site which is undergoing a period of general modification. Any additional revisions to the landscape plan should be completed before permits are submitted for the future addition.

As you are aware, any change to floor area, and net increase of impervious surfaces, will require future landscape compliance under this ordinance. Mr. Reeves has successfully attempted to report all new adjustments or errors to be updated on the revised alternate landscape plans to date. The arborist office only requests the most efficient means to have a complete landscape plan for the purpose of permitting.

We will support the applicant, staff, and the board to help achieve the appropriate outcome.

Philip Erwin
Chief Arborist
Building Inspection

# ROBERT REEVES <br> \& Associates, Inc. <br> PLANNING AND ZONING CONSULTANTS 

February 28, 2017

Todd Duerksen
Chief Zoning Inspector, Building Inspection
Department of Sustainable Development \& Construction
320 East Jefferson
Dallas, Texas 75203
RE: Revised Landscape Plan
Case BDA 167-020
The Crescent
Dear Mr. Duerksen:
As you are aware, the Board of Adjustment held this case over until March 21, 2017 in order for my client to submit a revised landscape plan.

Attached is a revised landscape plan, which includes a new $1,250 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. patio adjacent to Office Tower Two for a new East Hampton Sandwich Company restaurant. I have also included a rendering and site plan of the new patio.

Installation of the patio will require removing three newly planted High Rise Oak Trees (18 caliper inches) and reducing the general planting area by 1,250 square feet to 74,300 square feet. Four new River Birch Trees ( 20 caliper inches) will be planted adjacent to drive to the underground garage at the northern end of the site.

Mr. Duerksen, let me know if you need additional information.
Sincerely:

Robert Reeves
cc: Phil Erwin





## Memorandum

# CITY OF DALLAS 

Date March 9, 2017
To Steve Long, Board Administrator
Subject BDA \#167-020; 100 Crescent Court
The chief arborist does support the additional proposed revisions (shown in Attachment D) to the alternate landscape plan for 100 Crescent Court which was submitted for the February hearing. It is my belief the revisions sustain a plan which does not violate the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Three oak trees will be removed and four birch trees will be placed back onto the property. I believe the removal and modification is acceptable for the use on the property.

As you are aware, any change to floor area, and net increase of impervious surfaces, will require future landscape compliance under this ordinance. As was stated in my previous comments, Mr . Reeves has successfully attempted to report all new adjustments or errors to be updated on the revised alternate landscape plans to date. His diligence on following up on a transitioning property such as 100 Crescent Court is appreciated.

Philip Erwin
Chief Arborist
Building Inspection

## City of Dallas

## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

## Data Relative to Subject Property:

Case No.: $\mathrm{BDA} / 67-020$
Date: $\qquad$ Location address: 100 Crescent Court Zoning District:PD193,SUP 925, HC Heavy Commercial Subdistrict

Lot No.: 1A
Block No.: 2/948
$\qquad$ Acreage: 9.9414 acres Census Tract: 18.00

Street Frontage (in Feet): (1) Cedar Npr. 958'
(2) Maple 1,082'
(3) Pearl $559^{\circ}$
4) McKinney $300^{\circ}$

## To the Honorable Board of Adjustment:

Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): Crescent TC Investors LP
Applicant: $\qquad$ Robert Reeves Telephone: (214) 749-0530

Mailing Address: 900 Jackson St., Suite 160, Dallas, Texas
Zip Code: 75202

E-mail Address:_rob.reeves@sbcglobal.net
Represented by: Robert Reeves \& Associates, Inc. $\qquad$ Telephone: (214) 749-0530

Mailing Address: 900 Jackson St., Suite 160 Dallas, Texas Zip Code: 75202
E-mail Address: _rob.reeves@sbcglobal.net
Affirm that a request has been made for a Variance $\qquad$ , or Special Exception X of $\qquad$ An alternate landscape plan for 100 Crescent Ct .

Application is now made to the Honorable Board of Adjustment, in accordance with the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, to grant the described appeal for the following reason: The Crescent would like to revise the $8 / 16 / 16$ board-approved alternative landscape plan, BDA156-076, to properly identify trees that were proposed, however were not planted per the approved plan. A waiver of the 2 -year waiting period was board-approved on 11/15/2016.

Note to Applicant: If the appeal requested in this application is granted by the Board of Adjustment, a permit must be applied for within 180 days of the date of the final action of the Board, unless the Board specifically grants a longer period.

## Affidavit

Before me the undersigned on this day personally appeared $\qquad$ Robert Reeves
(Affiant/Applicant's name) who on (his/her) oath certifies that the above statements are true and correct to his/her best knowledge and that he/she is the owner/or principal/or authorized representative of the subject property.


Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th








# Notification List of Property Owners BDA167-020 

## 177 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 100 | CRESCENT CT |
| 2 | 2516 | MAPLE AVE |
| 3 | 2504 | MAPLE AVE |
| 4 | 2508 | MAPLE AVE |
| 5 | 2628 | MAPLE AVE |
| 6 | 2120 | MCKINNEY AVE |
| 7 | 2324 | MCKINNEY AVE |
| 8 | 2222 | MCKINNEY AVE |
| 9 | 2101 | CEDAR SPRINGS RD |
| 10 | 2305 | CEDAR SPRINGS RD |
| 11 | 2215 | CEDAR SPRINGS RD |
| 12 | 2510 | CEDAR SPRINGS RD |
| 13 | 2121 | MCKINNEY AVE |
| 14 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 15 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 16 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 17 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 18 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 19 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 20 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 21 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 22 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 23 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 24 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 25 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 26 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
|  |  |  |

## Owner

CRESCENT TC INVESTORS LP
HEYMANN CLAIRE L
PASHA \& SINA INC
PASHA \& SINA INC
GREENWAY MAPLE LP
MCPP 2100 MCKINNEY LLC
MAPLE AND MCKINNEY L P
AMREIT UPTOWN DALLAS LP
ROSEWOOD COURT LLC
GPI CEDAR MAPLE LP
ASHTON UPTOWN LP
CRESCENT REAL ESTATE
CRESCENT PLZ HOTEL OWNER
STRONG ASA \& NANCY
ADELGLASS JEFFREY \&
MCKENZIE ARETA B
HIXSON ROBERT L JR \&
BADINTER SIMON M
RAK PROPERTIES INC
FRICKE MICHAEL T \& ARLENE S
COTTEL WILLIS I TRUSTEE
SHINN LLOYD \&
BOSSE JEFFREY F \& DONNA S
QUIST SHARON S
MOSER FAMILY TRUST
PEJOVICH BRENDA FAMILY LIVING TRUST THE

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 28 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 29 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 30 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 31 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 32 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 33 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 34 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 35 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 36 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 37 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 38 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 39 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 40 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 41 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 42 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 43 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 44 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 45 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 46 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 47 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 48 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 49 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 50 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 51 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 52 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 53 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 54 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 55 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 56 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 57 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 4 |  |  |

## Owner

STERN MATT D
STONE EVAN
OHRE DAVID E
POWELL MARK W
SAVAGE LIVING TRUST THE
TOELLER GARY RICHARD \& ANNE S TRUSTEES
SONNENSCHEIN INVESTMENTS LTD
FONBERG PETER
ELLINGTON SCOTT
CARLOW CORP
SMITH LINDA J
DIXON GENE JR \&
ABOU QAMAR MAAMOUN Y
MITCHELL F LANE
GALLETTA NANCY J
BAILEY CHARLES R \& VIRGINIA H
KLS INVESTMENTS LLC
FDRE LLC
WITRY MARY CAROL
MANUEL GREGORY W \&
CUMMINGS KEVIN \& GUINEVERE
SANDLIN MARK R
VAN CLEAVE ROBERT C \&
GUBA RAYMOND KERSHAW
BROWER SHANNON
KIM TAESEUNG BEN \&
YAMINI SARA M
QUIST SHARON S
1013 NW LOOP 410 VENTURE
MCKNIGHT JAMES ROSS \& BILLIE
MITCHELL KEITH \& LOIS TRUST THE

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58 | 2525 | N PEARLST |
| 59 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 60 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 61 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 62 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 63 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 64 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 65 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 66 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 67 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 68 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 69 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 70 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 71 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 72 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 73 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 74 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 75 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 76 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 77 | 2525 | N PEARLST |
| 78 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 79 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 80 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 81 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 82 | 2525 | N PEARL ST |
| 83 | 2401 | MCKINNEY AVE |
| 84 | 2512 | MAPLE AVE |
| 85 | 2610 | MAPLE AVE |
| 86 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 87 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 88 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |

Owner
ALVARADO JOSEPH
HAUSLEIN FERDINAND A JR
WALKER ROBERT M \& GUDRUN S
LEE JAMES J \& DORIS P
TAYLOR BERNARD \&
ALBERTS DENNY \& CYNTHIA COMPARIN
DOUGLASS GREGORY
NURENBERG PAMELA \&
PARKS JAMES LEE
ROMAN FRANK
CROWDER KEVIN \& KAREN
ROBINSON STEPHEN W \& JEAN M
ROSS STEPHANIE REVOCABLE TRUST
SCHAKE ERIC
TEL REAL ESTATE LLC
CARTER DONALD J \& LINDA JO
MAYER TOM \& SUSAN
KARKOUTLY AMAN \&
WITZKE DAVID
QUINN TERRENCE JEROME \&
WAGNER DUER III
HADDOCK RON W \&
SOLOMON WILLIAM T \& GAY F
LARKIN JOHN G \&
ANDERSON CHARLES C JR \& MOLLY R
ELK FINANCIAL INC
HEIDARI ALI
2620 MAPLE AVENUE LLC
FOSS ERIC
CRESCENT TOWER RESIDENCES LP
TORRENCE FLP

## Label \# Address

| 89 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 91 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 92 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 93 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 94 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 95 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 96 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 97 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 98 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 99 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 100 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 101 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 102 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 103 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 104 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 105 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 106 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 107 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 108 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 109 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 110 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 111 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 112 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 113 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 114 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 115 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 116 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 117 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 118 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 119 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
|  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |

## Owner

CHOTI CAROLE LAMPESIS \& MICHAEL ANDREW
CREWS KYLE W \& ANNE C CREWS KYLE W \& ANNE C CREWS BENTON HELEN RASPBERRY TRUST

ALEXANDER GREG
AMENDED AND RESTATED DAGNON REV TRUST
WOEHR MICHELLE S \& GUSTAVE
STEPHANIAN EDIC
MOROS HORACIO JAVIER
THELIN THOMAS
ZOYS GEORGE N
VEERARAGHAVAN UMA \& KRISHNA
CHI WEIWEI \&
RITZ TOWER 405 LLC
CLARKE DIEN S \& FRED E III
HENRY JAMES J \& PATRICIA M
ATTICUS PEARL STREET LLC
HASHEM OMAR \& MIASSAR
FABER CAREY E
SREERAMA RAVI KUMAR \&
WORTLEY MICHAEL D \& PATRICIA
LEVY MARLON \&
PERSONS MELISSA LEE \&
MUSSULMAN DANIEL G
KERNSTINE KEMP \& CASSANDRA
CLAUSE CARL \& ROSALIE
CAMMACK BRUCE A \& MICHELE G
CLAUSE CARL \& ROSALIE
PESSES IAN \&
UPTOWN DREAMS LLC
HOLMES CHARLTON C

## Label \# Address

| 120 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 122 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 123 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 124 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 125 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 126 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 127 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 128 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 129 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 130 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 131 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 132 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 133 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 134 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 135 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 136 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 137 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 138 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 139 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 140 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 141 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 142 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 143 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 144 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 145 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 146 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 147 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 148 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 149 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 150 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |

## Owner

MILLER PAMELA MARGARET
STEVENS KRISTEN E
YOUNGMAN STEPHEN A \& DENISE A
ROBERSON SHANNON G
TWOMEY FAMILY TRUST AGREEMENT
SMITH OPERATING AND MANAGEMENT CO
PORTER ZACHARY \& EMILY RAY
HEEBE ADREA D
KLAASSEN LIVING TRUST
RODER RICHARD
KRISHNAN SUMANT GOPAL
BEREZINA VICTORIA
ULLMAN MYRON EDWARD \& CATHY EMMONS TRUSTEES
HARGIS KENNETH \& DARLENE LIVING TRUST
FAURIA THOMAS J \& RENEE
HARASYM STEVEN MICHAEL
SHORECREST FAMILY LP
KEN CARLILE 2004 TRUST THE
RIPPETO J DOUGLAS
NICKERSON STEVEN CASH \& EVELYN THOMAS
NICKERSON STEVEN CASH \& EVELYN THOMAS
MUHL BRADLEY GILBERT \& HOLLY BOWEN
FRAZIER DEBBIE
BLUE CRESCENT VENTURE LP
FOX PATRICK K \& CYNTHIA E
FORD SCOTT T \& JOAN D
CRADICK CAROLINE CHARETTE TR
SANTAGA GREGORY P \& ANN M JOINT REVOCABLE TRUST
AVANT HARRY L
BARSACHS EDWIN HARRY JR \&
DORF ROGER \& SANDRA DORF

## Label \# Address

| 151 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 152 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 153 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 154 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 155 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 156 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 157 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 158 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 159 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 160 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 161 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 162 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 163 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 164 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 165 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 166 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 167 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 168 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 169 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 170 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 171 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 172 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 173 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 174 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 175 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 176 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 177 | 2555 | N PEARL ST |
| 177 | 2 |  |

## Owner

PARSELL SUSAN P
GRANGER KIMBERLEY
LAM SAMUEL M MD
MD COMMONS COMMERCIAL
LAZOF FAMILY TRUST
MOTSENBOCKER ALAN K \& ANNE B
DUNN FREDRICK L \& PRISCILLA A
AKBARI HOMAIRA
MUHL BRADLEY GILBERT \& HOLLY
SIKKEL MARK
HOLT TEXAS PROPERTIES INC
OLSON R CASEY \& MARGARET L
RC TRUST THE \&
GORES ALEC ELIAS REV LIVING TRUST THE
ROGERS MARY MCDANIEL
ROGERS ROBYN M REVOCABLE
THE FRONT PORCH LLC
FRONT PORCH LLC THE
DARVISHSEFAT FARID YU
DARVISHSEFAT FARID YU
SHINN LLOYD \&
HEDGEHOG REAL ESTATE LLC
CHILANGO LLC
KAPLAN GABRIEL TR
GRANGER KIMBERLEY
REESJONES TREVOR
VAN WOLFSWINKEL RANDALL

FILE NUMBER: BDA167-029(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations at 13439 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as a 3.35 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1), which limits the maximum story height to 15 feet. The applicant proposes to construct and maintain a structure with a story height of 32 feet, which will require a 17 foot variance to the height regulations.

