

April 7, 2025

REC'D APR 08 2025

Dear Planning and Zoning Commission Members

We are opposing Case SUP2502-0010 to be discussed during the April 8, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

There are numerous reasons that this request should be denied. Below are our concerns:

- The applicant is asking to build across two separate property lines. I question whether or not that is allowed by the Universal Building Code.
- 1131 Bancroft is platted separately from 1432 Mount Gilead, though under the same ownership. The request to build this non-compliant building includes two addresses - one on Bancroft and one on Mount Gilead. Shouldn't they be platted as one address, if the applicant is building on both? We would like to ask that the applicant withdraw his request until the property is properly platted.
- The potential build location is behind our home and will be a huge eye sore, from our back windows and from our backyard. We do not want to look out our windows and from our backyard, at a 3,000 sq ft warehouse storage building. There are available units throughout our area that provide vehicle storage. It is not necessary to have this in our backyard. We already look out at their guest house, barn, multiple animal shelters and water tank. When will the building stop?
- We are a residential neighborhood not an industrial area. Is a 3,000 square foot hobby workshop, luxury car garage, or storage building on this property compliant with the city code for residential areas? It seems to be a better fit in an industrial area, with other storage facilities/warehouses.
- The request for a 5 foot setback variance is excessive and invasive to the adjacent properties. There is already an existing guest house in place on the property, that is non-compliant with the 15 foot setback regulations. See attached photos. We do not want another structure up against the fence, with only a 5 foot setback.
- The request for 3,000sf is two and a half times the permitted 1,200sf. This is an excessive request, along with the setback variance requested, and is unfair to the neighborhood. What if multiple others requested such egregious variances?
- Based on the exhibit provided, in addition to the 3,737 sq ft main house, which includes a full garage, there appears to be at least 8 other structures (sheds, barns, livestock feeding stations or buildings) at 1432 Mount Gilead/1131 Bancroft. In addition, there's a guest house of 2,033sq ft on that property, butting up against the back fence. How many structures are allowed by zoning to be on a property?

- Our home already has flooding issues, as the city permitted our next-door neighbor to overbuild his property including his home, a residence for his mother-in-law, a pool, a circle drive, a playhouse and a pickleball court. I suspect other neighbors will also suffer flooding, if this is allowed.
- Before coming to you, Mr. Grundman petitioned the neighbors to gain approval of this plan. We did not sign our approval, and we are against this large storage facility and the overbuilding of this property. It requires variances of the city code, which are detrimental to the adjacent property owners.

Overbuilding and filling up the footprint of each property needs to stop! I urge you to deny this request. Setting a precedent such as this will be harmful to our city. You wouldn't want this in your backyard either.

Please deny this request.

Ted Hebert & Beth Hebert  
1012 Oakwood Drive  
Keller, TX 76248  
972.896.5934

Beth Hebert  
Ted Hebert

200 ft Buffer



~~REC'D MAY 5 0 2025~~

May 6, 2025

REC'D MAY 0 5 2025

Dear Mayor &amp; City Council Members,

We are opposing Case SUP2502-0010, which was unanimously denied by the P&Z Committee on April 6<sup>th</sup>.  
 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VCfS-HIldro> Time 1:50:29) Address: 1432 Mt Gilead Rd/1131 Bancroft Rd

Below are our concerns:

1. **Number of Detached Structures on Property (variance)** - In addition to the 3,737 sq ft main house, which includes a full garage, this property contains a guest house of 2,016sq ft, as well as at least 8 other structures (sheds, barns, livestock feeding stations, etc). The City of Keller allows for 2 accessory structures, not 9! P&Z opposed this.
2. **Size (SUP)**- The request for a 3,000sf accessory building is two and a half times the permitted 1,200sf. This is an excessive request and was not supported by P&Z. What if multiple others requested such egregious variances? This "accessory" storage building will be larger than the homes around it and will also exceed over 50% of the main structure, requiring an SUP.
3. **Setback (variance)** - The request for a 5 foot setback variance is invasive to the adjacent properties. There is already an existing guest house in place on the property, that is non-compliant with the 15 foot setback regulations. P&Z opposed this. See attached photo.
4. **Location of Proposed Storage Building** - As mentioned by P&Z, all buildings on this 4.5 acre property are squeezed into the back quarter of the property and are against the neighboring back property line. An additional building in this location is extreme. When will the building stop?
5. **Masonry vs Metal** - Any accessory building over 200 sq ft is required to be "brick, stone or same material as main structure". Therefore, a metal building of 3,000sf would not meet our city's UDC, which is strongly encouraged. The main structure is masonry. This proposed building is metal and is going to stand out - per P&Z.
6. **Building Across Two Properties** - The property is not properly platted to add a building such as this. The applicant is requesting to build across two separate property lines.
7. **Location** - We are a residential neighborhood not an industrial area. Is a 3,000 square foot hobby workshop, luxury car garage, or storage building on this property a good fit? It seems to be a better fit in an industrial area, with other large storage facilities/warehouses.
8. **Drainage** - Our home already has flooding issues, as our next-door neighbor has overbuilt his property, which includes his home, a residence for his mother-in-law, a pool, a circle drive, a playhouse and a pickleball court - all sitting on less than an acre. Because of this, flooding occurs during heavy rains, and we have lost 9 oak trees, in the last year alone, due to poor drainage/standing water on the back portion of our property. More concrete will create additional drainage issues.

