

COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA

SPECIAL PERMIT RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

BLAIR G. CHILDS, TRUSTEE, & ERIN SHAFFER, TRUSTEE, SP 2004-DR-027 Appl. under Sect(s). 8-914 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit reduction to minimum yard requirements based on error in building location to permit accessory structure to remain 7.7 ft. from side lot line and 1.6 ft. from rear lot line. Located at 1885 Virginia Ave. on approx. 14,910 sq. ft. of land zoned R-2. Dranesville District. Tax Map 41-1 ((13)) (4) 44A. (Admin. moved from 8/3/04, 7/27/04, 9/28/04, 11/30/04, 2/15/05, and 3/8/05 at appl. req.) (Indefinitely deferred from 4/19/05 at app. req.) (Reactivated on 5/27/08.) Ms. Gibb moved that the Board of Zoning Appeals adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the captioned application has been properly filed in accordance with the requirements of all applicable State and County Codes and with the by-laws of the Fairfax County Board of Zoning Appeals; and

WHEREAS, following proper notice to the public, a public hearing was held by the Board on July 29, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Board has made the following findings of fact:

1. The applicants are the owners of the land.
2. The applicants' mistake was made in good faith.
3. The treehouse specifically is not detrimental to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity.
4. The treehouse is in the woods and does not have much of an impact.
5. Testimony indicated there was no other place to locate the treehouse.

That the applicant has presented testimony indicating compliance with Sect. 8-006, General Standards for Special Permit Uses, and Sect. 8-914, Provisions for Approval of Reduction to the Minimum Yard Requirements Based on Error in Building Location, the Board has determined:

- A. That the error exceeds ten (10) percent of the measurement involved;
- B. The non-compliance was done in good faith, or through no fault of the property owner, or was the result of an error in the location of the building subsequent to the issuance of a Building Permit, if such was required;
- C. Such reduction will not impair the purpose and intent of this Ordinance;
- D. It will not be detrimental to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity;
- E. It will not create an unsafe condition with respect to both other property and public streets;
- F. To force compliance with the minimum yard requirements would cause unreasonable hardship upon the owner; and
- G. The reduction will not result in an increase in density or floor area ratio from that permitted by the applicable zoning district regulations.

AND, WHEREAS, the Board of Zoning Appeals has reached the following conclusions of law:

1. That the granting of this special permit will not impair the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance, nor will it be detrimental to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity.
2. That the granting of this special permit will not create an unsafe condition with respect to both other properties and public streets and that to force compliance with setback requirements would cause unreasonable hardship upon the owner.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the subject application is **APPROVED**, with the following development conditions:

1. This special permit is approved for the location of the accessory structure (play equipment) as shown on the plat prepared by Dominion Surveyors Inc., dated February 2, 2004 as revised through May 7, 2004, as submitted with this application and is not transferable to other land.

This approval, contingent upon the above-noted conditions, shall not relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations or adopted standards.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 5-2. Mr. Hammack and Mr. Hart voted against the motion.

A Copy Teste:

Suzanne L. Frazier, Deputy Clerk
Board of Zoning Appeals