



City of Panama City Planning and Economic Development
Department

STAFF REPORT

Planning Board Applications for May 10, 2021

Staff findings of consistency with the pertinent Florida Statutes, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and the City's Land Development Regulations, along with the Staff recommendations, are as follows:

Request Eleven

Owner/ Applicant: Jeffrey and Deborah Hagan, owner and Jeffrey Hagen applicant

Case Number: PB 21-53

Address/Location: 2308 W Beach Drive Panama City, Florida 32401

Request: We would like to request a variance to build a two-story garage carriage house and carport on the footprint of an existing carport and covered pool structure that were damaged in Hurricane Michael. The existing structures are 3 feet from the back of the property. The designed structure is consistent with the historic feel and architecture of the 1912 era house which we are renovating. Current setback and height restrictions prevent us from maintaining that consistency.

Land Use Designation / Zoning District: Residential - One (R-1)

Tract Size: 0.461 +/- acres

Background: The request to the City is to grant a variance to have a maximum height limit of that of the principal structure instead of the current limit of 12' for accessory structures. The request for this variance is due to the proposed design of a garage with a workshop space on the second floor.

The Comprehensive Plan:

Objective 1.4: The City has adopted Land Development Regulations which contain specific provisions for implementation of this Plan. Such regulations will contain innovative land use management provisions such as for mixed use areas and planned unit developments.

Policy 1.4.1: The City will administer land development regulations for implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. At minimum, these regulations will:

- (b) Regulate the use of land and water consistent with this Element and ensure the compatibility of adjacent land uses through provision of or reference to specific and detailed requirements which will include, but not be limited to, maintenance of an official land use map, maintenance of land use districts and allowable uses including accessory land uses, maintenance of environmental protection and development standards, creation of measures to reduce the potential for nuisances caused by incompatible land uses, provisions for the elimination of non-conforming uses, and other such relevant requirements.

The LDR Code:

Sec. 110-4. - Accessory Structures.

A. Generally. It is the purpose of this section to regulate the type, installation, configuration, and use of accessory structures in order to ensure that they are not harmful either aesthetically or physically to residents in the surrounding areas.

1. General standards and requirements. Any number of different accessory structures may be located on a parcel, provided that the following requirements are met:

i. There shall be an authorized principal development, in conformance with the requirements as set forth in this code, on the parcel.

ii. All accessory structures shall comply with standards pertaining to the principal use, unless exempted or superseded elsewhere in this Unified Land Development Code.

iii. Accessory structures shall not be located in a required buffer or landscape area.

iv. Accessory structures shall be included in all calculations of impervious surface and stormwater runoff, floor area ratio (for commercial uses only), density, and in and any other site design requirements applicable to the principal use of the lot.

v. Accessory structures may be subject to development review and shall require a site development plan and attendant documentation as required by chapter 102 of this Code, as applicable.

vi. Accessory structures shall be allowed only on side or rear yards, unless otherwise specified herein.

vii. No accessory structure shall be used for industrial storage of hazardous, incendiary, noxious, or pernicious materials.

viii. Accessory structures that are within the required setback areas shall be limited to 12 feet in height, unless it is within three feet of a property line, in which case it shall be limited to eight feet in height.

The Five Conditions (*Section 102-42 (d)*):

1. *That the requested variance maintains the basic intent and purpose of the subject regulations, particularly as it affects the stability and appearance of the City;*

We support the city's goal to ensure that development should be consistent with other structures in the same area and to be aesthetically pleasing. Our desire is to build a structure that would provide storage space and protection for our vehicles, but that is architecturally consistent with the historic feel of our house which was built in 1912. A modern garage, with a 12-foot height maximum would look out of place and not add to the charm of the neighborhood, as would a structure that mimics the feel of a carriage house that would have been added in 1912. Our backyard is relatively small and would require the structure to be attached to the main house in order to meet setback requirements. This would not be historically consistent nor would it be as visually appealing. We believe that the structure as designed and located on the footprint of the existing damaged structure would be visually appealing in the St. Andrews area if we receive a variance from Sect. 110-4Aviii restrictions.

This point is met.

2. *That the requested variance is otherwise compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community;*

Our home is on the west end of Beach Drive and is a single family residence that is among a number of larger historic homes with some historic significance as well as some newer and smaller homes. The front of the home has a large front yard that looks out onto St. Andrews Bay with no obstructed views. We purchased the house with the intent to renovate it and add to the charm that exists in the St. Andrews neighborhood and community. The damaged carport and former pool structures need to be replaced. We currently have very limited ability to park our vehicles or to store yard equipment which adds a cluttered look to the neighborhood, which sees a lot of neighbors out walking or people driving past. The larger structure will enable us to provide a more visually appealing, neat back yard. There are many homes in the area that have separate structures that are quite tall and built with minimal setbacks, as were the buildings we want to replace.

This point is met.

3. *That the requested variance is consistent with, and in furtherance of, the goals, objectives and policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, and all other similar plans adopted by the City;*

The comprehensive plans seeks to ensure that the city's neighborhoods have a consistent, esthetically pleasing look and feel. When we purchased the home prior to Hurricane Michael, our goal was to renovate it to capture the historic architecture and charm that exists in the Historic St. Andrews area. We would like to return it to the proud and grand home it once was. We believe that the carriage house/garage as designed and placed will help to accomplish that goal.

This point is met.

4. *That the plight of the petitioner is due to unique circumstances of the property or petitioner which would render conformity with the strict requirements of the subject regulations unnecessarily burdensome;*

We believe the height and size the building is necessary to provide the architectural consistency that would be appropriate. We have limited space in our back lard to fit this structure. It was designed to stand in the footprint of the existing carport and pool structures, both of which exceed current code requirements for height with their current setback from the rear line to leave small, but useable back yard area and maintain the back porch that is part of the home. It is not possible to build the designed structure with a 25 foot setback without attaching it to the house in some fashion, which would ruin the home's character.

This point is met.

5. *That the variance requested is the minimum variance that is necessary to afford relief to the petitioner, while preserving the character, health, safety and welfare of the community;*

While not as visually appealing due to reduced separation from the house, a variance to build the designed structure with a 12-foot setback from the back property line would be an option that could work for us and still provide the architecturally consistent feel we're trying to achieve.

This point is met.

Findings: The applicant's request to allow for a variance of a maximum height allowance matching that of the principal structure instead of a 12' one meets all five points.



Jacob Fredriksson
Planner I
Development Services

Date April 14, 2021