ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, PANEL A
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2016
AGENDA

| BRIEFING | L1FN CONFERENCE CENTER AUDITORIUM <br> 1500 MARILLA STREET <br> DALLAS CITY HALL | 11:00 A.M. |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| PUBLIC HEARING | L1FN CONFERENCE CENTER AUDITORIUM <br> 1500 MARILLA STREET <br> DALLAS CITY HALL | 1:00 P.M. |

Donna Moorman, Chief Planner Steve Long, Board Administrator

## MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Approval of the August 16, 2016 Panel A
Public Hearing Minutes
BDA156-093(SL)
10715 Wyatt Street
M2
REQUEST: Of Karen Leger to reimburse the filing fees submitted for special exceptions to the fence height and visual obstruction regulations

## UNCONTESTED CASE

## BDA156-095(SL)

17610 Midway Road
REQUEST: Application of Lee Morris, represented
by Elaine Pickering of Adams Engineering, for a special exception to the off-street parking regulations

## REGULAR CASES



5017 W. Lovers Lane
REQUEST: Application of Thomas Barnhart for a variance to the off-street parking regulations

10715 Wyatt Street
REQUEST: Application of Karen Leger for special exceptions to the fence height and visual obstruction regulations

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)

## MISCELLANEOUS ITEM NO. 2

## FILE NUMBER: BDA156-093

REQUEST: To reimburse the filing fee submitted in conjunction with requests for special exceptions to the fence height and visual obstruction regulations

LOCATION: 10715 Wyatt Street

## APPLICANT: Karen Leger

## STANDARD FOR A FEE WAIVER OR A FEE REIMBURSEMENT:

The Dallas Development Code states that the board may waive the filing fee for a board of adjustment application if the board finds that payment of the fee would result in substantial financial hardship to the applicant.

The Dallas Development Code further states:

- The applicant may either pay the fee and request reimbursement at the hearing on the matter or request that the issue of financial hardship be placed on the board's miscellaneous docket for predetermination.
- In making this determination, the board may require the production of financial documents.


## Timeline:

June 24, 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.

August 4, 2016: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

August 9, 2016: The applicant emailed a letter requesting a waiver of the filing fee regarding this application (see Attachment A).

August 10, 2016: The Board Administrator forwarded the code provision as it related to the board of adjustment considering fee waiver and fee reimbursement requests, and given these provisions and the fact that the applicant had submitted the application, that the applicant consider redrafting a letter to request a reimbursement of the filing fee (see Attachment A).

August 11, 2016: The applicant emailed the Board Administrator requesting the he place the fee reimbursement request on the docket, and that she would get the needed documents together to request the reimbursement (see Attachment A).

August 12, 2016: The Board Administrator forwarded the code provision as it relates to fee reimbursements (Sec 51A-1.105(b)(6)) to the applicant, and informed her that typically when this type of request is made, the applicant will submit any additional documentation that shows how payment of the filing fee results in substantial financial hardship to the applicant (i.e. additional financial documents as in but not limited to copies of 1040's, W-4's, bank statements - all with account numbers redacted). The Board Administrator also emailed the applicant that the deadline to submit information to be included in the Board's docket was 1 p.m., September $9^{\text {th }}$.
September 9, 2016: The Board Administrator spoke with the applicant and confirmed with her that the only information that she had submitted to be included in the Board's docket was the email that she had sent on August $11^{\text {th }}$. The applicant informed the Board Administrator that she would consider bringing any written documents to the public hearing with the documentary evidence rule in mind.

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

## Attachments:

Long, Steve
Wednesday, September 07, 2016 1:13 PM
'Karen Barton Leger'
FW: Fee REIMBURSEMENT request in conjunction with BDA156-093, Property at 10715 Wyatt Street
fee waiver and reimbursement.pdf; documentary evidence.pdf; Panel $A$ hearing date and deadlines.doc

Dear Ms. Leger,

This is to remind you that the deadline to submit any information on your fee reimbursement request for me to include in the board's docket is this Friday at 1 p.m.

To date, the only thing I have from you on this fee reimbursement request is the email that you sent me below on August $11^{\text {th }}$. (I am not including the original letter you sent me regarding a fee WAIVER request given it was my understanding from you that you had planned to redraft/resubmit a letter to the fee REIMBURSEMENT request).

Please write or call me if you have questions: 214/670-4666.

Thank you,

Steve

From: Long, Steve
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 6:05 AM
To: 'Karen Barton Leger'
Cc: Duerksen, Todd; Moorman, Donna; McCullough, Mary
Subject: RE: Fee REIMBURSEMENT request in conjunction with h BDA156-093, Property at 10715 Wyatt Street
Dear Ms. Leger,

Please be advised that your request for a reimbursement of the filing fee made in conjunction with the application to the board of adjustment at the address referenced above will be put on the Tuesday, September $20^{\text {th }}$ agenda per your request below.

As I wrote to you earlier this week, typically when an applicant makes a request for the board to consider reimbursing the filing fee submitted in conjunction with an application, the applicant will submit documentation that shows how payment of the filing fee results in substantial financial hardship to them (i.e. additional financial documents as in but not limited to copies of 1040's, W-4's, bank statements - all with account numbers redacted)).

Once again, I would call to your attention the attachments the I sent to you earlier this week - a document that provides your public hearing date and other deadlines for submittal of additional information to staff/the board, and the board's rule on documentary evidence.

Please write or call me at 214/670-4666 if I can assist you in any other way on this fee reimbursement request.
Thank you,
Steve
PS: Please feel free to send any documents related to your fee reimbursement request to
steve.long@dallascityhall.com or mail it to me at the following address:
Steve Long, Board of Adjustment Administrator
City of Dallas Sustainable Development and Construction
1500 Marilla Street, Room 5BN
Dallas, Texas 75201

From: Karen Barton Leger [mailto:karenbartonleger@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 10:53 PM
To: Long, Steve
Cc: Duerksen, Todd
Subject: Re: Potential Fee REIMBURSEMENT request in conjunction withh BDA156-093, Property at 10715 Wyatt Street
Hi Steve,
My husband will get the needed documents together to request the reimbursement. When do we need to have the information to you?

Thank you,
Karen Barton Léger
Sent from my iPhone. Please excuse any spelling errors.
On Aug 10, 2016, at 7:48 AM, Long, Steve [steve.long@dallascityhall.com](mailto:steve.long@dallascityhall.com) wrote:
Dear Ms. Leger,
As you know from the email that I sent you on August $5^{\text {th }}$, your board of adjustment application referenced above for requests for special exceptions to the fence height and visual obstruction regulations is scheduled for Tuesday, September $20^{\text {th }}$.

But in response to your email below and letter attached, I am forwarding for your review the code provision as it relates to requests for the board of adjustment to consider reimbursements of filing fees made in conjunction with submitted board of adjustment applications: Sec 51A$1.105(\mathrm{~b})(6)$.

Typically when an applicant makes a request for the board to consider reimbursing the filing fee submitted in conjunction with an application, the applicant will submit documentation that shows how payment of the filing fee results in substantial financial hardship to them (i.e. additional financial documents as in but not limited to copies of 1040's, W-4's, bank statements - all with account numbers redacted)).

Upon review of the filing fee reimbursement code standard would you please let me know by this Friday, August $12^{\text {th }}$ whether you want to make this filing fee reimbursement request to the board. If you do wish to proceed with a request for the board to consider reimbursing the filing fee, please be advised it will be heard on the same day as your application for special exceptions to fence height and visual obstruction regulations: Tuesday, September $20^{\text {th }}$.

On the assumption that you would want to make this filing fee reimbursement request to the board, I am attaching the same documents I emailed you on August $5^{\text {th }}$ - a document that

Please write or call me at 214/670-4666 if I can assist you in any other way on reimbursements of board of adjustment filing fees.

Thank you,
Steve

From: Karen Barton Leger [mailto:karenbartonleger@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 9:20 PM
To: Long, Steve
Subject: Filing Fee Waiver Request: BDA156-093, Property at 10715 Wyatt Street
Dear Mr. Long,
Please see attached letter requesting the filing fee be waived regarding our appeal. Any help and assistance would be greatly appreciated.

If you would, please confirm receipt and advise approximately how long until a decision is made regarding the fee waiver.

If you need further information from me, please let me know.
Kind regards,

## Karen Leger

469-693-0768 cell
<fee waiver and reimbursement.pdf>
<documentary evidence.pdf>
<Panel A hearing date and deadlines.doc>
<Letter to Mr. Steve Long 1.pdf>

## FILE NUMBER: BDA156-095(SL)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Lee Morris, represented by Elaine Pickering of Adams Engineering, for a special exception to the off-street parking regulations at 17610 Midway Road. This property is more fully described as Lot 1, Block V/8705, and is zoned CR, which requires parking to be provided. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a structure for a restaurant with drive-in or drivethrough service, restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service, general merchandise or food store 3500 square feet or less, personal service, dry cleaning or laundry store, motor vehicle fueling station, medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center, and office uses, and provide 250 of the required 288 parking spaces, which will require a 38 space special exception to the off-street parking regulations.

## LOCATION: 17610 Midway Road

## APPLICANT: Lee Morris

Represented by Elaine Pickering of Adams Engineering

## REQUEST:

A request for a special exception to the off-street parking regulations of 38 spaces is made to:

1. maintain the existing structure/tenant mix/uses (restaurant with drive-in or drivethrough service; restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service; general merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less; personal service; dry cleaning or laundry store; motor vehicle fueling station; medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center; and office uses) on a site developed with a retail center (Bent Tree Midway Village Shopping Center); and
2. remodel one of the existing structures/uses within the center (McDonald's) by adding approximately 100 square feet of building area and a drive-through lane to it, and in the process eliminating approximately 10 existing off-street parking spaces.
The applicant proposes to provide 250 (or 87 percent) of the total 288 off-street parking spaces required to maintain the uses within the existing center and to make the minimal proposed improvements as described above to one of the structures/ uses on the subject site.

## STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO THE OFF-STREET PARKING

 REGULATIONS:1) The Board of Adjustment may grant a special exception to authorize a reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces required under this article if the board finds, after a public hearing, that the parking demand generated by the use does not warrant the number of off-street parking spaces required, and the special exception would not create a traffic hazard or increase traffic congestion on adjacent and
nearby streets. The maximum reduction authorized by this section is 25 percent or one space, whichever is greater, minus the number of parking spaces currently not provided due to delta credits, as defined in Section 51A-4.704(b)(A). For the commercial amusement (inside) use and the industrial (inside) use, the maximum reduction authorized by this section is 75 percent or one space, whichever is greater, minus the number of parking spaces currently not provided due to delta credits, as defined in Section 51A-4.704(b)(4)(A). For the office use, the maximum reduction authorized by this section is 35 percent or one space, whichever is greater, minus the number of parking spaces currently not provided due to delta credits, as defined in Section 51A-4.704(b)(4)(A). Applicants may seek a special exception to the parking requirements under this section and an administrative parking reduction under Section 51A-4.313. The greater reduction will apply, but the reduction may not be combined.
2) In determining whether to grant a special exception, the board shall consider the following factors:
(A) The extent to which the parking spaces provided will be remote, shared, or packed parking.
(B) The parking demand and trip generation characteristics of all uses for which the special exception is requested.
(C) Whether or not the subject property or any property in the general area is part of a modified delta overlay district.
(D) The current and probable future capacities of adjacent and nearby streets based on the city's thoroughfare plan.
(E) The availability of public transit and the likelihood of its use.
(F) The feasibility of parking mitigation measures and the likelihood of their effectiveness.
3) In granting a special exception, the board shall specify the uses to which the special exception applies. A special exception granted by the board for a particular use automatically and immediately terminates if and when that use is changed or discontinued.
4) In granting a special exception, the board may:
(A) Establish a termination date for the special exception or; otherwise provide for the reassessment of conditions after a specified period of time;
(B) Impose restrictions on access to or from the subject property; or
(C) Impose any other reasonable conditions that would have the effect of improving traffic safety or lessening congestion on the streets.
5) The board shall not grant a special exception to reduce the number of off-street parking spaces required in an ordinance granting or amending a specific use permit.
6) The board shall not grant a special exception to reduce the number of off-street parking spaces expressly required in the text or development plan of an ordinance establishing or amending regulations governing a specific planned development district. This prohibition does not apply when:
(A) the ordinance does not expressly specify a minimum number of spaces, but instead simply makes references to the existing off-street parking regulations in Chapter 51 or this chapter; or
(B) the regulations governing that specific district expressly authorize the board to grant the special exception.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval, subject to the following condition:

- The special exception of 38 spaces shall automatically and immediately terminate if and when the restaurant with drive-in or drive-through service; restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service; general merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less; personal service; dry cleaning or laundry store; motor vehicle fueling station; medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center; and office uses on the subject site are changed or discontinued

Rationale:

- Staff concurs with the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer who recommended approval of the applicant's request.
- Staff concluded that the applicant had substantiated that the parking demand generated by the restaurant with drive-in or drive-through service; restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service; general merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less; personal service; dry cleaning or laundry store; motor vehicle fueling station; medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center; and office uses on the subject site does not warrant the number of off-street parking spaces required, and the special exception would not create a traffic hazard or increase traffic congestion on adjacent and nearby streets.


## Zoning:

Site: $\quad$ CR (Community retail)
North: R-7.5A) (Single family district 7,500 square feet)
South: City of Carrollton
East: $\quad \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{A})$ (Duplex)
West: $\quad$ CR (Community retail)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with an existing shopping center (Bent Tree Midway Village Shopping Center). The area to the north is developed with single family uses; the area to the east is developed with duplex uses; the area to the south is the City of Carrollton (retail uses); and the area to the west is developed with retail 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 FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS:

- This special exception to the off-street parking special exception regulations of 38 spaces focuses on: 1) maintaining the existing structure/tenant mix/uses (restaurant with drive-in or drive-through service; restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service; general merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less; personal service; dry cleaning or laundry store; motor vehicle fueling station; medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center; and office uses) on a site developed with a retail center (Bent Tree Midway Village Shopping Center); and 2) remodeling one of the existing structures/uses within the center (McDonald's) by adding approximately 100 square feet of building area and a drive-through lane to it, and in the process eliminating approximately 10 existing off-street parking spaces.
- The applicant proposes to provide 250 (or 87 percent) of the total 288 off-street parking spaces required to maintain the uses within the existing center and to make the minimal proposed improvements as described above to one of the structures/ uses on the subject site.
- The Dallas Development Code requires the following off-street parking requirements:
- Restaurant with drive-in or drive-through service: 1 space per 100 square feet of floor area with a minimum of 4 spaces.
- Restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service: 1 space per 100 square feet with a minimum of 4 spaces.
- General merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less: 1 space per 200 square feet of floor area. If more than 10 off-street parking spaces are required, handicapped parking must be provided.
- Personal service: 1 space per 200 square feet of floor area. If more than 10 offstreet parking spaces are required, handicapped parking must be provided.
- Dry cleaning or laundry store: 1 space per 200 square feet of floor area. If more than 10 off-street parking spaces are required, handicapped parking must be provided.
- Motor vehicle or fueling station: 2 spaces.
- Medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center: 1 space per 200 square feet of floor area. Handicapped parking must be provided.
- Office use: 1 space per 333 square feet of floor area. If more than 10 off-street parking spaces are required, handicapped parking must be provided.
- The applicant has submitted a site plan that lists the uses and square footages of each business in the existing shopping center, and that the total number of spaces to be provided is 250 and that the total number of spaces required is 288.
- The applicant has submitted a study showing that the maximum observed parking demand for the shopping center (Bent Tree Midway Village) and the restaurant with drive-in service (McDonald's) on the subject site was 146 parking spaces. (The applicant proposes to provide 250 off-street parking spaces).
- The applicant states there are no proposed tenant or use changes for the property; and that while it was originally assessed that the existing shopping center has an excess of parking, it was later discovered when plans proceeded with adding the
small addition and drive-through lane that the existing shopping center did not meet code hence the application for 38 spaces (10 spaces that will be lost with a new drive-through lane to an existing restaurant with drive-through service use on the site along with 28 spaces to remedy the existing shopping center and its tenants/uses that are not parked to code).
- The Sustainable Development Department Project Engineer submitted a review comment sheet marked "Has no objections".
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
- The parking demand generated by the restaurant with drive-in or drive-through service; restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service; general merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less; personal service; dry cleaning or laundry store; motor vehicle fueling station; medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center; and office uses on the site does not warrant the number of off-street parking spaces required, and
- The special exception of 38 would not create a traffic hazard or increase traffic congestion on adjacent and nearby streets.
- If the Board were to grant this request, and impose the condition that the special exception of 38 spaces shall automatically and immediately terminate if and when the restaurant with drive-in or drive-through service; restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service; general merchandise or food store 3,500 square feet or less; personal service; dry cleaning or laundry store; motor vehicle fueling station; medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center; and office uses are changed or discontinued, the applicant would be allowed to maintain the existing uses in the center, and construct and maintain a small addition and drive-through lane to the existing restaurant with drive-through service use on the site with these specific uses and with the specified square footages, and provide 250 of the 288 code required offstreet parking spaces.


## Timeline:

July 19, 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.

August 4, 2016: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

August 5, 2016: The Board Administrator contacted the applicant's representative and emailed the following information:

- 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 August $31^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the September $9^{\text {th }}$ 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."

September 6, 2016: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for September public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction 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, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

September 7, 2016: The Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer submitted a review comment sheet marked "Has no objections".



## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Data Relative to Subject Property:
Case No.: BDA


Date:
7/19/16

Location address:
17610 Midway Rd. (17602 Midway, 17606 Midway)
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Zoning District: CR

Lot No.: $\qquad$ Block No.:

V/8705 Acreage: $\qquad$ Census Tract:


Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) $\qquad$ 2) $\qquad$ 3) $\qquad$ 4) $\qquad$ 5)


## To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :

Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): Bent Tree Midway S/C, LTD.

Applicant: $\qquad$ Telephone: 817.487.1253 Telephone: $\qquad$
Mailing Address:
511 E John Carpenter Frwy Suite 375 Irving, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: 75062 E-mail Address: lee.morris@us.mcd.com

Represented by: $\qquad$ Telephone: 817.328 .3200

8951 Cypress Waters Blvd., Ste. 150, Dallas, TX $\qquad$ Zip Code: 75019
Mailing Address: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

E-mail Address:
elaine.pickering@adams-engineering.com

Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance $\qquad$ , or Special Exception X, of $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 42 \\ & 4\end{aligned}$ parking space reduction from the 292 spaces required for various uses. See attached parking analysis. 288

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 parking demand generated by the use doesn't warrant the number of off-street parking spaces required. $70 \%$ of McDonald's business is drive thru traffic, and adding a second drive thru lane and order point to this site will reduce the time it takes cars to go through the drive thru, thus reducing the amount of time spent in queuing. In order to add a second drive-thru lane and order point, 10 parking spaces need to be removed, and the full site is already deficient by 31 spaces, with a building addition of 100 SF , another parking space is required. Based on the parking study analysis, the maximum parking demand for this site is 114 spaces. After construction, there will be 250 spaces left, therefore no traffic hazard or increase in traffic congestion on adjacent or nearby streets is anticipated.

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
(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.

Respectfully submitted:

(Affiant/Applicant's signature)
Subscribed and sworn to before me this $\qquad$ day of


# иешлечэ <br>  

Building Official's Report

## I hereby certify that

represented by did submit a request

Lee Morris
Elaine Pickering
for a special exception to the parking regulations
17610 Midway Road

BDA156-095. Application of Lee Morris represented by Elaine Pickering for a special exception to the parking regulations at 17610 Midway Road. This property is more fully described as Lot 1, Block $\mathrm{V} / 8705$, and is zoned CR ; which requires parking to be provided The applicant proposes to construct and maintain a nonresidential structure for a restaura with drive-in or drive-through service, restaurant without drive-in or drive-through service, general merchandise or food store 3500 square feet or less, personal service, dry cleanin! or laundry store, motor vehicle fueling station, medical clinic or ambulatory surgical center and office uses, and provide 250 of the required 288 parking spaces, which will require a: space special exception ( $13.2 \%$ reduction) to the parking regulation.

Sincerely,

- ~ir
;





April 7, 2016
Ms. Heather Macomber
Adams Engineering \& Development Consultants
8951 Cypress Waters Blvd., Ste. 150
Dallas, Texas 75019
Dear Ms. Macomber:
Lee Engineering has completed the parking analysis for the expansion of the existing McDonald's located at 17610 Midway Road Dallas, Texas. The McDonald's is a part of the Bent Tree Midway Village shopping center, shown in the site plan on the first page of attachments to this letter. This report documents the study procedures and findings.

The existing McDonald's is 3,905 square feet and has 32 on-site parking spaces surrounding the restaurant on the south, east, and west sides within the limits of the leased area. Additionally, 52 other parking spaces are part of the shopping center's common area and available to all tenants in the shopping center. Of these 52 shared parking spaces, 21 are located just north of the McDonald's building. Thus, there are a total of 53 parking spaces available surrounding McDonalds ( $=32+21$ ).

Including all tenant-specific and common areas, the Bent Tree Midway Village has 257 regular parking stalls and 10 handicap spots, for a total of 267 parking spaces. Note that the site plan indicates 257 spaces, but Lee Engineering has field verified that 267 is the correct number.

Based on the property data provided by the Bent Tree Midway Village site plan, there are a total of 21 tenant suites in the development. Total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the development is estimated at 43,835 square feet of which 13,955 square feet is occupied by restaurants and 29,880 square feet is occupied by retail businesses. It should be noted that 3,521 square feet is noted as the existing McDonald's floor area in the Bent Tree Midway Village site plan. However, it was confirmed with the applicant that the actual floor area of the existing McDonald's is 3,905 square feet.

The Dallas City Code Section 51A-4.210 "Retail and Personal Service Uses" requires one parking space per 100 square feet of floor area for restaurants without and with drive through windows (Land Use Code 24 and 25) and one parking space per 200 square feet of floor area for retail uses (Land Use Code 27). Table 1 summarizes the parking needs for Bent Tree Midway Village based on the City Code.

