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| 3 | BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: | MR. BARNES: I'll call the meeting |  |
| 4 | LES HUDSON, Alternative Chairman | order |  |
| 5 | ROB BARNES, Member. | MS RATLIFF. That was Rob Barn | who |
| 6 | AARON RIGDOn, Member |  | W |
| 7 | BILL ERNST, Alternative | called the meeting to order. It's 5:15. |  |
| 8 | CAROLYN LASWELL, Alternative | Generally, the clerk doesn't get invo |  |
| 9 |  | in a meeting, but, tonight, our chairman | is not |
| 10 | STAFF: | here, so we need to elect an acting cha | rman. |
| 11 | KAthie Ratliff, City Clerk. | That was not on the agenda, and it's rea | ally not |
| 12 |  | a formal motion, but between the mem | ers they |
| 13 | CIty of fulton: | will select or volunteer to take the place | of |
| 14 | KYLE BRUEMMER, City Engineer. | the chairman for tonight. Is there anyb | dy who |
| 15 |  | would like to volunteer? I believe it's |  |
| 16 | FOR the bleythings: | Mr. Hudson. |  |
| 17 | CALEB COLBERT | Mr. Hudson, would you mind joining | me to |
| 18 |  | my left? You get to have the gavel. W | hile |
|  | FOR THE MAUPINS: | he's moving, if I could please remind th |  |
| 20 | DAVID BANDRÉ | audience to please silence your phone | so that |
| 21 |  |  |  |
| 22 |  | way it doesn't go off during the middle | of the |
| 23 | Mr. Colin Wallis | meeting. And if you haven't signed our |  |
|  | Lexitas Legal | check-in sheet, if you will do that befor | you |
| 24 | 711 North Eleventh Street | leave, we appreciate it. If there are any |  |
|  | St. Louis, Missouri, 63101 | exhibits tonight, you'll bring them to m | , and |
| 25 | (314) 644-2191 | I'll introduce them as Exhibit A, Exhibit |  |



|  | Page 9 | Page 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | reference some of the exhibits throughout my | 1 the City interprets the 25-foot front-yard |
|  | remark, but I just kind of want to run through | 2 setback as being calculated from the back of |
|  | hat's in your binder | 3 the curb, and was advised, again, then of the |
|  | Exhibit 1 is sort of a timeline of events | 4 ten foot side-yard setback. Taking that |
|  | at explain kind of how we got here today | 5 interpretation, Shad designed a home for my |
| 6 | Exhibit 2 is a site plan. This | 6 clients, submitted those plans to Tanglewood |
|  | rvey prepared by Crockett Engineering, which | 7 Estate Homeowners Association, and these plans |
|  | ws | 8 were approved. |
|  | talk about this evening | 9 Once the plans were approved through the |
| 10 | hibit 3 is our variance application tha | 10 homeowners association, the developers, the |
|  | e submitted to the City | 11 builder, excuse me, applied for a building |
| 12 | xhibit 4 is the hearing notice and the | 12 permit. A building permit was issued. Once |
|  | ap of property owners within 185 feet that was | 13 the permit was issued, Shad laid out exactly |
|  | nt out by the City. | 14 where the building would be located on the lot. |
| 15 | Exhibit 5 is the Callaway County GSI map | 15 All the lines were staked. Anybody could see |
|  | ich shows the dimensions of lots | 16 exactly where the building, the home, was going |
|  | nglewood Estates | 17 to be located on the lot. And the city, again, |
| 18 | Exhibit 6 is the building permit that was | 18 came out, inspected the stake lines, the lot |
|  | sued with respect to Travis and Karla | 19 lines, approved Shad to move forward with |
|  | ything's home. | 20 construction. So Shad poured concrete. |
| 2 | Exhibit 7 is an exis | 21 Then throughout that construction phase, |
|  | nt-yard setback that was granted as to | 22 each time the City would come out and inspect |
| 2 | glewood Estates. | 23 the property, and I think four or five |
| 2 | And Exhibit 8 is a ve | 24 inspections occurred in total and Shad will |
| 25 | City ordinances at issue. | 25 come up and talk about that in a minute. But |
|  | 0 | 12 |
| 2 | 1 through 8 into e | 2 time the home was approved to move to the next |
|  | would just ask that the Chair acknowledge tha | 3 phase of construction, and all that occurred in |
| 4 | se have submitted | 4 October and November of 2023. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN HUDSON: We acknowledge that they | 5 Fast forward to February of '24, and |
| 6 | have. | 6 that's when we were first contacted by the City |
| 7 | MR. COLBERT: Okay. Thank you. | 7 of Fulton, and we were advised that there was a |
|  | Exhibits 1 through 8 marked and admitted into th | 8 neighbor that had a complaint about the |
| 9 | record.) | 9 location of the home on the lot. |
| 10 | MR. COLBERT: So let me just jump back to, | 10 So, the City of Fulton came out, said, |
| 11 | how did we get here, what are we here | 11 okay, here's the complaint; it relates to the |
|  | cuss this evening and what's sort of our | 12 side-yard setback, and there's a complaint that |
| 13 | proposed solution. I think the easiest way to | 13 you're several feet into the side-yard setback. |
|  | run through that is to kind of talk through the | 14 The City of Fulton completed its analysis, |
| 15 | timeline | 15 said, no, there's no encroachment; you can move |
| 16 | Again, my clients are Travis and Karla | 16 to the next phase of the construction. |
| 17 | Bleything that own Lot 93 in Tanglewood | 17 At that point, my client ordered roof |
| 18 | Estates. They contracted with Shad Salmons | 18 trusses and continued with construction. Three |
| 19 | with Heart of Missouri Construction to design | 19 or four weeks later, there was another |
| 20 | and build a home on Lot 93 in Tanglewood. Shad | 20 complaint from the same neighbor, that we |
| 21 | Salmons reached out to -- excuse me, the City | 21 understand, again, had some concerns about the |
| 22 | of Fulton in July of 2023 to get clarificatio | 22 location of the building on the lot. |
| 23 | on how the City interpreted the setback | 23 At that point, the City came back out and |
| 24 | requirements. | 24 said, okay, we've looked at this again. |
| 25 | And, at that time, Shad was advised that | 25 Actually, the correct interpretation of the |



