## BZA Packet

February 20, 2024

## Hello All,

Enclosed please find your packet for the meeting of February 20, 2024.

## We have:

- 9 new cases

If you receive any citizen inquiries regarding these cases the proposed plans may be viewed by going to:
www.mtnbrook.org

- Calendar (upper right corner)
- Board of Zoning Adjustment (February 20, 2024)
- Meeting Information (for agenda) and Supporting Documents (to view proposed plans and/or survey select link associated with the case number)

If you have any questions about the cases please don't hesitate to give me a call at 802-3811 or send me an email at slatent@mtnbrook.org ...

## Looking forward to seeing you on Tuesday!

## Tyler

# 16MEETING AGENDA <br> City Of Mountain Brook <br> Board Of Zoning Adjustment <br> February 20, 2024 <br> PRE-MEETING: 4:30 P.M. <br> Regular meeting: 5:00 P.M. 

## Meeting to be held in person at city hall and virtually using zoom video CONFERENCING <br> (ACCESS INSTRUCTIONS ON MEETING WEBPAGE)


#### Abstract

NOTICE Any variance which is granted today expires and becomes null and void one year from today unless construction is begun in less than one year from today on the project for which the variance is granted. If construction will not be started within one year from today, the applicant may come back in 11 months and ask for a six-month extension, which the Board normally grants.

Any variance which is granted, regardless of the generality of the language of the motion granting the variance, must be construed in connection with, and limited by, the request of the applicant, including all diagrams, plats, pictures and surveys submitted to this Board before and during the public hearing on the variance application.


1. Approval of Minutes: December 18, 2023
2. Case A-24-01: Stuart and Mary Hurst, property owners, request a variance from the terms of the Zoning Regulations to allow alterations to the existing nonconforming single family dwelling to be 30.4 feet from the front property line (Winthrop Avenue) in lieu of the required 35 feet. -20 Winthrop Avenue
3. Case A-24-02: Matt and Allison Scully, property owners, request a variance from the terms of the Zoning Regulations to allow an addition to be 5 feet from the side property line (south) in lieu of the required 8 feet. $\mathbf{- 1 2}$ Alden Lane
4. Case A-24-03: Lib and Coates Covington, property owners, request variances from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow an addition to be 11.46 feet from the side property line (east) in lieu of the required 12.5 feet and to be 24.68 feet from the rear property line (south) in lieu of the required 35 feet. - $\mathbf{1 4}$ Montrose Circle
5. Case A-24-04: Scott and Jenny Sobera, property owners, request variances from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow a detached accessory structure (greenhouse) to be 5 feet from the rear property line (north) in lieu of the required 10 feet. 2824 Canoe Brook Circle
6. Case A-24-05: Stephen Taylor and Catherine Agricola, property owners, request variances from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow an alteration to the existing non-conforming garage to be 9.4 feet from the left side property line (west) in lieu of the required 12.5 and a screened in porch addition to be 23.5 feet from the secondary front property line (Cherry Street) in lieu of the required 35 feet. $\mathbf{3 8 2 2}$ Jackson Blvd.
7. Case A-24-06: James Howe, property owner, requests variances from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow an addition for an elevator shaft to be 8.2 feet from the left side property line (east) for portions of the structure above 22 feet in height in lieu of the required 12 feet. 18 Spring Street
8. Case A-24-07: John and Lynette Thurber, property owners, request variances from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow pool equipment to be 6 feet from the rear property line (east) in lieu of the required 10 feet. 32 Country Club Blvd.
9. Case A-24-08: Mike and Penny Fuller, property owners, request variances from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow additions and alterations to the existing nonconforming dwelling to be 13 feet 6 inches from the left side property line (north) in lieu of the required 15 feet, and to allow the building area to be 26.1 percent in lieu of the maximum allowed of 25 percent. 76 Country Club Blvd.
10. Case A-24-09: John Montgomery, property owner, requests a variance from the terms of the Zoning Regulation to allow a pool to be located 7 feet from the rear property line (south) in lieu of the required 10 feet. 25 Fairway Drive
11. Next Meeting: Monday, March 18, 2024
12. Adjournment

# Variance Application - Part I 

Project Data

## Address of Subject Property <br> 20 Winthrop Avenue, Mountain Brook, AL 35213

Zoning Classification Residence B - Non-conforming
Name of Property Owner(s) Mary Stuart and Stuart Hurst
Phone Number (205) 329-3883 Email mary.stuart.hurst@gmail.com
Name of Surveyor Weygand Surveyors
Phone Number (205) 942-0086 Email $\qquad$
Name of Architect (if applicable) Mary Coleman Clark Architect LLC
Phone Number (205) 999-0304 Email mcc@mccarchitect.com
Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing

Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance request(s):

|  | Zoning Code <br> Requirement | Existing <br> Development | Proposed <br> Development |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Area (sf) |  |  |  |
| Lot Width (ft) |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) primary | 35.0 feet | 25.5 feet | 30.4 feet |
| Front Setback (ft) secondary |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: <br> Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: |  |  |  |
| Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Rear Setback (ft) |  |  |  |
| Lot Coverage (\%) |  |  |  |
| Building Height $(\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |

## A-24-01



## A-24-01 Aerial

1/3/2024, 7:31:43 AM

## Aerial 2021

Red: Band_1

Green: Band_2 Blue: Band_3


| 1:1,128 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 mi |
|  | - | 1 | , |
| 0 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 km |

Jefferson County Department of Information Technology, JeffCoAL, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, USDA

## Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment

## A-24-01

## Petition Summary

Request to allow alterations to the existing non-conforming single family dwelling to be 30.4 feet from the front property line (Winthrop Avenue) in lieu of the required 35 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes alterations to front of the existing non-conforming home which feature removing a covered entry, a new door and front windows and a new roof.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardship in this case is the existing design constraint. Portions of the existing structure including the front entry roof are as close as 25.5 feet from the front property line. The main part of the structure is 30.4 feet from the front property line. This proposal would remove the roof structure over the front entry which would see the front encroachment reduced from the current 25.5 feet to 30.4 feet.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to meet "e." of the following hardship standards:
Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing design constraints with the front of the structure already located in the setback).

