# Legislation Details (With Text) 



## Application \#PL2023-085 - Variance to Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Article 6, Section 6.040, Table 6-3, Rear Yard Setback - 102 SE Carolina Ct; Grant Shields, applicant

## Issue/Request:

The applicant proposes to remove the existing uncovered deck at the rear of the residence and replace it with a $21^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ wide x $12^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ deep covered, screened-in porch/deck. The proposed screened-in porch results in a $27^{\prime}-44^{\prime \prime}$ rear yard setback, which encroaches $2^{\prime}-8$ " into the $30^{\prime}$ rear yard setback for a principal building (i.e. residence). Because the screened-in porch is a roofed structure, it is considered to be an addition to the house and therefore is subject to the same 30 ' setback requirement as the house.

## Proposed BZA Motion:

I move to approve a variance to the minimum 30' rear setback requirement for a principal structure in the R-1 zoning district, to allow a screened deck/porch addition to maintain a $27^{\prime}-4$ " setback from the rear property line.

Grant Shields, Applicant
Hector Soto, Jr., AICP, Senior Planner

Recommendation: The Development Services Department recommends APPROVAL of a variance to the minimum 30' rear setback requirement for a principal structure in the R-1 zoning district, to allow a screened deck/porch addition to maintain a 27 '-4" setback from the rear property line.