1 texted me and said everything was good to proceed with the project.
$11 / 16$, we dug the footers.
11/17, footers were inspected by the City of Fulton inspector and was told to proceed with the concrete pour.
$11 / 20$ through $11 / 22$, we did the rough end of the plumbing for underneath the slab of concrete. City of Fulton inspected and told us we were to cover up plumbing, and also the City of Fulton came out and GPS all footings for City of Fulton mapping.

The week of $12 / 04$, the slab was inspected for steel. We were told to move forward with the concrete pour.
$12 / 18$, lumber was delivered and framing began.

January 31 st of '24, framing of all exterior and interior walls were completed.

February the 2nd, I received a text message from a neighbor stating that we were 8 feet toward the property line, and I told him, you know, we got everything inspected with the City of Fulton; if we had questions, we needed to contact them.

February 5th, those neighbors contacted the City of Fulton. The City came out to the job site that morning and told me I could proceed with the build.

February 8th, trusses were measured.
February 13th, trusses were delivered. And they're there on the job site as of today.

February 29th, I get a call from the City
inspector stating that John -- or David
McDonald contacted the City of Fulton, which was contacted by the neighbors, met with the City inspector and the City engineer, and I was told then that we were 26 feet from the curb, and we needed to be 35 feet from the curb or 50 feet from the center line of the street. The City of Fulton told us to stop the building process until we get this resolved.

March the 1st, Tom Riley, he contacted me and he said he wanted all parties involved to meet on March the 4th at $3: 15$, all parties involved: Travis Bleything, myself, the City of Fulton, the Mayor, City Administrator, City Engineer and City Inspector, Tom Riley, two board members of the Tanglewood Estates of HOA, David McDaniel, Jim Glascock, the developers

## and the neighbors on the north side.

We tried to make concessions with them.
They told they wanted it in full compliance.
At that meeting, we agreed to -- that I would
pay to have Crockett Engineering to come out
and survey the pins, so we could get exact measurements.

They did that on March the 8th. On the front corner, we were 13 feet off the property line, and on the northwest corner we're 9 feet, 6 inches from the property line. Do you have any questions?

MS. RATLIFF: The Board cannot interact at this point but there may be a time later. Thank you.

MR. SALMONS: All right, thank you.
MR. BLEYTHING: My name is Travis Bleything. I'm the homeowner with my wife, obviously, at Lot 93 there in Tanglewood. I didn't really get involved until the meeting that they spoke of, with all of the players involved, where we kind of, with the urgence of Tom Riley, were supposed to meet and try to work through the problem; not so much address how we got there, but try to work through the
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problem to see if we come to some agreement before it got to all this.

That, obviously, wasn't going to happen at that time, and we kind of began what I would call the negotiation process. Which in the beginning, l'll speak for myself, I wasn't really clear on who was supposed to take the lead or how to handle those negotiations. The neighbor and I spoke on the phone, kind of what have you heard, you know, it was cordial, but we really didn't have any answers at that point.

Ironically, $3 / 16$, we bumped into each other again in Columbia and kind of had the same conversation; and at that time, it was announced kind of we both had representation, so we knew it was going to go down a much different road. From $3 / 13$ to 3 , basically, 25 there was a lot of -- not a lot, but there was not back and forth through the lawyers with some negotiations that we offered, that was sort of talked about, that was presented from me that was kind of followed with a note.

So, at that point, with the urgence and the feedback from the City, it was to proceed

1 with the variance, was the next step. So with
2 the cooperation of them, Shad and Caleb, we
3 went ahead and filed for the variance, and here
4 we are. So that's all I got.
MR. COLBERT: Well, with that in mind, let me jump back in here again.

Again, Caleb Colbert, attorney at 827 East Broadway. So to kind of pick up the timeline, where we were, you know, we had the discussions with the neighbors. We weren't able to get everything worked out, and so that's why we are here tonight. We're asking for a solution, and the Fulton City Code creates that solution through this board. The Board of Adjustment has broad discretion to grant variances, which I'm paraphrasing, are necessary to alleviate unnecessary hardship based on special circumstances or special conditions, which apply in any particular scenario.

In here, we think there are plenty of special conditions to justify granting the requested variances. In particular, let's talk about the lot dimensions of the property we're talking about, so Lot 93 . If you look at Exhibit 5, and, really, the second page of

Exhibit 4 as well, you'll see that this particular lot is a pie-shaped lot.

Most of the lots in Tanglewood that are depicted there in Exhibit 5, are a 100 -feet wide at the road frontage, 100 -feet wide at the back. My clients' lot tapers down to 77 feet at the back. So, essentially, we don't have the full length of that lot to work with. So that is a unique condition of this, which is not applicable to every other lot in the subdivision. We, essentially, have to shift the building as close as we can to the road to make it fit.

If you move further back in the lot, again, going back to the narrower portion of the lot, you just end up creating more of side-yard encroachment. So as a practical matter, the dimensions of the lot create sort of a special circumstance.