## LOCATION: 13439 Preston Road

APPLICANT: Rosemary Papa<br>Represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC

## REQUEST:

A request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 17 ' is made to construct and maintain a 4-story fitness facility structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$, and $4^{\text {th }}$ floors have stories at $20^{\prime}, 32$ ', and $22^{\prime}$ in height, respectively, and exceed the maximum story height of $15^{\prime}$ required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1 by as much as 17' on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.

## STANDARD FOR A VARIANCE:

The Dallas Development Code Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) 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.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial
Rationale:

- Staff concluded that the variance should be denied because there was no property hardship to the site that warranted a variance to the height regulations. The applicant had not demonstrated how the features of the flat, rectangular in shape, and 3.35 acre site preclude it from being developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification while complying with code provisions including height regulations.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

Site: PD 887 (Planned Development)
North: PD 887 (Planned Development)
South: PD 887 (Planned Development)
East: $\quad$ PD 17 (Planned Development)
West: PD 887 (Planned Development)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish. The areas to the north east, south, and west are developed with nonresidential uses.

## Zoning/BDA History:

1. Z123-186, Property located generally east of the Dallas North Tollway, south of Southern Boulevard, south of Monfort Place, south of the northern boundary of Woodchase Apartments, south fof the northern boundary of Preston View Estates, west of Preston Road, and north of Interstate Highway 635 (LBJ Freeway). (Property that includes the subject site).

On June 12, 2013, the City Council created an ordinance changing the zoning on property that had been zoned PD 130, PD 215, PD 250, PD 279, PD 322, PE 423, PD 713, CR, CS, GO(A), RR, LO-2, MO-2, MF1(A), MF-4(A), MU-1, MU-2, MU-3, and P(A) to PD 887.
2. BDA167-030, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (property west of the subject site)
3. BDA167-031, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (property west of the subject site)

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 25 made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor is $40^{\prime}$ in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 25'.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to the minimum number of stories required by PD 887) of 1 story is made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure, a structure that is 1-story less than the 3 stories required on properties in PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B).

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 15 ' is made to construct and maintain a 10 -story hotel structure where the proposed $5^{\text {th }}$ floor is 30 in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 15'.

## GENERAL FACTS ISTAFF ANALYSIS:

- The request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 17 ' focuses on constructing and maintaining a 4-story fitness facility structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$, and $4^{\text {th }}$ floors have stories at $20^{\prime}, 32^{\prime}$, and $22^{\prime}$ in height, respectively exceed the maximum story height of $15^{\prime}$ required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1 by as much as 17 ' on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.
- The subject site is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1). PD 887 provides the following related to "stories":

1. Minimum number of stories above grade is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
2. Maximum number of stories above grade is 12 .

- Section 51A-13.304(a)(4) provides regulations for MU District Type specifically stating the ground story height is a minimum/maximum of $15^{\prime} / 30^{\prime}$ and the upper story height is a minimum/maximum of $10^{\prime} / 15^{\prime}$.
- The applicant has submitted an elevation of the proposed fitness center structure detailing the height of all four floors/stories. The elevation denotes the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor/story to meet the height requirement; the $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor story to be 20 ' (or 5 ' over the maximum story height); the $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor/story to be $32^{\prime}$ (or 17 ' over the maximum story height); and the $4^{\text {th }}$ floor/story to be 22 ' (or 7 ' over the maximum story height).
- The site is flat, rectangular in shape, and according to the application is 3.35 acres in area.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
- That granting the variance to the height 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.
- The variance to height regulations is necessary to permit development of the subject site that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that the subject site cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- The variance to height setback regulations 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 this parcel of land (the subject site) not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- If the Board were to grant the request for a variance to the height regulations, a determination should be made if any conditions should be imposed with this request (i.e. submitted site plan and/or elevation).


## Timeline:

January 26, 2017: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

February 15, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

February 15, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant's representative the following information:

- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the March $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the March $10^{\text {th }}$ 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.

March 6, 2017: The applicant's representative submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment $A$ ).

March 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the March public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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



Fitness Block - 029 (Height)

- Per Article PD887: Subdistrict 1
- Sec.51P-887.109 (a1)District Type: WMU-12
- Per Article 13:
- See chart for Regulations for MU District Type
- Story Height:
- Upper Story ( $\min / \max \mathrm{ft}$ ): $10 / 15$

We are requesting a variance to increase the maximum Upper Story Height from $15^{\prime}$ to $32^{\prime}$.

## BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DALLAS:

SECTION 1. That the zoning classification is changed from Subdistrict 1 A within Planned Development District No. 887 to Subdistrict 1B within Planned Development District No. 887 on the property described in Exhibit A, which is attached to and made a part of this ordinance ("the Property").

SECTION 2. That Section 51P-887.104, "Creation of Subdistricts," of Article 887, "PD 887," of Chapter 51P, "Dallas Development Code: Planned Development District Regulations," of the Dallas City Code is amended by adding a new Paragraph (2.1) to read as follows:
"(2.1) Subdistrict 1B. Subdistrict 1B is intended to be a walkable high-density, mixed-use area within the interior of Subdistrict 1A. At the core of this subdistrict is an enhanced esplanade that features additional pedestrian amenities and open space. Similar to Subdistrict 1A, this subdistrict also allows for a mix of residential and nonresidential uses, including both large-format and small-format retail."

SECTION 3. That Section 51P-887.105, "Definitions," of Article 887, "PD 887," of Chapter 51P, "Dallas Development Code: Planned Development District Regulations," of the Dallas City Code is amended by adding a new Paragraph (5.1) to read as follows:
"(5.1) PATHWAY means an area at street level that provides a passage for pedestrians."

SECTION 4. That Section 51P-887.109, "Subdistrict Regulations," of Article 887, "PD 887," of Chapter 51P, "Dallas Development Code: Planned Development District Regulations," of the Dallas City Code is amended to read as follows:

## "SEC. 51P-887.109. SUBDISTRICT REGULATIONS.

(a) Subdistrict 1 .
(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-12 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.

|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\pi} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \text { o } \\ & \frac{1}{5} \\ & \vdots \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\substack{\infty \\ \vdots}}{\frac{\infty}{\bar{y}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{\tilde{N}} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mu | Ss | Gc | Apt | Ts | Th | Mh | Sf | Civ | $\bigcirc$ |
| LOT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area per unit or building ( min sf ) | none | none | none | none | 1,200 | 1,200 | depends on \# of units | 3.500 | 3,000 | 2,000 |
| Area per building (max sf) | none | none | none | none | none | none | 20,000 | 5,000 | none | none |
| Width (min ft ) | none | none | none | none | 16 | 16 | 50 | 35 | 30 | 20 |
| Width (max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | 100 | 45 | none | none |
| Lot coverage (max) | 100\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 60\% | 60\% | 60\% | 5\% |
| FRONT SETBACK AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (min/max ft) | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 15/none | 15/none | 20/none | 10/none |
| Side street ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 10/none | 10/none | 10/none | 10/none |
| Service street (min/max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | 10/none |
| REQUIRED STREET FRONTAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 90\% | 90\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | none | none | none | none |
| Side street ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | none | none | none | none |
| Service street (min/max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| PARKING SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From primary street (min ft ) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | none | none | 20 | none |
| From side street (min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| From service street (min ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | none | none | 10 | none |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district, alley ( $\min \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| SIDE SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district $(\min \mathrm{ft})$ | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting alley (min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| REAR SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district (min ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting alley (ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting service street ( ft ) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | none | none | 10 | 10 |
| HEIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building height (min stories) | District dependent | 1 | District dependent | District dependent | 2 | District dependent | 2 | 1 | 1 | none |
| Building height (max stories/ft) |  | 1/30 |  |  | $3^{1 / 2} / 50$ |  | $21 / 2 / 35$ | $21 / 2 / 35$ | District dependent | 35 |
| STORY HEIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ground story (min/max ft) | 15/30 | 15/30 | 11/22 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | none | none |
| Upper story (min/max ft) | 10/15 | none | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | none | none |
| GROUND STORY TRANSPARENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street facade (min) | 50\% | 50\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Side street facade (min) | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Service street facade (min) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none. | none | none | none |
| UPPER STORY TRANSPARENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street facade (min) | 20\% | none | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Side street facade (min) | 20\% | none | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Service street facade (min) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| ENTRANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street entrance | required | required | required | required | required | required | required | required | none | none |
| Entrance spacing (max linear ft) | 100 | 100 | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Side street entrance | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | none | none |
| Service street entrance | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | none | none |
| BLANK WALL AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (max linear ft) | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | none | none |
| Side street (max linear ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Service street (max linear ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
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The subject property is located in a PD 887 and is also subject to Section 51A, Article XIII: Form Districts requirements and the City's Thoroughfare Plan. The combination and interaction of these three complex documents creates unique special conditions that result in an unnecessary hardship to the applicant. Based on the variance criteria below, the applicant is requesting a variance based on the special conditions these three documents create.

## Variance Criteria

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

PD 887 - Purpose and Vision

Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multimodal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

The variance request is within the intended vision of the PD887 Ordinance and is not contrary to the public interest. Currently, the site has a substantially vacant mall with two vacant anchor retail buildings and a dilapidated parking lot with substandard lighting. The applicant wants to construct the equivalent of Uptown Dallas in the Midtown District. The variance that we are requesting is not contrary to the public interest and is in fact, supporting the public interest of redeveloping Valley View Mall.

City Council has entered into a TIF reimbursement agreement with the developer that incentivizes this project and includes drawings for the project approved by the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review. the other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning

The city has implemented a new Thoroughfare Plan overlay for PD887 (see below).


LEGEND:
$=$. $=$ STUDY AREA BOUNDARY
$\square$ PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THOROUGHFARE PLAN

FRONTAGE ROAD
m- CONCEPTUALMINORSTREETS, DEVELOPMENT DRIVEN*

* THESE MINOR STREETS ARE CONCEPTUAL AND INTENDED ONLY TO ILLUSTRATE DESIRED CONNECTIVITY FOR NEW STREETS. ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENTS MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS IF THEY PROVIDE EQUIVALENT CONNECTIVITY AND COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 51P-887.115 (STREET STANDARDS) AND SECTION 51A-13.502 (NEW MINOR STREETS).

Article 13 Sec. 51A-13.703 Site Plan Review Item c stipulates the Primary Street Designation. Based on these criteria, we have developed a plan showing the Primary Streets designated for this block (see below).


## Additional Criteria:

Article 13 Section 51A-13.304 Development Types Item a3D states that Structured Parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any Primary Street for the first $30^{\prime}$ of the building measured inward from the street facing facade.

Having to abide by the above requirements of PD 887 and Article 13, in addition to the City's Thoroughfare Plan, creates a restrictive area and shape for each block.

PD887 allows for large format retail as long as all parking is provided in a parking structure. Large format retail, hotel or cinemas, which are a critical component of the PD887 purpose and vision, cannot be located on the ground floor because:

1) The Thoroughfare Plan, as adopted by the City of Dallas, travels through the applicant's property and requires roads to be built which create blocks with a restrictive area and shape
2) Due to the desired density of the projects, each block must contain structured parking.
3) Due to the size, shape and area of each of the blocks, the parking garage must be located in the center of the block.
4) Ground floor retail must be used to wrap the parking garage to meet the active use requirement for structured parking within the PD.
5) These required conditions have forced large format retail, theatres and hotels to be located above the ground floor.
6) These uses require an upper story height of greater than $15^{\prime}$.
(C) The variance is not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person or privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning

The granting of this Story Height Variance is not to relieve a self-created hardship or for financial reason but specifically in response to a hardship of the area and shape of this block created by the thoroughfare plan, the streets plan that is an exhibit to the PD, and other PD restrictions the combined effect of which is to force larger permitted uses like the proposed use to be located on upper stories when locating in this block. Upper stories are restricted to 15 feet in height, which would prohibit this particular use even though it is a permitted use and consistent with the vision for this district.

The subject site cannot be designed in a manner that meets all PD restrictions and allows for the proposed use on the ground floor level. There are physical limitations that necessitate the granting of the variance for the proposed permitted use to allow it to be located on an upper level.

PD 887.

## Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District

## SEC. 51P-887.101.

## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY.

PD 887 was established by Ordinance No. 29032, passed by the Dallas City Council on June 12, 2013. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.102. PROPERTY LOCATION AND SIZE.

