

**ZONING HEARING BOARD OF UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP**

**APPLICATION NO.** 2011-12 : **HEARING DATE:** June 15, 2011  
:  
**APPLICATION OF:** Andrew and Marcia : **DECISION DATE:** July 15, 2011  
McNally :  
:  
:  
**PROPERTY:** 728 Caley Road :  
:  
Upper Merion Township :

**OPINION AND ORDER OF THE UPPER MERION  
TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD**

The Applicant, Andrew and Marcia McNally, (hereinafter referred to as the “Applicant”), filed an application requesting a variance to Section 165-33.C(1) in order to construct a garage that will encroach into the required side yard setback area and a variance to Section 165-33.C(3) in order to locate an accessory structure within the required side yard setback. The application was properly advertised, and a public hearing was held before the Upper Merion Township Zoning Hearing Board on June 15, 2011 at the Upper Merion Township Building. All members of the Zoning Hearing Board were present as well as the Solicitor, Zoning Officer, and Court Reporter.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Applicant is Andrew and Marcia McNally, 728 Caley Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406.
2. The Applicant is the legal owner of the subject property.

3. The property is located at 728 Caley Road, King of Prussia, PA, 19406, Upper Merion Township.
4. The Applicant was not represented by an attorney.
5. The property is zoned “R-2A” Residential.
6. The lot is approximately 13,600 sq. ft.
7. The Applicant is proposing a garage that will encroach into the minimum side yard setback area. The minimum is 12 ft. and the Applicant is proposing 7.5 ft.
8. The Applicant also violates the minimum side yard aggregate yard setback of 30 ft. because the existing side yard setback on the other side of the property is 18.5 ft., which would give a total of 26 total ft. rather than a 30 ft. aggregate.
9. The proposed addition to the existing single family dwelling will encompass a garage and a laundry room.
10. The area proposed for the garage is going over current impervious surface so storm water run-off will not be an issue.
11. The location of the garage and laundry room is the most appropriate location to promote the proper interior flow of the existing structure.
12. The existing garage will be converted to an office and an addition to the family room, therefore, a new garage will be necessary.
13. The Applicant is also asking for relief for a shed because of other improvements in the existing rear yard.
14. The Applicant does not need the size of shed proposed by the Applicant, but rather can make it a shed that is 8 ft. by 10 ft., which is smaller than the one proposed by the Applicant.

15. The shed must be placed 4 ft. from the side property line and 8 ft. from the rear property line.
16. There were no residents who testified in favor of the project.
17. There were no residents who testified against the project.

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Applicant, Andrew and Marcia McNally, (hereinafter referred to as the “Applicant”), filed an application requesting a variance to Section 165-33.C(1) in order to construct a garage that will encroach into the required side yard setback area and a variance to Section 165-33.C(3) in order to locate an accessory structure within the required side yard setback.

As a preliminary matter, the applicable standards for determining whether to grant a dimensional variance differ from those of a use variance. The standard 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).

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.

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.

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).

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); Sotereanos, 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).

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:

1. 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.
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.

The Applicant is proposing to convert his existing garage to an office and an extension of a family room. The Applicant wants to add a new addition comprised of a garage and laundry room. The location of the addition is the most logical location for the interior flow of the existing dwelling. The Applicant's addition will encroach into the side yard setback area and violate the side yard aggregate setback minimum. The Applicant is also proposing a shed, however, the board felt the proposed shed setbacks were not reasonable and asked the Applicant to reduce the size of the shed to 8 ft. by 10 ft. and to locate it at least 8 ft. from the rear property line and at least 4 ft. from the side property line. The Applicant agreed to this request.

The relief sought by the Applicant is dimensional in nature, therefore, the standards of the Hertzberg case are applicable to the case at bar. Through the use of testimony, the Applicant sufficiently satisfied the standards of the Hertzberg case, therefore, the relief should be granted.

**ORDER OF THE UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP**

**ZONING HEARING BOARD**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED** that the Board finds that the Applicant presented sufficient testimony to grant the variances to Section 165-33.C(1) and Section 165-33.C(3).

These variances are conditioned upon the following conditions:

1. The Applicant must comply with the testimony of the Applicant at the public hearing on June 15, 2011.
2. The proposed shed must be at least 8 ft. from the rear property and at least 4 ft. from the side property line and measure no greater than 8 ft. by 10 ft.

Decision Dated: July 15, 2011

**UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP  
ZONING HEARING BOARD**

---

Robert J. Montemayor - Chairman

---

Mark S. DePillis, Esq. – Vice Chairman

---

Brad Murphy - Secretary

**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.