The other special circumstance is the one we've already mentioned. I mean, this home and its layout and location on the lot were inspected and approved four or five times throughout construction. And in each scenario, it was approved to move forward to the next

## phase. So my client has spent tens of thousands of dollars in reliance upon those approvals and being permitted to move to the next phase of construction. <br> If the variances aren't granted, we will have unnecessary hardship because at least as to the side-yard, we have to eliminate that corner of the garage, and the front-yard -again, I know we will talk about this later, but then we lose a functional garage. We don't have a garage that would fit vehicles if we were going to have to come into compliance with the setback requirements. <br> So all and all, I think the Board has the discretion to grant the relief that is requested here, and it boils down to what's the right thing here? <br> My client did everything that a reasonable homeowner would do. My client contracted with the homebuilder. That homebuilder went through the permitting process with the homeowners association. They went through the permitting process with the City, and at each step along the way, they were given approval. Then now, we're ready to enclose the structure and put

the roof trusses on, we're told that, no, the home doesn't meet our requirements and you may have to tear things out.

And, respectfully, that doesn't seem like a fair outcome, and the Board of Adjustment is here to make sure we end up with a fair outcome. So, again, l'd be happy to answer any questions later on in the hearing. Thank you.
(Court reporter clarification.)
CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Anyone else? If not, we'll move onto to the next phase. There will be -- we'll need -- we'll have three calls to speak in opposition. This is the first call.

MR. BANDRÉ: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Bandré. I'm an attorney at 227 Madison in Jefferson City. I'm here representing Steve and Cheryl Maupin, who are the homeowners immediately to the side of this property.

This is a bad situation. We acknowledge that this is a bad situation. We acknowledge this is not easy on the applicants or the builder or the inspector or anyone else, but, respectfully, this is not a situation where this board can just do what it seems is right

1 or fair. Your code is very specific as to what circumstances a variance can be granted.
Specifically, Section 120-31 sets out a number
of items that you can consider in going through this.

Can the land in question yield a
reasonable return if used for a normal purpose? Is the plight due to unique and not to general neighborhood considerations? Does it alter the essential character of the property and on and on, but there is one necessity that your code calls for. That is an absolute requirement in order to grant the variance.

And I'm quoting, "The applicant shall clearly establish that as a practical matter the property cannot be used for a permitted use without coming into conflict with restrictions of the zoning chapter." That is a requirement of the code.

And while this is a terrible situation for everyone involved, it's also a terrible situation for my clients; and they have the absolute right to rely on the City Code; and the City Code to be followed. They have, is it six inches sure on the side lot. Are six
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inches a giant deal? I don't know. But the reality of the situation is, a variance is a variance, and it can only be granted if the property can't be used for the intended purpose. Here you have the proper layout of this lot.

It is a pie-shaped lot. It's always been a pie-shaped lot, and a house will fit on it. Will this house fit on it? I don't know. But a house will fit on it. It has been significantly planted, and it can be used for a residential property. And with that, under your code, the rest of this, respectfully, is merely explaining why this is a bad situation.

Precedent comes into play when we say, oh, it's only six inches; oh, it's only 10 feet; and that's why there have to be certain hard and fast standards that are set forth under the law. The law of the city is its code. And you all, just like every municipal volunteer, and God love you for that by the way, has sworn to uphold the code of the city. And the code of the city sets forth a very exacting standard of what should be here.

Who should suffer from this? Not our

Page 25 place to say. The homeowners don't appear to have done anything wrong. But that does not entitle them to a variance. Has the City done something wrong? Has the inspector done something wrong? Has the builder done something wrong? Has the candlestick maker done something wrong? This is all, essentially, irrelevant for the purpose of today. This is not about right and wrong. This is about legal, allowable, permissible versus impermissible under your code.

And when the code states that, "The applicant shall clearly establish that as a practical matter the property cannot be used for permitted use without coming into conflict with restrictions of the zoning chapter, and the Board is then to consider if the harm complained of in the variance application is the result of a self-inflicted hardship." Ultimately, at the end of the day, this house is in the wrong spot.

And, again, fault, there is clearly more than enough to go around in this situation, but, respectfully, and with all deference to those who are in favor of the variance being
granted, I would direct the Board's attention Page 26
granted, I would direct the Board's attention to Section 120-31 of your code because I believe it is crystal clear as to what can be done and what can't be done, and the rights of the appeal of something occurs that is not lawful under the code. Thank you very much for your time.

As a matter, I am happy to stand up here and try to spew that out again at the second hearing when we reach that time, and I'm assuming that learned counsel and everybody else will say the same thing. I can tell you the same thing again later, or I can say ditto to this meeting because I know you all have things to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Okay, this is the second call.

MR. MAUPIN: Good afternoon, Board. My name is Stephen Maupin, the neighbor to the -to the north here of proposed variance here, so --

MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Maupin, could we have your address please?

MR. MAUPIN: Yeah, it's 3503 Tanglewood Way. So Mr. Bandres spoke to the legal terms

1 of why a variance should not be accepted here, and I just want to kind of give a -- just a background of us, and how we came to be in Fulton. Whenever Cheryl and I first got married, we lived over in Columbia, and, shortly, after we had our first -- first kid, Ralston, our boy, we were looking to move back to Fulton, so we looked all over the City trying to decide where we wanted to put down roots, and we ultimately decided on Tanglewood.

Tanglewood is a great -- we wanted to be in a subdivision. We knew that. We wanted to be in a subdivision with covenants and restrictions and an HOA, so something like this wouldn't happen to us. We wouldn't have to worry about something being built next to us that we didn't want. We worked our butts off to build this house and to live there for -- to watch our kids grow. And by essentially allowing the variance, is it affecting the value of our home. There is no other way around it.

