ZONING HEARING BOARD OF UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP

APPLICATION NO. 2011-05	:	**HEARING DATE:** April 6, 2011
	:	
APPLICATION OF: Ralph & Barbara DiCianno	:	**DECISION DATE:** May 18, 2011
	:	
PROPERTY: 509 Dartmouth Drive	:	
	:	
Upper Merion Township	:	

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP ZONING HEARING BOARD

The Applicant, Ralph and Barbara DiCianno, (hereinafter referred to as the "Applicant"), filed an application requesting a variance to Section 165-37.C in order to construct an addition that will encroach into 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 April 6, 2010 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 Ralph and Barbara DiCianno, 509 Dartmouth Drive, King of Prussia, PA 19406.
2. The Applicant is the legal owner of the subject property.
3. The property is located at 509 Dartmouth Drive, King of Prussia, PA 19406.
4. The Applicant was not represented by an attorney.

5. The property is zoned “R-2” Residential.

6. The lot is approximately 9,700 sq. ft.

7. The Applicant is proposing an addition to an existing single family dwelling.

8. The addition will comprise a bedroom, bathroom, mudroom and garage on the main floor.

9. The Applicant wants the addition to house an elderly parent.

10. The property has an irregular shape, thereby, necessitating the need for a variance.

11. The Applicant is required to have a 10 ft. side yard setback and the Applicant is proposing 5 ft. from the side property line.

12. Only one quarter of the proposed addition will encroach into the 10 ft. required side yard, thereby, making the encroachment *de minimus*.

13. The Applicant is locating the addition in the place proposed because of significant slopes to the rear of the property. The Applicant also has better storm water management with the addition being erected in the location proposed.

14. The neighbor most affected by the project does not oppose the project, however, the parties have agreed to have the Applicant replace a crumbling stone wall that is in between the neighbor most affected and the Applicant. This board can not condition the approval of replacing the crumbling wall, because the wall is not on the property that is the subject of the application, however, the Applicant has agreed to fix the wall.

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

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Applicant, Ralph and Barbara DiCianno, filed an application requesting a variance to Section 165-37.C in order to construct an addition that will encroach into 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 an addition to an existing single family dwelling in order to accommodate an elderly parent. The addition will encroach 5 ft. into the required 10 ft. minimum side yard setback, however, the encroachment will only be one corner of the property, thereby, making the encroachment *de minimus*. The property has an irregular shape with steep slopes in the backyard, therefore, the proposed location of the addition is the most logical and efficient location on the parcel. The selected location of the proposed addition will also help an existing storm water management issue for the subject parcel. The only resident that testified at the hearing was concerned about the repair and replacement of a stone wall, however, the stone wall is not on the subject property, therefore, the Zoning Hearing Board can not condition approval on replacement of the stone wall. There were no other residents who testified at the hearing.

The Applicant is requesting a dimensional variance rather than a use variance, therefore, the standards of the Hertzberg case are applicable to the case at bar. The Applicant sufficiently satisfied all the criteria of the Hertzberg case, therefore, the variance 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 a variance to Section 165-37.C in order to construct an addition that will encroach into the required side yard setback. This variance is conditioned upon the Applicant's compliance with the testimony of the Applicant at the public hearing on April 6, 2011.

Decision Dated: May 18, 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.