PD 887 is established on property generally bounded by Southern Boulevard on the north, Preston Road on the east, LBJ Freeway on the south, and the Dallas North Tollway on the west. The size of PD 887 is approximately 445 acres. (Ord. 29032)

SEC. 51P-887.103.
PURPOSE AND VISION.
(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.104. CREATION OF SUBDISTRICTS.

(a) This special purpose district is divided into the following subdistricts:
(2) A regulating plan is not a site plan, as required for all development (see Section 51A-13.703, "Site Plan Review").
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Any change to a regulating plan is a change in zoning district classification and must follow the zoning amendment procedure in Section 51A-4.701.
(e) Compliance with Regulating Plan.

The requirements of the regulating plan are conditions that must be complied with before a certificate of occupancy may be granted.

## SEC. 51A-13.703. SITE PLAN REVIEW.

(a) Site Plan Required.
(1) Except as provided in Paragraph (2), all development must receive site plan approval by the building official in accordance with Section $51 \mathrm{~A}-4.803$ before issuance of a building permit. A certificate of occupancy will not be issued unless all aspects of the development fully conform to the approved site plan.
(2) A site plan is not required if the permit is only needed for:
(A) restoration of a building that has been damaged or destroyed by fire, explosion, flood, tornado, riot, act of the public enemy, or accident of any kind; or
(B) construction work that does not change the use or increase the existing building height, floor area ratio, or nonpermeable coverage of the lot.
(b) Additional Site Plan Requirements.

The following site plan elements are required in addition to any requirements in Section 51A-4.803.
(A) Designated primary, side, and service streets.
(B) Development types designated on specific lots.
(C) Location and description of pedestrian amenities.
(D) Location and specifications of minor and existing streets.
(E) Location and specifications of open space.
(F) Location of all setback lines.
(G) Building elevations showing compliance with building facade require-
ments.
(H) Location and specifications of landscaping.
(I) Locations and specifications of site lighting, outdoor storage and
display, and signs.
(c) Primary Street Designation.
(1) Applying the standards in this subsection, the building official shall determine whether streets are considered primary or side streets.
(2) If a lot abuts only one street, the street is a.primary street. Any street within a - SH overlay is also considered a primary street.
(3) If a lot runs from one street to another and has double frontage, both streets are primary streets.
(4) If a lot is located on a corner, one street is a primary street and one street is a side street, except as provided in Paragraph (5). The primary street is:
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(A) the street abutting the longest face of the block; or
(B) the street parallel to the alley within the block.
(5) When a lot is located on a corner, both streets are primary streets if:
(A) a majority of the lots on the shorter block face are platted perpendicu-
larly to the longer face of the block;
(B) there are two primary streets designated on a regulating plan; or
(C) the applicant designates both streets as primary streets.

## (d) Service Street Designation.

(1) The building official shall determine whether a service street is appropriate based on the criteria contained in this subsection.
(2) The applicant must control the land along an entire block face of a service street, and the service street must be designated from one street intersection to another street intersection.
(3) A site with a service street must have at least two frontages and one frontage must be a primary street.
(4) Only one service street may be designated abutting any block.
(e) Multiple Development Types on a Single Lot or Parcel.

## (1) Calculation of Lot Coverage.

(A) Where multiple development types are located on a single building site, the calculation of lot coverage is based on the proportion of total coverage required for each development type in relation to the proposed building footprints.
(B) As an example, a building site with one proposed mixed use shopfront building (allowed 100 percent coverage) with a lot coverage of 10,000 square feet and two proposed general commercial buildings (allowed 80 percent coverage) with a combined lot coverage of 20,000 square feet would have a lot coverage of 86 percent.

$$
\frac{10,000 \text { SF }}{30,000 \text { SF }} \times 1.00+\frac{20,000 \text { SF }}{30,000 \text { SF }} \times 0.80=86 \% \text { Lot Coverage }
$$

(C) Where the lot coverage for all proposed development types is the same, no calculation is necessary.

## (2) Calculation of Required Frontage.

(A) In order to ensure the pedestrian frontage remains as consistent as possible, if multiple development types are located on a single building site, the building official shall calculate required street frontage on a building-by-building basis.
(B) As an example, a site with a mixed use shopfront building with 180 linear feet of street frontage (required go percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 200 feet. A proposed general commercial building with 200 linear feet of street frontage (required 70 percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 286 feet in width.

## (f) Consistency With Regulating Plan.

The building official shall determine that the site plan is consistent with any adopted regulating plan prior to approval.

## (3) Parking Setbacks and Access.

(A) On-site surface parking must be located behind the parking setback
(B) The parking setback line applies only to the ground story.
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(C) Except when configured as a multi-way boulevard or indented parking, no on-site surface parking is permitted between a building and the street. (See Division 57A-13.500, "Minor Streets and Streetscapes.")
(D) Structured parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any -SH overlay or any primary street for the first 30 feet of the building measured inward from the street-facing facade. There is no active ground-story use requirement for structured parking along a service street.
(E) The requirements of Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) above do not apply to on-street or underground parking.
(F) The required street frontage may be interrupted to allow for a maximum 30 -foot-wide vehicular entrance to a parking structure or area.
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EXHIBIT G

## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Case No.: BDA


Data Relative to Subject Property:
Date: _ January 26, 2017

Zoning District:
$P_{\text {WMU-12 }}^{D 887}($ Subj. 1)
Location address: _13439 Preston Road $\qquad$
Lot No.: $\qquad$ Block No.: A/7409 Acreage 3.35 Census Tract: $\qquad$ 0136.15

Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) ___500.0'_ 2)_291.0' $\qquad$ 3) $503.8^{\prime}$ 4) $291.0^{\prime}$ $\qquad$ 5) $\qquad$
To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :
Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): _Algodon Properties, LLC $\qquad$
Applicant: _Rosemary Papa $\qquad$ Telephone: __469-533-5021 $\qquad$
Mailing Address: _13101 Preston Road, Suite 510 Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: _75240 $\qquad$
E-mail Address:
$\qquad$ rosemary@beckventures.com

Represented by: $\qquad$ Myron Dornic $\qquad$ Telephone: _214-953-5946 $\qquad$
Mailing Address: _2323 Ross Avenue, Suite 600, Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: _75201 $\qquad$
E-mail Address:
__mdornic@jw.com
Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance _X , or Special Exception __, of __ 17 $\qquad$
_to the maximum upper story height for the mixed use shopfront development type of 15'

Application is made to the Board of Adjustment, in accordance with the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, to grant the described appeal for the following reason:
The current maximum upper story height is 15'. This significantly limits the potential uses for the upper stories. The Developer has a tenant to operate a 184,000 SF fitness facility located in 3 upper stories that requires higher story heights due to the nature of the use.

Note to Applicant: If the appeal requested in this application is granted by the Board of Adjustment, a permit must be applied for within 180 days of the date of the final action of the Board, unless the Board specifically grants a longer period.

Affidavit
Before me the undersigned on this day personally appeared
 who on (his/her) oath certifies that the above statements are true and correct to his/her best knowledge and that he/she is the owner/or principal/or authorized representative of the subject property.

Respectfully submitted:

12

Date of Hearing


## Building Official's Report

| I hereby certify that | Rosemary Papa |
| ---: | :--- |
| represented by | Myron Dornic |
| did submit a request | for a variance to the building height regulations |
| at | 13439 Preston Road |

BDA167-029. Application of Rosemary Papa represented by Myron Dornic for a variance to the building height regulations at 13535 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as a 3.35 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD-887, which limits the maximum story height to 15 feet. The applicant proposes to construct a nonresidential structure with a story height of 32 feet, which will require a 17 foot variance to the maximu building height regulation.

Sincerely,

City of Dallas
Internal Development Research Site


Within the form district zoning the intention is to create active use on the ground floor of buildings. In order to achieve this streetscape character, many smaller format stores and restaurants need to line the inline storefront space at grade. Within the master PD, only a couple subdistricts allow for large format retail within the blocks, this being one of such subdistricts. In order to achieve the intention of the zoning, it is imperative that developers locate the large format retail above the first floor. The typical large format retailer has floor to ceiling heights in excess of 15' and thus we are requesting a variance to allow for this type of large format retail to exist within this subdistrict, in conformance with the intent of the zoning and vision plan.

Due to the significant size of this Athletic Club tenant and the requirements to have a minimum of 2 stories in this sub-district, the only option to include this use in the district is to locate it above the ground floor, on at least 3 stories, which would require higher upper story heights. Early on in the design process, the Midtown District TIF Board and the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review reviewed and approved the elevations of this block which exceeds the $15^{\prime}$ maximum. Based on these approvals, the Developer proceeded with pursuing uses that exceeded the 15' maximum. In addition the Dallas Office of Economic Development and the City of Dallas City Council have signed a developer agreement with the Developer incentivizing them to build such a facility within the district. In conclusion, and for all these reasons, we believe "a literal enforcement of the zoning ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice done".

We request that the Board extend the permit date to within 270 days of the date of the final action.














AREA OF REQUEST<br>3.353 ACRE TRACT<br>Part of Lot 3, Block A/7409<br>Valley View Center<br>H. Wilburn Survey, Abstract No. 1567<br>City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas

DESCRIPTION, of a 3.353 acre tract of land situated in the H. Wilburn Survey, Abstract No. 1567, Dallas County, Texas; said tract being part of Lot 3, Block A/7409, Valley View Center, an addition to the City of Dallas, Texas according to the plat recorded in Volume 72178, Page 1879, as affected by Certificate of Error recorded in Volume 73134, Page 2254, both of the Deed Records of Dallas County, Texas; said tract also being part of that certain tract of land described as "Tract 2" in Special Warranty Deed to 13331 Preston Road, L.P. recorded in Instrument No. 201200326375 of the Official Public Records of Dallas County, Texas; said 3.353 acre tract being more particularly described as follows (Bearing system for this survey is based on the State Plane Coordinate System, North American Datum of 1983 (2011), Texas North Central Zone 4202. Distances shown have been adjusted by applying the Dallas County TxDOT combination factor of 1.000136506 ):

COMMENCING, at a 3-inch aluminum disk stamped "PACHECO KOCH - DM" set in the west right-of-way line of Preston Road (a variable width right-of-way); said point being the northeast corner of Lot 2, Block A/7409 of said Valley View Center; from said point a $1 / 2$-inch iron rod found bears North 67 degrees, 30 minutes West, a distance of 0.7 feet;
(Grid: N: 7,025,142.50, E: 2,488,920.16)
THENCE, in a northerly direction, along the said west line of Preston Road, the following two (2) calls:

North 00 degrees, 53 minutes, 00 seconds West, a distance of 27.81 feet to a 3-inch aluminum disk stamped "PACHECO KOCH - DM" set; from said point a $1 / 2$-inch iron rod found bears North 69 degrees, 24 minutes West, a distance of 0.7 feet;

North 01 degrees, 18 minutes, 30 seconds West, a distance of 328.41 feet to a 3-inch aluminum disk stamped "PACHECO KOCH - DM III" set at the POINT OF BEGINNING;
(Grid: N: 7,025,498.58, E: 2,488,912.23)
THENCE, South 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds West, departing the said west line of Preston Road, a distance of 503.84 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, North 00 degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds West, a distance of 291.00 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, North 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds East, a distance of 500.03 feet to a point for corner in the said west line of Preston Road;

THENCE, South 01 degrees, 18 minutes, 30 seconds East, along the said west line of Preston Road, a distance of 291.02 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

CONTAINING: 146,064 square feet or 3.353 acres of land, more or less.
This document was prepared under 22 TAC $\S 663.21$, does not reflect the results of an on the ground survey and is not to be used to convey or establish interest in real property except those rights and interests implied or established by the creation or reconfiguration of the boundary of the political subdivision for which it was prepared.


# Notification List of Property Owners 

## BDA167-029

10 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13439 | PRESTON RD |
| 2 | 13439 | PRESTON RD |
| 3 | 13439 | PRESTON RD |
| 4 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 5 | 13343 | PRESTON RD |
| 6 | 13398 | PRESTON RD |
| 7 | 13444 | PRESTON RD |
| 8 | 13420 | PRESTON RD |
| 9 | 13410 | PRESTON RD |
| 10 | 13410 | PRESTON RD |

## Owner

ALGODON I LP
ALGODON PROPERTIES LLC
ALGODON I LP
13331 PRESTON RD LP
13331 PRESTON RD LP
350 ST NICHOLAS REALTY CORP \&
FONBERG HOLDINGS LTD
GILLILAND PPTIES II LTD
ARNOLD SQUARE INVESTMENTS LLC
CAPITAL ONE N A

FILE NUMBER: BDA167-030(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations at 13131 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as a 2.964 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B), which limits the maximum story height to 15 feet. The applicant proposes to construct and maintain a structure with a story height of 40 feet, which will require a 25 foot variance to the height regulations.

## LOCATION: 13131 Preston Road

APPLICANT: Rosemary Papa
Represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC

## REQUEST:

A request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to $25^{\prime}$ is made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor is 40 ' in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1 B by 25 ' on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.

Note that the applicant has filed another request on this property that will be heard by Board of Adjustment Panel A on March $21^{\text {st. }}$ BDA167-031 - a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to the minimum number of stories required by PD 887) of 1 story to construct and maintain the 2-story theater structure, a structure that is 1-story less than the 3 stories required on properties in PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B).

On March 6, 2017, the applicant's representative emailed the Board Administrator requesting that that both applications be presented at the same time since they are related, and that if that is not possible, the first case heard should be for the upper story height increase (BDA 167-030), and if that variance is not granted, then the applicant would likely withdraw Case BDA 167-031.