Cheryl will talk later in the next hearing about the cases of how that happens, and the big thing for us, too, is the line-of-sight out
of our front door. With this big of a setback issue in coming this far into -- in front of the street into our side house, we cannot see cars coming down the street. Our kids are going outside, our dogs, our pets, and they can't see cars because the house is too close. These type of setbacks are in place for a reason.

And let's see here, and the big thing, too, is we have so many people that have come over for, just this past weekend, for a baby -or a wedding shower, from out-of-town, and everyone spoke to the fact of, what is going on with that house? They've had -- they're not from Fulton. They're from other states, other places, and they noticed it right off the bat. Why is that house so close to yours? What is going on with that?

People from the golf course that don't live in Fulton, friends of mine, they all reached out, why is that house being built so close to your house? What is going on?

That's just kind of our stance on the whole. We feel very, very bad for the homeowners. Us and the Bleythings had no part

1 in this, Page 29 in this, whatsoever, but we're both asking, you know, to make consolations here, and we just don't feel that's right. So, thank you.

MS. MAUPIN: I'm Cheryl Maupin, Stephen's wife, so I'm the neighbor adjacent to 3305 Tanglewood Way. I'm also a licensed real estate broker in the State of Missouri, and our team is currently ranked seventh in the United States for transaction volume sold with our company. So I like to think I have some knowledge with regards to property values.

I don't need to sit here and discuss how this negatively affects our property. It's obvious; it's real estate 101. Stephen's talked about some of the stuff we're dealing with already. You know, if we go to sell and neighbor doesn't -- and a homeowner -- buyers and stuff that are coming in have an issue with it -- I mean, everybody that came to our bridal shower and the baby shower, they noticed it right off the bat, right before they even came in our door.

How would potential buyers not? How would they not give less for our home than another home? How would our sale of our home for less
not affect that? That's basic real estate. I don't want to get into that, because I want to talk about an obvious lesser issue that I'm not sure everybody is taking into consideration.

I'd say over 60 percent of buyers in this market right now, when they walk through the door, they aren't saying, I want to live in Fulton. They're saying, I want to live in one of five cities surrounding Columbia or Jeff City. Typically, Fulton is one of them. Small towns have such a tremendous opportunity for growth in this current climate right now, and a top thing for homeowners is location. They don't want, you know, if they're looking in subdivisions, which are a lot of them are, the first thing they say to me is, I don't want to be in a subdivision where the houses are on top of me.

You know, they'll walk in and say, man, does the City of Fulton just let anything go, if we keep just letting sloppy work like this get done, and it was sloppy, no sugarcoating it. It doesn't matter whose fault it was, it's not within the setbacks and it ruins the aesthetic of a community.

So are you going to allow it this time and not next time? Here or there? You know, l'm sure the lawyers would talk -- would be happy to discuss the implications of selective enforcement for a small fee, you know? These little decisions day in and day out that you make, the compounding effect affects the whole community. So, I mean, these little -- the little decisions that you are making will impact the growth and the death of Fulton Missouri.

MR. GLASCOCK: My name is James Glascock or Jim Glascock. I'm the President and developer of Tanglewood Estates Corp. I'm not going to take --

MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Glascock, if I may interrupt, could I please have your address, please?

MR. GLASCOCK: My home address is 3713 Southland Drive, Columbia, Missouri. My office is 209B East Green Meadows, Columbia, Missouri.

MS. RATLIFF: Perfect, thank you.
MR. GLASCOCK: And I've been over here developing this subdivision since 1996. It's not a quick fix. I want to bring something up
that kind of concerns me in great degree. I'm not taking a side for or against either side, because it's not going to be happy for whoever wins and whoever loses. There's several points I want to make. One, Shad was not a buyer from Tanglewood. He bought the property from a previous owner. That property was sold a number of years ago, and he bought it from them.

When we have a closing with a buyer, they get from us a plot plan that shows where the setbacks are required. It's done by our engineering company, which is Crockett Engineers. We provide it to everyone who builds at that thing. I'm sure Cheryl got one when they got it. So when they brought us their plans, we did not approve that house sitting where they put it. We approved the plan of that house, because they did not do what's called a plot plan, house-on-lot plot plan. That is required in Columbia, Missouri, totally.

