



City of San Antonio

Agenda Memorandum

Agenda Date: May 19, 2025

In Control: Board of Adjustment Meeting

DEPARTMENT: Development Services Department

DEPARTMENT HEAD: Michael Shannon, Director

CASE NUMBER: BOA-25-10300064

APPLICANT: Burea Inc.

OWNER: Burea Inc.

COUNCIL DISTRICT IMPACTED: District 1

LOCATION: 910 East Mistletoe Avenue

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 41 and Lot 42, NCB 6461

ZONING: “C-1 UC-4 AHOD” Light Commercial North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor
Airport Hazard Overlay District

CASE MANAGER: Joel Vela, Senior Planner

A request for

A 25’ and 10’ variance from the minimum 30’ rear setback and 15’ buffer to allow a 5’ rear setback and buffer.

Section 35-310.01 and Section 35-510

Executive Summary

The subject property is located between North St. Mary’s Street and TX Highway 281. The property owner also owns the property abutting to the east and is planning on moving the existing building to the rear of the subject property. The property abuts both an “MF-33” and “R-6”, which requires a Type-B / 15-foot buffer against the “R-6” Residential Single-Family lot. The proposed development will be a food service establishment and the building in the rear will be the kitchen. The abutting empty lot is proposed to be the parking lot, however a rezoning would be required.

Code Enforcement History

The property has no code enforcement history.

Permit History

RES-RBP-APP25-35501844 – Building Addition – Pending BOA Decision

Zoning History

The subject property is within the Original 36 square miles of the City of San Antonio and was zoned “B” Residence District. The property was rezoned by Ordinance 48029, dated May 19, 1977, to “B-1” Business District. Under the 2001 Unified Development Code, established by Ordinance 93881, dated May 3, 2001, the property zoned “B-1” Business District was converted to the current “C-1” Light Commercial District.

Subject Property Zoning/Land Use

Existing Zoning

“C-1 UC-4 AHOD” Light Commercial North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District

Existing Use

Commercial – Proposed Restaurant

Surrounding Property Zoning/ Land Use

North

Existing Zoning

“IDZ UC-4 AHOD” Infill Development Zone North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District with uses permitted in “RM-4” Residential Mixed District and “R-3 UC-4 AHOD” Single-Family Residential North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District

Existing Use

Vacant Lot

South

Existing Zoning

“R-6 UC-4 AHOD” Residential Single-Family North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District and “MF-33 UC-4 AHOD” Multi-Family North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District

Existing Use

Multi-Family and Single-Family Dwellings

East

Existing Zoning

“C-1 UC-4 AHOD” Light Commercial North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District

Existing Use

Single-Family Residence

West

Existing Zoning

“C-2 UC-4 AHOD” Commercial North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District and “R-6 UC-4 AHOD” Residential Single-Family North St. Mary’s Street Urban Corridor Airport Hazard Overlay District

Existing Use

Commercial Uses

Comprehensive Plan Consistency/Neighborhood Association

The subject property is in the Midtown Area Regional Center Plan and is designated as “Neighborhood Mixed-Use” in the future land use component of the plan. The subject property is located within the notification area of Tobin Hill Community Neighborhood Association and the San Antonio Texas District One Resident Association, and they have been notified of the request.

Street Classification

East Mistletoe Avenue is classified as a Local Street.

Criteria for Review – Rear Setback and Buffer

According to Section 35-482(e) of the UDC, in order for a variance to be granted, the applicant must demonstrate all of the following:

1. The variance is not contrary to the public interest.

The public interest is defined as the general health, safety, and welfare of the public. In this case, the public interest is represented by rear setback and buffer required in the proposed commercial development. Staff finds that the request is contrary to the public interest as the standards exist to preserve privacy, green space, light access, and safety between properties.

2. Due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship.

Staff finds no special conditions existing on the property that a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. The lot does not have any unusual topography and the rear yard has enough space to accommodate the new proposed structure while adhering to the setback and buffer standards.

3. By granting the variance, the spirit of the ordinance will be observed, and substantial justice will be done.

The spirit of the ordinance is defined as the intent of the code, rather than the exact letter of the law. The request is not in the spirit of the ordinance as the city code provides regulations to create adequate space and buffering between commercial and residential uses.

4. The variance will not authorize the operation of a use other than those uses specifically authorized in the zoning district in which the variance is located.

No uses other than those allowed within the district will be allowed with this variance.

5. Such variance will not substantially injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property or alter the essential character of the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds the request will substantially injure the adjacent residential property as it can lead to loss of privacy for neighbors, increased noise, and visual intrusion.

6. The plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is due to unique circumstances existing on the property, and the unique circumstances were not created by the owner of the property and are not merely financial and are not due to or the result of general conditions in the district in which the property is located.

Staff finds the plight of the owner of the property for which the variance is sought is not due to unique circumstances existing on the lot, and the owner is creating the unique circumstances. The property is not shaped in a manner to create an obstacle for development and the standards were properly established prior to the proposed development.

Alternative to Applicant's Request

The alternative to the applicant's request is to conform to the rear setback and buffer regulations of the UDC Section 35-310.01 and Section 35-510.

Staff Recommendation – Rear Setback and Buffer

Staff recommends Denial in BOA-25-10300044 based on the following findings of fact:

1. The standards exist to preserve privacy, green space, light access, and safety between properties.
2. The city code provides regulations to create adequate space between commercial and residential uses for proper distancing, potential nuisance prevention, and safety purposes.