



Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** ABZA 19-6    **Version:** 1  
**Type:** Appeal-BZA    **Status:** Archived  
**In control:** City Council  
**Final action:** 11/13/2019

**Title:** Public hearing to consider Daniel Carlson's appeal of a decision by the Board of Zoning Appeals approving variances of the lot coverage and height requirements allowing construction of a two-story detached garage in the rear yard of an existing single-family dwelling at 1780 Goodrich Avenue.

**Sponsors:** Chris Tolbert

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:** Sec. 63.501. - Accessory buildings.

**Attachments:** 1. Appeal Application, 2. Variance Application, 3. Site Plan and Elevations, 4. Staff Report, 5. BZA Resolution, 6. BZA Minutes, 7. Correspondence, 8. Map and Photos, 9. ENS and Extension Letter, 10. Carlson email 11-03-19, 11. Applicant email and attachments 11-01-19, 12. Neighbor emails, 13. AppealWithAddlSignatures

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
11/13/2019	1	City Council	Denied	Pass
11/6/2019	1	City Council	Laid Over	Pass

Public hearing to consider Daniel Carlson's appeal of a decision by the Board of Zoning Appeals approving variances of the lot coverage and height requirements allowing construction of a two-story detached garage in the rear yard of an existing single-family dwelling at 1780 Goodrich Avenue.

See attached BZA Resolution

Daniel Carlson is appealing a decision by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) approving variances of the lot coverage and height requirements for accessory buildings (garage) requirements in order to construct a two-story detached garage in the rear yard of an existing single-family dwelling.

The zoning code allows an accessory building height of 15' for gable-style roofs and a lot coverage of 35% of the rear yard, or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less.

The applicant requested an accessory building height of 16'-4" and a lot coverage of 1,240 square feet which includes an existing 120 square foot shed and the proposed 1,120 square foot garage. The BZA approved both variances. The appellant contends that due to clerical problems at the Department of Safety and Inspections, the appellant's objections to the proposed variance were never heard at the BZA public hearing dated Monday, October 7th, 2019. The appellant also contends that the project is out of scale for their neighborhood. The appellant stated that there are more objections to the variance by neighborhood homeowners than was evidenced at the BZA hearing.

Does this issue fall within the 60 day rule? Yes

If yes, when does the 60 days expire? November 1, 2019

Has an extension been granted? Yes

If so, to what date? December 23, 2019

A letter extending the deadline for action by another 60 days was sent on October 23, 2019.

Matthew Graybar  
651-266-9080