Table 1: Bent Tree Midway Village Existing Parking Needs per City Code

| Land Use Type | Parking Ratio | Total Square Feet | Required Number of Spaces |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Restaurants | 1 space per 100 sq ft | 13,955 | 140 |
| Retail | 1 space per 200 sq ft | 29,880 | 150 |
| Total |  |  | 290 |

Based on Table 1, it can be inferred that the Bent Tree Midway Village has 23 less parking spaces ( $=290-267$ ) than required by the City Code.

The existing McDonald's has plans for expansion of the existing building and the drive through facility. A second drive-through lane and ordering station will be added outside the building, along with building expansion of 99 square feet for a second drive-through window. The site plan for the proposed development has been developed by Adams Engineering and it is provided with the attachments. Based on this document, the total new floor area for the McDonald's building is proposed to be 4,004 square feet. Ten existing parking stalls east of the existing McDonald's building will be removed to expand the existing drive-through facility. It should be noted that the proposed expansion will add drive through capacity but will not increase the restaurant's 'dine in' capacity.

The proposed McDonald's expansion will reduce the overall available parking in the shopping center from 267 spaces to 257 . Table 2 summarizes the parking needs for Bent Tree Midway Village based on City Code with the proposed changes to the McDonald's facility.

Table 2: Bent Tree Midway Village Proposed Parking Needs per City Code

| Land Use Type | Parking Ratio | Total Square Feet | Required Number of Spaces |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Restaurants | 1 space per 100 sq ft | 14,054 | 141 |
| Retail | 1 space per 200 sq ft | 29,880 | 150 |
| Total |  |  | 291 |

Based on Table 2, it can be inferred that the Bent Tree Midway Village will have 34 less parking spaces (=291-257) than required by the City Code under proposed conditions.

The applicant is proposing to apply for a parking requirement reduction under the following section of the City Code:

1. Section 51A-4.311 Special Exception: Parking Demand

This special exception enables the board to permit $25 \%$ parking reduction after a public hearing. The exception is granted if the board determines that the parking demand generated by the use does not warrant the number of off-street parking spaces required and the special exception will not create a traffic hazard or increase traffic congestion on adjacent or nearby streets.
2. Section 51A-4.320 Special Reduction: Shared Parking

This special exception allows two different land uses to share parking if their peak demands have been observed at different times and the available parking can satisfy the peak demand of the development.

Based on information provided in the ITE Parking Generation (4th Edition), peak hour parking demands for a fast food restaurant with drive through occur between 11:30 AM - 1:30 PM and between 5:00 PM - 7:00 PM on a weekday. Over the weekend, the peak hour parking demands for such land use occur between 11:30 AM-1:30 PM.

ITE Parking Generation was also used to determine peak hour parking demands for a HighTurnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant. The peak hour demands for such land use occur between 11:30 AM - 1:30 PM and between 5:00 PM-7:00 PM on a weekday. Over the weekend the peak hour parking demands for a High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant occur between 11:30 AM - 1:30 PM and between 6:00 PM-8:00 PM. Peak hour operations timing for High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant were considered to factor in the effect of Panda Express which is located next to the subject McDonald's facility and has similar peak demand characteristics.

Based on the above-indicated peak hours for typical parking demand, Lee Engineering performed parking occupancy counts for peak times on a typical weekday and Saturday. Parking data for Bent Tree Midway Village was collected on Thursday, March 31, 2016 and on Saturday April 2, 2016 to determine the current peak parking demand.

The number of vehicles in the parking lot was documented every 15 minutes. The raw data is provided as an attachment to this letter. The maximum weekday number of cars observed on-site was 114 vehicles from 12:15 PM - 12:30 PM, and the maximum weekend parking peak was observed to be 99 spaces from 12:45 PM-1:00 PM. At no time did the parking demand exceed the available on-site parking ( $257+10=267$ stalls). Table 3 and Table 4 summarize the existing parking demand for weekday and weekend conditions, respectively.

Table 3: Weekday Parking Demand

| Lunch <br> Peak <br> Time | Parked Cars near <br> McDonalds <br> (53 spaces avail.) | Total Parked Cars <br> for the Entire <br> Shopping Center <br> (267 spaces avail.) | PM Peak <br> Time | Parked Cars near <br> McDonalds <br> (53 spaces avail.) | Total Parked Cars <br> for the Entire <br> Shopping Center <br> (267 spaces avail.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:30 AM | 19 | 76 | $5: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ | 23 | 84 |
| 11:45 AM | 20 | 93 | $5: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 25 | 88 |
| 12:00 PM | 25 | 110 | $5: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 26 | 92 |
| 12:15 PM | 30 | 114 | $5: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 23 | 94 |
| 12:30 PM | 26 | 111 | $6: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ | 20 | 101 |
| 12:45 PM | 27 | 108 | $6: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 24 | 95 |
| 1:00 PM | 19 | 98 | $6: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 25 | 99 |
| 1:15 PM | 20 | 89 | $6: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 27 | 104 |
| Maximum | 30 | 114 | Maximum | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | 104 |

Table 4: Weekend Parking Demand

| Lunch <br> Peak <br> Time | Parked Cars near <br> McDonalds <br> (53 spaces avail.) | Total Parked Cars <br> for the Entire <br> Shopping Center <br> (267 spaces avail.) | PM Peak <br> Time | Parked Cars near <br> McDonalds <br> (53 spaces avail.) | Total Parked Cars <br> for the Entire <br> Shopping Center <br> (267 spaces avail.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:30 AM | 24 | 92 | $5: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ | 5 | 57 |
| 11:45 AM | 25 | 79 | $5: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 5 | 57 |
| 12:00 PM | 23 | 85 | $5: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 5 | 55 |
| 12:15 PM | 24 | 89 | $5: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 3 | 63 |
| 12:30 PM | 29 | 91 | $6: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ | 7 | 53 |
| 12:45 PM | 32 | 99 | $6: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 3 | 45 |
| 1:00 PM | 20 | 86 | $6: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 3 | 52 |
| 1:15 PM | 16 | 86 | $6: 45$ PM | 3 | 51 |
| Maximum | 32 | 99 | Maximum | 7 | 63 |

Tables 3 and 4 show that in the 53 parking spaces immediately surrounding McDonald's, the highest observed quantity of parked vehicles was 32 . That is, about $39 \%$ (21) spaces were unutilized. With the proposed McDonald's expansion, there will not be any increase in dine-in capacity, but 10 spaces east of the building will removed. With the reduction of 10 parking spaces, total available parking spaces surrounding McDonald's would be 43 , which is 10 more than the observed peak demand. Based on the observed parking demand, no traffic hazard or traffic congestion on adjoining streets is predicted with the proposed McDonald's expansion if there is no significant change in surrounding land use or traffic pattern. Hence, the special exception based on parking demand is applicable.

With the proposed McDonald's expansion, the 52 shared parking spaces will remain unchanged. It was also observed that $57 \%$ of the shopping center's parking spaces are unutilized under weekday peak conditions, and $62 \%$ are unoccupied under weekend peak conditions. This clearly indicates that adjoining retail businesses' have spare parking capacity. While a 5 - to 10 -percent upward adjustment to parking demand might be assumed to account for seasonal variations, the stripcommercial type stores currently occupying the shopping center do not typically experience the type of seasonal variation seen in December at larger shopping centers such as malls and big box stores. Hence, the special reduction based on shared parking is also applicable.

Based on the collected traffic data presented in this report, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The existing McDonald's is 3,905 square feet and will expand 4,004 square feet. The proposed expansion will not add any 'dine in' capacity of the restaurant but improve drive through capacity. Thus, the proposed expansion is not expected to increase parking demand.
2. The maximum observed parking demand for Bent Tree Midway Village was 114 parking spaces from 12:15 PM to 12:30 PM on a weekday. During the peak operations about $57 \%$ of parking spaces were not occupied.
3. The maximum observed parking demand for McDonald's was 32 parking spaces from 12:45 PM to 1:30 PM on Saturday. During the peak demand, about $39 \%$ of parking spaces
immediately surrounding McDonald's were not occupied.
4. The new McDonald's will provide 22 on-site parking spaces. It will also remove 10 parking spaces on the east side of the facility. This will reduce the total parking capacity of Bent Tree Midway Village to 257 spaces. Based on the observed parking demand and proposed total parking supply, it is predicted that $55 \%$ spaces will be unoccupied if there is no change in parking demand.

Recommendation: This study recommends that the parking reduction be granted based on the low observed existing parking demand.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me.
Sincerely,


Joshua D Smith, P.E., PTOE
Project Manager
Lee Engineering
Firm No. F-450


4-7-2016

Attachments:

1. Bent Tree Midway Village site plan
2. Shared parking agreement map
3. Proposed site plan for McDonald's improvement/expansion
4. Observed parking demand data

## PROPERTY DATA

| Suite | Tenant | SF |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 101 | TEXACO | 2000 |
| 102 | AVAILABLE | 2100 |
| 106 | H\＆R BLOCK | 1050 |
| 108 | SPORT WINGS | 2100 |
| 110 | ELEGANT SMILES DENTIST | 2100 |
| 112 | AVAILABLE | 1400 |
| 118 | AVAILABLE | 2450 |
| 122 | DIVA STYLES SALON | 1380 |
| 124 | TRINITY MILLS CHIROPRACTIC | 9700 |
| 128 | PHYSIOFIT GYM | 1027.5 |
| 136 | KEITH＇S COMICS | 22.5 |
| $136 C R$ | CAMERA ROOM | 1050 |
| 138 | JEANNIE＇S NAILS | 2800 |
| 140 | ASTORIA BIRYANI HOUSE | 1050 |
| 142 | BENT TREE CLEANERS | 2100 |
| 143 | ASTORIA BALLROOM | 1050 |
| 144 | TOP ALTERATIONS | 3350 |
| 150 | SWEET BASIL |  |
|  |  | 3531 |
| 17606 | McDONALDS | 2500 |
| 17602 | PANDA EXPRESS |  |
|  |  | 43461 |
| TOTAL |  |  |
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|  |  |
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Data Collection Sub-Areas: Red - McDonald's; Blue - Panda Express; Green - North; Orange - East; Pink - Rear
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## BENT TREE MIDWAY VILLAGE - PARKING STUDY