You will not get a permit if you don't bring in that piece of paper showing where that house is going to be on that lot. They don't
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| Page 33 | Page 35 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 approve it. I don't know if it's -- if it's | 1 want to clarify that if the Board were to ask |
| 2 not required here in Fulton, but it should be. | 2 anyone to speak, they're going to ask for them |
| 3 Now, whose fault that is? Is it the City | 3 to affirm and swear that the truth they're |
| 4 of Fulton, that's the builder, that's the owner | 4 going to tell is everything to their knowledge. |
| 5 of the lot, but it evidently did not happen | 5 Mr. Hudson, if you would like to have Mr -- |
| 6 because the architect of control, which | 6 speak, if you will read, ask him to state his |
| 7 control, along with all members of the | 7 name and then read this to him? |
| 8 homeowners association, they approve it fi | 8 MR. BRUEMMER: And just to make sure I got |
| 9 I approve it second; I | 9 it right, did the rules change halfway in? Is |
| 10 | 10 that the question? |
| 11 on that lot in any way shape or fo | 11 MR. RIGDON: Pretty much. |
| 12 So what was approved by us was | 12 MR. BRUEMMER: The rule -- the rules |
| 13 approved related to where it fits on the lo | 13 didn't change. On -- I was noticing on Exhibit |
| 14 I want you to know that. Beyond that, my only | 146 on what was presented earlier, it shows the |
| 15 concern is you cannot do what maybe needs to be | 15 building permit application. The building |
| 16 done, and that is change the lot lines | 16 permit application also has a sketch of the |
| 17 anything else. Only one person can do that | 17 property lines on it, and it shows the setbacks |
| 18 which I will not do, because I'm going to | 18 on it of 10 feet on either side and 25-foot on |
| 19 somebody if I do it. So there's only one | 19 the front on it. Where the issue came is the |
| 20 person who can alter any of the lot plans, the | 20 interpretation or the judgment out in the |
| 21 plot requirements and we will not re-subdivide | 21 |
| 22 that lot or anybody else's without | 22 There was, to my knowledge, no property |
| 23 cooperation, which will be Cheryl and Steve or | 23 line marked out in the field, staked out in the |
| 24 without Shad. So those are two possib | 24 field, no survey done. Our inspector, you |
| 25 that you got to be considering. | 25 know, did not see those marks. |
|  |  |
| $2$ | MR. RIGDON: For a stand <br> 2 sounds like distance from the |
| 3 look, if you owned that house and this was here | 3 the end of the lot line. Is there a standard |
| 4 next to you, what would be your opinio | 4 practice where the lot lines just weren't |
| 5 Beyond that, I have nothing else to say, but | 5 marked very good, I'm making the assumption, |
| 6 thank you. If you have any questions, you're | 6 but did somebody from the City do that line? |
| 7 welcome to give me | 7 Sorry to -- |
| 8 CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Anyone else wishing to | 8 MR. BRUEMMER: I think it was a judgment |
| 9 speak in opposition? | 9 by our inspector out there of where that |
| 10 declare this hearing closed, and there will be | 10 property line started and stopped. Not being a |
| 11 discuss | 11 right-of-way professional or surveyor |
| 12 MR. RIGDON: Aaron Rigdon here. I was | 12 themselves, what they have to go by is what |
| 13 looking through Mr. Colbert's write-up that we | 13 they're looking at on a plat, and what is -- |
| 14 were given before this. I mean, the biggest | 14 what is general. |
| 15 thing that stuck out to me is, there | 15 And, so, when they're looking at a plat, |
| 16 sugge | 16 and they're saying, okay, 25 feet, if they made |
| 17 interpretation of the setback calculations on | 17 that interpretation and said 25 foot from this |
| 18 February 29th, which kind of caus | 18 location or that location, that is a judgment |
| 19 encroachm | 19 call. Just like it would be on -- when they |
| 20 Was there a change in the building code at | 20 were out there with Mr. Salmons, or another |
| 21 all that way, or can you dive | 21 builder is out there, they're making a judgment |
| 22 anybody for that matter, if that would really | 22 without, actually, locating the property pins. |
| 23 change or if that's something that's always | 23 MR. RIGDON: That's quite a large |
| 24 been in | 24 discrepancy that we're talking about and -- |
| 25 MS. RATLIFF: Before you speak, I just | 25 MS. RATLIFF: At this point, we're just |

specifically speaking about this hearing, but as long as we stay on topic to that.

MR. BARNES: Mr. Bruemmer, Rob Barnes speaking. I assumed and you seem to have it, that with a building permit that is off on a sketch or drawing that would show those setbacks, I'm not finding that. Was that in the packet or --

MR. BRUEMMER: I don't think -- looking at Exhibit 6 as it was presented, I do not see that sketch plat in that sketch with that. So I brought it with me, because I got that --

MR. BARNES: You thought it might be important --

MR. BRUEMMER: Right, I thought that it might be important. So I was interested to see if that was put on there, and I found it interesting that it wasn't in Exhibit 6.

MR. BARNES: Carrying on with Aaron's comments, I, too, kind of noticed a reference several times in some of the documentation provided ahead of time of back of the curb; and I can only -- well, I don't want to draw or make an assumption, but I think if I'm playing this scenario out the best I can in my own
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mind, but somewhere along the way there became a realization the back of the curb and property line were not one and the same. And, in fact, they must have been seven to -- I don't know, ten feet difference.

And I'm not sure my question and its subsequent answer really changes how I might ultimately decide, but l'll ask it anyway: do we believe that back of the curb was a reference made repeatedly where a person would have taken that as fact in the -- in their due diligence of staking -- a staking of a home, or and, Kyle, I know you probably can't -- some of what I'm trying to get to is you can't answer directly because you didn't make the statement, so it's probably unfair to even ask them.

I guess l'll stick with the comment that I'm kicking around in my head, the difference between the back of the curb and the property line not being one and the same, at least that's what it appears to be. I'll guess I'll just I'll stop there.

MR. BRUEMMER: I guess I would say that your statement that back of the curb and property line are not one and the same is
accurate
And, you know, I think there was a
judgment made, and that judgment was inaccurate
by both the inspector and the builder.
MR. RIGDON: Whoever could answer this:
but were there any changes made to the plans of
the house or how it's that -- or the side or
both of the projects between getting approval and --

MS. RATLIFF: Shad, you can come up and we'll get you sworn in.

MR. RIGDON: Between getting initial approval and what it looks today as far as where it's --

MR. SALMONS: No, there hasn't been any change to it.

MS. RATLIFF: One second before you answer that.

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Please state your name.
MR. SALMONS: Shad Salmons.
(Shad Salmons sworn.)
MS. RATLIFF: Thank you.
MR. SALMONS: Aaron, we had -- these are
the plans we've had from day one since we started this process. No changes have been
made, you know, from when we submitted to the HOA, to the City, you know, all that, they've been the same house plans.

