ZONING HEARING BOARD OF UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP

APPLICATION NO. 2012-019	: **HEARING DATE:**	September 19, 2012 October 3, 2012
APPLICATION OF: Yuwen Li	: **DECISION DATE:**	October 3, 2012
PROPERTY: 321 W. Beidler Road Upper Merion Township	:	

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD

The Applicant, Mr. Yuwen Li (hereinafter referred to as the "Applicant"), filed an application requesting a variance to Section 165-23 of the Upper Merion Township Zoning Code (the "Code"). The application was properly advertised, and public hearings were held before the Upper Merion Township Zoning Hearing Board on September 19, 2012 and October 3, 2012 at the Upper Merion Township Building. All members of the Zoning Hearing Board were present, except Mr. Stephen Levine, as well as the Solicitor, Zoning Officer, and Court Reporter.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Applicant is Mr. Yuwen Li, with a mailing address at 321 Beidler Road, King of Prussia, Upper Merion Township.
2. The Applicant is the legal owner of the subject property.
3. The property is located at 321 Beidler Road, King of Prussia, Upper Merion Township.
4. The Applicant was not represented by an attorney.

5. The subject property is located in the "R-2" zoning district.

6. The lot is approximately 8,100 square feet.

7. The subject property is a single family residence with a carport and backyard shed.

8. On October 26, 2011, the Upper Merion Township Zoning Heard Board issue and Order and Opinion granting the Applicant three variances to construct the carport on the subject property.

9. The carport is 10x25 feet in dimension and one foot from the property line.

10. The Applicant now seeks to enclose a portion of the carport to make a storage room within the carport in the approximate dimensions of 10x10 feet.

11. To enclose the carport, the Applicant requires a variance for the side-yard setback.

12. The Applicant introduced a schematic of the carport in his Application, which was marked as Exhibit "A-1."

13. There were no residents who testified in favor of the project.

14. There were no residents who testified against the project.

15. The Board voted two (2) in favor and two (2) opposed to the variance. A tie vote constitutes a denial in accordance with Section 906 of the Municipalities Planning Code.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16. The Applicant, Yuwen Li, filed an application requesting a variance from Section 165-23 in order to enclose the rear portion of the carport to make a storage room that will encroach into the side yard setback.

17. The standard to determine whether to grant a dimensional variance as outlined by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court is that the Applicant must 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, 721 A.2d 43 (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).

18. In Hertzberg, the Supreme Court held that the Zoning Hearing Board must, at the beginning of its analysis of an appeal from the terms of a Zoning Ordinance, determine whether the requested relief is for a use variance or a dimensional variance. Id. If the Board determines that the relief is for a use variance, then the Board should use the traditional five-part test, which is set forth in both the Municipalities Planning Code and case law. If the requested relief is for a dimensional variance, then the standard to be applied will be different. Id. While the Court in Hertzberg did not specifically identify a single standard for a dimensional variance, it noted that the requirements for a dimensional variance were something less than that of a use variance. Id.

19. In its opinion, the Court went on to opine that some of the factors that a Zoning Hearing Board should look at to determine whether to grant a dimensional variance should include, where applicable:

    (1) The economic detriment to Applicant if the variance was denied;

    (2) The financial hardship created by any work necessary to bring the building into strict compliance with the zoning requirements; and,

    (3) The characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood. Id.

While these factors are not exhaustive, the Court in Hertzberg and subsequent cases have referred to them specifically as findings a Zoning Hearing Board should make in its determination of whether to grant or deny a dimensional variance.

20. Although the language of Hertzberg is expansive, the current trend is to apply the relaxed standard for dimensional variances only to the consideration of whether unnecessary hardship results from unique physical characteristics or conditions of the land. The Friendship Preservation Group, Inc. v. Zoning Hearing Board of Adjustment of the City of Pittsburgh, 808 A.2d 327 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002); Cardamone v. Whitpain Township Zoning Hearing Board, 771 A.2d 103 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001).

21. 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. Cmwlth. 1999); Soteranos, Inc. v. Zoning Board of Adjustment of the City of Pittsburgh, 711 A.2d 549 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1998). Moreover, variances to zoning codes should be granted sparingly and only under exceptional circumstances; a variance should not be granted simply because such a grant would permit the owner to obtain greater profit from or use of the property. Commonwealth v. Zoning Hearing Board of Susquehanna, 677 A.2d 853 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1996).

22. In order to grant a variance, the Board must make the findings set forth in § 910.2 of the Municipalities Planning Code, 53 P.S. § 10910.2, where relevant. The law established by the Pennsylvania courts further establishes these standards, stated in full herein. See, Alpine Inc. v. Abington Township Zoning Hearing Board, 654 A.2d 186 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995); Appeal of Lester M. Prang, Inc., 169 Pa. Cmwlth. 626, 647 A.2d 279 (1994). The findings that the Board must make, where relevant, in granting a variance as set forth in the Municipalities Planning Code are as follows:

a. That there are unique physical 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.

b. 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.

c. That such unnecessary hardship has not been created by the Applicant.

d. 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.

e. 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.

23. Here, the Applicant is proposing to enclose a portion of an existing carport to be used a storage room. The enclosed portion of the carport requires a variance for the side yard setback. The Applicant admitted that there are other locations on which a storage room could be sited but that he preferred the proposed site for aesthetic and convenience factors. There are no unique physical circumstances peculiar to the subject property that would inflict an unnecessary hardship on the Applicant to locate a storage room on a portion of the property that would not require variance from the Code.

24. The Board voted two (2) in favor and two (2) opposed to the variance. A tie vote constitutes a denial in accordance with Section 906 of the Municipalities Planning Code.

ORDER OF THE UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP

ZONING HEARING BOARD

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED that the Board finds that the Applicant did not present sufficient testimony to grant a variance to Section 165-23 to enclose the rear portion of a carport to make an enclosed storage room within the carport. Accordingly, the Applicant's request for a variance is denied.

Decision Dated: October 3, 2012

UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD

MEMBERS VOTE AGAINST APPLICATION:

Robert J. Montemayor – Chairman

Brad Murphy – Vice Chairman

MEMBERS VOTE IN FAVOR OF APPLICATION:

Lynne Z. Gold-Bikin - Secretary

William J. Clements

NOTE 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 has received Zoning Hearing Board approval, the Applicant must secure all applicable permits from Upper Merion Township within one (1) year of the date of the approval or the decision granting approval.