FRUITA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
Date: Thursday, February 27, 2020
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Place: Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 325 E. Aspen Avenue, Fruita, CO.

The following item will be presented at this public hearing of the Fruita Board of Adjustment for their consideration. If you have an interest in the item on the agenda, please call (970) 858-0786 or come to the Planning & Development Department office located at 325 E. Aspen Avenue to review the information in the file. If you have a concern with an item on the agenda, your appearance at the hearing is encouraged to ensure your concerns are accurately represented or you can write a letter outlining your concerns and submit it to the Planning & Development Department prior to the meeting. Physically disadvantaged persons, who wish to obtain information or need assistance in attending the public hearing, may call (970) 858-0786. The hearing impaired may call Relay Colorado at 1-800-659-2656, or visit our website: www.fruita.org

General Rules
Land use public hearings are similar to a court proceeding. Proper procedures will ensure a fair hearing for all and allow the land use items to be acted on in a timely manner. In the interests of time and to assure a fair hearing for everyone, the following rules will be followed:

1. There will generally be a 15-minute presentation (maximum) by the applicant.
2. Individual speakers will normally be limited to 3 minutes each.
   (Additional comments may be submitted in writing.)
3. The applicant will then have a rebuttal time of approximately 5 minutes.

Each person wishing to speak will raise their hand and be recognized by the Chair and asked to come forward and speak into the microphone stating their name and address. The purpose of a land use hearing is to have the facts of a case presented in a manner that will assist the decision-makers in making a fair, legal, and complete decision. The hearing is a fact-finding forum by unbiased decision-makers. Unruly behavior, such as booing, hissing, cheering, applause, verbal outbursts, or other inappropriate behavior, detract from the hearing and will not be permitted.

A. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   November 17, 2016

E. HEARING ITEMS

Application # 2020-05
Application Name: Fessler Variance
Application Type: Variance
Property Owner: Michael Fessler
Representative: Clayton Homes; David Mahovsky
Location: 230 Honeysuckle Circle
Zone: Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Description: This is a request for a variance on the east setback from 20’ to 12’ in the Red Cliffs Subdivision.

F. ADJOURNMENT
RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. THE HEARING IS OPENED BY THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
   The Chair reads the item on the agenda.

2. THE STAFF PRESENTS THE STAFF REPORT
   The Fruita City staff present their reports.

3. THE PETITIONER SUMMARIZES THE PROJECT
   The petitioner or his/her representative is asked to present the proposal. Presentations should be brief and to the point, but covering all of the main aspects of the project.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS
   People speaking should step up to the microphone and speak clearly, stating their name and address. They should be brief and to the point and try not to repeat what others have said. The Chair asks for those in favor of the item to speak and then those opposed to the item to speak. Any others who wish to speak are then asked to come up to the microphone.

5. REBUTTAL
   The Chair asks for the petitioner’s rebuttal. During this brief time, the petitioner should address the major questions raised by the public and the Board.

6. THE HEARING IS CLOSED TO PUBLIC COMMENTS AND THE ITEM IS DISCUSSED
   The Chair closes the public hearing to public comments. No further comments from the public are allowed at this time. The Board discusses the item and may ask the petitioner, staff or members of the public to come back to the microphone to answer questions.

7. VOTE
   The Chair asks the Board for a motion on an item. After the motion is seconded, the Chair asks for a discussion on the motion. The motion may be amended and if it is amended, the Board votes on whether to accept the amendment. After discussion and consideration of any amendments, the Board votes on the motion. If the motion fails, or if there is a tie vote, another motion may be made and voted on using the same procedure. In addition to recommending an item be approved, approved with conditions or denied, the Board may also table an item or continue an item to a later date.
A. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL
Chairman Bruce Bonar called the Board of Adjustment public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. Board of Adjustment members in attendance were: Bruce Bonar, Jim Morris, Cullen Purser and Lisa Connors.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Lisa Connors led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Bruce Bonar- We have an agenda before us, are there any additions, subtractions or amendments?