MR. RIGDON: That house at that time fit on that lot?

MR. SALMONS: By going by what we were told, yes.

MR. ERNST: They didn't -- with the original building application, there was a plot plan included?

MR. BRUEMMER: Correct.
MR. ERNST: Was it correct?
MR. BRUEMMER: Yes, it is correct according to our code.

MR. ERNST: I mean, we're -- there's -- on the building application, there's a square. Did they have the dimensions of the lot right and all that stuff on there?

MR. BRUEMMER: So what it shows, it's 25 feet from what's labeled a property line to the structure in the front, and then on the side, 10 feet was labeled as the property line to the structure.

MR. ERNST: But the dimensions of the lot, did they indicate the dimensions of the lot


5 MS. RATLIFF: I'd just like to add to make 6 it clear to the public, this is to not grant
7 the variance for what reason or for what -- for the existing six-inch --

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: For the existing --
MS. RATLIFF: -- encroachment?
MR. BARNES: This would be the six-inch encroachment.

MS. RATLIFF: Thank you. Call for a vote.
CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Call for a vote. All
those in favor of a motion, please say aye?
MR. BARNES: Aye.
MS. RATLIFF: I'd like to take a role call
vote, please. For Mr. Rigdon?
MR. RIGDON: Aye.
MS. RATLIFF: Ms. Laswell?
MS. LASWELL: Yes.
MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Ernst?
MR. ERNST: Yes.
MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Hudson?
CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Yes.

## MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Barnes?

MR. BARNES: Aye.
MS. RATLIFF: All those in favor of not
granting the motion or not granting the
approval of the permit of an existing six-inch
encroachment on the side-yard setback from what
is indicated in the Fulton City Code, Section
120-31 (c) for the home located at 3501
Tanglewood Way, Lot 93, Tanglewood Estates, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Okay. Now, we will declare the hearing of the second hearing open, and that is for the hearing to hear the request of Travis and Kayla Bleything, asking for a variance permit -- asking for a variance permitting the existing 9 -foot encroachment of the front-yard setback, from what is located in the City Code Section 120-31(c) for their home located at 3501 Tanglewood Way, Lot 93, Tanglewood Estates, Fulton, Missouri. Fulton City Code requires a 25 front-yard setback from the property line.

There will be three calls in favor. Three calls against and then we'll close the hearing and we will have discussion. We will have
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MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Mr. Chair. Again, Caleb Colbert, attorney at 827 East Broadway in Columbia. And, again, we are asking for your support for the front-yard variance. A couple things I want to point out.

Number one, there is a precedent for granting variances to the front-yard setback in Tanglewood. Exhibit 7 in your binder is a front-yard setback variance that was approved for 3312 Tanglewood Estates -- excuse me Tanglewood Way, and it was an identical issue.

In that situation, the homeowner completed a structure. The City of Fulton, after the fact, flagged there was an encroachment into the front-yard setback, and the Board of Adjustment granted a variance. I want to -- I know we've been here a while this evening, but that hearing started at 5:43 p.m., and it concluded at 5:50. So in a matter of seven minutes, that homeowner -- this board gave that homeowner a front-yard setback variance for the exact same issue that we're talking about here.

## Again, the minutes reflect that a city

 inspector allowed a homeowner to construct this home into the front-yard setback. The Board of Adjustment granted relief in that scenario.I would offer, just for the record, the same exhibits, Exhibits 1 through 8 that I offered in the prior hearing. I offer those into the record in this hearing as well. Have Exhibits 1 through 8 been received?

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Yes.
MR. COLBERT: Okay, thank you. A prior speaker mentioned the prospect of an encroachment creating damages to property values. Well, I think that's pretty speculative when you consider that there's an encroachment at 3312 Tanglewood Way, which doesn't seem to have impacted property values in the subdivision.

And, number two, when balancing the harms of who is going to be impacted by the denial of
the variance, whether there is impact of property values is speculative. If you never sell your home, there's never any impact there. But to the Bleythings, we know it's going to cost them tens of thousands of dollars to tear

1 out this structure, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars to start from scratch.

So in the balancing of the harms and trying to evaluate who is impacted the most, again, it seems like the party that suffers a concrete distinct injury today by the denial of the variance is my client, the homeowners.

I did want to respond to Mr. Bandres' comments on the legal justification for granting the variance. The section that Mr. Bandres cited is subsection 2.

I have to direct your attention to subsection 1 , which says, "In order that the spirit of this zoning code be observed and substantial justice done, the zoning board of adjustment shall upon application or appeal, determine and vary the terms hereof by making a finding of fact that owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship."

I already went over sort of the special conditions and the unnecessary hardship in the prior hearing. I'll just sort of incorporate that testimony here. I don't want to, you
know, repeat that; but, again, the standard is, is there unnecessary hardship here as a result of special conditions? Respectfully, I think there is. So we would, respectfully, ask for your support for the variance. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Second call for anyone wishing to speak in favor.

MR. TALBERT: Shane Talbert, 3411 Tanglewood Way. I just want to reference Mr . Barnes spoke about that 25 -foot. We were trying to decide if that was the property line or the pin or whatever you want to reference.

I built a house right down the street from them. During that process, I got that same drawing. It shows a rectangle structure. It was always said and always referenced; pins were never said. Dennis Houchins was the inspector at that time. We never spoke about pins. We spoke about the curb. And it was always 25 feet from the curb.

