



b) *The Zoning Regulations State:*

The proposed addition onto the back of the single-family dwelling would encroach into the 10-foot separation approximately 2½ feet. See Code of Ordinances Section 100.4.06.1.b.

c) *Interested Property Owners:*

Neighboring property owner to the east at 1825 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW, Mike Dunbar, spoke in favor of the request.

d) *Discussion:*

Secretary Passmore briefly reviewed the application and the ordinance requested to be varied from in order to complete the house addition as proposed. He noted that the existing accessory building that requires the 10-foot separation does not currently meet the required setbacks. Mrs. Green mentioned that at the time the accessory building was built it met the required setbacks. Mr. Green reviewed the proposed addition and stated that they desired their house to look as though it was not added onto, but flowed naturally. He stated that to meet the 10-foot separation the addition would need to be cut at an angle that would appear very unbalanced and decrease the value of the addition. He stated that other options of different sizes will give the appearance of a house that has been added onto versus one that is uniform. Mrs. Green added that they enjoy their neighborhood and desire to stay in their house for the long term, and this addition would enable them to stay into the future.

Member Foy noted many houses and garages that do not meet current setbacks within the neighborhood. Member Shea confirmed that if an angle is placed on the encroaching wall in order to meet the separation the addition would be narrowed by about three feet. Mr. Foy clarified the intent of the ordinance as it attempts to create space between adjacent structures and/or property lines to structures. Member Brown asked what other options the contractor presented once it was determined that a variance would be needed. Mrs. Green stated that the options the contractor presented would not look right with the existing house and explained the interior layout of her house.

Chairperson Lampe confirmed that the patio doors would lead to an at-grade patio and not create any further variance requirements. Ms. Shea confirmed that moving the garage would be an option, but potentially a costly option. Ms. Shea stated that the Board needs to find a substantial hardship that is not of the land owners' making in order to grant a variance and that for this type of a project, it is often difficult to prove that a hardship exists. Mr. Foy agreed with Ms. Shea but stated the difficulty in this case is because the garage was placed in conformance with the regulations when it was built and is similar to the other accessory buildings throughout the entire neighborhood.



This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.  
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.