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
b. will not be detrimental to the streetscape (as the non-conforming front portion of the structure would move farther from the street than what exists today);
g. is in harmony with the spirit and intent of the zoning ordinance (as the front encroachment would be reduced from 25.5 feet to 30.4 feet).

## Impervious Area

The proposal exceeds the maximum impervious surface limit.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article IV, Section 129-52 Area and dimensional requirements

## Appends

LOCATION: 20 Winthrop Avenue
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence B District
OWNERS: Mary and Stuart Hurst




| PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION 3/16" = 1'-0" | ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS FOR MARY STUART AND STUART HURST 20 WINTHROP AVENUE | VARIANCE APPLICATION DECEMBER 15, 2023 SUPPLEMENTAL DRAWINGS | Mjot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



December 15, 2023
Tyler Slaten
City Planner
City of Mountain Brook
56 Church Street
Mountain Brook, AL 35213

## Variance Application

On behalf of the Owners, Mary Stuart and Stuart Hurst, enclosed is a variance application for 20 Winthrop Avenue, Mountain Brook, AL 35213. The scope of the project includes alterations and additions to an existing residence, as shown in the provided supplemental drawings.

Sincerely,


Mary Coleman Clark

## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?

20 Winthrop Avenue is a Residence B Non-conforming lot with an existing structure built over the 35 ' front setback requirement. The roof structure over the existing front entry is $\mathbf{2 5 . 5}$ ' from the front property line; the existing residence is $\mathbf{3 0 . 4}$ ' from the front property line.

Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (i.e., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...")

The Owners would like to make alterations and additions to the existing residence, and a portion of the existing residence built over the front setback line, posing an existing design constraint that is non-conforming to the zoning code. The Owners would like to reduce this encroachment by removing the roof structure over the existing front entry. Further proposed improvements in the front setback include replacing the front door and flanking windows and replacing the roofing on the existing residence.

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations?

The proposed alterations to the front exterior elevation would not restrict the neighbors' access to light and air as the improvements reduce the existing encroachment in the front setback.


Variance Application - Part I

## Project Data

Address of Subject Property $\qquad$ 12 ALDEN LANE Zoning Classification $\qquad$
Name of Property Owners) ALLISOHg\& MATTHEW SCULLY
Phone Number 205-790-1658 Email allison-burg@gmail.com
Name of Surveyor DAVID EHTREKIN/SURVEYING SOLUTIONS
Phone Number 205.991 .8965 Email davidentrekin ssi-ala.com Name of Designer (if applicable) NXLCHAEL ERIC DALE Phone Number 205-873.1676 Email eric ericdale.com $\boxed{\text { Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing }}$

Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance requests):


A-24-02 Zoning



1/3/2024, 7:39:11 AM
Aerial 2021
Red: Band_1

|  | 1:1,128 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 mi |
|  |  | 1 |  |
| 0 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 km |

Jefferson County Department of Information Technology, JeffCoAL, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, USDA

# Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment 

## A-24-02

## Petition Summary

Request to allow an addition to be 5 feet from the side property line (south) in lieu of the required 8 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes the addition of a covered screened porch.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardships in this case are the narrow and unusual lot shape and existing design constraints. The lot tapers from 75 feet wide in the front to 20 feet wide in the rear. The right side property line is angled and squeezes in toward the existing single family dwelling. The proposed location of the covered screened porch is currently a raised terrace that is 3.8 feet from the side property line at it closest point. The proposal would shave the corner of the existing terrace to make the proposed porch 5 feet from the side property line.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to meet "a.", "c.", and "e." of the following hardship standards:

Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness (the lot tapers down to 20 feet wide in the rear)
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape (lot line along the side with proposed addition is angled)
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing design constraints of the existing raised terrace).

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (as the proposed porch is somewhat minor in nature and will not substantially change the structure's relationship with adjacent property).

## Impervious Area

The proposal is in compliance with the maximum impervious surface area allowed.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article IV, Section 129-52 Area and dimensional requirements

Appends<br>LOCATION: 12 Alden Lane

ZONING DISTRICT: Residence B District
OWNERS: Allison and Matthew Scully

```
BRG = bearing
BLDG = building
CALC = calculated
CAP = capped iron
CL = centerline
CH = chord
CONC = concrete
C = covered
d = deflection
D = curve delta angle
E = east
ESMT = easement
FC = fence
FD = found
HW = headwall
IPF = iron pin found
IPF* = iron pin found w/KBW cap
IPS = iron pin setw/SSI cap
L = length
MEAS = measured
MIN = minimum
MH}=\mathrm{ manhole
N = north
OH}=\mathrm{ overhang
P}=\mathrm{ porch
PC = point of curve
POB = point of beginning
POC = point of commencement
PT = point of tangent
PVMT = pavement
R = radius
REC = recorded
RES = residence
ROW = right of way
S = south
SAN = sanitary
STM = storm
SWR = sewer
SYN = synthetic
UTIL = utility
U = uncovered
W = west
Yl = yard inlet
* = degrees
    minutes, in
    = bearings or angles
        seconds, in
    = bearings or angles
    = feet, in distance
AC = acres
\pm more or less,
    or plus or minus
```


## STATE OF ALABAMA

SHELBY COUNTY


I, David B. Entrekin, a registered Land Surveyor, certify that I have surveyed Lot 12, Block 5, COLONIAL HILLS as recorded in Map Book 18, Page 22 in the Office of the Judge of Probate, Jefferson County, Alabama; that all parts of this survey and drawing have been completed in accordance with the current requirements of the Standards of Practice for Surveying in the State of Alabama to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief; that the correct address is as follows: 12 Alden Lane according to my survey of October 19,2023 . Survey is not valid unless it is sealed with embossed seal or stamped in red.