He said you can build all the way back to the back of your property if you want, you know, but you got to be 25 feet from the curb. Continually said, continually said and

| $\text { Page } 49$ | Page 51 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 continually said. | 1 somebody saying, I think this is where it is, |
| 2 My house wasn't an issue because I built | 2 or, Shad, I'm going to take Shad's word it's |
| 340 feet back. I wanted it back; I wanted a | 325 feet from the -- or 35 feet. |
| 4 large driveway. Not effected. Now by me | 4 From my experience, which is probably two |
| 5 making that choice, I'm in the same predicament | 5 weeks after this process or before this |
| 6 they are. I walk out my front door, I see | 6 process, I got told with X , a red X , this was |
| 7 neighbor's house. I can't see down the | 7 25; you cannot build inside of this. So I just |
| 8 but that | 8 wanted to tell you my experience from her. |
| 9 buy a lot next to them to not have anybody ever | 9 CHAIRMAN HUDSON: This is the third call |
| 0 | 10 for anyone speaking to speak in favor. Seeing |
| y | one come forward, we will move on to three |
| 12 So l just wanted that on record to say | 12 calls in opposition. This is the first call to |
| 13 | eak in opposition. |
| 14 from the curb, 25 foot from the curb, 25 feet | 14 MR. BANDRÉ: Again, your code in Section |
|  | 15 120-31-- |
| 16 MR. SALMONS: Shad Salmons aga | 16 MS. RATLIFF: I hate to interrupt. If |
| 17 MS. RATLIFF: Mr. Salmons, can we have | 7 you'd pleas |
| 18 y | 18 MR. BANDRÉ: I'm sorry, ma'am. |
| 19 MR. SALMONS: Well, 2602 | 19 MS. RATLIFF: That's okay. |
| 20 MS. RATLIFF: Thank you. | 20 MR. BANDRÉ: David Bandrè, 227 Madison |
| 21 MR. SALMONS: Kind of st | 21 Street, Jefferson City, Missour |
| 22 too, that's -- from | 22 Section 120-31 of your code |
| 23 f | 23 |
| 24 come out, and we measured 25 feet from the 25 curb. So that's what I was told as well | 24 area heights and lot regulations. It does 25 provide that the 25 feet is front-yard, comma, |
|  | e 52 |
| 1 through this whole process. Thank you. | 1 from property line. |
| 2 MR. HELSEL: Heath Helsel. I'm building | 2 Again, and l'm saying this for the record, |
| 3 house out there as | 3 I know l've said it, I'm not trying to drag |
| 4 MS. RATLIFF: Can I get your | 4 this out, get that out there; but it is my |
| 5 MR. HELSEL: Well, it's not really defined | 5 belief that under your code, particularly |
| 6 yet, but I think it's | 6 Section 120-31, that if this property can |
| 7 MS. RATLIFF: Thank y | 7 lawfully can be used for a house that meets the |
| 8 MR. HELSEL: So you said that it was kind | 8 requirements. In other words, it has 7,000 |
| 9 of takin | 9 square feet as required by a R-1 lot, there's |
| 10 | 10 room for 25 feet front setback from the |
| 11 from the setback. I had the same problem. | 11 property line; 10 feet side-yard from the |
| 12 was building too far back, because I was -- I | 12 property line; and 25 rear-yard from the |
| 13 had to be 25 feet off the back. I was never | 13 property line, that you can't grant a variance. |
| 14 told 25 feet off t | 14 That's lousy for the homeowners and the |
| 15 about 4,000 square feet, because I wante | 15 builders and everyone else, but there has to be |
| 16 make sure it got center | 16 a correct forum within which to have those |
| 17 The inspector came out and made an X on my | 17 issues heard. Respectfully, this is not that |
| 18 lot to where I could not -- she was on hand | 18 forum because this is a limited forum. It is |
| 19 talking | 19 an important forum. It is a forum that has a |
| 20 this X. It was defined to me after we had a | 20 lot of things come through. Precedent versus |
| 21 little argument about | 21 code is not a fair fight. Because code is |
| 22 the back, and she was there with me, told me | 22 binding, and code is enforceable. |
| 23 this, so it's -- I could not build in fron | 23 I don't know, my guess is the members |
| 24 that. She was not going to allow me to go. So | 24 the Board don't know the reasons for the amount |
| 25 I had a 25 -- it wasn't a guess. It wasn't | 25 of the variance that was granted in other |


| 1 | situations, but it is irrelevant for this |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | issue, because what is relevant is that this is |
| 3 | a valid and buildable lot, having, based on my |
| 4 | terrible math, 7,500 square feet at a minimum |
| 5 | of space. Although with a pie-shaped lot, I |
| 6 | don't know. |
| 7 | But it certainly is a lot that was |
| 8 | developed, and I would trust that the developer |
| 9 | has all of the lots out there in excess of what |
| 10 | the code is. Again, my clients could have |
| 11 | bought another lot. They could have bought up |
| 12 | all the lots on the street, but what they have |
| 13 | an absolute right to do is rely on the code. |
| 14 | And rely on the protections that that code |
| 15 | provides them. |
| 16 | Going back to the Wild West, that is why |
| 17 | people move to towns, so that they had the |
| 18 | protection of the laws in those towns. And if |
| 19 | those laws can easily be thrown away because |
| 20 | mistakes are made by any third party, then |
| 21 | those protections don't exist. |
| 22 | It is our belief that the code is clear as |
| 23 | to what a property line is. If a mistake was |
| 24 | made by an inspector, a city employee, a |
| 25 | secretary, whoever it was who gave that, I |
| 24 | with city code. To live in a community means |
| 24 | another. |
| 18 | appreciate the stress of building a new home |
| 19 | under normal circumstances and the desire to |
| 20 | move forward at all times. We do not wish to |
| 21 | impede their progress toward their new home. |
| 17 | We do, however, wish for their home to comply |
| 15 | muture neighbors. Having built multiple homes one may impact |
| 13 | is Melody Czeschin. I live across the street |
| 11 | from the property under discussion tonight at |
| 12 | 3502 Tanglewood Way. |
| 2 | variance, and I know that does not grant a |
| 3 | variance under your code because there's not a |
| 4 | provision that allows it. Thank you. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN HUDSON: Second call for anyone |
| 6 | speaking in opposition. |
| 7 | MS. CZESCHIN: Good evening. I forgot the |
| 8 | proper greeting on the sheet, what it said. |
| 13 |  | all.