## STANDARD FOR A VARIANCE:

The Dallas Development Code Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) 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.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial
Rationale:

- Staff concluded that the variance should be denied because there was no property hardship to the site that warranted a variance to the height regulations. The applicant had not demonstrated how the features of the flat, somewhat irregular in shape, approximately 3 acre site preclude it from being developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification while complying with code provisions including height regulations.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

Site: $\quad$ PD 887 (Planned Development)
North: PD 887 (Planned Development)
South: PD 887 (Planned Development)
East: PD 887 (Planned Development)
West: PD 887 (Planned Development)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.. The areas to the north east, south, and west are developed with nonresidential uses.

## Zoning/BDA History:

1. Z123-186, Property located generally east of the Dallas North Tollway, south of Southern Boulevard, south of Monfort Place, south of the northern boundary of Woodchase Apartments, south fof the northern boundary of Preston View Estates, west of Preston Road, and north of Interstate Highway 635 (LBJ Freeway). (Property that includes the subject site).
2. BDA167-029, Property located at 13439 Preston Road (property east of the subject site)
3. BDA167-031, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (the subject site)
4. BDA167-032, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (property east of the subject site)

On June 12, 2013, the City Council created an ordinance changing the zoning on property that had been zoned PD 130, PD 215, PD 250, PD 279, PD 322, PE 423, PD 713, CR, CS, GO(A), RR, LO-2, MO-2, MF1(A), MF-4(A), MU-1, MU-2, MU-3, and P(A) to PD 887.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) to construct and maintain a 4-story fitness facility structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$, and $4^{\text {th }}$ floors have stories at 20', $32^{\prime}$, and 22' in height, respectively, and exceed the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to the minimum number of stories required by PD 887) of 1 story is made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure, a structure that is 1-story less than the 3 stories required on properties in PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B).

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to $15^{\prime}$ is made to construct and maintain a 10-story hotel structure where the proposed $5^{\text {th }}$ floor is 30 in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 15'.

## GENERAL FACTS ISTAFF ANALYSIS:

- The request for a variance to the height regulations of (specifically to story height) of 25 focuses on constructing and maintaining a 2-story theater structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor is 40 ' in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 '
required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 25 ' on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.
- The subject site is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B). PD 887 provides the following related to "stories":

1. Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. Structures constructed in an esplanade within Street Section Type B1 of the Street Plans may not exceed one story. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
2. Maximum number of stories above grade is 20.

- Section 51A-13.304(a)(4) provides regulations for MU District Type specifically stating the ground story height is a minimum/maximum of $15^{\prime} / 30^{\prime}$ and the upper story height is a minimum/maximum of $10^{\prime} / 15^{\prime}$.
- The applicant has submitted an elevation of the proposed 2-story theater structure detailing the height of its two stories. The elevation denotes the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor/story to meet the height requirement; and the $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor story to be 40 ' (or 25 ' over the maximum story height).
- The site is flat, somewhat irregular in shape, and according to the application is 2.964 acres in area.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
- That granting the variance to the height 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.
- The variance to height regulations is necessary to permit development of the subject site that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that the subject site cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- The variance to height setback regulations 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 this parcel of land (the subject site) not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- If the Board were to grant the request for a variance to the height regulations, a determination should be made if any conditions should be imposed with this request (i.e. submitted site plan and/or elevation).


## Timeline:

January 26, 2017: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

February 15, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

February 15, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant's representative the following information:

- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the March $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the March $10^{\text {th }}$ 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.

March 6, 2017: The applicant's representative submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A).

March 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the March public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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



Theater Block - 030 (Height)

- Per Article PD887: Subdistrict 1B
- Sec.51P-887.109 (c1) District Type: WMU-20
- Per Article 13:
- See chart for Regulations for MU Classification.
- Story Height:
- Upper Story ( $\min / \max \mathrm{ft}$ ): $10 / 15$

We are requesting a variance to increase the maximum Upper Story Height from 15' to 40'.

## (2) Stories.

(A) Minimum number of stories above grade is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 12.
(3) Urban form setback. An additional 20-foot setback from the minimum setback is required for any portion of a structure above five stories fronting on all streets except Preston Road.
(b) Subdistrict 1A.
(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-20 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.
(2) Stories.
(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 20 .
(3) Urban form setback. An additional 20 -foot setback from the minimum setback is required for any portion of a structure above five stories fronting on all streets except Preston Road.
(c) Subdistrict 1 B .
(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-20 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.
(2) Stories.
(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. Structures constructed in an esplanade within Street Section Type B1 of the Streets Plan may not exceed one story. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A13.302 (b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 20.

|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { u} \\ & \frac{1}{5} \\ & \stackrel{y}{5} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ¿े } \\ & \text { ¿ } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & I \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \sim \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mu | Ss | Gc | Apt | Ts | Th | Mh | Sf | Civ | $\bigcirc$ |
| LOT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area per unit or building (min sf) | none | none | none | none | 1,200 | 1,200 | depends on \# of units | 3.500 | 3,000 | 2,000 |
| Area per building (max sf) | none | none | none | none | none | none | 20,000 | 5,000 | none | none |
| Width (min ft ) | none | none | none | none | 16 | 16 | 50 | 35 | 30 | 20 |
| Width (max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | 100 | 45 | none | none |
| Lot coverage (max) | 100\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 60\% | 60\% | 60\% | 5\% |
| FRONT SETBACK AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (min/max ft) | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 15/none | 15/none | 20/none | 10/none |
| Side street ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 10/none | 10/none | 10/none | 10/none |
| Service street (min/max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | 10/none |
| REQUIRED STREET FRONTAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (min/max ft) | 90\% | 90\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | none | none | none | none |
| Side street (min/max ft) | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | none | none | none | none |
| Service street (min/max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| PARKING SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From primary street (min ft ) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | none | none | 20 | none |
| From side street ( min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| From service street (min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | none | none | 10 | none |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district, alley (min ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| SIDE SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district (min ft) | - or 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | Oor 5 | oor 5 | - or 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting alley (min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| REAR SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 15 | 15. | 15 | 15 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district (min ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting alley (ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting service street ( ft ) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | none | none | 10 | 10 |
| HEIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building height (min stories) | District dependent | 1 | District dependent | District dependent | 2 | District dependent | 2 | 1 | 1 | none |
| Building height (max stories/ft) |  | 1/30 |  |  | $31 / 2 / 50$ |  | $21 / 2 / 35$ | $21 / 2 / 35$ | District dependent | 35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ground story (min/max ft) | 15/30 | 15/30 | 11/22 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | none | none |
| Upper story ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 10/15 | none | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | none | none |
| GROUND STORY TRANSPARENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street facade (min) | 50\% | 50\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Side street facade (min) | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Service street facade (min) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| UPPER STORY TRANSPARENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street facade (min) | 20\% | none | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Side street facade (min) | 20\% | none | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Service street facade (min) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| ENTRANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street entrance | required | required | required | required | required | required | required | required | none | none |
| Entrance spacing (max linear ft) | 100 | 100 | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Side street entrance | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | none | none |
| Service street entrance | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | none | none |
| BLANK WALL AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (max linear ft) | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | none | none |
| Side street (max linear ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Service street (max linear ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |

The subject property is located in a PD 887 and is also subject to Section 51A, Article XIII: Form Districts requirements and the City's Thoroughfare Plan. The combination and interaction of these three complex documents creates unique special conditions that result in an unnecessary hardship to the applicant. Based on the variance criteria below, the applicant is requesting variances based on the special conditions these three documents create.

## Variance Criteria

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

PD 887 - Purpose and Vision
(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

The variance request is within the intended vision of the PD887 Ordinance and is not contrary to the public interest. Currently, the site has a substantially vacant mall with two vacant anchor retail buildings and a dilapidated parking lot with substandard lighting. The applicant wants to construct the equivalent of Uptown Dallas in the Midtown District. The variance that we are requesting is not contrary to the public interest and is in fact, supporting the public interest of redeveloping Valley View Mall.

City Council has entered into a TIF reimbursement agreement with the developer that incentivizes this project and includes drawings for the project approved by the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review.
(B) The variance is necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from the other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning

The city has implemented a new Thoroughfare Plan overlay for PD887 (see below).


LEGEND:

```
m . m STUDY AREA BOUNDARY
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THOROUGHFARE PLAN
FRONTAGE ROAD
\(=m=\frac{\text { CONCEPTUAL MINOR STREETS, }}{\text { DEVELOPMENT DRIVEN* }}\)
```

* THESE MINOR STREETS ARE CONCEPTUAL AND INTENDED ONLY TO ILLUSTRATE DESIRED CONNECTIVITY FOR NEW STREETS. ALTERNATVE ALIGNMENTS MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLLC WORKS IF THEY PROVIDE EQUIVALENT CONNECTIVITY AND COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 51P-887.115 (STREET STANDARDS) AND SECTION $51 A-13.502$ (NEW MINOR STREETS).

Article 13 Sec. 51A-13.703 Site Plan Review Item c stipulates the Primary Street Designation. Based on these criteria, we have developed a plan showing the Primary Streets designated for this block (see below).


## Additional Criteria:

Article 13 Section 51A-13.304 Development Types Item a3D states that Structured Parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any Primary Street for the first $30^{\prime}$ of the building measured inward from the street facing facade.

Having to abide by the above requirements of PD 887 and Article 13, in addition to the City's

## Thoroughfare Plan, creates a restrictive area and shape for each block.

PD887 allows for large format retail as long as all parking is provided in a parking structure. Large format retail, hotel or cinemas, which are a critical component of the PD887 purpose and vision, cannot be located on the ground floor because:

1) The Thoroughfare Plan, as adopted by the City of Dallas, travels through the applicant's property and requires roads to be built which create blocks with a restrictive area and shape
2) Due to the desired density of the projects, each block must contain structured parking.
3) Due to the size, shape and area of each of the blocks, the parking garage must be located in the center of the block.
4) Ground floor retail must be used to wrap the parking garage to meet the active use requirement for structured parking within the PD.
5) These required conditions have forced large format retail, theatres and hotels to be located above the ground floor.
6) These uses require an upper story height of greater than 15 .
(C) The variance is not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person or privilege in dèveloping a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning

The granting of this Story Height and Minimum Number of Stories Variances are not to relieve a selfcreated hardship or for financial reason but specifically in response to a hardship of the area and shape of this block created by the thoroughfare plan, the streets plan that is an exhibit to the PD, and other PD restrictions the combined effect of which is to force larger permitted uses like the proposed use to be located on upper stories when locating in this block. Upper stories are restricted to 15 feet in height, which would prohibit this particular use even though it is a permitted use and consistent with the vision for this district. With a second story height of $40^{\prime}$, the 2 story portion of the building is consistent with the massing of a 3-4 story building and provides the same pedestrian experience. The subject site cannot be designed in a manner that meets all PD restrictions and allows for the proposed use on the ground floor level. There are physical limitations that necessitate the granting of the variance for the proposed permitted use to allow it to be located on an upper level.

## ARTICLE 887.

PD 887.

## Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District

## SEC. 51P-887.101. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY.

PD 887 was established by Ordinance No. 29032, passed by the Dallas City Council on June 12, 2013. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.102. PROPERTY LOCATION AND SIZE.

PD 887 is established on property generally bounded by Southern Boulevard on the north, Preston Road on the east, LBJ Freeway on the south, and the Dallas North Tollway on the west. The size of PD 887 is approximately 445 acres. (Ord. 29032)

SEC. 51P-887.103. PURPOSE AND VISION.
(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.104. CREATION OF SUBDISTRICTS.

(a) This special purpose district is divided into the following subdistricts:
(2) A regulating plan is not a site plan, as required for all development (see Section 51A-13.703, "Site Plan Review").
(d) Modification of a Regulating Plan.

Any change to a regulating plan is a change in zoning district classification and must follow the zoning amendment procedure in Section $51 \mathrm{~A}-4.70$.

(e) Compliance with Regulating Plan.

The requirements of the regulating plan are conditions that must be complied with before a certificate of occupancy may be granted.

## SEC. 51A-13.703. <br> SITE PLAN REVIEW.

(a) Site Plan Required.
(1) Except as provided in Paragraph (2), all development must receive site plan approval by the building official in accordance with Section 51A-4.803 before issuance of a building permit. A certificate of occupancy will not be issued unless all aspects of the development fully conform to the approved site plan.
(2) A site plan is not required if the permit is only needed for:
(A) restoration of a building that has been damaged or destroyed by fire, explosion, flood, tornado, riot, act of the public enemy, or accident of any kind; or
(B) construction work that does not change the use or increase the existing building height, floor area ratio, or nonpermeable coverage of the lot.
(b) Additional Site Plan Requirements.

The following site plan elements are required in addition to any requirements in Section 51A-4.803.
(A) Designated primary, side, and service streets.
(B) Development types designated on specific lots.
(C) Location and description of pedestrian amenities.
(D) Location and specifications of minor and existing streets.
(E) Location and specifications of open space.
(F) Location of all setback lines.
(G) Building elevations showing compliance with building facade require-
ments.
(H) Location and specifications of landscaping.
(I) Locations and specifications of site lighting, outdoor storage and
display, and signs.