Order No. 962185
Purchaser: Scully
Type of Survey: Property Boundary

SURVEYING SOLUTIONS, INC. 2232 CAHABA VALLEY DRIVE SUITE M BIRMINGHAM, AL 35242 PHONE: 205-991-8965


David B. Entrekin, Reg. L.S. \#30345


$$
\frac{10-24-2023}{\text { Date of Signature }}
$$




## A-24-02






December 13, 2023

Board of Zoning Adjustment
City of Mountain Brook
Mountain Brook, AL 35213

Re: 12 Alden Lane
Allison \& Matt Scully, Owners

## Dear Board Members:

The Scullys would like to turn an existing raised masonry terrace on the right rear side of their home into a screened porch with roof cover. Because of the severely angled right side property line, this proposed work is closer than the 8 feet side setback granted by "special provisions" in the Zoning Code for non-conforming narrow lots in Zone B.

Currently, this terrace at its closest point (a corner) is 3.8 feet from the right property line. The Scullys will amend the existing terrace by taking away a small area at that corner so that the final setback of the porch would be 5 feet at the closest point.

The shape of the lot presents a severe hardship in developing the structure for the porch. The surrounding area is made up mostly of odd-shaped lots with unique problems, but probably none as peculiar as this one. The particular problems presented by the angled right side property line along with narrow width of the lot do not apply to other lots in the area generally. (Please see photo 1.)

The back of the neighbor's garage faces this terrace (See photo 2.) The neighbors do not currently have a terrace or porch at the rear. That neighbor has large holly shrubs that very effectively obscure the view between the properties.

We are not adding any impermeable surfaces to the lot with the roof addition since the terrace is masonry.

Thank you for your consideration.


Eric Dale

> 935 LANDALEROAD
> BIRMINGHAM. AL 35222
> 205.873 .1676
> ERIC@ERICDALE.COM

## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?

- the lot is oddly shaped with an angled right property line that severely impacts the usability of the lot.
- At the front setback line, the width of the lot is much leas than the 75 ft . zoning standard.

Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (ie., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...")
No

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations? The immediate neighborhood is mode yo of odd-sizedand shaped lots with little standardization. Most have unique characteristics and problems, but this lot is especially burdened by its odd shape with extremely angled right property line. The extreme narrowness at the rear of this lot makes any
Kind of development difficult.

# Variance Application - Part I 

Project Data

## Address of Subject Property <br> 14 Montrose Circle, 35213

Zoning Classification Residence B
Name of Property Owner(s) Lib and Coates Covington
Phone Number 205-447-0101 Email coatescovington0@gmail.com
Name of Surveyor MTM Engineers - Joey Miller
Phone Number 205-283-5878 Email jmiller@mtmengineers.com
Name of Architect (if applicable) Carrie Taylor
Phone Number 205-835-8069 Email carrie@carrietaylorarchitect.com
Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing

Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance request(s):

|  | Zoning Code <br> Requirement | Existing <br> Development | Proposed <br> Development |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot Area (sf) |  |  |  |
| Lot Width (ft) |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) primary |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) secondary |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback |  | $11.54^{\prime}$ | $11.46^{\prime}$ (previously <br> approved setback <br> was 11.41') |
| Right Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: <br> Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: | $12.5^{\prime}$ |  | $24.68^{\prime}$ |
| Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  | $24 \%$ | $24.68^{\prime}$ (previously approved |
| Rear Setback (ft) | $35^{\prime}$ |  | $26 \%$ |

## A-24-03 Zoning



## A-24-03 Aerial



1/3/2024, 7:51:20 AM
Aerial 2021


Green: Band_2


Blue: Band_3
Red: Band_1

| 1:1,128 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 mi |
|  |  | 1 | $\xrightarrow{1}$ |
| 0 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 km |

Jefferson County Department of Information Technology, JeffCoAL, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, USDA

## Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment

## A-24-03

## Petition Summary

Request to allow an addition to be 11.46 feet from the side property line (east) in lieu of the required 12.5 feet and to be 24.68 feet from the rear property line (south) in lieu of the required 35 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes the addition of a covered screened porch.

## Background

Variances were granted to allow side and rear encroachments prior to the house being constructed in its current location. The proposed porch area was anticipated by those variances and approved in the same location as what is currently being requested. The approved porch area was not constructed in this location when the house was initially built, and the applicants are now seeking approval for the same area as the original approval.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardships in this case are the unusual lot shape and existing design constraints. The front of the lot is situated in a curve and the house is pushed back towards the rear corner of the lot. It is non-conforming as it relates to the side and rear setback. There is also an irregularly shaped lot line in the back corner of the yard.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to meet "c.", and "e." of the following hardship standards:
Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape (unusual lot shape at the rear and the front is in a curve)
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing design constraints of the home).

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (as the proposed porch is minor in nature).

## Impervious Area

The proposal is in compliance with the maximum impervious surface area allowed.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article IV, Section 129-52 Area and dimensional requirements

## Appends

LOCATION: 14 Montrose Circle
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence B District
OWNERS: Lib and Coates Covington

BUILDER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EROSION CONTROL MEASURES. BUILDER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING A SITE FREE FROM DRAINAGE PROBLEMS.





## CARRIE TAYLOR

ARCHITECT

December $22^{\text {nd }}, 2023$
Tyler Slaten
Senior Planner
City of Mountain Brook
56 Church Street
Mountain Brook, AL 35213
Dear Mr. Slaten,
Please find attached an application for a variance for a side and rear setback for the residence located at 14 Montrose Circle. This variance is based on a previously approved variance wherein the footprint of the proposed project was approved but not fully constructed.

The lot in question is an irregular corner lot as well as located on a curve, so that the benefits of the space of a corner lot are not realized. Even so, the current home is compliant with the front setback, however the rear of the home is compliant with the variance approved in 2019. The addition would also comply with these setbacks, so we are requesting the same variance as approved previously in order to complete the project.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thanks,
Carrie Taylor


Principal Architect, Carrie Taylor Architect, LLC

## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?