Thursday (3/31/16) Occupancy
TOTAL PARKING SPACES:

|  | MCD'S - | PANDA - | NORTH - | EAST - | REAR - | TOTALS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RED | BLUE | GREEN | ORANGE | PINK | COT |
| SPACES | 50 | 27 | 56 | 67 | 57 | 257 |
| HC SPACES | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  | 10 |
| TOTAL SPACES: | 52 | 29 | 58 | 71 | 57 | 267 |


| TIME | McD'S - <br> RED | PANDA - <br> BLUE | NORTH - <br> GREEN | EAST - <br> ORANGE | REAR - <br> PINK | 15-MIN <br> TOTALS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:30 AM | 19 | 8 | 25 | 21 | 3 | 76 |
| 11:45 AM | 20 | 17 | 25 | 28 | 3 | 93 |
| 12:00 PM | 25 | 25 | 26 | 33 | 1 | 110 |
| 12:15 PM | 30 | 21 | 25 | 34 | 4 | 114 |
| 12:30 PM | 26 | 21 | 28 | 32 | 4 | 111 |
| 12:45 PM | 27 | 22 | 28 | 30 | 1 | 108 |
| 1:00 PM | 19 | 23 | 29 | 26 | 1 | 98 |
| 1:15 PM | 20 | 10 | 28 | 29 | 2 | 89 |
| Max | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 34 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 2 2}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5:00 PM | 23 | 4 | 28 | 27 | 2 | 84 |
| 5:15 PM | 25 | 5 | 28 | 28 | 2 | 88 |
| 5:30 PM | 26 | 6 | 29 | 29 | 2 | 92 |
| 5:45 PM | 23 | 10 | 29 | 30 | 2 | 94 |
| 6:00 PM | 20 | 16 | 30 | 33 | 2 | 101 |
| 6:15 PM | 24 | 13 | 28 | 28 | 2 | 95 |
| 6:30 PM | 25 | 10 | 31 | 31 | 2 | 99 |
| 6:45 PM | 27 | 15 | 33 | 27 | 2 | 104 |
| Max | 27 | 16 | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 33 | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ |

## BENT TREE MIDWAY VILLAGE - PARKING STUDY

Saturday (4/2/16) Occupancy

TOTAL PARKING SPACES:

|  | McD'S - <br> RED | PANDA - <br> BLUE | NORTH - <br> GREEN | EAST - <br> ORANGE | REAR PINK | TOTALS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPACES | 50 | 27 | 56 | 67 | 57 | 257 |
| HC SPACES | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  | 10 |
| TOTAL SPACES: | 52 | 29 | 58 | 71 | 57 | 267 |


| TIME | McD'S - <br> RED | PANDA - <br> BLUE | NORTH - <br> GREEN | EAST - <br> ORANGE | REAR - <br> PINK | 15-MIN <br> TOTALS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:30 AM | 24 | 9 | 33 | 24 | 2 | 92 |
| 11:45 AM | 25 | 6 | 28 | 18 | 2 | 79 |
| 12:00 PM | 23 | 8 | 30 | 22 | 2 | 85 |
| 12:15 PM | 24 | 14 | 30 | 19 | 2 | 89 |
| 12:30 PM | 29 | 11 | 27 | 22 | 2 | 91 |
| 12:45 PM | 32 | 9 | 30 | 26 | 2 | 99 |
| 1:00 PM | 20 | 12 | 27 | 25 | 2 | 86 |
| 1:15 PM | 16 | 11 | 31 | 26 | 2 | 86 |
| Max | 32 | 14 | 33 | 26 | 2 | 107 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6:00 PM | 5 | 14 | 13 | 24 | 1 | 57 |
| 6:15 PM | 5 | 11 | 13 | 28 | 0 | 57 |
| 6:30 PM | 5 | 9 | 12 | 28 | 1 | 55 |
| 6:45 PM | 3 | 13 | 15 | 32 | 0 | 63 |
| 7:00 PM | 7 | 9 | 9 | 28 | 0 | 53 |
| 7:15 PM | 3 | 6 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 45 |
| 7:30 PM | 3 | 10 | 9 | 29 | 1 | 52 |
| 7:45 PM | 3 | 11 | 10 | 26 | 1 | 51 |
| Max | 7 | 14 | 15 | 32 | 1 | 69 |


| PARKING ANALYSIS FOR 17610 MIDWAY RD. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUITE | DBA | USE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AREA } \\ & (\mathrm{SF}) \end{aligned}$ | RATIO | REQUIRED |
| 101 | TEXACO | GENERAL MERCHANDISE OR FOOD STORE 3,500 SF OR LESS | 2,000 | 200 | 10.00 |
| 101 | TEXACO | MOTOR VEHICLE FUELING STATION |  |  | 2.00 |
| 102 | UNOCCUPIED | GENERAL MERCHANDISE OR FOOD STORE 3,500 SF OR LESS | 2,100 | 200 | 10.50 |
| 106 | H\&R BLOCK | PERSONAL SERVICE | 1,050 | 200 | 5.25 |
| 108 | SPORT WINGS | RESTAURANT WITHOUT DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 1,400 | 200 | 7.00 |
| 110 | ELEGANT SMILES DENTIST | MEDICAL CLINIC | 2,100 | 200 | 10.50 |
| 112 | UNOCCUPIED | GENERAL MERCHANDISE OR FOOD STORE 3,500 SF OR LESS | 1,400 | 200 | 7.00 |
| 118 | UNOCCUPIED | GENERAL MERCHANDISE OR FOOD STORE 3,500 SF OR LESS | 1,400 | 200 | 7.00 |
| 122 | DIVA STYLES SALON | PERSONAL SERVICE | 2,450 | 200 | 12.25 |
| 124 | TRINITY MILLS CHIROPRACTIC | MEDICAL CLINIC | 1,380 | 200 | 6.90 |
| 128 | PHYSIOFIT GYM | PERSONAL SERVICE | 9,700 | 200 | 48.50 |
| 136 | KEITH'S COMICS | GENERAL MERCHANDISE OR FOOD STORE 3,500 SF OR LESS | 1,050 | 200 | 5.25 |
| 138 | JEANNIE'S NAILS | PERSONAL SERVICE | 1,050 | 200 | 5.25 |
| 140 | ASTORIA BIRYANI HOUSE | RESTAURANT WITHOUT DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 2,800 | 100 | 28.00 |
| 142 | BENT TREE CLEANERS | DRY CLEANING OR LAUNDRY STORE | 1,050 | 200 | 5.25 |
| 143 | ASTORIA BAEHROM | GGAAAUNITY-SERUICECENTER OFFICE | 2,100 | 333200 | 6.340 .50 |
| 144 | TOP ALTERATIONS | PERSONAL SERVICE | 1,050 | 200 | 5.25 |
| 150 | SWEET BASIL | RESTAURANT WITHOUT DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 3,350 | 100 | 33.50 |
| 17606 | McDONALD'S | RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 4,004 | 100 | 40.04 |
| 17602 | PANDA EXPRESS | RESTAURANT WITHOUT DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 2,500 | 100 | 25.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | GENERAL MERCHANDISE OR FOOD STORE 3,500 SF OR LESS | 7,950 | 200 | 39.75 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | MOTOR VEHICLE FUELING STATION |  |  | 2.00 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | PERSONAL SERVICE | 15,300 | 200 | 76.50 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | RESTAURANT WITHOUT DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 10,050 | 100 | 100.50 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | MEDICAL CLINIC - | 3,480 | 200 | 17.40 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | DRY CLEANING OR LAUNDRY STORE | 1,050 | 200 | 5.25 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | GOMAUNHFYSERVIEEEENFER OFFICE | 2,100 | 333200 | 6.3 (0.30.50 |
| SUB-TOTAL |  | RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICE | 4,004 | 100 | 40.04 |
| TOTAL REQUIRED |  |  | 43,934 |  | 298 292 |
| TOTAL PROVIDED |  |  |  |  | 250 |


| From: | Elaine Pickering [elaine.pickering@adams-engineering.com](mailto:elaine.pickering@adams-engineering.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, August 03, 2016 4:15 PM |
| To: | Long, Steve |
| Subject: | RE: BDA156-095, Property at 17610 Midway Road |
| Attachments: | $2016-08-03$ BOA cover letter.pdf; Overall Site Plan.pdf |

Steve,

Please review the attached letter and let me know if this is what you're needing. I think I covered everything we discussed this morning, but I may have missed something. I included a cleaner copy of the overall site plan. The only difference between this one and the one in the packet is that the hand-written info is incorporated.

Elaine Pickering, PE (VA, TX, AL, AR, FL, LA, MS \& TN)
Program Manager
Adams|Engineering \& Development Consultants
Tyler |Dallas |Austin |Tampa

## fb | in | Website | Map

From: Long, Steve [mailto:steve.long@dallascityhall.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 9:30 AM
To: Elaine Pickering [elaine.pickering@adams-engineering.com](mailto:elaine.pickering@adams-engineering.com)
Subject: BDA156-095, Property at 17610 Midway Road
Dear Ms. Pickering,
Would you please give me a call on the board of adjustment application referenced above that you are representing for Lee Morris? My phone number is 214/670-4666.

Thank you,
Steve Long, Board of Adjustment Administrator
Department of Sustainable Development and Construction

August 3, 2016

Mr. Steve Long<br>City of Dallas<br>Department of Sustainable Development and Construction<br>1500 Marilla Street<br>5DN<br>Dallas, TX 75201<br>RE: McDonald's/Bent Tree Midway Village 17602, 17606, 17610 Midway Rd<br>Case No.: BDA 156-095

Dear Mr. Long:
The purpose of this letter is to serve as an introduction/additional information for the abovereferenced Special Exception request to the Board of Adjustment. The request as written is for a reduction of 38 parking spaces from the code-required 288 parking spaces for the entire Bent Tree shopping center, which is made up of a strip center, McDonald's restaurant and Panda Express restaurant. However, the proposed construction project will only eliminate ten parking spaces from the shopping center. There are no proposed tenant or use changes from the existing conditions. The proposed remodel of the McDonald's (which uncovered the existing non-compliance of the shopping center parking) will add 99 SF of building area (on the drive thru side of the building for an expansion of the cash booth) and a side-by-side drive thru to improve the response time for drive thru customers. The construction of the side-by-side drive thru lanes will require the removal of the ten parking spaces at the rear of the McDonald's.

Nationally, McDonald's generates two-thirds of their business from drive thru sales. As such, they often find that their restaurants don't need as much parking as may be required by code. At single-lane drive thrus, a backup in the drive thru lane may cause some customers to park and go inside for a carry-out order. Construction of the side-by-side drive thru increases the volume of customers able to be served and further reduces the need for parking.

This has been a bit of a process to get to this point. The plans for the proposed remodel of the McDonald's were initially prepared in December 2015. At that time, information from the landlord indicated the shopping center had an excess of available parking, which we did not independently verify. In the process of working with them on the reduction needed for the McDonald's, it was discovered that the shopping center did not currently meet code. There had not been any code compliance issues or tenant complaints about a lack of parking, it just didn't meet the current city standards. A parking study was commissioned to document the actual parking needs. This study, prepared by Lee Engineering, was completed on April 7, 2016. During the process of working through the submission process for the special exception with

[^0]city staff, the number of parking spaces required and provided were adjusted as the requirements for each use in the shopping center were verified and some existing parking spaces were identified as obstructing the line of sight visibility triangles, and therefore not valid for the parking count. This is the source of the discrepancies between the traffic study and final submission and the changes to the submission paperwork. The Overall Site Plan included in the submission shows a detailed breakdown of each use and the code-required parking for that use. A cleaner copy of the site plan is attached for your use since the reduction of the fullsize drawing submitted with the package is difficult to read.

