

## City of Smyrna

## Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	2020-	-307	Version:	1	Name:	1429 Walker Court- V20-0	)41
Туре:	Variance Request				Status:	Passed	
File created:	8/6/2				In control:	License and Variance Boa	ard
On agenda:	8/12/2	2020			Final action:	8/12/2020	
Title:	Public Hearing - Variance Request V20-041 - Allow impervious surface increase from 45% to 48% - Land Lot 560 - 1429 Walker Court - Arnaldo & Angela San Martin						
Sponsors:							
Indexes:							
Code sections:							
Code sections:						20-041-043.pdf, 3. Elevation: e Plan_V20-041-043.pdf	s_V20-041-043.pdf, 4.
	Impe		alculation_V			e Plan_V20-041-043.pdf	s_V20-041-043.pdf, 4. 

## <u>\$ IMPACT</u>: N/A

**Public Hearing** - Variance Request V20-041 - Allow impervious surface increase from 45% to 48% - Land Lot 560 - 1429 Walker Court - Arnaldo & Angela San Martin

**AND BACKGROUND**: The applicant is seeking several variances to allow for the construction of a new ning pool on the subject property. These variance requests include a side setback reduction, rear setback on, and an impervious surface increase. Section 801 sets the setback requirements and maximum ious area in the RDA zoning district while Section 501 governs accessory structures.

**MMENDATION / REQUESTED ACTION**: The applicant is requesting to deviate from the development rds established by the City for the following: maximum impervious area of 45%, rear setback of 5 feet, and etback of 10 feet. The applicant is requesting variances to increase the impervious surface area from 45% to educe the rear setback from 5 feet to 3 feet, and to reduce the side setback from 10 feet to 3 feet. According tion 1403 of the Zoning Ordinance, variances must be reviewed under the following standards: (1) Whether are unique and special or extraordinary circumstances applying to the property; (2) Whether any alleged ip is self-created by any person having an interest in the property; (3) Whether strict application of the coe would deprive the applicant of reasonable use of the property; and (4) Whether the ce proposed is the minimum variance needed. Community Development has reviewed the request against riance review standards and found it to be in compliance with four (4) of the four (4) standards. At the time of port, Community Development has not received any calls in opposition to the request. After a review of the rds above, Community Development believes that the encroachment will not adversely affect surrounding nts; therefore, staff recommends **approval** of the requested variance with the following conditions:

Approval is conditioned upon substantial compliance with the site plan submitted with the variance application.