MILLER TURETSKY RULE MCLENNAN

MARK D. TURETSKY JOHN A. RULE KEITH B. MCLENNAN* TRACEY L. POTERE BRANDON H. ZANAN

*ALSO MEMBER OF NEW JERSEY BAR

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

3770 RIDGE PIKE COLLEGEVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA 19426 (610) 489-3300 OFFICE (610) 489-1157 FACSIMILE www.millerturetsky.com JAMES H. FREEMAN
OF COUNSEL
MITCHELL W. MILLER
RETIRED
JILL K. ANDERSON, J.D.

September 18, 2014

SENT VIA CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED 7012 1640 0002 1498 1679

Sanjay and Janet Kumar 2753 Maplewood Mews Norristown, PA 19403

Re: 2753 Maplewood Mews, Norristown, PA 19403; Parcel No. 43-00-08014-00-7; Notice of Decision of the Lower Providence Township Zoning Hearing Board – Application Z-14-16

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Kumar:

I am writing in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. This is a notice of decision of the Lower Providence Township Zoning Hearing Board taken at the hearing held on August 28, 2014. Pursuant to the decision of the Zoning Hearing Board your application for a variance from the rear yard and side yard setback requirements of Sections 143-37(A)(2) of the Lower Providence Township Zoning Ordinance is GRANTED.

Should you have any questions regarding the foregoing please contact me.

Very Truly Yours,

Brandon H. Zanan

Pc. Nancy J. McFarland, Zoning Hearing Board Chair Thomas A. Borai Eric C. Frey, Esquire Joyce D. Cluley Robert G. Hardt Kathie A. Eskie

ZONING HEARING BOARD OF LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP

APPLICATION NO. Z-14-16

: HEARING DATE: August 28, 2014

:

APPLICATION OF: Sanjay and Janet Kumar

:

PROPERTY:

2753 Maplewood Mews Lower Providence Township Norristown, PA 19403 Parcel No. 43-00-08014-00-7

OPINION, DECISION AND ORDER OF THE LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD

Applicants Sanjay and Janet Kumar (hereinafter referred to as the "Applicants") filed an application requesting variances from the rear yard and side yard setback requirements of Section 143-37(A)(2) of the Lower Providence Township Zoning Ordinance in connection with proposed porch roof construction. The application was properly advertised, and a public hearing was held before the Lower Providence Township Zoning Hearing Board on August 28, 2014 at the Lower Providence Township Building. All members of the Zoning Hearing Board were present. Also present were Keith McLennan, the Solicitor, Michael Mrozinski, the Director of Community Development responsible for Zoning/Code Enforcement and the Court Reporter.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Applicants are Sanjay and Janet Kumar.
- 2. The Applicants are the owners of the subject property, which is located at 275'3 Maplewood Mews, Norristown, PA 19403 (the "Property"). The parcel number is 43-00-08014-00-7
 - 3. The applicable zoning is R-2 Residential District.

- 4. The Applicants were not represented by legal counsel.
- 5. The present use on the Property is a single family residence.
- The Applicants acquired the Property in 1998.
- 7. The lot size is 14,875 square feet.
- 8. The following exhibits were marked at the hearing:
 - B-1: Application
 - B-2: Advertisement
 - B-3: Proof of publication
- A-1: Sketch outlining the exiting property lines, house, existing concrete slab porch, and proposed roof
 - A-2: Letters of support for application from neighbors
- Applicants seek to build a roof contiguous with the house roof replacing an older and deteriorated flat aluminum roof.
- 10. The proposed roof would cover a slightly larger area of the porch than what is currently covered.
- 11. The proposed roof would be fifteen (15) feet from the side property line, and would be flush with the point where it joins the wall and roof of the existing house, which is also fifteen (15) feet from the side property line. Twenty (20) feet is the permitted side yard setback allowance.
- 12. The proposed roof would be 58 feet 9.25 inches from the rear property line. Sixty(60) feet is the permitted rear yard setback allowance.
 - 13. There was no adverse public comment regarding this application.
 - 14. There is an unnecessary hardship requiring the grant of a variance.
 - 15. The proposed roof will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION

The Applicants have requested a variance from the setback requirements of Section 143-37(A)(2) of the Lower Providence Township Zoning Ordinance. The request seeks relief as to the dimensional requirements that require a twenty (20) foot setback on the side yard, and a sixty (60) foot setback on the rear yard.

