

City of San Antonio

Agenda Memorandum

File Number:18-1037

Agenda Item Number: 10.

Agenda Date: 12/18/2017

In Control: Board of Adjustment

Case Number:	A-18-003
Applicant:	Gabriela Escobedo
Owner:	David R. Bernal Gabriela Escobedo
Council District:	4
Location:	230 Prospect Road
Legal	Lot 22, Block 57, NCB 8633
Description:	
Zoning:	"R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard
	Overlay District
Case Manager:	Oscar Aguilera, Planner

<u>Request</u>

A request for a ten foot variance from the 20 foot rear setback, as described in Section 35-310.09, to allow an addition to be ten feet from the rear property line.

Executive Summary

The applicant wishes to add an addition to the rear of the home and she is asking to encroach ten feet into the 20 foot rear setback. The property is only 3120 square feet and the home is too small (832 square feet) for the family's needs. The applicant will comply with the side setback requirements.

Subject Property Zoning/Land Use

Existing Zoning	Existing Use
ç ,	Single-Family Dwelling
Airport Hazard Overlay District	

Surrounding Zoning/Land Use

Orientation	Existing Zoning District(s)	Existing Use
North	"R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District	Single-Family Dwelling, Vacant Lot

"R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District	Single-Family Dwelling
"R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District	Single-Family Dwelling
"R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District	Single-Family Dwelling

Comprehensive Plan Consistency/Neighborhood Association

The subject property is within the boundaries of the Kelly / South San PUEBLO Neighborhood Plan and currently designated Low Density Residential in the future land use component of the plan. The subject property is within the Quintana Community Neighborhood Association. As such, they were notified and asked to comment.

Criteria for Review

According to Section 35-482(e) of the UDC, in order for a variance to be granted, the applicant must demonstrate all of the following:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The public interest is represented by setbacks to provide separation between incompatible uses and to ensure fair and equal access to air and light. The proposed living space meets the five foot side setback requirement. The ten foot rear setback will be in harmony with the neighboring properties. Staff finds that the request is not contrary to the public interest.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

The special condition in this case is that the current home is only 832 square feet in living area and the applicant is struggling to complete an addition that meets the required setback. Staff finds that a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and substantial justice will be done.

The spirit of the ordinance is the intent of the requirements rather than the strict letter of the law. The intent of the setback is to provide sufficient separation between incompatible uses. As the dwelling unit does meet the side setback, and the applicant will provide a ten foot rear setback, staff finds that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized for the district in which the property for which the variance is sought is located.

The requested variance will not authorize the operation of a use on the subject property other than those specifically permitted in the "R-6 AHOD" Residential Single-Family Airport Hazard Overlay District.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

As the proposed addition will provide a ten foot rear setback and the adjacent rear lot is vacant, it is unlikely that adjacent property will be harmed by the proposed development.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial, and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

The unique circumstance present in the case is that the property addition does meet the side setback and there are similar rear setbacks within the subdivision. This setback issue is not merely financial in nature.

Alternative to Applicant's Request

Denial of the variance request would result in the owner having to meet the required 20 foot rear setback.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends **APPROVAL of the requested variance in A-18-003**, based on the following findings of fact:

- 1. The variance is unlikely to harm adjacent properties, and;
- 2. The proposed living space meets the five foot side setback requirement.