Some are expecting those who are
blameless, us neighbors, to bear the burden of another's error. The burden of this error cannot be forced on the surrounding neighbors.
Per city code, the builder is expected to have full knowledge of the rules and how to comply with them.

We were raised here with the understanding that the rules meant something and that everyone is held accountable. How this mismeasurement occurred is indeed complicated and very unfortunate for all involved.

Let's understand that this decision does not just impact homeowners within 185 feet of the situation, but a decision to allow this deviation can impact property values for anyone selling a home in our neighborhood of 90-plus houses, not to mention to the safety of those passed by the property and the legal precedent this will set for other builders to bend the rules throughout our city. Thank you.

MR. CZESCHIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, my name is Jeremy Czeschin. I live across the street at 3502 Tanglewood Way. I first became aware of the situation, and the
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process when we all received our certified letter from the City. At that point, I reached out to Stephen and Cheryl. They shared with me a letter that their representation had provided to the Board. So I reviewed each case cited in that letter in detail, and I would like to highlight a few items that made me question why a variance is being considered.

First, from the Missouri State
Constitution, all four of the following items are required in order to support the legality of a variance. For a variance, an applicant must prove relief is necessary because of the unique character of the property rather than for personal considerations; and applying the strict letter of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship; and the imposition of such a hardship is not necessary for the preservation of the plan; and granting the variance will result in substantial justice to

In one of the cases cited, Antioch Community Church versus Kansas City -- the City of Kansas City, it's stated that, "The general rule is that the authority to grant a variance
should be exercised sparingly and only under exceptional circumstances."

To reinforce this, in Hutchens versus St. Louis, I quote, "Such counties should exercise their power to grant a variance sparingly and in accordance with the public welfare."

We've already heard about potential effects on property value, but one thing is certain where the house is located does create a safety risk. There are the -- any cars parked in the driveway would obstruct the sidewalk, forcing people to walk around, and the site lines that would obstruct from anybody walking from the north end of the subdivision to the south end are also impeded.

In this case, there was a mention of a prior variance. I was in the subdivision when that happened. I believe it is, approximately, one foot. Now, we're talking about, approximately, 9 feet, which is 36 percent of the minimum required setback. Thank you for your time.

MS. MAUPIN: Cheryl Maupin, 3503
Tanglewood Way. One thing I have a hard time understanding is the builder, at the very same
time on the other side of the lot, built his home at the same time that the Bleythings' was being built, and those meet the setbacks. So why is that house setback, and the other one meets all the setbacks and this one does not? If they said that they didn't know what the setbacks were?

MR. GLASCOCK: James Glascock, 3713 Southland, Columbia, Missouri. I want to make the same point that was made by the previous speaker, regarding the second house there. If you take the item that was sent out to all homeowners in the area, it shows the depiction of all the fronts of all the houses. There's only one, and that's this house here that does not appear to be quite a ways back. I assume you did this with some type of a drawing or somebody had to measure that to make that occur; is that correct? Is that correct, KC? Can you tell me --

MS. RATLIFF: I'm Kathie Ratliff. I'm the city clerk. KC is not here tonight. Kyle might be able to speak to that in time, but thank you --

MR. GLASCOCK: What I'm trying to say is,

1 if you look at what was sent out to all the homeowners, it basically shows every house quite a bit more than this house. So everybody else, when they get their permit, it seems knew it had to be 35 feet from the back of the curb or 25 feet from the property line. Just to reiterate, unless you got a question of me.

MS. RATLIFF: None at this time, thank you.

MR. GARY CZESCHIN: I haven't planned to speak, but my name is Gary Czeschin. I live at 3404 Tanglewood Way. And I have lived in this subdivision almost 20 years. We were here at the time when the other variance was approved. And one of the reasons why it might have gone through so quickly is that all of the neighbors accepted and signed off, to my knowledge, all -- that they were okay with that one-foot variance on that particular house in that particular situation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HUDSON: This is third and final call for anyone wishing to speak in opposition -- to opposition. Seeing no one come forward, we're closing the hearing now and will have discussion on the issue.

MR. BARNES: Not everyone all at once. I think there was a comment when this hearing here, when the first hearing opened, when you stand up and get to the second part, you pretty well say ditto. Very complicated issues, and I know no real outcome that's positive or good in this particular scenario. A small community, you know a lot of the folks that are in this room. I know the builder in question, very competent, a very caring individual, works hard, does a good job.

Certainly, my heart goes to the folks building a home. Been there, done that. It's painful when things go well, as pointed out.

This particular member of the Board of Adjustment would like to make a motion to deny the variance in this particular case.

MR. ERNST: Seconded.
MS. RATLIFF: Court reporter, before I call roll, I want to make it clear that Rob Barnes made the motion and Bill Ernst was the second, thank you. I'll start with Ms.
Laswell. Are you in agreement to deny the variance?

MS. LASWELL: Yes.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
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