This variance request is based on an approved variance request from 2019. The lot is an irregularly shaped corner lot , with the corner being curved, not rectilinear. The house is in keeping with this difficult front setback, however this causes the home to sit closer to the rear and opposite side lot lines The porch addition would be constructed within the original footprint that the deck was in for the previously approved variance application.

Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (i.e., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...")

No, the addition is to be constructed within variance setbacks approved for the rest of the home.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations?

[^0]Variance Application - Part I


Phone Number $\qquad$ Email

Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing

Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance requests):


## A-24-04 Zoning



## A-24-04 Aerial



1/30/2024, 8:07:15 AM
Aerial 2021
Red: Band_1


Jefferson County Department of Information Technology, JeffCoAL, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, USDA

# Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment 

## A-24-04

## Petition Summary

Request to allow a detached accessory structure (greenhouse) to be 5 feet from the rear property line (north) in lieu of the required 10 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes the construction of a detached greenhouse. The proposed greenhouse would be 19 feet 3 inches by 13 feet 10 inches. This is approximately 266 square feet in area.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The applicant stated that the corner lot configuration and topography are hardships.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to possibly meet "d." of the following hardship standards:

Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape
d. exceptional topographic conditions (applicant states there is a drop off)
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (as the proposed greenhouse is somewhat minor in nature).

## Impervious Area

The proposal exceeds that maximum allowed impervious surface limit.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article XIX, Section 129-314 Accessory structures and accessory buildings on residential lots

## Appends

LOCATION: 2428 Canoe Brook Circle

ZONING DISTRICT: Residence A District

OWNERS: Dr. and Mrs. Jenny Sobera






AERIAL PLAN



RIGHT ELEVATION PLAN


## What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity?

The difficult situation (hardship) on this site is that we're working with a corner lot with two level/ beautiful fronts with 60' setbacks. That leaves our options with two sides for our goal Hartley Botanic planthouse installation. Given a large drop-off to a lower driveway and pool thoroughfare, that leaves us with one general area to install the planthouse. Our site plan call's out 5 ' setback here and the other secondary back/ side lot line, and we went down this avenue with design and planning originally until we came to pull a permit and learned of the $10^{\prime}$ municipal setback. Given the tighter environment there, it would be intrusive to the space to install it any closer to the house and make the project unbearable altogether. Also, given that this space faces the neighboring gable and additional architectural elements, this would allow for plant and planthouse screening to separate the two spaces (entertaining and utility of the neighbor).

Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant?
No. The site is simply limited to outdoor living space due to how the home had to be situated with the 60' front setbacks.

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the zoning regulations?

Given that there is an existing 9' privacy wall, the neighbor and the client feel that it gives the perfect amount of space to plant screening plant material to cover the higher portion of the neighbors gable and our clients entertaining space from the neighbor. All neighbors in the vicinity agree with the goal project that it will help the space and not adversely affect their home.

Variance Application - Part I
Project Data
Address of Subject Property 3822 Jackson BIrd. 35213 zoning Classification Residence $B$
Name of Property Owners) Stephen "Taylor" a Catherine Agricola
Phone Number -205-6/6-2873 Email taylor, ayr ricolacestifel. com
Name of Surveyor Robert Reynolds
Phone Number 205-823-7900 Email $\qquad$
Name of Architect (if applicable) Greg Harper
Phone Number 205-369.6729 Email greg@frecise home design. com
Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing
Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance requests):


A-24-05 Zoning
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# Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment 

## A-24-05

## Petition Summary

Request to allow an alteration to the existing non-conforming garage to be 9.4 feet from the left side property line (west) in lieu of the required 12.5 and a screened in porch addition to be 23.5 feet from the secondary front property line (Cherry Street) in lieu of the required 35 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes a structural alteration to the existing non-conforming garage to add a $2^{\text {nd }}$ story within the current roofline with new dormer windows and a new roof over an existing deck to create a screened in porch.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardships in this case are the corner lot configuration, irregular lot shape and existing design constraints. The secondary front lot line along Cherry Street is angled and creates an odd secondary front setback in relation to the existing home. The existing deck proposed to be covered and screened is to the rear of home, but the closest corner to Cherry Street is 23.5 feet from the property line. The closest corner of the principal dwelling is 8.5 feet from the property line along this same side. The existing garage is non-conforming with regard to the side setback at 9.4 feet. The scope of work involving the garage includes adding a $2^{\text {nd }}$ story within the existing roof line without adding additional height or changing the footprint. The side setback encroachment of the garage will not change.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to meet "c." and "e." of the following hardship standards:
Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape (secondary front property line is angled creating an irregular shape)
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing garage is non-conforming with regard to the side setback and proposed screened porch is existing but uncovered)

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (will not change the encroachment, height or relationship between the existing garage and adjacent property)
b. will not be detrimental to the streetscape (the screened porch along the secondary front will be 15 feet farther away than the existing single family dwelling).

## Impervious Area

The proposal exceeds that maximum allowed impervious surface limit.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article IV, Section 129-52 Residence B District

## Appends

LOCATION: 3822 Jackson Boulevard
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence B District
OWNERS: Taylor and Catherine Agricola
I. Robert Reynolds, a Registered Surveyor, do here by state that this is a true and correct plat or map of Lot
SHADES VALLEY GARDENS $\qquad$ Block $\qquad$ of $\qquad$
Book 24., Page 68 in the Office of the Judge Of Probate in Jefferson_County, Alabama. All parts of this survey and drawing have been completed in accordance with the current requirements of the Standards of Practice of Surveying in the State of Alabama to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. The improvements on said premises are as shown. There are no visible encroachments on over or across said lands except as shown. According to my survey this the .. .....then day of $\qquad$

NOTE: This survey is not transferable to any additional institutions or subsequent owners.
Purchaser: Agricola
Address: 3822 Jackson Blvd.


