

City of Smyrna

City of Smyrna
A.Max Bacon City Hall /
Council Chambers
2800 King Street
Smyrna, GA 30080
770-434-6600
www.smyrnacity.com

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 2020-308 Version: 1 Name: 1429 Walker Court- V20-042

Type: Variance Request Status: Passed

File created: 8/6/2020 In control: License and Variance Board

On agenda: 8/12/2020 Final action: 8/12/2020

Title: Public Hearing - Variance Reguest V20-042 - Reduce accessory structure rear setback from 5 feet to

3 feet - Land Lot 560 - 1429 Walker Court - Arnaldo & Angela San Martin

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. Varmemo_V20-041-43.pdf, 2. Application_V20-041-043.pdf, 3. Elevations_V20-041-043.pdf, 4.

Impervious Calculation V20-041-043.pdf, 5. Site Plan V20-041-043.pdf

DateVer.Action ByActionResult8/12/20201License and Variance BoardApproved ItemPass

WARD / COUNCILMEMBER: Ward 3 / Travis Lindley

\$ IMPACT: N/A

<u>Public Hearing</u> - Variance Request V20-042 - Reduce accessory structure rear setback from 5 feet to 3 feet - 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 rious 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 provisions of the code 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 boort, 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 the respective of the requested variance with the following conditions:

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