Cullen Purser- I move that we approve the agenda as it is written.

Lisa Connors- Second.
4 Yes Votes; Motion Passes

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Bruce Bonar- The next item before us is approve of the minutes from August 11, 2014. Are there any comments? No comments. Can we have a motion to approve the minutes?

Jim Morris- I make a motion that we approve the minutes.

Lisa Connors- Second.
4 Yes Votes; Motion Passes.

E. HEARING ITEMS
Bruce Bonar read the application number and name.

Application #: 2016-25
Application Name: Redcliff Variance
Application: Variance
Property Owner: Mary Huseman
Representative: Norrice Derner
Location: 239 Red Cliffs Drive
Zone: Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Discription: This is a request for approval of a 6 foot variance to the minimum required front and rear setbacks required in the Red Cliffs Subdivision PUD Guide.

Bruce Bonar asked the applicant to give their presentation.

Charles Reams gave a presentation on the hearing item. Mr. Reams described his relationship with the property owner, he is the conservator for Brandy and Alexander Steele who are minors that will be living on the property. Mary Huseman is the guardian for the children. Mary Huseman deeded the lot to the conservatorship and Mr. Reams being the conservator, purchased a mobile home to put on the lot so Brandy and Alexander Steele would have a place to live. Mr. Reams talked about
how he and Norrice Derner, his assistant, found out that the mobil home was in violation of the setbacks in the neighborhood. Mr. Reams went on to discuss the size of the lot and the size of the mobil home and how the mobil home is 6 feet too big for the lot in order to meet the required setbacks which is why they are asking for a variance to the setbacks. Mr. Reams gave some examples of how many setback violations already exist in the Red Cliffs neighborhood. Mr. Reams counted 12 setback violations based on the city’s GIS map. Mr. Reams feels that with so many violations of setbacks in this neighborhood, approving this variance request wouldn’t create a detriment to this area/neighborhood.

Dahna Raugh gave the Staff presentation and went through the approval criteria that must be met for approval of a variance application. Mrs. Raugh stated that this variance request would not be a detriment to the public good and does not impair the intent and purpose of the Land Use Code and Master Plan. Mrs. Raugh said that the lot in question is larger than most lots in the Red Cliffs subdivision and does not present any hardships, there is nothing unique about it. Mrs. Raugh said that although staff certainly understands that the applicants are in a tough spot with a house that is too big for the lot it is intended to occupy, there does not appear to be a difficulty or hardship related to the land that would make the requested variance reasonable and necessary. Mrs. Raugh went through the forth approval criteria mentioned in the Staff Report and said that the actions by the applicants/property owners have created the violation of the setback requirements. They were the ones who put to big of a house on this lot that it wasn’t intended to occupy. Mrs. Raugh agrees that the requested 6 foot variance would be the minimum needed to solve the problem. Mrs. Raugh said that this application does not meet the approval criteria that must be met so Staff is recommending denial of the variance request.

REBUTTAL:

Mr. Reams understands that it is Staff’s job to use the Land Use Code in order to make their decision and recommend denial of this application. Mr. Reams feels that under the circumstances, this variance request should be granted due to the conditions that already exist in the neighborhood. He also feels that it would be of no suprise to anyone in the neighborhood if the variance was granted.

PUBLIC HEARING:

No comments.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Jim Morris said he drove through the neighborhood a few times and feels that granting the variance request wouldn’t cause any issues. Feels that no one in the neighborhood would ever know a variance would have been granted. Mr. Morris feels that this is a case where the Board of Adjustment can make a decision on something without having any negative impact on anybody.

Lisa Connors doesn’t see how approving the variance would adversely effect the appearance of the neighborhood.

Cullen Purser would have a concern if it were to effect the neighbors but feels that it will not. Mr. Purser feels that the applicants should move the home back as far as they can so it doesn’t give the appearance of being so close to the street.