STG




## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?
I have an unusual shaped kat, o a ho a corder lot. Our froponed project is filling in the interior of structures that are already on the property, for which I assume variances were previously granted. Gill of the existing exterior structure $\theta$ reotine will remain the Game withe the exception of dormer in the roof a possibly q new hallway where the porch currently is as well as putting a roof over current porch.
Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (ie., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...")
None, previous addition was done by previous owner.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations?
 have att ached the plans for our project proposed project.
Thank you.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board of Zoning Adjustment,
My name is Taylor Agricola and I live at 3822 Jackson Blvd. I am writing today to request approval of a couple of variances to an addition to my property. I think it is important to note that almost all of my project will be done in the existing exterior footprint and roofline of the structures that are already on my property with 3 minor exceptions which I will note here. FYI, I have attached plans of my project that I have had drawn.

The majority of my project will be an addition to my existing garage. Currently the garage has very tall ceilings, so I am not proposing adding an additional story to the garage, I will fill in the interior of the existing structure by adding a $2^{\text {nd }}$ story to that existing structure, while keeping the garage below still functional as a garage. Exception \# 1 lies here, I will be working in the existing exterior footprint and roofline with the exception of adding a dormer window to the roof in the garage that will face the Cherry Street alley at the back of my property, this dormer is in my attached plans.

I am also considering adding a hallway that will connect the main house to the garage, which is in the attached plans, this will be the only new construction to exterior footprint, and it will be where the existing back porch is, and based on my measurements it would be compliant as it would be 35.5 feet from the set back on the Cherry Street side of my property. At this point we are undecided whether we will add this hallway, or leave that as part of our back porch.

The last exception to working in existing roofline, is that we are planning to rebuild our existing back porch in the exact location it is currently, but add a roof over the porch so that it will be screened in and covered.

Thanks in advance for your consideration. If you need any additional info please feel free to reach out to me.

Thanks again,


Taylor Agricola

## Variance Application - Part I

## Project Data

Address of Subject Property 18 Spring Street
Zoning Classification


Name of Property Owners) James Howe
Phone Number 949-878-1757 Email Jamesfhowe © 5 bc global net Name of Surveyor E DG
Phone Number $205-403$ - 9158 Email Ditto erdgalabama.com
Name of Architect (if applicable) Frustona Design Phone Number 205-807-7045 Email Jake a frustecic.com
Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing
Please fill inst oily applicable project information (relating directly to the variance requests):
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# Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment 

## A-24-06

## Petition Summary

Request to allow an addition for an elevator shaft to be 8.2 feet from the left side property line (east) for portions of the structure above 22 feet in height in lieu of the required 12 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes the addition of a new elevator shaft.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardship in this case is the narrow lot width. The lot is 50 feet wide and qualifies for the side setback regulations for narrow lots to be 8 feet for portions of the structure below 22 feet in height and 12 feet for portions above. The existing home is situated 8.2 feet from the side property line. The proposed elevator shaft would not encroach closer than the existing 8.2 feet, but would extend above 22 feet in height where the required setback moves to 12 feet.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to meet "e." of the following hardship standards:
Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing design constraint as current home is 8.2 feet from the side setback)

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (addition is somewhat minor in nature)

## Impervious Area

The proposal exceeds that maximum allowed impervious surface limit.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article V, Section 129-63 Residence C District

## Appends

LOCATION: 18 Spring Street

ZONING DISTRICT: Residence C District

OWNERS: James Howe




## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?


Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (i.e., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback. ")


How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning


# Variance Application - Part I 

Project Data

## Address of Subject Property 32 Country Club Blvd.

Zoning Classification Residential
Name of Property Owner(s) John and Lynette Thurber
Phone Number 301/ 538-6857 Email jsthurber@yahoo.com
Name of Surveyor $\qquad$
Phone Number $\qquad$ Email $\qquad$
Name of Architect (if applicable) Landscape Architect Peter Falkner Pool Builder Cox Pools
Phone Number $\qquad$ Email Mark Oberkirch

Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing
John Thurber, Mark Oberkirch, Peter Falkner
Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance request(s):

|  | Zoning Code <br> Requirement | Existing <br> Development | Proposed <br> Development |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Area (sf) |  |  |  |
| Lot Width (ft) |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) primary |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) secondary |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: <br> Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: |  |  |  |
| Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  | Pool Equip 6' |
| Rear Setback (ft) |  |  |  |
| Lot Coverage (\%) |  |  |  |
| Building Height $(\mathrm{ft})$ |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |

## A-24-07 Zoning



## A-24-07 Aerial
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## A-24-07

## Petition Summary

Request to allow pool equipment to be 6 feet from the rear property line (east) in lieu of the required 10 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes the installation of pool equipment including the pump.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: Staff cannot identify a hardship on the land related to this request. However, it is worth pointing out that the proposed pool equipment would be surrounded by a masonry sound barrier to reduce the noise levels produced by the pump. This location in the rear yard also abuts an alley which moves it farther away from the rear neighbors than if the adjacent property directly bordered the subject location. The pool itself will be located outside of the required 10 foot setback.

## Standard Hardships Required

Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (as the proposed equipment is minor in nature and will be surrounded by a masonry enclosure).

No change to the impervious surface percentage.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article XIX, Section 129-314 Accessory structures and accessory buildings on residential lots

## Appends

LOCATION: 32 Country Club Boulevard
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence A District
OWNERS: John and Lynette Thurber


U: \PROJECTS\FALK0014 32 Country Club Blvd \Survey Pelham \Cad \Dwg $\backslash$ FALK0014 32 cOUNTRY CLUB BLVD.dwg


## Pool Tips USA

# How Loud is a Pool Pump? The Ultimate Guide to Understanding Pool Pump Noise 

Written by: Hank Cooper 鱼 Published: March 15,2023

## Spread the love

Welcome to our ultimate guide to understanding pool pump noise. For pool owners, the sounc of a pool pump can be a familiar and often necessary noise, but it can also be a nuisance, especially if it's too loud. In this guide, we'll take a closer look at the factors that contribute to pool pump noise, how it can affect your health and wellbeing, and the best tips and tricks for reducing noise. We'll also explore the best quietest pool pumps on the market and address some cominon misconceptions about pool pump noise.

