

**AGENDA FOR THE
OBION MUNICIPAL BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS/
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2025
2:00 PM
OBION TOWN HALL**

- I. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER**
- II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- III. CITIZENS COMMENTS**
- IV. NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. Variance Request – Juan Martinez**
 - B. Discussion on potential zoning revisions**
- V. OLD BUSINESS**
- VI. OTHER BUSINESS**
- VII. ADJOURNMENT**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Obion Board of Zoning Appeals
FROM: Donny Bunton, Community Planner, NWTDD
DATE: March 31, 2025
SUBJECT: STAFF REPORT ON AGENDA ITEMS

- I. DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER
- II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- III. CITIZENS COMMENTS
- IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Variance Request – Juan Martinez (212 North 9th Street)



Background. Mr. Juan Martinez is requesting side yard setback variances for both side yard setbacks for property located at 212 North 9th Street. The property is zoned R-1 (Low Density Residential), which requires ten feet side yard setbacks. The property is approximately 74 feet wide and it is currently vacant.

Mr. Martinez is proposing to place a 68' long manufactured home on the property. This means that side yard setback variances of approximately 7' per side would be needed, which would leave the proposed structure only (approximately) 3' from each property line.

Analysis. The property is considered a non-conforming lot, as it was created prior to the adoption of zoning and it does not meet the minimum lot width requirement (of 100 feet). This fact provides some grounds for a variance from the side yard setbacks. However, it is questionable whether a variance

would be warranted, which would allow the proposed structure to be so close to the neighboring property, when there are a few potential options, which would allow placement of the structure without need of a variance.

Option 1) The structure could be placed on the lot sideways, with its narrow portion running parallel with the North 9th Street. This would allow both side setbacks to be met, but the appearance might seem aesthetically unpleasing.

Option 2) Mr. Martinez owns the property directly north of the subject property. However, there is a city-owned alley between the two Martinez-owned properties. If the two properties were actually adjacent (and not separated by an alley) then they could be considered as one property for zoning purposes. This would mean that the proposed structure could be placed over the interior property line, thereby meeting both side yard setbacks. However, the only way for this scenario to be possible, would be if the City were to abandon the alley and turn over its ownership to Mr. Matinez. However, the staff planner is not privy to the City's plans or intentions for the subject alley or whether it would have any interest in abandoning it.

Conclusion. The staff planner thinks it would probably be too impactful on the neighboring property (to the south) for a variance to be approved to allow placement of a manufactured home within 3-4 feet of their property line.

B. Discussion on potential zoning revisions

The Planning Commission will discuss potential changes needed in the Zoning Ordinance, prior to the planning contract ending in June. The first change being discussed is whether to allow the side yard on a corner lot to have more of a traditional side yard setback, rather than to have a another required second front yard setback (as currently worded).

- V. OLD BUSINESS**
- VI. OTHER BUSINESS**
- VII. ADJOURNMENT**