We are opposed to this request to build a large storage facility and overbuilding of this property. The requested variances would be detrimental to adjacent property owners and the City of Keller.

Approval of this unreasonable request would be setting a precedent, which is harmful to our city. Overbuilding and filling up the footprint of each property needs to stop! As the P&Z Commission has recommended, please deny this request!

Ted & Beth Hebert  
 1012 Oakwood Drive  
 Keller, TX 76248  
 972.896.5934 [REDACTED]

Ted & Beth Hebert

200 ft BUFFER



**From:** Kelly Ballard  
**Sent:** Monday, May 12, 2025 8:51 AM  
**To:** Community Development  
**Cc:** Sarah Hensley  
**Subject:** FW: opposition to 3,000 square-foot garage

Kelly Ballard, TRMC, CMC  
City Secretary  
Keller, Texas

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, May 9, 2025 3:18 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil <[CityCouncil@cityofkeller.com](mailto:CityCouncil@cityofkeller.com)>  
**Subject:** opposition to 3,000 square-foot garage

Wayne Hoelscher. I live at 1100 Oakwood Drive.

I am in OPPOSITION to the 3,000 square-foot garage at 1131 Bancroft Road and 1432 Mount Gilead Road.

This was moved to the May 20 City Council meeting.

From what I can tell, the garage would be a massive wall across almost all of 1016 Oakwood Drive's view and part of 1012's view, replacing a country view. This can't be allowed.

Planning and zoning said this property needed to be plotted before the garage could be built. Shouldn't it be plotted first, then go to City Council for approval so there is more information? Planning and zoning didn't seem to know what any of the 8 existing buildings were used for. A guest house was built not that many years ago and a storage building? years before that. WHY WASN'T THIS PROPERTY PLOTTED BEFORE THE GUEST HOUSE (#8?) WAS ALLOWED TO BE BUILT, IF THAT IS A REQUIREMENT? They said 1 or 2 extra buildings were allowed, not 8 buildings!

I monitor City Council meetings for many years. The storage building has a little over a two foot setback. On the map provided, the guest house is 24' on one side and 28' on the other side. Standing by my back fence and looking down, there is a small amount of setback on one side and the guest house appears to be against the fence (zero setback?) on the other side. Looks the same on the map. I may have missed this, but I found NO City Council meetings on either building when they were built. I always wondered how they got away with such small setbacks. WHAT HAPPENED TO THE 15' SETBACK REQUIREMENT? There is a reason. Not following this rule caused

FW: opposition to 3,000 square-foot garage

major problems. This man has 4.5 acres of land all over the place, and he doesn't want room for setbacks?

In May, 2024, a somewhat small drainage pipe was installed on my property (1100) and my neighbors property (1020) connected to a pump on their property. THEY INDICATED THIS WAS REQUIRED BECAUSE THE GUEST HOUSE WAS FLOODING? There are gutters on the guest house, so lots of water went somewhere. Wouldn't they be required to do some kind of flooding survey? Lots and lots of roofs on this property cause lots of water. It took them 3 and one half weeks of grief to get the pipe moved on their side. This part I'm not sure about. The amount of dirt dug up in my neighbors yard indicated the pump was on the other side of the guest house. DID THEY INSTALL THE PIPE IN OUR YARDS BECAUSE THERE IS ZERO SETBACK AND NO ROOM TO INSTALL THEM IN THEIR YARD?

#### QUESTIONS AND SUMMARY:

Why wasn't this property plotted when the guest house was built?

My main question is, WHERE WAS THE CITY OF KELLER? The answer can't be, 'we didn't know about the guest house?'. People live in this building. On the one side, the owner followed no City of Keller requirements. On the other side, there should have been City of Keller people there regular for many tasks. Was there no one there to verify that the owner followed the rules? No City Council meeting. Little or no setback. Too many building. Flooding of a new building, really?

Now they want to build another huge building to greatly increase the flooding on the property. Doesn't make sense to me.

**From:** Debbie Wolfe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 5, 2025 6:22 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncil  
**Cc:** Community Development  
**Subject:** Objections to SUP-2502-0010

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Council Members,

I am a nearby neighbor of the subject property and I would like to register my objection to the two variances requested as part of this SUP.

Variance 1: The applicant's rationale for a 5' rear setback in lieu of the required 15' setback disregards the impact on current and future neighbors of such a large structure placed so close to the property line. It would adversely affect the open feel of this area of north Keller. This variance should be denied.

Variance 2: The applicant provided no rationale for allowing 7 accessory structures in excess of the 2 allowed by the UDC. Allowing more than 2 accessory structures would set a bad precedent. It should not be a hardship for the applicant to consolidate the uses of these other structures into the one proposed. I recommend the applicant be required to remove all existing structures other than the ADU as a condition of granting this SUP.

Other than that, the proposed structure is consistent with others in the area and with SUPs that have been granted over the past few years. I would support it under the conditions I've outlined above.

Thank you,

***Debbie Wolfe***  
1285 Mount Gilead Rd  
Keller, TX 76262  
650-888-6711