Whether you're a new pool owner or a seasoned pro, it's essential to understand how loud your pool pump is and how to maintain a quiet and enjoyable pool area. Keep reading to learn everything you need to know about pool puinp noise and how to reduce it.

Anxiety and Depression: Constant exposure to noise can also have a negative impact or mental health, contributing to symptoms of anxiety and depression. This can be particularly problematic for individuals who already struggle with mental health issues.

It's clear that the impact of pool pump noise goes far beyond annoyance. The psychological effects of constant noise exposure can have a significant impact on your overall health and well-being.

## Factors That Contribute to Pool Pump Noise

Pump Type: The type of pool pump you have can significantly affect the amount of noise it produces. Single-speed pumps tend to be the loudest, while variable-speed pumps are quieter.

Pump Age and Condition: Older and poorly maintained pool pumps tend to make more noise than newer and well-maintained ones. Regular maintenance can help reduce ncise levels.

Pump Location: The location of your pool pump can also affect noise levels. Fumps that are close to living areas or bedrooms w II be more noticeable and disruptive.

Installation and Surroundings: Proper installation of the punp, including vibration pads and a soundproofed pump house or enclosure, can help reduce noise levels. The surroundings of the pump, such as nearby walls or fences, can also affect the noise level.

## The Role of Pool Pump Location in Noise Emission

Distance from Pump to Living Area: The cistance between the pool pump and living areas can significantly affect the noise levels. The closer the pump is to living

Enclosure Placement: If a sound enclosure is used, it should be placed as far away from living areas as possible. Sound barriers like walls, shrubs, or fences, can be installed to reduce the noise level further.

Water Feature Positioning: If the pool has a water feature like a waterfall, it's important to consider where it's located concerning the pool pump. The sound of the water feature can help mask the noise of the: pump, but if the water feature is too close to the pump, it may rnake the overall noise level worse.

## The Impact of Pool Pump Age on Noise Levels

Wear and Tear: As pool pumps age, the components can begin to wear and $v$ brate, causing an increase in noise levels.

Outdated Technology: Older pool pumps may not be as efficient or as quiet als newer models due to advancements in technology.

Maintenance: Proper mairtenance can help extend the life of a pool pump and reduce ncise levels. Neglecting maintenance can cause components to degrade faster and increase noise levels.

Energy Efficiency: Older pool pumps may be less energy-eff cient, causing them to work harcer and produce more noise. Upgrading to a newer, more efficient model can reduce noise levels while also saving on energy costs.

## Tips and Tricks for Reducing Pool Pump Noise

Choose the Right Pool Pump: When purchasing a pool purrp, look for mode's that advertise noise reduction features or low decibel levels. These pumps may cost a bit more upfront, but they can save you from the headache of dealing with a noisy pump in the long run.
re use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience hy remembering your pelerences
ad repeat v sits. By blatking "Accopt", you cansent to t ie use of A L the cockies
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Install a Fence: Placing a fence around your pool pump can help to block out the noise it produces. This can be a simple wooden fence or a more elaborate acoustic barrier designed specifically for pool pumps

Adjust Pump Settings: Lowering the speed of your pool purnp can also reduce the amount of noise it produces. Many pool purnps come with acljustable speed settings, so experiment with different speeds until you find a setting that produces less noise without sacrificing performance.

Regular Maintenance: Keeping your pool pump in good working order can also reduce the amount of noise it produces. Regularly cleaning the pump and its parts, checking for loose connections or damaged components, and replacing worn-out parts can all help to keep your pump running quietly.

## Strategies for Soundproofing Your Pool Pump

If reducing the noise level of your pool pumo through location, replacement or repair is not possible, then soundproofing is the next step. Here are some strategies for soundproofing your pool pump:

Enclose the pool pump in a soundproof box or cabinet made of materials that absorb sound, such as mass loaded vinyl, foam, or fiberglass.

Install a sound barrier between the pool pump and your living areas, such as a fence, wall or shrubs.

3 Use a vibration pad under the pool pump to reduce the transfer of sound and vibration to the ground.

4 Upgrade your pool pump with a newer model that is designed to run nore quietly.
5. Use a pool pump cover that reduces noise and vibration, while also protect na the pump from weather and debris.

## The Best Quietest Pool Pumps on the Market

If you're looking for a pool pump that won't disrupt the peace and quiet of your backyard oasis, consider one of the following quiet pool pumps.

Pentair SuperFlo VS Variable Speed Pool Pump: This pump operates at a low decibel level and has variable speed settings for efficient and quiet operation.

Hayward TriStar VS Variable Speed Pool Pump: Another energy-efficient option, this pump has a permanent magnet motor that operates quietly and smoothly

Intex Krystal Clear Sand Filter Pump: This pump is desigred for smaller aboveground pools and operates quietly without sacrificing perforrnance.

Sta-Rite IntelliPro Variable Speed Pool Pump: This pump has a permanent magnet motor that operates at a low decibel level and features a built-in timer for easy scheduling.

Jandy FloPro Variable Speed Pump: This pump is designed for medium to largesized pools and operates quietly with its permanent magnet inotor and adjustable settings.

Investing in a quiet pool pump can greatly enhance your pool experience and allow for a more relaxing environment. Consider one of these top-rated pumps for a peaceful and enjoyable swim season.

## Top 2 Quietest Pool Pumps: Reviews and Analysis

If you're in the market for a quiet pool pump, there are several options availab e. Here, we'll review two of the quietest models on the market:

Cookie Settings

Hayward SP2303VSP MaxFlo VS Variable-Speed Pool Pump - This pump is another excellent choice for those seeking a quiet pool experience. Its perrnanent magnet, totally enclosed fan-cooled motor, and advanced hydraulic design help to minimize noise while maximizing energy efficiency.

Both of these pool pumps are designed to be energy-efficient and operate quietly, making them excellent choices for those who want a more peaceful pool experience. By investing in a high-quality, quiet pool pump, you can enjoy your pool without the distraction of loud, constart noise.