BDA167-030 streets are primary streets. -

## (c) Primary Street Designation.

(1) Applying the standards in this subsection, the building official shall determine whether streets are considered primary or side streets.
(2) If a lot abuts only one street, the street is a primary street. Any street within

Attach A
a - SH overlay is also considered a primary street.
(3) If a lot runs from one street to another and has double frontage, both
(1) Applying the standards in
(4) If a lot is located on a corner, one street is a primary street and one street is a side street, except as provided in Paragraph (5). The primary street is:
(A) the street abutting the longest face of the block; or
(B) the street parallel to the alley within the block.
(5) When a lot is located on a corner, both streets are primary streets if:
(A) a majority of the lots on the shorter block face are platted perpendicu-
larly to the longer face of the block;
(B) there are two primary streets designated on a regulating plan; or
(C) the applicant designates both streets as primary streets.
(d) Service Street Designation.
(1) The building official shall determine whether a service street is appropriate based on the criteria contained in this subsection.
(2) The applicant must control the land along an entire block face of a service street, and the service street must be designated from one street intersection to another street intersection.
(3) A site with a service street must have at least two frontages and one frontage must be a primary street.
(4) Only one service street may be designated abutting any block.

## (e) Multiple Development Types on a Single Lot or Parcel.

(1) Calculation of Lot Coverage.
(A) Where multiple development types are located on a single building site, the calculation of lot coverage is based on the proportion of total coverage required for each development type in relation to the proposed building footprints.
(B) As an example, a building site with one proposed mixed use shopfront building (allowed 100 percent coverage) with a lot coverage of 10,000 square feet and two proposed general commercial buildings (allowed 80 percent coverage) with a combined lot coverage of 20,000 square feet would have a lot coverage of 86 percent.

$$
\frac{10,000 \text { SF }}{30,000 \mathrm{SF}} \times 1.00+\frac{20,000 \mathrm{SF}}{30,000 \mathrm{SF}} \times 0.80=86 \% \text { Lot Coverage }
$$

(C) Where the lot coverage for all proposed development types is the same, no calculation is necessary.

## (2) Calculation of Required Frontage.

(A) In order to ensure the pedestrian frontage remains as consistent as possible, if multiple development types are located on a single building site, the building official shall calculate required street frontage on a building-by-building basis.
(B) As an example, a site with a mixed use shopfront building with 180 linear feet of street frontage (required 90 percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 200 feet. A proposed general commercial building with 200 linear feet of street frontage (required 70 percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 286 feet in width.

## (f) Consistency With Regulating Plan.

The building official shall determine that the site plan is consistent with any adopted regulating plan prior to approval.

## (3) Parking Setbacks and Access.

(A) On-site surface parking must be located behind the parking setback line.
(B) The parking setback line applies only to the ground story.
(C) Except when configured as a multi-way boulevard or indented parking, no on-site surface parking is permitted between a building and the street. (See Division 57A-13.500, "Minor Streets and Streetscapes.")
(D) Structured parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any -SH overlay or any primary street for the first 30 feet of the building measured inward from the street-facing facade. There is no active ground-story use requirement for structured parking along a service street.
(E) The requirements of Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) above do not apply to on-street or underground parking.
(F) The required street frontage may be interrupted to allow for a maximum 30 -foot-wide vehicular entrance to a parking structure or area.
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$\begin{aligned} \text { MIDTOWN } & \text { DALLAS, TEXAS } \\ \text { DA14007 } & 10 / 30 / 2015\end{aligned}$
STUCCO FRAME
WITH SIGNAGE
DA14007 - 0/30/2015
GARAGE SCREENING
(EVERY OTHER BAY) $\quad$ PRE-CAST CONCRETE WAIL
BLOCK 4 ELEVATIONS

(4) SOUTH Elevation
$\underbrace{\text { Scale: } 1^{\prime \prime}=20.0}_{2001 \text { Bryan Street:: } \text { Sulte } 3}$
2001 ryan streel.isule 3100 :: Dallas IX 75201 :: tel 214.969 .5311

The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is the regulating plan for this PD, and its contents are incorporated by reference into the PD. This excerpt from the plan
demonstrates that a theater with a taller story height was contemplated from the inception of this project.


City of Dallas

## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Case No.: BDA 167-030
Data Relative to Subject Property:
Date: _January 26, 2017 $\qquad$ PD887(Sbd. 1B)
Location address: _13131 Preston Road, Dallas TX
Zoning District: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Lot No.: $\qquad$ Block No.: $\qquad$ $A / 7409$ Acreage: 2.964 Census Tract:

Street Frontage (in Feet): $\qquad$ 475.5' 2) __ $244.8^{\prime}$ _ 3) $\qquad$ $63.1^{\prime}$ $\qquad$ 4) $419.3^{2}$ 5) $\quad 273.5^{\prime}$ $\qquad$
To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :
Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): _13331 Preston Road, L.P.
Applicant: _Rosemary Papa $\qquad$ Telephone: __469-533-5021 $\qquad$
Mailing Address: _13101 Preston Road, Suite 510 Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: _75240 $\qquad$
E-mail Address:
$\qquad$ rosemary@beckventures.com

Represented by: $\qquad$ Myron Dornic $\qquad$ Telephone: _214-953-5946 $\qquad$
Mailing Address: _2323 Ross Avenue, Suite 600, Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: _75201 $\qquad$
E-mail Address:
mdornic@jw.com
Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance _X, or Special Exception $\qquad$ , of $\qquad$ 25' $\qquad$ __to the maximum upper story height for the mixed use shopfront development type of $15^{\prime}$. $\qquad$
Application is made to the Board of Adjustment, in accordance with the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, to grant the described appeal for the following reason: $\qquad$
The current maximum upper story height is 15 '. This significantly limits the potential uses for the upper stories. The Developer has a tenant to operate a $39,000 \mathrm{SF}$ luxury theater facility located in the second story that requires a higher story height due to the nature of the use, specifically a movie theatre screen.

Note to Applicant: If the appeal requested in this application is granted by the Board of Adjustment, a permit must be applied for within 180 days of the date of the final action of the Board, unless the Board specifically grants a longer period.
Before me the undersigned on this day personally appeared who on (his/her) oath certifies that the above statements are true and correct to his/her best knowledge and that he/she is the owner/or principal/or authorized representative of the subject property.
 subscribed and sworn to before me this 26
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## Building Official＇s Report

I hereby certify that Rosemary Papa
represented by Myron Dornic
did submit a request for a variance to the building height regulations
at 13131 Preston Road

BDA167－030．Application of Rosemary Papa represented by Myron Dornic for a variance to the building height regulations at 13131 Preston Road．This property is more fully described as a 2.964 acre tract in Lot 3，Block A／7409，and is zoned PD－887，which limits the maximum story height to 15 feet．The applicant proposes to construct a nonresidential structure with a story height of 40 feet，which will require a 25 foot variance to the maximu height regulation．

Sincerely，




Within the form district zoning, the intention is to create active use on the ground floor of buildings. In order to achieve this streetscape character, many smaller format stores and restaurants need to line the inline storefront space at grade. Within the master PD, only a couple subdistricts allow for large format retail within the blocks, this being one of such subdistricts. In order to achieve the intention of the zoning, it is imperative that developers locate the large format retail above the first floor. The typical large format retailer has floor to ceiling heights in excess of $15^{\prime}$ and thus we are requesting a variance to allow for this type of large format retail to exist within this subdistrict, in conformance with the intent of the zoning and vision plan.

Due to the specialized use of this tenant, the only option to include this use in the district is to locate it above the ground floor, which would require a higher upper story height. Early on in the design process, the Midtown District TIF Board and the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review reviewed and approved the elevations of this block.

In addition, the Dallas Office of Economic Development and the City of Dallas City Council have signed a developer agreement with the Developer incentivizing them to build such a facility within the district. In conclusion, and for all these reasons we believe "a literal enforcement of the zoning ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice done". We request that the Board extend the permit date to within 270 days of the date of the final action._








DESCRIPTION, of a 2.964 acre tract of land situated in the H. Wilburn Survey, Abstract No. 1567, Dallas County, Texas; said tract being part of Lot 3, Block A/7409, Valley View Center, an addition to the City of Dallas, Texas according to the plat recorded in Volume 72178, Page 1879, as affected by Certificate of Error recorded in Volume 73134, Page 2254, both of the Deed Records of Dallas County, Texas; said tract also being part of that certain tract of land described as "Tract 2" in Special Warranty Deed to 13331 Preston Road, L.P. recorded in Instrument No. 201200326375 of the Official Public Records of Dallas County, Texas; said 2.964 acre tract being more particularly described as follows (Bearing system for this survey is based on the State Plane Coordinate System, North American Datum of 1983 (2011), Texas North Central Zone 4202. Distances shown have been adjusted by applying the Dallas County TxDOT combination factor of 1.000136506 ):

COMMENCING, at a 3 -inch aluminum disk stamped "PACHECO KOCH - DM" set in the west right-of-way line of Preston Road (a variable width right-of-way); said point being the northeast corner of Lot 2, Block A/7409 of said Valley View Center; from said point a 1/2-inch iron rod found bears North 67 degrees, 30 minutes West, a distance of 0.7 feet;
(Grid: N: 7,025,142.50, E: 2,488,920.16)
THENCE, North 00 degrees, 53 minutes, 00 seconds West, along the said west line of Preston Road, a distance of 4.67 feet to the intersection of the said west line of Preston Road and the future centerline of proposed James Temple Road;

THENCE, departing the said west line of Preston Road, and along said future centerline, the following three (3) calls:

South 88 degrees, 26 minutes, 06 seconds West, a distance of 964.81 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve to the right;

Along said curve to the right, having a central angle of 07 degrees, 47 minutes, 57 seconds, a radius of 150.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of North 87 degrees, 39 minutes, 55 seconds West, 20.40 feet, an arc distance of 20.42 feet to the beginning of a reverse curve to the left;

Along said curve to the left, having a central angle of 24 degrees, 28 minutes, 12 seconds, a radius of 146.06 feet, a chord bearing and distance of South 84 degrees, 19 minutes, 30 seconds West, 61.91 feet, an arc distance of 62.38 feet to the end of said curve;

THENCE, North 17 degrees, 35 minutes, 03 seconds West, departing said future centerline, a distance of 31.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; said point being the beginning of a nontangent curve to the left; (Grid: $\mathrm{N}: 7,025,145.07, \mathrm{E}: 2,487,864.42$ )

THENCE, in a southwesterly direction, along said curve to the left, having a central angle of 20 degrees, 03 minutes, 49 seconds, a radius of 181.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of South 62 degrees, 23 minutes, 02 seconds West, 63.06 feet, an arc distance of 63.38 feet to the end of said curve;

AREA OF REQUEST

### 2.964 ACRE TRACT

(continued)
THENCE, South 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds West, a distance of 419.34 feet to a point for corner;
THENCE, North 00 degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds West, a distance of 273.51 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, North 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 31 seconds East, a distance of 475.50 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, South 00 degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds East, a distance of 244.82 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

CONTANING: 129,131 square feet or 2.964 acres of land, more or less.
This document was prepared under 22 TAC $\S 663.21$, does not reflect the results of an on the ground survey and is not to be used to convey or establish interest in real property except those rights and interests implied or established by the creation or reconfiguration of the boundary of the political subdivision for which it was prepared.


# Notification List of Property Owners 

## BDA167-030

3 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 2 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 3 | 13343 | PRESTON RD |

## Owner

13331 PRESTON RD LP
SERITAGE SRC FINANCE LLC
13331 PRESTON RD LP

FILE NUMBER: BDA167-031(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations at 13131 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as a 2.964 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B), which requires a minimum number of three stories. The applicant proposes to construct and maintain a structure with two stories, which will require a one story variance to the height regulations.

## LOCATION: 13131 Preston Road

APPLICANT: Rosemary Papa<br>Represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC

## REQUEST:

A request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to the minimum number of stories required by PD 887) of 1 story is made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure, a structure that is 1-story less than the 3 stories required on properties in PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B) on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.

Note that the applicant has filed another request on this property that will be heard by Board of Adjustment Panel A on March 21 ${ }^{\text {st. }}$ BDA167-030 - a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 25 ' to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor is $40^{\prime}$ in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by $25^{\prime}$ ).

On March 6, 2017, the applicant's representative emailed the Board Administrator requesting that that both applications be presented at the same time since they are related, and that if that is not possible, the first case heard should be for the upper story height increase (BDA 167-030), and if that variance is not granted, then the applicant would likely withdraw Case BDA 167-031.

## STANDARD FOR A VARIANCE:

The Dallas Development Code Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) 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.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial
Rationale:

- Staff concluded that the variance should be denied because there was no property hardship to the site that warranted a variance to the height regulations. The applicant had not demonstrated how the features of the flat, somewhat irregular in shape, approximately 3 acre site preclude it from being developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification while complying with code provisions including height regulations.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

Site: $\quad$ PD 887 (Planned Development)
North: PD 887 (Planned Development)
South: PD 887 (Planned Development)
East: PD 887 (Planned Development)
West: PD 887 (Planned Development)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish. The areas to the north east, south, and west are developed with nonresidential uses.

## Zoning/BDA History:

1. Z123-186, Property located generally east of the Dallas North Tollway, south of Southern Boulevard, south of Monfort Place, south of the northern boundary of Woodchase Apartments, south fof the northern boundary of Preston View Estates, west of Preston Road, and north of Interstate Highway 635 (LBJ Freeway). (Property that includes the subject site).
2. BDA167-030, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (the subject site)
3. BDA167-029, Property located at 13149 Preston Road (property east of the subject site)
4. BDA167-032, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (property east of the subject site)

On June 12, 2013, the City Council created an ordinance changing the zoning on property that had been zoned PD 130, PD 215, PD 250, PD 279, PD 322, PE 423, PD 713, CR, CS, GO(A), RR, LO-2, MO-2, MF1(A), MF-4(A), MU-1, MU-2, MU-3, and P(A) to PD 887.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 25 ' made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor is $40^{\prime}$ in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 25'.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) to construct and maintain a 4-story fitness facility structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$, and $4^{\text {th }}$ floors have stories at $20^{\prime}, 32^{\prime}$, and 22' in height, respectively, and exceed the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to $15^{\prime}$ is made to construct and maintain a 10-story hotel structure where the proposed $5^{\text {th }}$ floor is $30^{\prime}$ in height and exceeds the maximum story height of $15^{\prime}$ required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 15'.

