



## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** 2022-7503, **Version:** 1

---

**Title:**

**1817 Lakelet Loop** - Request for a rear yard setback variance from twenty (20) feet to fourteen and one-half (14.5) feet for a screen room addition in the PD (Planned Development) district; BV2022-107 (Rafael & Jiang Suarez, Applicants) District 1 - Dallari (Hilary Padin, Project Manager)

**Department/Division:**

Development Services - Planning and Development

**Authorized By:**

**Kathy Hammel**

**Contact/Phone Number:**

Hilary Padin (407) 665-7331

**Motion/Recommendation:**

1. Deny the request for a rear yard setback variance from twenty (20) feet to fourteen and one-half (14.5) feet for a screen room addition in the PD (Planned Development) district; or
2. Approve the request for a rear yard setback variance from twenty (20) feet to fourteen and one-half (14.5) feet for a screen room addition in the PD (Planned Development) district; or
3. Continue the request to a time and date certain.

**Background:**

- The subject property is located in the Regency Estates subdivision and is within the Mikler/Chapman Planned Development (PD).
- The request is to construct a ten (10) foot by twenty-three (23) foot screen room addition encroaching five and one-half (5.5) feet into the required twenty (20) foot rear yard setback.
- The property abuts a retention pond.
- The Homeowners Association has approved the request to construct a screen room addition.
- Two (2) letters of support have been received from the adjacent neighbors.
- The request is for a variance to Section 30.451 of the Land Development Code of Seminole County for Development Standards for Planned Developments.
- There have not been prior variances for the subject property.

### **Staff Findings:**

The applicant has not satisfied all six (6) criteria under Section 30.43(b)(3) of the Seminole County Land Development Code for granting a variance as listed below:

1. That special conditions or circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures or building in the same zoning district; and
2. That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant; and
3. That the granting of the variance requested will not confer on the applicant special privileges that are denied by Chapter 30 to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district; and
4. That the literal interpretation of the provisions of Chapter 30 will deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning classification; and
5. That the variance requested is the minimum variance that will make possible reasonable use of the land, building or structure; and
6. That the grant of the variance would be in harmony with the general intent of Chapter 30.

Staff finds that the following variance criteria has not been satisfied:

The general intent of the Land Development Code is to maintain consistent setbacks; therefore, the grant of the variance would not be in harmony with the general intent of Chapter 30. Section 30.43(b)(3)(f)

### **Staff Conclusion:**

Based upon the foregoing findings, the requested variance is not in the public interest and failure to grant the variance would not result in an unnecessary and undue hardship.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Based on the stated findings, staff recommends denial of the request, but if the Board of Adjustment determines that the applicant has satisfied all six (6) criteria under Section 30.43(b)(3) of the Seminole County Land Development Code for granting a variance, staff recommends the following conditions of approval:

1. Any variance granted will apply only to the screen room addition (10' x 23') as depicted on the attached site plan; and
2. Any additional condition(s) deemed appropriate by the Board of Adjustment, based on information presented at the public hearing.