## The Advantages and Disadvantages of Inverter Pool Pumps

Pool owners looking to upgrade their pool pump may be considering an inverter pool pump. These pumps use advanced technology to vary the speed of the motor based on the pool's needs. Before making a decision, it's important to consider the advantages and disadvantages of inverter pool pumps.

## Advantages

Energy-afficient: Inverter pool pumps can save up to $90 \%$ on energy costs compared to traditional singlespeed pumps. They adjust the motor speed to match the pool's needs, reducing wasted energy.

Quiet operation: Because the motor speeds up or slows down based on the pool s needs, inverter pool pumps typically operate at a lower decibel level than traditional pumps.

## Disadvantages

Higher upfront cost: Inverter pool pumps are more expensive than treiditional pumps, which can be a significant investment upfront.

Complexity: Inverter pool pumps are more complex than traditional pumps, which can make them more difficult to install and maintain.

## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?
Our lot is fairly tight, and the back property line is the alleyway. Our pool project design, which was approved by the
City of Mountain Brook back in Octobor, requires a small area for the pump equipment. We had planned for it to be
tocated behind the garage, approx 6 feet from the wall along the alleyway. This location is over 40 feet from any adjacent
property structures, and would be the least intrusive to our neighbors, especially with it being surrounded by a 4 foot high wall
and with dampened noise built-in to the advanced technology pump equipment. .There would be little detectable noise heard
by any of our neighbors. Other options for location of the pool equipment would satisfy the 10 ' setback requirement, but would be closer to the neighbor next door, and more intrusive in terms of noise and visibility.
Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (i.e., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...") No.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations?
This design layout would be the least intrusive to our neighbors, without compromising safety or access, which is the intent and purpose of the Zoning Regulation. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

# Variance Application - Part I 

## Project Data

Address of Subject Property 76 Country Club Blvd. Mountain Brook, 35213
Zoning Classification Residence A District
Name of Property Owner(s) Mike and Penny Fuller
Phone Number (205)837-1305 Email ptfuller@,hotmail.com
Name of Surveyor Weygand Surveyors
Phone Number (205)942-0086 Email info@weygandsurveyor.com
Name of Architect (if applicable) Jeffrey Dungan Architects - project lead Sarah Barr
Phone Number (205)329-7033 Email sarah@jeffreydungan.com
Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing

Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance request(s):

|  | Zoning Code Requirement | Existing Development | Proposed Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Area (sf) | 30,000 sf | $16,802.5 \mathrm{sf}$ | $16,802.5 \mathrm{sf}$ |
| Lot Width (ft) |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) primary |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) secondary |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback | 15'-0" | approx. 13'-6" | same as existing |
| Right Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow lots in Res-B or Res-C: <br> Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow lots in Res-B or Res-C: Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Rear Setback (ft) |  |  |  |
| Lot Coverage (\%) | 25\% | 21.3\% | 26.1\% |
| Building Height (ft) |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |

## A-24-08 Zoning



## A-24-08 Aerial



# Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment 

## A-24-08

## Petition Summary

Request to allow additions and alterations to the existing non-conforming dwelling to be 13 feet 6 inches from the left side property line (north) in lieu of the required 15 feet, and to allow the building area to be 26.1 percent in lieu of the maximum allowed of 25 percent.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work additions and alterations to the existing non-conforming dwelling which includes extending the existing left side of the structure that is 13 feet 6 inches from the property line. The proposal also includes the removal of an existing detached garage and the construction of a new detached garage.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardship related to the side setback request is the existing design constraint of the non-conforming home. The proposal would not increase the encroachment or move the side of the home closer to the property line, but would extend the side of the home from front to back.

## Variance Request for Building Area Coverage

Nexus: The applicant stated that the hardship is that lot is 16,802 square feet in total area which is less than the 30,000 square foot minimum in Res-A. The applicant also mentioned the front property line being nearly 22 feet back from the edge of the street. Neither of these stated hardships are peculiar or unusual to the surrounding area.

The average lot size for this block ( 13 lots between Country Club Boulevard, Matthews Road and Fairway Drive) is approximately 18,978 square feet. The median lot size is 16,593 . This puts the subject location very close to the average lot size and slightly above the median. The building area coverage maximum is 25 percent which applies evenly to all Residence-A lots regardless of size. A smaller lot is not a hardship as it relates to the ratio of building coverage allowed. Furthermore, the previous zoning regulations for minimum lot size in Residence-A was 15,000 square feet and it still had a maximum building coverage allowed of 25 percent. There are numerous Residence-A lots in this area and across the city that are well below the 30,000 square foot minimum because they were brought in or created under the 15,000 square foot requirement.

## Standard Hardships Required for the Side Setback

The subject request appears to meet "e." of the following hardship standards:
Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing design constraint as current home is 13 feet 6 inches feet from the side setback)

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (will not encroach closer to the property line than the existing side of the home)

## Standard Hardships Required for the Building Area

Staff could not identify a hardship that relates to the proposed building area.
Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties

## Impervious Area

The proposal exceeds that maximum allowed impervious surface limit.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article III, Section 129-34 Residence A District

Appends<br>LOCATION: 76 Country Club Boulevard

ZONING DISTRICT: Residence A District

OWNERS: Mike and Penny Fuller










## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)?
Please see attached "Hardship and Statement of Scope"
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (i.e., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...")
No, the hardship arises from several factors mentioned in the attached "Hardship and
Statment of Scope" and was not created by the property owner.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations?
The suggested mitigation measures in the attached "Hardship and Statement of Scope" help keep the design of the property in line with the intent of the Zoning Regulations by limiting the stormwater impact of the slightly larger lot coverage.

This variance request is for a slight increase in lot coverage, and the extension of an existing wall that overhangs the northeastern setback. The hardship with this lot in terms of lot coverage is that the survey shows the property line is set nearly twenty-two feet back from the edge of the street, when typically property lines fall between $8-10$ feet from the street. That's an extra $\pm 1200$ square feet of land that is maintained by the property owner, not the city, but isn't applicable to lot coverage calculations. The inclusion of this land that visibly is part of the lot, even if not per the surveyed property lines, would put our proposed design at under the required $25 \%$ lot coverage. With the current property line location, our lot coverage is slightly over the $25 \%$ limit, at $26.1 \%$. In addition, this lot was labeled Residence A District, which has a minimum square footage of 30,000 sf. This lot has only $16,802.5 \mathrm{sf}$, creating a difficulty and disproportion in size of structure to the allowed lot coverage.