## GENERAL FACTS ISTAFF ANALYSIS:

- The request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to the minimum number of stories required by PD 887) of 1 story focuses on constructing and maintaining a 2-story theater structure, a structure that is 1-story less than the 3
stories required on properties in PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B) on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.
- The subject site is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B). PD 887 provides the following related to "stories":

1. Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. Structures constructed in an esplanade within Street Section Type B1 of the Street Plans may not exceed one story. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
2. Maximum number of stories above grade is 20.

- The applicant has submitted an elevation of the proposed 2-story theater structure detailing that is proposed to be 2 stories.
- The site is flat, somewhat irregular in shape, and according to the application is 2.964 acres in area.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
- That granting the variance to the height 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.
- The variance to height regulations is necessary to permit development of the subject site that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that the subject site cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- The variance to height setback regulations 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 this parcel of land (the subject site) not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- If the Board were to grant the request for a variance to the height regulations, a determination should be made if any conditions should be imposed with this request (i.e. submitted site plan and/or elevation).


## Timeline:

January 26, 2017: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

February 15, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

February 15, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant's representative the following information:

- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the March $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the March $10^{\text {th }}$ 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.

March 6, 2017: The applicant's representative submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A).

March 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the March public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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



## Theater Block -031 (Stories)

- Per Article PD887: Subdistrict 1B
- Sec.51P-887.109 (c1) District Type: WMU-20
- Sec.51P-887.109 (c2a): Min \# of stories: 3

We are requesting a variance to decrease the minimum \# of stories from 3 to 2.

## (2) Stories.

(A) Minimum number of stories above grade is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 12 .
(3) Urban form setback. An additional 20 -foot setback from the minimum setback is required for any portion of a structure above five stories fronting on all streets except Preston Road.
(b) Subdistrict 1A.
(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-20 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.
(2) Stories.
(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 20 .
(3) Urban form setback. An additional 20 -foot setback from the minimum setback is required for any portion of a structure above five stories fronting on all streets except Preston Road.

## (c) Subdistrict 1B.

(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-20 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.

## (2) Stories.

(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. Structures constructed in an esplanade within Street Section Type B1 of the Streets Plan may not exceed one story. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 20.

The subject property is located in a PD 887 and is also subject to Section 51A, Article XIII: Form Districts requirements and the City's Thoroughfare Plan. The combination and interaction of these three complex documents creates unique special conditions that result in an unnecessary hardship to the applicant. Based on the variance criteria below, the applicant is requesting variances based on the special conditions these three documents create.

## Variance Criteria

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

PD 887 - Purpose and Vision
(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

The variance request is within the intended vision of the PD887 Ordinance and is not contrary to the public interest. Currently, the site has a substantially vacant mall with two vacant anchor retail buildings and a dilapidated parking lot with substandard lighting. The applicant wants to construct the equivalent of Uptown Dallas in the Midtown District. The variance that we are requesting is not contrary to the public interest and is in fact, supporting the public interest of redeveloping Valley View Mall.

City Council has entered into a TIF reimbursement agreement with the developer that incentivizes this project and includes drawings for the project approved by the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review.
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(B) The variance is necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from the other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning The city has implemented a new Thoroughfare Plan overlay for PD887 (see below).


LEGEND:
$m$ STUDY AREA BOUNDARY
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THOROUGHFARE PLAN
FRONTAGE ROAD
$=$ CONCEPTUALMINORSTREETS,
DEVELOPMENT ORIVEN*

* THESE MINOR STREETS ARE CONCEPTUAL AND INTENDED ONLY TO ILLUSTRATE DESIRED CONNECTIVITY FOR NEW STREETS. ALTERNATNE ALIGNMENTS MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS IF THEY PROVIDE EQUIVALENT CONNECTIVITY AND COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 51P-887.115 (STREET STANDARDS) AND SECTION $51 A-13,502$ (NEW MINOR STREETS).

APRIL 16, 2015

Article 13 Sec. 51A-13.703 Site Plan Review Item c stipulates the Primary Street Designation. Based on these criteria, we have developed a plan showing the Primary Streets designated for this block (see below).


## Additional Criteria:

Article 13 Section 51A-13.304 Development Types Item a3D states that Structured Parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any Primary Street for the first $30^{\prime}$ of the building measured inward from the street facing facade.

Having to abide by the above requirements of PD 887 and Article 13, in addition to the City's
Thoroughfare Plan, creates a restrictive area and shape for each block.

PD887 allows for large format retail as long as all parking is provided in a parking structure. Large format retail, hotel or cinemas, which are a critical component of the PD887 purpose and vision, cannot be located on the ground floor because:

|  | BDA167-031 |
| :---: | :--- |
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1) The Thoroughfare Plan, as adopted by the City of Dallas, travels through the applicant's property and requires roads to be built which create blocks with a restrictive area and shape
2) Due to the desired density of the projects, each block must contain structured parking.
3) Due to the size, shape and area of each of the blocks, the parking garage must be located in the center of the block.
4) Ground floor retail must be used to wrap the parking garage to meet the active use requirement for structured parking within the PD.
5) These required conditions have forced large format retail, theatres and hotels to be located above the ground floor.
6) These uses require an upper story height of greater than $15^{\prime}$.
7) Since the second story height is $40^{\prime}$ to accommodate the theater use, the building mass is consistent with a 3-4 story building, instead of a typical 2 story building.
(C) The variance is not granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person or privilege in developing a parcel of land not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land with the same zoning

The granting of this Story Height and Minimum Number of Stories Variances are not to relieve a selfcreated hardship or for financial reason but specifically in response to a hardship of the area and shape of this block created by the thoroughfare plan, the streets plan that is an exhibit to the PD, and other PD restrictions the combined effect of which is to force larger permitted uses like the proposed use to be located on upper stories when locating in this block. Upper stories are restricted to 15 feet in height, which would prohibit this particular use even though it is a permitted use and consistent with the vision for this district. With a second story height of $40^{\prime}$, the 2 story portion of the building is consistent with the massing of a 3-4 story building and provides the same pedestrian experience.

The subject site cannot be designed in a manner that meets all PD restrictions and allows for the proposed use on the ground floor level. There are physical limitations that necessitate the granting of the variance for the proposed permitted use to allow it to be located on an upper level.

## ARTICLE 887.

PD 887.

## Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District

## SEC. 51P-887.101. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY.

PD 887 was established by Ordinance No. 29032, passed by the Dallas City Council on June 12, 2013. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.102. PROPERTY LOCATION AND SIZE.

PD 887 is established on property generally bounded by Southern Boulevard on the north, Preston Road on the east, LBJ Freeway on the south, and the Dallas North Tollway on the west. The size of PD 887 is approximately 445 acres. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.103.

## PURPOSE AND VISION.

(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

SEC. 51P-887.104.

## CREATION OF SUBDISTRICTS.

(a) This special purpose district is divided into the following subdistricts:
(2) A regulating plan is not a site plan, as required for all development (see Section 51A-13.703, "Site Plan Review").

## (d) Modification of a Regulating Plan.

Any change to a regulating plan is a change in zoning district classification and must follow the zoning amendment procedure in Section 51A-4.701.


## (e) Compliance with Regulating Plan.

The requirements of the regulating plan are conditions that must be complied with before a certificate of occupancy may be granted.

## SEC. 51A-13.703. <br> SITE PLAN REVIEW.

## (a) Site Plan Required.

(1) Except as provided in Paragraph (2), all development must receive site plan approval by the building official in accordance with Section $51 \mathrm{~A}-4.803$ before issuance of a building permit. A certificate of occupancy will not be issued unless all aspects of the development fully conform to the approved site plan.
(2) A site plan is not required if the permit is only needed for:
(A) restoration of a building that has been damaged or destroyed by fire, explosion, flood, tornado, riot, act of the public enemy, or accident of any kind; or
(B) construction work that does not change the use or increase the existing building height, floor area ratio, or nonpermeable coverage of the lot.
(b) Additional Site Plan Requirements.

The following site plan elements are required in addition to any requirements in Section 51A-4.803.
(A) Designated primary, side, and service streets.
(B) Development types designated on specific lots.
(C) Location and description of pedestrian amenities.
(D) Location and specifications of minor and existing streets.
(E) Location and specifications of open space.
(F) Location of all setback lines.
(G) Building elevations showing compliance with building facade require-
ments.
(H) Location and specifications of landscaping.
(I) Locations and specifications of site lighting, outdoor storage and
display, and signs.

## (c) Primary Street Designation.

(1) Applying the standards in this subsection, the building official shall determine whether streets are considered primary or side streets.
(2) If a lot abuts only one street, the street is a primary street. Any street within a -SH overlay is also considered a primary street.
(3) If a lot runs from one street to another and has double frontage, both streets are primary streets.
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(4) If a lot is located on a corner, one street is a primary street and one street is a side street, except as provided in Paragraph (5). The primary street is:
(A) the street abutting the longest face of the block; or
(B) the street parallel to the alley within the block.
(5) When a lot is located on a corner, both streets are primary streets if:
(A) a majority of the lots on the shorter block face are platted perpendicularly to the longer face of the block;
(B) there are two primary streets designated on a regulating plan; or
(C) the applicant designates both streets as primary streets.
(d) Service Street Designation.
(1) The building official shall determine whether a service street is appropriate based on the criteria contained in this subsection.
(2) The applicant must control the land along an entire block face of a service street, and the service street must be designated from one street intersection to another street intersection.
(3) A site with a service street must have at least two frontages and one frontage must be a primary street.
(4) Only one service street may be designated abutting any block.

## (e) Multiple Development Types on a Single Lot or Parcel.

(1) Calculation of Lot Coverage.
(A) Where multiple development types are located on a single building site, the calculation of lot coverage is based on the proportion of total coverage required for each development type in relation to the proposed building footprints.
(B) As an example, a building site with one proposed mixed use shopfront building (allowed 100 percent coverage) with a lot coverage of 10,000 square feet and two proposed general commercial buildings (allowed 80 percent coverage) with a combined lot coverage of 20,000 square feet would have a lot coverage of 86 percent.

$$
\frac{10,000 \text { SF }}{30,000 \text { SF }} \times 1.00+\frac{20,000 \text { SF }}{30,000 \text { SF }} \times 0.80=86 \% \text { Lot Coverage }
$$

(C) Where the lot coverage for all proposed development types is the same, no calculation is necessary.

## (2) Calculation of Required Frontage.

(A) In order to ensure the pedestrian frontage remains as consistent as possible, if multiple development types are located on a single building site, the building official shall calculate required street frontage on a building-by-building basis.
(B) As an example, a site with a mixed use shopfront building with 180 linear feet of street frontage (required 90 percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 200 feet. A proposed general commercial building with 200 linear feet of street frontage (required 70 percent street frontage) must be BDA167-031 Attach A Pg 11 located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 286 feet in width.

## (f) Consistency With Regulating Plan.

The building official shall determine that the site plan is consistent with any adopted regulating plan prior to approval.

## (3) Parking Setbacks and Access.

(A) On-site surface parking must be located behind the parking setback line.
(B) The parking setback line applies only to the ground story.
(C) Except when configured as a multi-way boulevard or indented parking, no on-site surface parking is permitted between a building and the street. (See Division 57A-13.500, "Minor Streets and Streetscapes.")
(D) Structured parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any -SH overlay or any primary street for the first 30 feet of the building measured inward from the street-facing facade. There is no active ground-story use requirement for structured parking along a service street.
(E) The requirements of Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) above do not apply to on-street or underground parking.
(F) The required street frontage may be interrupted to allow for a maximum 30-foot-wide vehicular entrance to a parking structure or area.
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## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT



Note to Applicant: If the appeal requested in this application is granted by the Board of Adjustment, a permit must be applied for within 180 days of the date of the final action of the Board, unless the Board specifically grants a longer period.

who on (his/her) oath certifies that the above statements are true and correct to his/her best knowledge and that he/she is the owner/or principal/or authorized representative of the subject property.


$\longrightarrow$ sydeuəə
рә!иәд уо рәұиелэ--sem ןeəddy
Date of Hearing
LNヨWLSOCOV $\exists \mathrm{O}$ GY甘OG
MEMORANDUM OF

## Building Official's Report

## I hereby certify that Rosemary Papa

represented by Myron Dornic
did submit a request for a variance to the building height regulations
at 13131 Preston Road

BDA167-031. Application of Rosemary Papa represented by Myron Dornic for a variance to the building height regulations at 13131 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as a 2.964 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD-887 (Subdistrict 1 B ), which requires a minimum number of three stories. The applicant proposes to constri a nonresidential structure with two stories, which will require a one story variance to the height regulation.

Sincerely,


City of Dallas
Internal Development Research Site



Within the form district zoning, the intention is to create active use on the ground floor of buildings. In order to achieve this streetscape character, many smaller format stores and restaurants need to line the inline storefront space at grade. Within the master PD, only a couple subdistricts allow for large format retail within the blocks, this being one of such subdistricts. In order to achieve the intention of the zoning, it is imperative that developers locate the large format retail above the first floor. The typical large format retailer has floor to ceiling heights in excess of 15 , and, in a separate BOA application, we have requested a variance to allow for this type of large format retail to exist within this subdistrict, in conformance with the intent of the zoning and vision plan. |By allowing for a higher second story height, we are requesting a variance to allow for a minimum of 2 stories, instead of the 3 stories that are currently required.