I hope that you will find this additional information useful in your presentation to the Board and explanations to concerned citizens. In short summary, this is a request to remove ten parking spaces and provide a remedy to an existing non-compliant, but fully functioning, shopping center parking lot. Should you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Sincerely,


Elaine S. Pickering, PE
Program Manager
attachment




# Notification List of Property Owners BDA156-095 

## 35 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  | Owner |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 17602 | MIDWAY RD | BENT TREE MIDWAY SC LTD |
| 2 | 17610 | MIDWAY RD | BENT TREE MIDWAY S/C LTD |
| 3 | 17605 | MIDWAY RD | SOUTHLAND CORP |
| 4 | 2670 | MIDWAY RD | KIC PROP-8 LLC |
| 5 | 3320 | E TRINITY MILLS RD | KIVCO INC |
| 6 | 3330 | E TRINITY MILLS RD | ARC CAFEHLD001 LLC |
| 7 | 3400 | E TRINITY MILLS RD | RETAIL BUILDINGS INC |
| 8 | 3240 | E TRINITY MILLS RD |  |
| 9 | 4106 | COBBLERS LN | SER TEXAS LLC DBA HYPERION HOMES TEXAS LLC |
| 10 | 4110 | COBBLERS LN | BULLINS DUANA LYNN |
| 11 | 4114 | COBBLERS LN | BLOMFIELD BRITTANY |
| 12 | 4118 | COBBLERS LN | HALL BLAKE C \& BEVERLY |
| 13 | 4120 | COBBLERS LN | MCELRATH DANIEL J \& LISA |
| 14 | 4124 | COBBLERS LN |  |
| 15 | 4128 | COBBLERS LN | KANSO AYMAN |
| 16 | 4132 | COBBLERS LN | LANG JAMES D \& BARBARA J |
| 17 | 4136 | COBBLERS LN | BOYD SETH M \& STACEY L |
| 18 | 4140 | COBBLERS LN | KELLY STEPHEN J |
| 19 | 4144 | COBBLERS LN | NORIEGA HAYDEN B |
| 20 | 4105 | BROOKTREE LN | SOUTHEAST INVESTMENTS INC |
| 21 | 4101 | BROOKTREE LN | BEADLE ROSALYND CAMPISI-LE |
| 22 | 4104 | BROOKTREE LN | BRILLIANT ENTERPRISES INC |
| 23 | 4106 | BROOKTREE LN | HARTT CATHRYN |
| 24 | 4110 | BROOKTREE LN |  |
| 25 | 4131 | COBBLERS LN | GLASS CARSON M REV TR |
| 26 | 4127 | COBBLERS LN | HINOJOSA ALFREDO \& CLAUDIA |
|  |  |  |  |


| Label \# | Address |  | Owner |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | 4123 | COBBLERS LN | NEUBERT BOBBIE-JEANNE |
| 28 | 4119 | COBBLERS LN |  |
| 29 | 4115 | COBBLERS LN |  |
| 30 | 4111 | COBBLERS LN | ANGER SANDRA L |
| 31 | 4112 | BROOKTREE LN | BUSH GARY \& CRISTIN |
| 32 | 17605 | MIDWAY RD | SOUTHLAND CORPORATION THE |
| 33 | 4043 | TRINITY MILLS RD | WW TRINITY OAKS LTD |
| 34 | 17617 | MIDWAY RD | ADDISON APARTMENTS LLC |
| 35 | 4108 | BROOKTREE LN | TRUAX ELLEN |

## FILE NUMBER: BDA156-087(SL)

BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Toby Gray for special exceptions to the fence height and visual obstruction regulations at 611 Largent Avenue. This property is more fully described as Lots 1,2 , and part of Lot 9, Block C/2777, and is zoned $R-10(A)$, 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/or maintain an 8 foot high fence, which will require a 4 foot special exception to the fence height regulations, and to locate and maintain items in required visibility triangles, which will require special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations.

## LOCATION: 611 Largent Avenue

APPLICANT: Toby Gray

## REQUESTS:

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

1. A request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of up to 4 ' is made to maintain an existing cedar board-on-board fence (ranging from 5' 6" - 8' in height given grade changes on the property) in the site's Junius Street 30' front yard setback.
2. Requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations are made to maintain the aforementioned solid cedar board-on-board fence in the two, 20' visibility triangles on the both sides of the driveway into the site from Junius Street.

## STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FENCE HEIGHT REGULATIONS:

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

## 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 height):

No staff recommendation is made on this or any request for a special exception to the fence height regulations 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 concurs with the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer who had recommended denial of these requests from the information the applicant had submitted at the time of the September $6^{\text {th }}$ staff review team meeting stating that the fence encroachment into the visibility triangles creates a safety hazard to pedestrian traffic.
- The applicant had not substantiated from the information that he had submitted at the time of the September 6 h staff review team meeting how the location and maintenance of a 5' 6" - 8' cedar board-on-board fence in the two 20' drive approach visibility triangles into the site from Junius Street do not constitute a traffic hazard.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

Site: $\quad$ R-10(A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
North: $\quad$ R-10(A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
South: $\quad$ R-10(A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
East: $\quad$ R-10(A) (Single family district 10,000 square feet)
West: PD 397 (Planned Development)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a single family home. The areas to the north, south, and east west are developed with single family uses; and the area to the west is developed with retail 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 height):

- This request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of up to 4 ' focuses on maintaining an existing cedar board-on-board fence (ranging from 5' 6"8' in height given grade changes on the property) in the site's Junius Street 30' front yard setback.
- The subject site is zoned $\mathrm{R}-10(\mathrm{~A})$ which requires a minimum front yard setback of 30'.
- 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 subject site is located at the south corner of Largent Avenue and Junius Street.
- Given the single family zoning and location of the corner lot subject site, it has two 30' front yard setbacks - a front yard setback along Largent Avenue (the shorter of the two frontages of the subject site which is always a front yard in this case) and a front yard setback along Junius Street, (the longer of the two frontages which is typically considered a side yard where on this R-10(A) zoned property a 9' high fence could be erected by right). However the site has a front yard setback along Junius Street in order to maintain continuity of the established front yard setback along this street frontage where homes/lots to the southwest "front" on Junius Street.
- A scaled site plan and fence elevations have been submitted indicating a fence proposal that will reach 8' in height in the 30' Junius Street front yard setback.
- The submitted site plan represents only a fence to exceed 4' in height in the Junius Street front yard setback and not into the site's Largent Avenue front yard setback.
- The following information was gleaned from the submitted site plan:
- The proposal is represented as being approximately 110' in length parallel to the Junius Street, and approximately 30 ' in length perpendicular to this street on the northeast and southwest sides of the site in this front yard setback.
- The proposal is represented as being located mostly on the Junius Street front property line or approximately 11' from the pavement line. (Note that a small portion/length of the fence is noted to be located in the public right-of-way. While the site plan denotes "area of possible right-of-way widening (no documentation provided)", the request to the board of adjustment for the special exception to the fence height regulations will not remedy or address any portion of any item that is located in a right-of-way or easement. Any item located in a public right-of-way or easement will require a license from City Council or written approval by the agencies having interest in the easement).
- The proposal is located across from a properties developed with a nonresidential uses with no fence in the front yard setbacks.
- The Board Administrator conducted a field visit of the site and surrounding area along Junius Street (approximately 200' northeast and southwest of the subject site) and noted a no other fences that appeared to be above 4' in height in front yards.
- As of September 9, 2016, three letters had been submitted in support of the request, and no letters had been submitted in opposition.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing that the special exception to the fence height regulations of 4' will not adversely affect neighboring property.
- Granting this special exception request of 4' with a condition imposed that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations would require the proposal exceeding 4' in height in the Junius Street front yard setback to be maintained in the location and of the heights and material as shown on these documents.
- Note that no part of this application to the Board will provide any relief to any item that may be located in a public right-of-way or easement.


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

- These requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations focus on maintain an existing cedar board-on-board fence (ranging from 5' 6" - 8' in height given grade changes on the property) in the two, 20' visibility triangles on the both sides of the driveway into the site from Junius Street.
- 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 elevations representing a solid cedar fence (ranging from 5' 6" -8 ' in height given grade changes on the property) in the two, 20 ' visibility triangles on the both sides of the driveway into the site from Junius Street.
- The proposal is represented as being located mostly on the Junius Street front property line or approximately 11' from the pavement line. (Note that a small portion/length of the fence is noted to be located in the public right-of-way. While the site plan denotes "area of possible right-of-way widening (no documentation provided)", the request to the board of adjustment for the special exception to the visual obstruction regulations will not remedy or address any portion of any item that is located in a right-of-way or easement. (Any item located in a public right-of-way or easement will require a license from City Council or written approval by the agencies having interest in the easement).
- On September $7^{\text {th }}$, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer submitted a review comment sheet marked "Recommends that this be denied" with the following additional comment: "The fence encroachment into the visibility triangle creates a safety hazard to pedestrian traffic".
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing how granting the requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations existing cedar board-onboard fence (ranging from 5' 6" - 8' in height given grade changes on the property) in the two, 20 ' visibility triangles on the both sides of the driveway into the site from Junius Street do not constitute a traffic hazard.
- Granting these requests with the condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan and elevations 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.
- Note that no part of this application to the Board will provide any relief to any item that may be located in public right-of-way or easement.


## Timeline:

May 10, 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.

August 4, 2016: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

August 5, 2016: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant the following information:

- 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 August $31^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the September $9^{\text {th }}$ 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 requests; and
- the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to "documentary evidence."

September 6, 2016: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for September public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction 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, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.
September 7, 2016: The Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer submitted a review comment sheet marked "Recommends that this be denied" with the following additional comment: "The fence encroachment into the visibility triangle creates a safety hazard to pedestrian traffic".

September 9, 2016: The applicant submitted additional documentation on this application beyond what was submitted with the original application (see Attachment A). Note that this information was not factored into the staff recommendation since it was submitted after the September $6^{\text {th }}$ staff review team meeting.



|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Long, Steve | BOA1S6~ |
| From: | Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com) |
| Sent: | Friday, September 09, 2016 9:13 AM |
| To: | Long, Steve |
| Subject: | Re: BDA156-087, Property at 611 Largent Avenue |

The provided attachment shows the following items:

1. Images taken from street view of Google maps of Junius street in June of 2014 and the corner of Junius and Largent in May of 2015. These images are included for comparison with the current images in order to show the condition of the property line along Junius and visibility along the property line prior to the construction of the fence.
2. Emails from the neighbors at $614,618 / 622$, and 626 Largent indicating that they have no objections to the fence.
3. Diagrams of convex mirrors we are adding to the fence post at each side of the driveway in order to provide for pedestrians on the sidewalk to have increased visibility of the driveway when the gate is open.
Thank you,
Toby Gray
On Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 7:08 AM, Long, Steve < steve.long@dallascityhall.com> wrote:
Dear Dr. Gray,

I printed your attachment but I'm wondering if you want to "cover" the attachment with a letter or email that says what the attachment is - particularly an explanation of what the last two pages are - pages that show the convex mirrors. While one may deduce certain things from these elevations, it may be easy for you to do a very quick explanation as to what those elevations are - I have reason to believe they are convex mirrors that you are offering to install on your property at the Junius Street driveway. Are they?

If I don't have anything else from you by 1 o'clock today, I will just go with what you have sent me.