If we cannot factor in another 12-14 feet of property at the street - that is maintained by the lot owner but not unavailable for the lot coverage calculations- we propose installing mitigation measures to offset the potential impact of a slightly higher lot coverage:

- Installing a cistern to capture excess rain on site and reduce the city's stormwater load
- Working with the landscape architect to include rain gardens with native plants to help rain water soak into the ground instead of contributing to Mountain Brook's flooding issues.

The owner and design team want to update the property to modern standards while keeping the character of this century-old home. Instead of demolishing this historic house to give the owner exactly what she needs to accommodate her husband's disability - a degenerative brain disorder that will soon require the use of a wheelchair - we decided to redo the poorly done 1970s addition at the back of the property to keep more in line with the original character and provide the needed space for the master suite on the main level. The expansion at the front of the house is minimal and stays well back from the $40^{\prime}$ setback so as not to effect the experience along the street.

The old servants' quarters - a two-story structure located right up against the back property line will be torn down to allow for a smaller, single-story, single-car garage located closer to the house. Other improvements include a new roof (within allowed height limitations) and updates to the hardscaping - such as updating the driveway with permeable pavers.

Below are some photos of the existing house. Included in this application are plans and elevations


# Variance Application - Part I 

Project Data
Address of Subject Property 25 FAIRWAY DR.
Zoning Classification $\qquad$
Name of Property Owner(s) JOHN MOMTCOMORI
Phone Number 2652660223 Email JOHNGBIECDM.COM
Name of Surveyor BUCK CAUSMAN1

Name of Architect (if applicable)
Phone Number $\qquad$ Email $\qquad$
(区) Property owner or representative agent must be present at hearing

Please fill in only applicable project information (relating directly to the variance request(s):

|  | Zoning Code <br> Requirement | Existing <br> Development | Proposed <br> Development |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot Area (sf) |  |  |  |
| Lot Width (ft) |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) primary |  |  |  |
| Front Setback (ft) secondary |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback |  |  |  |
| Right Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: <br> Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |
| Left Side Setback (ft): <br> For non-conforming narrow <br> lots in Res-B or Res-C: <br> Less than 22' high $\rightarrow$ <br> 22' high or greater $\rightarrow$ |  |  | , |

## A-24-09 Zoning



## A-24-09 Aerial



1/30/2024, 11:24:32 AM
Aerial 2021Green: Band_2Blue: Band_3
Red: Band_1


County Department of Information Technology, JeffCoAL, Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P, USGS, EPA, USDA

## Report to the Board of Zoning Adjustment

## A-24-09

## Petition Summary

Request to allow a pool to be located 7 feet from the rear property line (south) in lieu of the required 10 feet.

## Scope of Work

The scope of work includes the installation of a new pool.

## Variance Request for Setback

Nexus: The hardships in this case are the irregular lot shape and existing design constraints of the home. The lot is very oddly shaped with angled rear and side property lines. The existing home is set back deeply into the lot which limits the space in the rear and pools must be located to the rear of the principal dwelling. The pool equipment and pump will be located outside of the required 10 foot setback.

## Standard Hardships Required

The subject request appears to possibly meet "c." and "e." of the following hardship standards:

Section 129-455 of the municipal code outlines the hardships that the board may consider as justification for the granting of a variance:
a. exceptional narrowness
b. exceptional shallowness
c. irregular shape (very irregular lot shape)
d. exceptional topographic conditions
e. other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of such parcel which would result in peculiar, extraordinary and practical difficulties (existing design constraint of house located toward the rear of the lot)

Applicable findings for any motion to approve should be read into the record of minutes. The Board may determine that the following findings are applicable to this case:

1. That special circumstances or conditions apply to the building or land in question, and
2. That these circumstances are peculiar to such building or land, and
3. That these circumstances do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity;
4. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from action by the applicant;
5. That the granting of this variance:
a. will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property (as only a small corner of the pool will encroach into the setback).

## Impervious Area

The proposal exceeds that maximum allowed impervious surface limit.

## Subject Property and Surrounding Land Uses

The property contains a single-family dwelling, and is surrounded by same.

## Affected Regulation

Article XIX, Section 129-314 Accessory structures and accessory buildings on residential lots

## Appends

LOCATION: 25 Fairway Drive
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence A District
OWNERS: John Montgomery


## Variance Application Part II

## Required Findings (Sec. 129-455 of the Zoning Ordinance)

To aid staff in determining that the required hardship findings can be made in this particular case, please answer the following questions with regard to your request. These findings must be made by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in order for a variance to be granted (please attach a separate sheet if necessary).

What special circumstances or conditions, applying to the building or land in question, are peculiar to such building or land, and do not apply generally to other buildings or land in the vicinity (including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings)? CONFIGURATIOH OF WT PINCHED B WI FARWAY AND AULY PARACOL TO COUNTRY CWM BLXD WHIGH SENOS STDRMWARER RUNDFF ACROSS NORTHWEST SIDE DICTATES ONLY POOL LDLATION IN REAR YARD TO BE OFFSET BETWGEN RESIDENCE AND EXISTH AUXIULARY STRUCTURE. SAID LOCATION, DUETO SPACEAND ELEVATION CHALIGGES, WILL PLAGE POLL THR品E FEET NTO EASEMENT ALONG SDHTH WEST BOUNGAPM?

Was the condition from which relief is sought a result of action by the applicant? (i.e., selfimposed hardship such as: "...converted existing garage to living space and am now seeking a variance to construct a new garage in a required setback...")
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

How would the granting of this variance be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning


[^0]:    The variance for this footprint was approved three years ago but not constructed in it's entirety. This variance would allow the project to be finished within the setbacks approved for the original project.

