

(A) Minimum Lot Width in R-P zoning = 60 feet.

The unsubdivided property's total lot width and frontage along North Church Street is currently about 122 feet. The applicant's proposed subdivision would place the existing apartment building on a lot that is about 90 feet wide (OK), but the lot for single-family residence would only be about 32 feet wide. This is being primarily dictated by the location of the existing fence lines, and existing driveway locations. \*\* This variance should be approved for the southern parcel only, and subject to the proposed subdivision plat only.

(B) Minimum Front Yard Building Setback in R-P zoning = 15 feet.

The current front yard setback for the existing apartment building is only 7 feet, at its closest point. The applicant's proposal is to maintain this existing distance --- based solely on the existing building. \*\* This variance should be approved, for the northern parcel and its existing building only. Any redevelopment or new building construction/expansions would need to comply with current setback requirements.

(C) Minimum Side Yard Building Setback in R-P zoning = 10 feet.

The current side yard setback for the two existing buildings is only 1 foot, along the current external boundaries (overall north & south property lines) and there is no proposed change to this setback distance. The proposed new internal property line will yield a side yard setback of 6' for each building at their closest points, which is dictated by the existing buildings being only 12 feet apart in these locations. \*\* This variance should be approved, for both parcels and for their existing buildings only. Any redevelopment or new building construction/expansions would need to comply with current setback requirements.

(D) Maximum dwelling unit density in R-P zoning = 10 units/acre.

Currently as one parcel with 7 dwelling units, the density is 11.48 du/acre. With the currently proposed subdivision creating a northern parcel with 6 dwelling units, the density (for just that parcel) would increase to 13.95 du/acre. \*\* This variance should be approved for the northern parcel and its existing building only.

Staff finds the requests consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Standards for the Exercise of Zoning Power (SFEZP), and with Variance review criteria, and recommends approval of R-P zoning for the rear portion of the property as requested, and for approval for each of these requested variances as stipulated above.

Regarding the rezoning request (HA-2025-01), Commissioner Hightower asked if the adjacent corner property would be affected. Mr. Martin stated it will not.

There being no further questions for staff, Chairman Miller opened the Public Hearing portion of the case.

Speaking in favor of the requests:

- Mr. Mason Barfield, Representing Applicants – 317 N. Hagan Bridge Rd.