Differing standards apply to use and dimensional variances. Generally, a variance requires the applicant to show that unnecessary hardship will result if a variance is denied, and that the proposed use will not be contrary to public interest. Hertzberg v. Zoning Bd. Of

Pittsburgh, 554 Pa. 249, 257, 721 A.2d 43, 47 (1998) (citing Allegheny West Civic Council,

Inc. v. Zoning Bd. Of Adjustment of the City of Pittsburgh, 547 Pa. 163, 167, 689 A.2d 225,

227 (1997)). The quantum of proof required to establish unnecessary hardship in the case of a dimensional variance is, however, lesser than when a use variance is sought. Id. at 258-59.

Regardless of the type of variance sought, the reasons for granting a variance must be substantial, serious, and compelling. POA Company v. Findlay Township Zoning Hearing Board, 551 Pa. 689, 713 A.2d 70 (1998); Evans v. Zoning Hearing Board of the Borough of Spring City, 732 A.2d 686 (Pa. Commw. 1999); Soteneanos, Inc. v. Zoning Board of Adjustment of the City of Pittsburgh, 711 A.2d 549 (Pa. Commw. 1998). Pursuant to the Municipalities Planning Code the following must be found in order for the Board to grant the requested variance:

(1) That there are unique circumstances or conditions, including irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of lot size or shape, or exceptional topographical or other physical conditions peculiar to the particular property and that the unnecessary hardship is due to such conditions and not the circumstances or conditions generally created by the provisions of the

zoning ordinance in the neighborhood or district in which the property is located.

- (2) That because of such physical circumstances or conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the provisions of the zoning ordinance and that the authorization of a variance is therefore necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property.
 - (3) That such unnecessary hardship has not been created by the applicant.
- (4) That the variance, if authorized, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or district in which the property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property, nor be detrimental to the public welfare.
- (5) That the variance, if authorized, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and will represent the least modification possible of the regulation in issue. 53 P.S. § 10910.2.

The unique circumstances of the Applicants and the subject Property require the grant of a variance. Undue hardship would result from a denial of the variance. This hardship is not self-imposed but is rather the result of the Applicants' property previously being built with a 15 foot side yard setback before the 2011 zoning ordinance amendment, and the new roof would not extend any further into the side yard setback. The current flat aluminum roof has deteriorated to such an extent that it has caused water to accumulate and cause damage to the adjacent family room wall. Also, the essential character of the neighborhood will not be affected as the proposed roof would keep with the character of the neighborhood. Applicants have proposed a roof that attempts to limit encroachment into required rear yard setback, and is therefore the minimum variance that will afford the required relief. The Applicants also requested a variance from Section 143-37(A)(2) concerning maximum impervious coverage,

but it was determined that the impervious coverage would not be affected as the concrete slab

under the roof was already in place.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the application for variances from the rear yard and

side yard setback requirements of Section 143-37(A)(2) of the Lower Providence Township

Zoning Ordinance are granted.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Applicants have standing to appear before the Board regarding the

requested relief.

2. Denial of the requested relief will impose an unnecessary hardship on the

Applicants.

3. The hardship is not self-imposed, and is due to the unique physical

circumstances of the Property.

4. The requested relief is necessary to enable the Applicants' reasonable use of the

Property, represents the minimum that will afford relief, and represents the least modification

possible of the regulation at issue. The proposed roof will also not alter the essential character

of the neighborhood in which the Property is located, and neighbors have no opposition to its

construction.

DECISION

The decision of the Lower Providence Township Zoning Hearing Board by a 5-0 vote is

as follows:

The application for variances from Section 143-37(A)(2) of the Lower Providence

Township Zoning Ordinance are granted.

Dated: September 15, 2014

ORDER

The foregoing Findings, Discussion and Decision are hereby approved and ordered.

LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD

Nancy McFarland, Chairwoman

Joyce D. Cluley, Vice Chairwoman

Thomas A. Borai

Robert G. Hardt

Kathie A. Eskie

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

There is a thirty (30) day period after the date of a decision for an aggrieved person to file an appeal in the Court of Common Pleas of Montgomery County to contest an approval or denial by the Zoning Hearing board. If the Applicant has been granted Zoning Hearing Board approval, the Applicant may take action on said approval during the thirty (30) day appeal period; however, the Applicant will do so at his or her own risk. If the Applicant received Zoning Hearing Board approval, the Applicant must secure all applicable permits from Lower Providence Township within one (1) year of the date of the approval or the decision granting approval.