Due to the specialized use of this tenant, the only option to include this use in the district is to locate it above the ground floor, which would require a higher upper story height. Early on in the design process, the Midtown District TIF Board and the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review reviewed and approved the elevations of this block.

In addition, the Dallas Office of Economic Development and the City of Dallas City Council have signed a developer agreement with the Developer incentivizing them to build such a facility within the district. In conclusion, and for all these reasons we believe "a literal enforcement of the zoning ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice done". We request that the Board extend the permit date to within 270 days of the date of the final action.
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# Notification List of Property Owners 

## BDA167-031

## 3 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 2 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 3 | 13343 | PRESTON RD |

## Owner

13331 PRESTON RD LP
SERITAGE SRC FINANCE LLC
13331 PRESTON RD LP

FILE NUMBER: BDA167-032(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Rosemary Papa, represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC, for a variance to the height regulations at 13131 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as a 2.457 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B), which limits the maximum story height to 15 feet. The applicant proposes to construct a nonresidential structure with a story height of 30 feet, which will require a 15 foot variance to the height regulations.

## LOCATION: 13131 Preston Road

APPLICANT: Rosemary Papa,
Represented by Misty Ventura of Shupe Ventura, PLLC

## REQUEST:

A request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to $15^{\prime}$ is made to construct and maintain a 10 -story hotel structure where the proposed $5^{\text {th }}$ floor is 30 ' in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 15' on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.

## STANDARD FOR A VARIANCE:

The Dallas Development Code Section 51A-3.102(d)(10) 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.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial

Rationale:

- Staff concluded that the variance should be denied because there was no property hardship to the site that warranted a variance to the height regulations. The applicant had not demonstrated how the features of flat, somewhat irregular in shape, and approximately 2.5 acre site preclude it from being developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification while complying with code provisions including height regulations.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

Site: $\quad$ PD 887 (Planned Development)
North: PD 887 (Planned Development)
South: PD 887 (Planned Development)
East: PD 887 (Planned Development)
West: PD 887 (Planned Development)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish. The areas to the north east, south, and west are developed with nonresidential uses.

## Zoning/BDA History:

1. Z123-186, Property located generally east of the Dallas North Tollway, south of Southern Boulevard, south of Monfort Place, south of the northern boundary of Woodchase Apartments, south fof the northern boundary of Preston View Estates, west of Preston Road, and north of Interstate Highway 635 (LBJ Freeway). (Property that includes the subject site).

On June 12, 2013, the City Council created an ordinance changing the zoning on property that had been zoned PD 130, PD 215, PD 250, PD 279, PD 322, PE 423, PD 713, CR, CS, GO(A), RR, LO-2, MO-2, MF1(A), MF-4(A), MU-1, MU-2, MU-3, and P(A) to PD 887.
2. BDA167-030, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (property west of the subject site)
3. BDA167-031, Property located at 13131 Preston Road (property west of the subject site)

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) of up to 25 made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor is $40^{\prime}$ in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 25'.

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to the minimum number of stories required by PD 997) of 1 story is made to construct and maintain a 2-story theater structure, a structure that is 1-story less than the 3 stories required on properties in PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B).

On March 21, 2017, the Board of Adjustment Panel A will consider a request for a variance to the height regulations (specifically to story height) to construct and maintain a 4-story fitness facility structure where the proposed $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}$, and $4^{\text {th }}$ floors have stories at $20^{\prime}, 32$, and 22' in height, respectively, and exceed the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1.

## GENERAL FACTS ISTAFF ANALYSIS:

- The request for a variance to the height regulations of (specifically to story height) of 15 ' focuses on constructing and maintaining a 10-story hotel structure where the proposed $5^{\text {th }}$ floor is $30^{\prime}$ in height and exceeds the maximum story height of 15 ' required in PD 887 Subdistrict 1B by 15' on a site that is currently developed with a combination of surface parking and retail use that the applicant intends to demolish.
- The subject site is zoned PD 887 (Subdistrict 1B). PD 887 provides the following related to "stories":

1. Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. Structures constructed in an esplanade within Street Section Type B1 of the Street Plans may not exceed one story. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
2. Maximum number of stories above grade is 20 .

- Section 51A-13.304(a)(4) provides regulations for MU District Type specifically stating the ground story height is a minimum/maximum of $15^{\prime} / 30^{\prime}$ and the upper story height is a minimum/maximum of $10^{\prime} / 15^{\prime}$.
- The applicant has submitted an elevation of the proposed 10 -story hotel structure detailing the height of its 10 stories. The elevation denotes all floors/stories the $1^{\text {st }}$ meet the height requirement with the exception of the 5 floor/story that is to be 30' (or 15' over the maximum story height).
- The site is flat, somewhat irregular in shape, and according to the application is 2.457 acres in area.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
- That granting the variance to the height 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.
- The variance to height regulations is necessary to permit development of the subject site that differs from other parcels of land by being of such a restrictive area, shape, or slope, that the subject site cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- The variance to height setback regulations 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 this parcel of land (the subject site) not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land in districts with the same PD 887 zoning classification.
- If the Board were to grant the request for a variance to the height regulations, a determination should be made if any conditions should be imposed with this request (i.e. submitted site plan and/or elevation).


## Timeline:

January 26, 2017: The applicant submitted an "Application/Appeal to the Board of Adjustment" and related documents which have been included as part of this case report.

February 15, 2017: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

February 15, 2017: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant's representative the following information:

- an attachment that provided the public hearing date and panel that will consider the application; the March $1^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the March $10^{\text {th }}$ 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.

March 6, 2017: The applicant's representative submitted additional documentation on this application to the Board Administrator beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A).

March 7, 2017: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for the March public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director, the Sustainable Development and Construction Assistant Director Engineering, the Board of Adjustment Chief Planner, the Building Inspection Chief Planner, the Board Administrator, the Building Inspection Senior Plans Examiner/Development Code Specialist, the Chief Arborist, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Senior Planner, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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



## Hotel Block - 032 (Height)
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- Per Article PD887: Subdistrict 1B
- Sec.51P-887.109 (c1) District Type WMU-20
- Per Article 13:
- See chart for Regulations for MU Classification.
- Story Height:
- Upper Story (min/max ft): $10 / 15$

We are requesting a variance to increase the maximum Upper Story Height to $15^{\prime}$ to $30^{\prime}$.

## (2) Stories.

(A) Minimum number of stories above grade is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 12 .
(3) Urban form setback. An additional 20 -foot setback from the minimum setback is required for any portion of a structure above five stories fronting on all streets except Preston Road.
(b) Subdistrict 1A.
(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-20 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.
(2) Stories.
(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A-13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 20 .
(3) Urban form setback. An additional 20-foot setback from the minimum setback is required for any portion of a structure above five stories fronting on all streets except Preston Road.
(c) Subdistrict 1B.
(1) In general. Except as provided in this article, the district regulations for the WMU-20 Walkable Urban Mixed Use District apply.
(2) Stories.
(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, minimum number of stories above grade is three. Minimum number of stories above grade for general commercial development types is two. Structures constructed in an esplanade within Street Section Type B1 of the Streets Plan may not exceed one story. The minimum height provisions of Section 51A13.302(b)(2), (3), (4), and (5) also apply.
(B) Maximum number of stories above grade is 20.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mu | Ss | Gc | Apt | Ts | Th | Mh | Sf | Civ | O |
| LOT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area per unit or building (min sf) | none | none | none | none | 1,200 | 1,200 | depends on \# of units | 3.500 | 3,000 | 2,000 |
| Area per building (max sf) | none | none | none | none | none | none | 20,000 | 5,000 | none | none |
| Width (min ft ) | none | none | none | none | 16 | 16 | 50 | 35 | 30 | 20 |
| Width (max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | 100 | 45 | none | none |
| Lot coverage (max) | 100\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 60\% | 60\% | 60\% | 5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (min/max ft) | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 15/none | 15/none | 20/none | 10/none |
| Side street ( $\min / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 5/15 | 10/none | 10/none | 10/none | 10/none |
| Service street (min/max ft ) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | 10/none |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 90\% | 90\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | 70\% | none | none | none | none |
| Side street (min/max ft ) | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | none | none | none | none |
| Service street (min/max ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| PARKING SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From primary street (min ft ) | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | none | none | 20 | none |
| From side street ( min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| From service street (min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | none | none | 10 | none |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district, alley (min ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | none | none | 5 | none |
| SIDE SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district $(\min \mathrm{ft})$ | - or 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | oor 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting alley ( min ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| REAR SETBACK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abutting single-family district (min ft ) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting multifamily, nonresidential district (min ft) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting alley ( ft ) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | 10 | 10 |
| Abutting service street ( ft ) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3/20+ | 3/20+ | none | none | 10 | 10 |
| HEIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building height (min stories) | District dependent | 1 | District dependent | District dependent | 2 | District dependent | 2 | 1 | 1 | none |
| Building height (max stories/ft) |  | 1/30 |  |  | $3^{1 / 2} / 50$ |  | $21 / 2 / 35$ | $21 / 2 / 35$ | District dependent | 35 |
| STORY HEIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ground story (min/max ft) | 15/30 | 15/30 | 11/22 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | none | none |
| Upper story ( $\mathrm{min} / \mathrm{max} \mathrm{ft}$ ) | 10/15 | none | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | 10/15 | none | none |
| GROUND STORY TRANSPARENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street facade (min) | 50\% | 50\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Side street facade (min) | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Service street facade (min) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| UPPER STORY TRANSPARENCY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street facade (min) | 20\% | none | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Side street facade (min) | 20\% | none | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | none | none |
| Service street facade (min) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| ENTRANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street entrance | required | required | required | required | required | required | required | required | none | none |
| Entrance spacing (max linear ft) | 100 | 100 | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Side street entrance | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | none | none |
| Service street entrance | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | allowed | none | none |
| BLANK WALL AREA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary street (max linear ft) | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | none | none |
| Side street (max linear ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Service street (max linear ft) | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
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The subject property is located in a PD 887 and is also subject to Section 51A, Article XIII: Form Districts requirements and the City's Thoroughfare Plan. The combination and interaction of these three complex documents creates unique special conditions that result in an unnecessary hardship to the applicant. Based on the variance criteria below, the applicant is requesting a variance based on the special conditions these three documents create.

## Variance Criteria

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

PD 887 - Purpose and Vision
(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.

BDA167-032
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

The variance request is within the intended vision of the PD887 Ordinance and is not contrary to the public interest. Currently, the site has a substantially vacant mall with two vacant anchor retail buildings and a dilapidated parking lot with substandard lighting. The applicant wants to construct the equivalent of Uptown Dallas in the Midtown District. The variance that we are requesting is not contrary to the public interest and is in fact, supporting the public interest of redeveloping Valley View Mall.

City Council has entered into a TIF reimbursement agreement with the developer that incentivizes this project and includes drawings for the project approved by the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review.
(B) The variance is necessary to permit development of a specific parcel of land that differs from the other parcels of land by being of such restrictive area, shape, or slope that it cannot be developed in a manner commensurate with development upon other parcels of land with the same zoning

The city has implemented a new Thoroughfare Plan overlay for PD887 (see below).


## LEGEND:

```
m 1 = STUDY AREA BOUNDARY
MROMOSOSD AMENDMENT TO
                                    THOROUGHFARE PLAN
#mang FRONTAGEROAD
m= CONCEPTUALMINORSTREETS,
    DEVELOPMENT DRIVEN*
```

* THESE MINOR STREETS ARE CONCEPTUAL AND INTENDED ONLY TO ILLUSTRATE DESIRED CONNECTIVITY FOR NEW STREETS, ALTERNATVE ALIGNMENTS MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLLC WORKS IF THEY PROVIDE EQUIVALENT CONNECTIVITY AND COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 51 P-887.115 (STREET STANDARDS) AND SECTION $51 A-13.502$ (NEW MINOR STREETS).

Article 13 Sec. 51A-13.703 Site Plan Review Item c stipulates the Primary Street Designation. Based on these criteria, we have developed a plan showing the Primary Streets designated for this block (see below).


## Additional Criteria:

Article 13 Section 51A-13.304 Development Types Item a3D states that Structured Parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any Primary Street for the first $30^{\prime}$ of the building measured inward from the street facing facade.

Having to abide by the above requirements of PD 887 and Article 13, in addition to the City's

Thoroughfare Plan, creates a restrictive area and shape for each block.

PD887 allows for large format retail as long as all parking is provided in a parking structure. Large format retail, hotel or cinemas, which are a critical component of the PD887 purpose and vision, cannot be located on the ground floor because:
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1) The Thoroughfare Plan, as adopted by the City of Dallas, travels through the applicant's property and requires roads to be built which create blocks with a restrictive area and shape
2) Due to the desired density of the projects, each block must contain structured parking.
3) Due to the size, shape and area of each of the blocks, the parking garage must be located in the center of the block.
4) Ground floor retail must be used to wrap the parking garage to meet the active use requirement for structured parking within the PD.
5) These required conditions have forced large format retail, theatres and hotels to be located above the ground floor.
6) These uses require an upper story height of greater than $15^{\prime}$.

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

The granting of this Story Height Variance is not to relieve a self-created hardship or for financial reason but specifically in response to a hardship of the area and shape of this block created by the Thoroughfare Plan, the streets plan that is an exhibit to the PD, and other PD restrictions the combined effect of which is to force larger permitted uses like the proposed use to be located on upper stories when locating in this block. Upper stories are restricted to 15 feet in height, which would prohibit this particular use even though it is a permitted use and consistent with the vision for this district.