Thank you,

Steve

From: Toby Gray [mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Long, Steve
Subject: Re: BDA156-087, Property at 611 Largent Avenue

## M Gmail

## Fw: fence at 611 Largent Ave

Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com)
Wed, Sep 7, 2016 at 2:58 PM
To: "Long, Steve" [steve.long@dallascityhall.com](mailto:steve.long@dallascityhall.com)
Email from 614 Largent
---------- Forwarded message $\qquad$
From: Collin OHara [cjw0918@yahoo.com](mailto:cjw0918@yahoo.com)
Date: Tue, Sep 6, 2016 at 2:00 PM
Subject: Fw: fence at 611 Largent Ave
To: Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com)

On Saturday, August 27, 2016 12:19 PM, Jim Lindsley [wpjim@sbcglobal.net](mailto:wpjim@sbcglobal.net) wrote:

Collin, I am Kandace Lindsey and my husband, Jim, and I live at 614 Largent; the red brick house across the street from you. We will agree to anything you want to do, so you have our permission to finish your house and yard however you see fit. I know you are so busy, but if you ever have a few minutes I would love to meet you and your boys. I have 7 grandchildren...all girls! Sorry this is so late, but welcome to our wonderful neighborhood!

Sent from my iPhone
On Aug 27, 2016, at 12:07 PM, Collin OHara [cjw0918@yahoo.com](mailto:cjw0918@yahoo.com) wrote:

Hi Jim,
I'm Collin O'Hara and my husband Toby Gray and I live at 611 Largent (Mr. Alford's old house) with our two young boys. As you may have seen the signs in our yard, we are in the process of obtaining permission to keep our fence along Junius street (the northwest side of our house) the way it is. I wanted to reach out to you and ask you if you have any objections to this. The builder did not obtain the proper permit to build at that fence height along that side of the house, so that is why we are doing this now. Please let me know if this is ok with you or if you have concerns. I would have come to your door and asked you directly, but I didn't want to catch you at a bad time or put you on the spot.

Also, I apologize for all of the pool/backyard construction that has been prolonged. Several rain delays have pushed the project way behind schedule. So sorry for any inconvenience this has caused.

$\qquad$

## Fw: fence at 611 Largent

Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com)
Wed, Sep 7, 2016 at 2:59 PM
To: "Long, Steve" [steve.Iong@dallascityhall.com](mailto:steve.Iong@dallascityhall.com)
Email from 618 Largent which includes response from 622 Largent
--------- Forwarded message $\qquad$
From: Collin OHara [cjw0918@yahoo.com](mailto:cjw0918@yahoo.com)
Date: Tue, Sep 6, 2016 at 1:59 PM
Subject: FF: fence at 611 Largent
To: Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com)

On Saturday, August 27, 2016 3:40 PM, Ed Cloutman [ecloutman@lawoffices.email](mailto:ecloutman@lawoffices.email) wrote:

Hi, Collin-
This is Ed Cloutman across the street at 618 Largent.
In response to your e-mail and the fence height issue before the City's Board of Adjustment, my wife, Betsy Julian, and I have no objection to to the fence height along Junius, and especially so because it faces a cul-de-sac and then tapers back and down as it joins the back fence paralleling Abrams Road.

I just mentioned this to Gill (H. Gill-King) at 622 Largent, and he authorized me to indicate our position as his view on the fence height. I don't know whether you need this stated by him directly or not (you know, the pesky hearsay problem).

On the pool construction, we all understand the delays and hassles of pool construction and maintenance, as both our homes have them. Not to worry about this temporary issue, as you two and your boys will enjoy the heck out of the pool as they grow up.

Ed, Betsy and Gill.
Sent from my iPhone
On Aug 27, 2016, at 12:11 PM, Collin OHara [cjw0918@yahoo.com](mailto:cjw0918@yahoo.com) wrote:

Hi Ed,
I'm Collin O'Hara and my husband Toby Gray and I live at 611 Largent (Mr. Alford's old house) with our two young boys. As you may have seen the signs in our yard, we are in the process of obtaining permission to keep our fence along Junius street (the northwest side of our house) the way it is. I wanted to reach out to you and ask you if you have any objections to this. The builder did not obtain the proper permit to build at that fence height along that side of the house, so that is why we are doing this now. Please let me know if this is ok with you or if you have concerns. I would have come to your door and asked you directly, but I didn't want to catch you at a bad time or put you on the spot.

Also, I apologize for all of the pool/backyard construction that has been prolonged. Several rain delays have pushed the project way behind schedule. So sorry for any inconvenience this has caused.

Thank you,
Collin O'Hara
214-923-9584

## Fw: fence at 611 Largent

Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com)
To: "Long, Steve" [steve.long@dallascityhall.com](mailto:steve.long@dallascityhall.com)
Email from 626 Largent
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Collin OHara [cjw0918@yahoo.com](mailto:cjw0918@yahoo.com)
Date: Tue, Sep 6, 2016 at 2:00 PM
Subject: Fw: fence at 611 Largent
To: Toby Gray [tobygray5@gmail.com](mailto:tobygray5@gmail.com)

On Sunday, August 28, 2016 10:50 AM, Jeff Stroh [JStroh@aguirreroden.com](mailto:JStroh@aguirreroden.com) wrote:

We don't have an issue with the fence
Sent from my iPhone
On Aug 27, 2016, at 12:17 PM, Collin OHara [cjw0918@yahoo.com](mailto:cjw0918@yahoo.com) wrote:

Hi Jeff,
As you may have seen the signs in our yard, we are in the process of obtaining permission to keep our fence along Junius street (the northwest side of our house) the way it is. I wanted to reach out to you and ask you if you have any objections to this. The builder did not obtain the proper permit to build at that fence height along that side of the house, so that is why we are doing this now. Please let me know if this is ok with you or if you have concerns. I would have come to your door and asked you directly, but I didn't want to catch you at a bad time or put you on the spot.

Thank you,
Collin O'Hara
214-923-9584
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## City of Dallas

## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

## Data Relative to Subject Property:

Location address: CII LARGENT AVE


Case No.: BDA $156-087$
Date: $5 / 10 / 16$

Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) $145.82^{1}$ 2) $\qquad$ 3) $145.04^{1}$ Zoning District: $R-10(A)$

## To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :

Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed):
Toby Gray and Cochin O'hara
$\square$ Telephone: $214-927-9155$
Mailing Address: 611 Largent Ave, Dallas TX Zip Code: 75214
E-mail Address: tobggray5@gmail.com
Represented by: $\qquad$ Telephone: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: $\qquad$ Zip Code: $\qquad$
E-mail Address: $\qquad$
Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance __, or Special Exception $1 /$, of 4 FEET OF FENCING FOR A FRONT OYARD PLACEMENT OF FENCE IN A VISIBILITY 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:
FENCE IS PRESENT ALONG DEAD END STREET WITH ONLY THE DRIVEWAY ACCESSIBLE FROM JUNIUS ROAD, ANA DOES NOT CAUSE VISUAL OBSTRUCTION FOR PEDESTRIAN OR MOTOR TRAFFIC. FENCE WAS IA PLACE PRIOR TO PURCHASE OF PROPERTY.

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.


Subscribed and sworn to before me this //_ day of


## Building Official's Report

## I hereby certify that Toby Gray

did submit a request
for a special exception to the fence height regulations, and for a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations
at 611 Largent Avenue


#### Abstract

BDA156-0:3\%. Application of Toby Gray for a special exception to the fence height regulations and a special exception to the visibility obstruction regulations at 611 Largent Avenue. This property is more fully described as Lots 1,2 , and part of Lot 9, Block C $/ 2777$ and is zoned $\mathrm{R}-10(\mathrm{~A})$, 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 an 8 foot high fence in a required front yard, which will require a 4 foot special exception to the fence regulation, and to construct a residential fence structure in a requirt visibility obstruction triangle, which will require a special exception to the visibility obstructi regulation.


Sincerely,
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# Notification List of Property Owners BDA156-087 

## 17 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 611 | LARGENT AVE |
| 2 | 6312 | LA VISTA DR |
| 3 | 700 | PAULUS AVE |
| 4 | 708 | PAULUS AVE |
| 5 | 714 | PAULUS AVE |
| 6 | 1824 | ABRAMS RD |
| 7 | 522 | LARGENT AVE |
| 8 | 614 | LARGENT AVE |
| 9 | 618 | LARGENT AVE |
| 10 | 622 | LARGENT AVE |
| 11 | 626 | LARGENT AVE |
| 12 | 6223 | WORTH ST |
| 13 | 6211 | WORTH ST |
| 14 | 6201 | WORTH ST |
| 15 | 6216 | JUNIUS ST |
| 16 | 6228 | WORTH ST |
| 17 | 6220 | WORTH ST |

## Owner

A \& A RESIDENTIAL DESIGN LLC
WILLINGHAM W W III ET AL
SLOCUM WILLIAM C III
WILLINGHAM WW 3 TRUSTEE \&
WILLINGHAM W W III TR \&
1924 ABRAMS LTD
SPIVEY CRAIG G \&
LINDSEY JAMES D
CLOUTMAN E B III
KING HARRELL GILL
STROH DENA DENOOYER \&
ADAMS RONALD B II \& ANN A
TESFAY SEIFU T \&
CAMPBELL EUGENE W
LAKE DONNA M
STRAUGHN CHRISTOPHER J \&
ROGERS MARK A

FILE NUMBER: BDA156-091(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Thomas Barnhart for a variance to the off-street parking regulations at 5017 W . Lovers Lane. This property is more fully described as Lot 34, Block A/5006, and is zoned CR, which requires that the owner of off-street parking must provide screening to separate the parking area from a contiguous residential use or vacant lot if either is in an $A, A(A), R, R(A), D, D(A), T H$, $\mathrm{TH}(\mathrm{A}), \mathrm{CH}, \mathrm{MF}, \mathrm{MF}(\mathrm{A}), \mathrm{MH}$, or $\mathrm{MH}(\mathrm{A})$ district and the parking area serves a nonresidential use. The applicant proposes to construct and/or maintain a structure and not provide the required screening, which will require a variance to the off-street parking regulations.

## LOCATION: 5017 W. Lovers Lane

## APPLICANT: Thomas Barnhart

## REQUEST:

A request for a variance to the off-street parking regulations, more specifically the screening provisions for off-street parking, is made to lease and maintain a general merchandise or food store less than 3,500 square foot use on the subject site that is developed with a vacant nonresidential structure, and with no screening between the required off-street parking on the site for this proposed use and the property to the north across an alley zoned $\mathrm{R}-7.5(\mathrm{~A})$ and single family residential in use.