The subject site cannot be designed in a manner that meets all PD restrictions and allows for the proposed use on the ground floor level. There are physical limitations that necessitate the granting of the variance for the proposed permitted use to allow it to be located on an upper level.

## ARTICLE 887.

PD 887.

## Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District

## SEC. 51P-887.101. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY.

PD 887 was established by Ordinance No. 29032, passed by the Dallas City Council on June 12, 2013. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.102. PROPERTY LOCATION AND SIZE.

PD 887 is established on property generally bounded by Southern Boulevard on the north, Preston Road on the east, LBJ Freeway on the south, and the Dallas North Tollway on the west. The size of PD 887 is approximately 445 acres. (Ord. 29032)

SEC. 51P-887.103.
PURPOSE AND VISION.
(a) Purpose. The Valley View - Galleria Area Special Purpose District is envisioned as the primary regional town center of North Dallas, characterized by an economically vibrant and environmentally sustainable mix of moderate to high density residential and non-residential land uses, supported by an enhanced system of streets and open spaces. The goals of this special purpose district are as follows:
(1) Encourage development that creates a diverse mix of compatible land uses in buildings designed to support a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly environment, reduce the dominance of visible parking, and reduce environmental impacts.
(2) Create a network of well-maintained, publicly-accessible open spaces with a range of sizes and functions, designed to enhance the quality of life for the growing resident population and workforce in the area.
(3) Create a network of connected public and private streets and pathways designed to enhance multi-modal accessibility while reducing automobile-dependence within the area through improvements that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation.
(b) Vision. The Valley View - Galleria Area Plan is intended to serve as a guide and should be consulted for goals, objectives, policy statements, and recommendations for development of this special purpose district. (Ord. 29032)

## SEC. 51P-887.104.

## CREATION OF SUBDISTRICTS.

(a) This special purpose district is divided into the following subdistricts:
(2) A regulating plan is not a site plan, as required for all development (see Section 51A-13.703, "Site Plan Review").

## (d) Modification of a Regulating Plan.

 must follow the zoning amendment procedure in Section 51A-4.701.
## (e) Compliance with Regulating Plan.

The requirements of the regulating plan are conditions that must be complied with before a certificate of occupancy may be granted.

## SEC. 51A-13.703. SITE PLAN REVIEW.

(a) Site Plan Required.
(1) Except as provided in Paragraph (2), all development must receive site plan approval by the building official in accordance with Section $51 \mathrm{~A}-4.803$ before issuance of a building permit. A certificate of occupancy will not be issued unless all aspects of the development fully conform to the approved site plan.
(2) A site plan is not required if the permit is only needed for:
(A) restoration of a building that has been damaged or destroyed by fire, explosion, flood, tornado, riot, act of the public enemy, or accident of any kind; or
(B) construction work that does not change the use or increase the existing building height, floor area ratio, or nonpermeable coverage of the lot.
(b) Additional Site Plan Requirements.

The following site plan elements are required in addition to any requirements in Section 51A-4.803.
(A) Designated primary, side, and service streets.
(B) Development types designated on specific lots.
(C) Location and description of pedestrian amenities.
(D) Location and specifications of minor and existing streets.
(E) Location and specifications of open space.
(F) Location of all setback lines.
(G) Building elevations showing compliance with building facade require-
ments.
(H) Location and specifications of landscaping.
(I) Locations and specifications of site lighting, outdoor storage and
display, and signs.

## (c) Primary Street Designation.

(1) Applying the standards in this subsection, the building official shall determine whether streets are considered primary or side streets.
(2) If a lot abuts only one street, the street is a primary street. Any street within a -SH overlay is also considered a primary street.
(3) If a lot runs from one street to another and has double frontage, both streets are primary streets.
(4) If a lot is located on a corner, one street is a primary street and one street is a side street, except as provided in Paragraph (5). The primary street is:
(A) the street abutting the longest face of the block; or
(B) the street parallel to the alley within the block.
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(5) When a lot is located on a corner, both streets are primary streets if:
(A) a majority of the lots on the shorter block face are platted perpendicu-
larly to the longer face of the block;
(B) there are two primary streets designated on a regulating plan; or
(C) the applicant designates both streets as primary streets.

## (d) Service Street Designation.

(1) The building official shall determine whether a service street is appropriate based on the criteria contained in this subsection.
(2) The applicant must control the land along an entire block face of a service street, and the service street must be designated from one street intersection to another street intersection.
(3) A site with a service street must have at least two frontages and one frontage must be a primary street.
(4) Only one service street may be designated abutting any block.

## (e) Multiple Development Types on a Single Lot or Parcel.

## (1) Calculation of Lot Coverage.

(A) Where multiple development types are located on a single building site, the calculation of lot coverage is based on the proportion of total coverage required for each development type in relation to the proposed building footprints.
(B) As an example, a building site with one proposed mixed use shopfront building (allowed 100 percent coverage) with a lot coverage of 10,000 square feet and two proposed general commercial buildings (allowed 80 percent coverage) with a combined lot coverage of 20,000 square feet would have a lot coverage of 86 percent.

$$
\frac{10,000 \text { SF }}{30,000 \mathrm{SF}} \times 1.00+\frac{20,000 \mathrm{SF}}{30,000 \mathrm{SF}} \times 0.80=86 \% \text { Lot Coverage }
$$

(C) Where the lot coverage for all proposed development types is the same, no calculation is necessary.

## (2) Calculation of Required Frontage.

(A) In order to ensure the pedestrian frontage remains as consistent as possible, if multiple development types are located on a single building site, the building official shall calculate required street frontage on a building-by-building basis.
(B) As an example, a site with a mixed use shopfront building with 180 linear feet of street frontage (required 90 percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 200 feet. A proposed general commercial building with 200 linear feet of street frontage (required 70 percent street frontage) must be located on an artificial lot with a width no greater than 286 feet in width.

## (f) Consistency With Regulating Plan.

The building official shall determine that the site plan is consistent with any adopted regulating plan prior to approval.

## (3) Parking Setbacks and Access.

(A) On-site surface parking must be located behind the parking setback line.
(B) The parking setback line applies only to the ground story.
(C) Except when configured as a multi-way boulevard or indented parking, no on-site surface parking is permitted between a building and the street. (See Division 57A-13.500, "Minor Streets and Streetscapes.")
(D) Structured parking must contain active uses on the ground story along any -SH overlay or any primary street for the first 30 feet of the building measured inward from the street-facing facade. There is no active ground-story use requirement for structured parking along a service street.
(E) The requirements of Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) above do not apply to on-street or underground parking.
(F) The required street frontage may be interrupted to allow for a maximum 30 -foot-wide vehicular entrance to a parking structure or area.



EXHIBIT G


## City of Dallas

## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Case No.: BDA $\qquad$
Data Relative to Subject Property:
Date: $\qquad$ January 26, 2017 $\qquad$
Location address: _13131 Preston Road, Dallas TX $\qquad$ Zoning District: PD 887 (Subd,1B)
$\qquad$ Block No.: A/7409 Acreage: 2.457 Census Tract: $\qquad$
Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) $\qquad$ 2) $263.2^{\prime}$ - 3) $\mathbf{4}^{4} 6.6^{\prime}$ 4)
237.1 $\qquad$ 5) $\qquad$
To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :
Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): _13331 Preston Road, L.P. $\qquad$
Applicant: _Rosemary Papa__ Telephone:__469-533-5021___
Mailing Address: _13101 Preston Road, Suite 510 Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: _75240 $\qquad$
E-mail Address:
$\qquad$ rosemary@beckventures.com $\qquad$
Represented by: $\qquad$ Myron Dornic $\qquad$ Telephone: _214-953-5946 $\qquad$
Mailing Address: _2323 Ross Avenue, Suite 600, Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: _ 75201 $\qquad$
E-mail Address:
$\qquad$ mdornic@jw.com
Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance _X , or Special Exception $\qquad$ , of __15'
__to the maximum upper story height for the mixed use shopfront development type of $15^{\prime}$. $\qquad$
Application is made to the Board of Adjustment, in accordance with the provisions of the Dallas Development Code, to grant the described appeal for the following reason:
The current maximum upper story height is $15^{\prime}$. This significantly limits the potential uses for the upper stories. The Developer has a hotel operator to manage a 250 key full-service hotel located in this block. The hotel ballroom amenity requires a higher story height due to the nature of the use. In order to have a pedestrian-friendly environment and activate the ground floor, this function is required to be located above the ground floor, which would require a higher upper story height.
Note to Applicant: If the appeal requested in this application is granted by the Board of Adjustment, a permit must be applied for within 180 days of the date of the final action of the Board, unless the Board specifically grants a longer period.

(Affiant/Applicant's name printed)
who on (his/her) oath certifies that the above statements are true and correct to his/her best knowledge and that he/she is the owner/or principal/or authorized representative of the subject property.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
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## Building Official's Report

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{rl}\begin{array}{r}\text { I hereby certify that } \\
\text { represented by }\end{array}
$$ \& Rosemary Papa <br>

Myron Dornic\end{array}\right\}\)| did submit a request | for a variance to the height regulations |
| ---: | :--- |
| at | 13131 Preston Road |

BDA167-032. Application of Rosemary Papa represented by Myron Dornic for a variance to the height regulations at 13131 Preston Road. This property is more fully described as ; 2.457 acre tract in Lot 3, Block A/7409, and is zoned PD-887, which limits the maximum story height to 15 feet. The applicant proposes to construct a nonresidential structure with story height of 30 feet, which will require a 15 foot variance to the maximum height regulation.

Sincerely,



In addition, the Dallas Office of Economic Development and the City of Dallas City Council have signed a developer agreement with the Developer incentivizing them to build such a facility within the district. In conclusion, and for all these reasons we believe "a literal enforcement of the zoning ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship, and so that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice done".

Also, early on in the design process, the Midtown District TIF Board and the Dallas Urban Design Peer Review reviewed and approved the elevations of this block.

We request that the Board extend the permit date to within 270 days of the date of the final action.






west elevation


AREA OF REQUEST<br>2.457 ACRE TRACT<br>Part of Lot 3, Block A/7409<br>Valley View Center<br>H. Wilburn Survey, Abstract No. 1567<br>City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas

City of Dallas, Dallas County, Texas
DESCRIPTION, of a 2.457 acre tract of land situated in the H . Wilburn Survey, Abstract No. 1567, Dallas County, Texas; said tract being part of Lot 3, Block A/7409, Valley View Center, an addition to the City of Dallas, Texas according to the plat recorded in Volume 72178, Page 1879, as affected by Certificate of Error recorded in Volume 73134, Page 2254, both of the Deed Records of Dallas County, Texas; said tract also being part of that certain tract of land described as "Tract 2" in Special Warranty Deed to 13331 Preston Road, L.P. recorded in Instrument No. 201200326375 of the Official Public Records of Dallas County, Texas; said 2.457 acre tract being more particularly described as follows (Bearing system for this survey is based on the State Plane Coordinate System, North American Datum of 1983 (2011), Texas North Central Zone 4202. Distances shown have been adjusted by applying the Dallas County TxDOT combination factor of 1.000136506 ):

COMMENCING, at a 3-inch aluminum disk stamped "PACHECO KOCH - DM" set in the west right-of-way line of Preston Road (a variable width right-of-way); said point being the northeast corner of Lot 2, Block A/7409 of said Valley View Center; from said point a 1/2-inch iron rod found bears North 67 degrees, 30 minutes West, a distance of 0.7 feet;
(Grid: N: 7,025,142.50, E: 2,488,920.16)
THENCE, North 00 degrees, 53 minutes, 00 seconds West, along the said west line of Preston Road, a distance of 4.67 feet to the intersection of the said west line of Preston Road and the future centerline of proposed James Temple Road;

THENCE, South 88 degrees, 26 minutes, 06 seconds West, a distance of 576.82 feet to a point;
THENCE, North 01 degrees, 33 minutes, 54 seconds West, departing said future centerline, a distance of 31.00 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE, South 88 degrees, 26 minutes, 06 seconds West, a distance of 387.99 feet to the beginning of a tangent curve to the right;

THENCE, in a northwesterly direction, along said curve to the right, having a central angle of 07 degrees, 47 minutes, 57 seconds, a radius of 119.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of North 87 degrees, 39 minutes, 55 seconds West, 16.19 feet, an arc distance of 16.20 feet to the beginning of a reverse curve to the left;

THENCE, in a northwesterly direction, along said curve to the left, having a central angle of 03 degrees, 56 minutes, 30 seconds, a radius of 181.00 feet, a chord bearing and distance of North 85 degrees, 44 minutes, 12 seconds West, 12.45 feet, an arc distance of 12.45 feet to the end of said curve;

THENCE, North 00 degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds West, a distance of 237.11 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, North 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 27 seconds East, a distance of 115.68 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, North 44 degrees, 26 minutes, 31 seconds East, a distance of 43.84 feet to a point for corner;

## AREA OF REQUEST

2.457 ACRE TRACT
(continued)
THENCE, North 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds East, a distance of 269.82 feet to a point for corner;

THENCE, South 00 degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds East, a distance of 263.16 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

CONTAINING: 107,036 square feet or 2.457 acres of land, more or less.


# Notification List of Property Owners 

 BDA167-0323 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 2 | 13131 | PRESTON RD |
| 3 | 13343 | PRESTON RD |

## Owner

13331 PRESTON RD LP
SERITAGE SRC FINANCE LLC
13331 PRESTON RD LP