## STANDARD FOR A VARIANCE:

The Dallas Development Code specifies that the board has the power to grant variances from the front yard, side yard, rear yard, lot width, lot depth, coverage, floor area for structures accessory to single family uses, height, minimum sidewalks, offstreet 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:

- The applicant had not substantiated how the physical features of the flat, rectangular in shape ( 59 'x 25 '), 0.8 acres (or approximately 3,500 square feet) site preclude it from being developed in a manner commensurate with the development upon other parcels of land in districts with the same CR zoning classification.
- Staff concluded that any hardship in this case is self-created in that the required screening that the applicant seeks variance for is prompted by the applicant's proposal/choice to obtain a certificate of occupancy (CO) for a new general merchandise or food store less than 3,500 square foot use that requires a greater number of off-street parking spaces than the original use, and that the City could issue a new CO to the applicant for the same use that had occupied the site with no screening required or variance to the off-street parking regulations related to screening required.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

$$
\text { Site: } \quad \text { CR (Community retail) }
$$

North: $\quad$ R-7.5(A) (Single family residential 7,500-square feet)
South: PD 771 \& MC-1 (Planned Development and Multiple commercial)
East: $\quad$ CR (Community retail)
West: $\quad$ CR (Community retail)

## Land Use:

The subject site is developed with a vacant nonresidential structure. The area to the north is developed with a single family residential; the areas to the east and west are developed with retail uses; and the area to the south appears to be developed with office 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 FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS (screening of off-street parking variance):

- This request for a variance to the off-street parking regulations focuses on leasing and maintaining a general merchandise or food store less than 3,500 square foot use on the subject site that is developed with a vacant nonresidential structure, and with no screening between the required off-street parking on the site for this
proposed use and the property to the north across an alley zoned R-7.5(A) and single family residential in use.
- The Dallas Development Code states the following related to the screening of offstreet parking:
(1) The owner of off-street parking must provide screening to separate the parking area from:
(A) a contiguous residential use or vacant lot if either is in an $A, A(A), R, R(A), D$, $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{A}), \mathrm{TH}, \mathrm{TH}(\mathrm{A}), \mathrm{CH}, \mathrm{MF}, \mathrm{MF}(\mathrm{A}), \mathrm{MH}$, or $\mathrm{MH}(\mathrm{A})$ district and the parking area serves a nonresidential use; or
(B) a contiguous single family or duplex use or a vacant lot if any of these are in an $R, R(A), D, D(A), T H, T H(A)$, or CH district and the parking area serves a multifamily use.
(2) If an alley separates a parking area from another use, the use is considered contiguous to the parking area. If a street separates a parking area from another use, the use is not considered contiguous to the parking area.
- The Dallas Development Code states that the screening for off-street parking required under Subsection (f)(1) must be a brick, stone, or concrete masonry, stucco, concrete, or wood wall or fence that is not less than six feet in height. The wall or fence may not have more than ten square inches of open area for each square foot of surface area, and may not contain any openings or gates for vehicular access. The owner of off-street parking must maintain the screening in compliance with these standards.
- The applicant submitted a site plan that indicates no screening to be provided between the off-street parking on the site and the property to the north across an alley zoned R -7.5(A) and single family residential in use.
- Building Inspection has stated that the required screening that the applicant seeks variance for is prompted by the applicant's proposal/choice to obtain a certificate of occupancy (CO) for a new use that requires a greater number of off-street parking spaces than the original use, and that the City could issue a new CO to the applicant for the same use that had occupied the site with no screening required or variance to the off-street parking regulations related to screening required.
- According to DCAD records, the "improvements" for property addressed at 5017 W. Lovers Lane is a 1,500 square foot "free standing retail store" constructed in 1946.
- The subject site is flat, rectangular in shape ( 59 'x 25 '), and according to the application, 0.8 acres (or approximately 3,500 square feet) in area.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing the following:
- That granting the variance to the off-street parking 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 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 CR zoning classification.
- The variance would not be granted to relieve a self-created or personal hardship, nor for financial reasons only, nor to permit any person a privilege in developing this parcel of land (the subject site) not permitted by this chapter to other parcels of land in districts with the same CR zoning classification.
- If the Board were to grant the variance request, and impose the submitted site plan as a condition, the applicant would be able to lease the vacant nonresidential structure on the site as a general merchandise or food store less than 3,500 square foot use with no screening between the required off-street parking for this proposed use on the site and the property to the north across an alley zoned R-7.5(A) and single family residential in use.


## Timeline:

July 12, 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.

August 4, 2016: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

August 5, 2016: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant the following information:

- 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 August $31^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the September $9^{\text {th }}$ 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."
$\bullet$
September 6, 2016: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for September public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction 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, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

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



APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

$$
\text { Case No.: BDA } 156-091
$$

Data Relative to Subject Property:
Date: $\qquad$ 7-12-16
Location address: SO 17 W LOVERS LANE Zoning District: $\qquad$ CR
Lot No.: $\qquad$ 34 Block No.: $\qquad$ A/s200 Acreage: $\qquad$ .08 Census Tract: $\qquad$ 73.02 Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) $\qquad$ 25 2) $\qquad$ 3) $\qquad$ 4) $\qquad$ 5)


To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :
owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): Dosly N Nicole Barnitatars
Applicant: $\qquad$ thomas Barenitares Telephone: $\qquad$ 2149249112
Mailing Address: 4515 Cosier RD Zip Code: 75220
Email Address: tombarwhart C SBC GlobAl, NET
Represented by: Thomas Barnitart Telephone: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: 455 blostera RD -
$\qquad$ zpipode: 72220

E-mail Address: ten llarnhart e Sic q loboliNET
 Stang The owner Must pound screening for cis stoezt

 ACCESS TO OAR STREET PARKiNG. ALITHUGH ZONED COMMUNITy REHI
 STREET PARKING SPARES ARE. REQUITED FOR SEE IN ITS ZONED PURPOSE,

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
(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)



## Building Official's Report

## I hereby certify that Thomas Barnhart

did submit a request for a variance to the off-street parking regulation
at 5017 W. Lovers Lane

BDA156-091. Application of Thomas Barnhart for a variance to the off-street parking regulation at 5017 W . Lovers Lane. This property is more fully described as Lot 34, Block A/5006, and is zoned CR, which requires that the owner of off-street parking must provide screening to separate the parking area from a contiguous-residential use or vacant lot if either is in an $A ; A(A), R, R(A), D, D(A), T H, T H(A), C H, M F, M F(A), M H$, or $M H(A)$ district and the parking area serves a nonresidential use. The applicant proposes to construct anc maintain a nonresidential structure and not provide the required screening, which will requ a variarice to the off-street parking regulation.

Sincerely,

City of Dallas Internal Development Res





# Notification List of Property Owners BDA156-091 

## 22 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 5023 | W LOVERS LN |
| 2 | 5017 | W LOVERS LN |
| 3 | 5000 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 4 | 5006 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 5 | 5010 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 6 | 5014 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 7 | 5018 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 8 | 5022 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 9 | 5026 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 10 | 5100 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 11 | 5106 | W AMHERST AVE |
| 12 | 5111 | W LOVERS LN |
| 13 | 5101 | W LOVERS LN |
| 14 | 5027 | W LOVERS LN |
| 15 | 5015 | W LOVERS LN |
| 16 | 5013 | W LOVERS LN |
| 17 | 5009 | W LOVERS LN |
| 18 | 5001 | W LOVERS LN |
| 19 | 5002 | W LOVERS LN |
| 20 | 5060 | W LOVERS LN |
| 21 | 5040 | W LOVERS LN |
| 22 | 5050 | W LOVERS LN |

## Owner

CROFT T GEORGE
BARNHART JOSLYN NICOLE
JONES LAUREL
MENDOZA MARIA DEL ROSARIO
BRANAM DAWN M
MILLER EMILY D
ROLLINS CHESTER BOLTON \&
5022 W AMHERST LLC
BLANCHARD FRANCES A TRUSTEE OF THE
GUGENHEIM NANCY GENE
WHITEHEAD JOHN RANDALL
MATUS WITOLD \&
CHANTILIS ANGELO S
JOE F G
501315 LOVERS LANE PS
501315 LOVERS LANE PS
WALDMAN FLORENCE A \&
LOVERS LANE ANTIQUE
PROVIDENCE CHRISTIAN
BRACKEN LINDA B FAMILY TRUST
PROVIDENCE CHRISTIAN
A \& D HARRIS FMLY LTD PS

FILE NUMBER: BDA156-093(SL)
BUILDING OFFICIAL'S REPORT: Application of Karen Leger for special exception to the fence height and visual obstruction regulations at 10715 Wyatt Street. This property is more fully described as Lot 17 , Block $8 / 5364$, and is zoned $R-7.5(A)$, which limits the height of a fence in the front yard to 4 feet and requires a 20 foot visibility triangle at driveway approaches and requires a 45 foot visibility triangle at street intersections. The applicant proposes to construct and maintain a 9 foot high fence, which will require a 5 foot special exception to the fence height regulations, and to locate and maintain items in required visibility triangles, which will require special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations.

## LOCATION: 10715 Wyatt Street

## APPLICANT: Karen Leger

## REQUESTS:

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

1. A request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of $5^{\prime}$ is made to replace an existing 6 ' high open wrought iron picket fence with a solid cedar fence (ranging from 5' $8^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime} 9^{\prime \prime}$ in height) to be located atop a proposed concrete retaining wall (ranging from 2' 2" - 3' 4" in height) in the site's Maplegrove Lane 30' required front yard.
2. Requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations are made to replace and maintain the aforementioned open wrought iron picket fence with a solid cedar fence in: 1) the 20' visibility triangle on the south side of the driveway into the site from Maplegrove Lane, and 2) the 45 ' visibility triangle at the intersection of Maplegrove Lane and Wyatt Street.

## STANDARD FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FENCE HEIGHT REGULATIONS:

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

## 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 height):

No staff recommendation is made on this or any request for a special exception to the fence height regulations 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):

1. Denial of the request for a special exception to the visual obstruction regulations related to locating and maintaining a solid cedar fence in the 20' visibility triangle on the south side of the driveway into the site from Maplegrove Lane

Rationale:

- Staff concurs with the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer who recommended denial of this request stating that the proposed fence in this triangle would create a safety hazard to pedestrian traffic.
- The applicant had not substantiated how the location and maintenance of the proposed fence in this 20 ' drive approach visibility triangle does not constitute a traffic hazard.

2. Approval of the request for a special exception to the visual obstruction regulations related to locating and maintaining a solid cedar fence in the 45' visibility triangle at the intersection of Maplegrove Lane and Wyatt Street, subject to the following condition:

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

Rationale:

- Staff concurs with the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer who has no objection to that the proposed fence in this triangle.


## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

## Zoning:

| Site: | R-7.5(A) (Single family district 7,500 square feet) |
| :--- | :--- |
| North: | R-7.5(A) (Single family district 7,500 square feet) |
| South: | R-7.5(A) (Single family district 7,500 square feet) <br> East: |
| R-7.5(A) (Single family district 7,500 square feet) <br> West: <br> R-7.5(A) (Single family district 7,500 square feet) |  |

## Land Use:

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

## Zoning/BDA History:

1. Miscellaneous Item \#2, BDA 156- On September 20, 2016, the Board of 093, Property at 10715 Wyatt Street Adjustment Panel A will consider ( the subject site) reimbursing the filing fee made in conjunction with this application.

## GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS (fence height):

- This request for a special exception to the fence height regulations of 5' focuses on replacing an existing 6' high open wrought iron picket fence with a solid cedar fence (ranging from 5' 8" $-5^{\prime} 9^{\prime \prime}$ in height) to be located atop a proposed concrete retaining wall (ranging from 2' 2 " -3 ' 4 " in height) in the site's Maplegrove Lane 30' required front yard.
- The subject site is zoned $\mathrm{R}-7.5(\mathrm{~A})$ which requires a minimum front yard setback of $25^{\prime}$. The subject site has a $30^{\prime}$ platted building line on both Maplegrove Lane and Wyatt Street.
- 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 subject site is located at the northeast corner of Maplegrove Avenue and Wyatt Street.
- Given the single family zoning and location of the corner lot subject site, it has two required front yards. The site has a 30' required front yard along Maplegrove Lane (the shorter of the two frontages of the subject site which is always a front yard), and a 30' required front yard along Wyatt Street, (the longer of the two frontages which is typically considered a side yard where on this R-7.5(A) zoned property a 9' high fence could be erected by right). However the site has a required front yard along Wyatt Street in order to maintain continuity of the established front yard setback along this street frontage where homes/lots to the east "front" on Wyatt Street.
- A scaled site plan/fence elevation has been submitted indicating a fence proposal that will reach 9' in height in the 30' Maplegrove Lane required front yard.
- The applicant has stated that the proposed solid cedar fence would be in approximately the same location as the existing open wrought iron picket fence on the property.
- The following information was gleaned from the submitted site plan/elevation:
- The proposal is represented as being approximately 56' in length parallel to the Maplegrove Lane, and 30' in length perpendicular to this street on the north and south sides of the site in this required front yard.
- The proposal is represented as being located approximately on the Maplegrove Lane front property line or 12' from this pavement line.
- The proposal is located across from a lot developed with a single family home that fronts south to Wyatt Street with no fence in the front yard setback.
- The Board Administrator conducted a field visit of the site and surrounding area along Maplewood Lane (approximately 200' north and south of the subject site) and noted a no other fences that appeared to be above 4' in height in front yards.
- As of September 9, 2016, a petition with 14 signatures and two letters has been submitted in support of the request, and no letters have been submitted in opposition.
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing that the special exception to the fence height regulations of 5 ' will not adversely affect neighboring property.
- Granting this special exception request of 5' with a condition imposed that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan/elevation would require the proposal exceeding 4' in height in the Maplegrove Lane required front yard to be constructed and maintained in the location and of the heights and material as shown on this document.


## GENERAL FACTS/STAFF ANALYSIS (visual obstruction special exceptions):

- These requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations focus on replacing an existing 6' high open wrought iron picket fence with a solid cedar fence (ranging from 5' $8^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime} 9^{\prime \prime}$ in height) to be located atop a proposed concrete retaining wall (ranging from 2' $2^{\prime \prime}-3^{\prime} 4$ " in height) in: 1) the $20^{\prime}$ visibility triangle on the south side of the driveway into the site from Maplegrove Lane, and 2) the 45' visibility triangle at the intersection of Maplegrove Lane and Wyatt Street.
- 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 has submitted a site plan/elevation representing a solid cedar fence (ranging from 5' $8^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime} 9^{\prime \prime}$ in height) to be located atop a proposed concrete retaining wall (ranging from 2' $2^{\prime \prime}-3$ ' 4 " in height) in: 1) the 20 ' visibility triangle on the south side of the driveway into the site from Maplegrove Lane, and 2) the 45' visibility triangle at the intersection of Maplegrove Lane and Wyatt Street.
- The applicant has stated that the proposed solid cedar fence would be in approximately the same location as the existing open wrought iron picket fence on the property.
- The Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer submitted a review comment sheet marked "Has no objections if certain conditions are met" with the following additional comment: "There are no objections to the proposed fence encroachment into the intersection visibility triangle. Engineering recommends denial of the proposed fence into the driveway visibility triangle as this would create a safety hazard to pedestrian traffic".
- The applicant has the burden of proof in establishing how granting the requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulations to locate and maintain a solid cedar fence (ranging from 5' 8" - 5' 9" in height) to be located atop a proposed concrete retaining wall (ranging from 2' $2^{\prime \prime}-3$ ' 4 " in height) in: 1) the $20^{\prime}$ visibility triangle on the south side of the driveway into the site from Maplegrove Lane, and 2)
the 45' visibility triangle at the intersection of Maplegrove Lane and Wyatt Street do not constitute a traffic hazard.
- The Board can make a separate determination of the requests for special exceptions to the visual obstruction regulation in this application. Granting both or one of these requests with the condition that the applicant complies with the submitted site plan/elevation would require the items in the visibility triangles to be limited to and maintained to the locations, height and materials as shown on this document.


## Timeline:

June 24, 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.

August 4, 2016: The Board of Adjustment Secretary randomly assigned this case to Board of Adjustment Panel A.

August 5, 2016: The Board Administrator emailed the applicant the following information:

- 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 August $31^{\text {st }}$ deadline to submit additional evidence for staff to factor into their analysis; and the September $9^{\text {th }}$ 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 requests; and
- the Board of Adjustment Working Rules of Procedure pertaining to "documentary evidence."
September 6, 2016: The Board of Adjustment staff review team meeting was held regarding this request and the others scheduled for September public hearings. Review team members in attendance included: the Sustainable Development and Construction 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, the Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer, and the Assistant City Attorney to the Board.

September 7, 2016: The Sustainable Development and Construction Department Project Engineer submitted a review comment sheet marked "Has no objections if certain conditions are met" with the following additional comment: "There are no objections to the proposed fence encroachment into the intersection visibility triangle. Engineering recommends denial of the proposed fence into the driveway visibility triangle as this would create a safety hazard to pedestrian traffic".



## APPLICATION/APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

## Data Relative to Subject Property:

Location address:
 Case No.: BDA $156-093$

Lot No.: $\square$ Block No: $\square$ Date: $\qquad$ $6-24-16$ Zoning District:嶓 $<$-7.5 (A) Street Frontage (in Feet): 1) 95.351 2) 136.51 3) $\qquad$ 4) $\qquad$ 5)


## To the Honorable Board of Adjustment :

Owner of Property (per Warranty Deed): Justin and Karen Leger
Applicant:

$\square$
Mailing Address: Lolls Wyatt Street Dullao, Th zip Code: TS 218 E-mail Address: Karen bartonlegerogna.l.com
Represented by: $\qquad$ Telephone: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: $\qquad$ Zip Code: $\qquad$

E-mail Address: $\qquad$
Affirm that an appeal has been made for a Variance _ , or Special Exception $X$, of


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:


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:


Subscribed and sworn to before me this $\qquad$ day of
 $-\frac{20110}{1 a \pi}$

[^1]
# иешцечэ <br> <div class="inline-tabular"><table id="tabular" data-type="subtable">
<tbody>
<tr style="border-top: none !important; border-bottom: none !important;"></tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<table-markdown style="display: none">|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |</table-markdown></div> 

## Building Official's Report

## I hereby certify that <br> Karen Leger

did submit a request
at
for a special exception to the fence height regulations, and for special exceptions to the visibility obstruction regulations

10715 Wyatt street

BDA156-093. Application of Karen Leger for a special exception to the fence height regulations and for special exceptions to the visibility obstruction regulations at 10715 Wy : Street. Thi. property is more fully described as Lot 17, Biock 8/5364, and is zoned R-7.5(A), which limits the height of a fence in the front yard to 4 feet and requires a 20 foo visibility triangle at driveway approaches and requires a 45 foot visibility triangle at street intersections. The applicant proposes to construct a 9 foot high fence in a required front yard, which will require a 5 foot special exception to the fence regulation, and to construct single family residential fence structure in required visibility obstruction triangles, which wil require special exceptions to the visibility obstruction regulation.

Sincerely,

Philip Sikes, Building Official

City of Dallas
Internal Development Research Site





July 16, 2016
Karen and Justin Leger
10715 Wyatt Street
Dallas TX 75218
469-693-0768
Dear Neighbors,
Please allow us to introduce ourselves if we have not yet formally met. Our names are Karen and Justin Leger, we are your neighbors on the corner house of Wyatt St. and Maplegrove Ln. We are in the process of getting permits to replace our wrought iron side yard fence with a new one. The city informed us that we will need to file for an exception in order for the permits to be issued as the previous owner did not build the fence to code or on the property line.

Our reason to replace the fence is to clean up the corner look and appeal. We want to add a retaining wall to hold the earth from falling on the sidewalk. As well as a wood fence on top to allow for more privacy for our growing children's playground.

We are attaching an illustration of the plans for the new fence. It was suggested from the city to aid in the process of the approval by having all neighbors, who are in view of the new construction, sign a petition stating that they are okay with the plans. If you would kindly review, and sign your approval, with the date and your address, on the attached diagram. Please give us a call at the number above if you have any questions regarding this request, we would be more than happy to discuss this with you. We are asking that you return this to us as soon as possible as we are trying to submit everything for the next hearing and the due date is July $22^{\text {nd }}$.

Thank you for your time and consideration! We greatly appreciate you working with us.

Best regards,

Karen and Justin Leger


Your signature signifies that you agree to the attached plan design for a new fence to be constructed at 10715 Wyatt Street Dallas, Texas 75218. We will be showing the signed petition to the Board of Appeals at a hearing anticipated for August 15, 2016.

Print Name
Signature
Date
Wyatt st






# Notification List of Property Owners BDA156-093 

## 22 Property Owners Notified

| Label \# | Address |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 10715 | WYATT ST |
| 2 | 10508 | MAPLEGROVE LN |
| 3 | 10632 | WYATT ST |
| 4 | 10622 | WYATT ST |
| 5 | 10744 | WYATT ST |
| 6 | 10748 | WYATT ST |
| 7 | 10804 | WYATT ST |
| 8 | 10511 | MAPLEGROVE LN |
| 9 | 10507 | MAPLEGROVE LN |
| 10 | 10803 | WYATT ST |
| 11 | 10745 | WYATT ST |
| 12 | 10735 | WYATT ST |
| 13 | 10435 | MAPLEGROVE LN |
| 14 | 10814 | WATERBRIDGE CIR |
| 15 | 10820 | WATERBRIDGE CIR |
| 16 | 10824 | WATERBRIDGE CIR |
| 17 | 10821 | WATERBRIDGE CIR |
| 18 | 10815 | WATERBRIDGE CIR |
| 19 | 10423 | MAPLEGROVE LN |
| 20 | 10424 | MAPLEGROVE LN |
| 21 | 10625 | WYATT ST |
| 22 | 10619 | WYATT ST |

## Owner

LEGER JUSTIN \& KAREN
SCHERER NANCY CLARKE
BRANDT MICHAEL DEAN
NAZARI MEHDI G
LAWSON RITA M
POLING REBECCA J \&
ELLISON AMBER \&
ASFOUR CECIL
GONZALEZ REBECCA B
FENNIG JACK STANLEY \& MILDRED
VILLAGRANA EDUARDO \& KELLY
VULK JOSEPH P
KINSER JEFFERY
NOLLEY FRANCES EMILY
BARACANI LORI ELLEN \&
LOWE JUDY A REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST
HARDING STEPHEN \&
WILSON JOANNE MILLER
BEVER TROY D \& JULIEANN
COLLINS DOROTHY EST OF
RAY CYNTHIA J
PHILLIP KYLE R \& BETHANY K


[^0]:    8951 Cypress Waters Blvd, Suite $150 \bullet$ Dallas, Texas 75019
    817.328.3200 • FAX 817.328.3299

    TBPE Reg. No. F-1002; www.adams-engineering.com

[^1]:    Notary Public in and for Dallas County, Texas