Bruce Bonar agrees with all the Board members. Mr. Bonar said the the Board of Adjustment can approve a variance request if it meets the approval criteria set out by the Fruita Land Use Code. Mr. Bonar went through the 5 approval criteria that must be met (see staff report). Mr. Bonar feels that there is a hardship although it is not a hardship of the land so Mr. Bonar feels that the applicants meet criteria number 3. Mr. Bonar feels that the applicants are the minors and they were acted for on the behalf of others who put a mobil home that was too big on the lot which it couldn’t meet the setbacks. Mr. Bonar feels that there is enough to allow the Board of Adjustment to approve this variance request.

Jim Morris made a motion to approve the variance.
Cullen Purser seconded the motion.

4 Yes Votes; Variance is approved.

Other Business:

None.

G. ADJOURNMENT

Bruce Bonar- I declare us adjourned. (Meeting adjourned at 7:25pm)
Application # 2020-05
Application Name: Fessler Variance
Application Type Variance
Property Owner: Michael Fessler
Representative: Clayton Homes; David Mahovsky
Location: 230 Honeysuckle Circle
Zone: Planned Unit Development (PUD)
Request: This is a request for a variance on the east setback from 20’ to 12’ in the Red Cliffs Subdivision.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This is a request for approval of an 8 foot variance to the streetside setbacks on the east side of the subject property within the Red Cliffs Subdivision. The property is located at 230 Honeysuckle Circle (Lot 15 of Block 2) within the the Red Cliffs Mobile Home Village Subdivision which was platted in 1981 (Plat is attached with Staff Report). The current dwelling unit measures approximately 975 square feet and currently meets all the required setbacks for this zone district. The proposed dwelling unit is approximately 1,500 square feet.

The property is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) and a PUD zone is defined as a zone which allows for modification of the normal use, density, size or other zoning restrictions for a particular development. As part of the PUD zoning approval process, a PUD Guide is required to be provided which identifies the modifications to the otherwise applicable zoning requirements. PUD Guides should identify setbacks, density, or any other uses within the subdivision. According to the PUD Guide and since the property is on a corner lot the following setbacks apply:

- Front – 20 feet (includes all street frontages);
- Side – 5 feet;
- Rear – 10 feet.

From the information provided with the application it appears that all setbacks can be met other than the street side setback on the east side of the property.

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING:

All surrounding land is zoned PUD for the mobile home subdivision and all surrounding land use is single family residential. There is a Community Residential (CR) zone farther to the east and a Community Services & Recreational zone farther to the southwest.
REVIEW OF APPLICABLE LAND USE CODE REQUIREMENTS:

17.13.050 VARIANCES

A. Applicability. A variance is an exception from the numerical requirements of this Title excluding the numerical standards contained in Chapter 11 and Chapter 41. Use variances are not permitted.

B. Procedure. Variances are reviewed and acted upon at a public hearing before the Board of Adjustment with the exception of variances for signs which are reviewed and acted upon at a public hearing before the City Council as per Chapter 41.

C. Approval Criteria. The Board of Adjustment may approve a variance request upon finding that the variance application meets or can meet the following approval criteria:

1. The variance granted is without substantial detriment to the public good and does not impair the intent and purposes of this Title and the Master Plan, including the specific regulation in question;

   Setbacks, especially front or street side setbacks are important and are required for a number of reasons, some of which include off street parking and utilities. Staff does not see a detriment to the public good and does not believe that the intent of purposes of the Land Use Code and Master Plan would be impaired by the requested variance. With that said, it appears that this criteria can be met.
2. By reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, depth, or shape of a legal lot of record at the time of enactment of this Title, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of such property, the strict application of the subject regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the owner of such property;

The legal lot does not appear to have any exceptional narrowness, shallowness, depth, or shape based on the time of enactment of this Title (Land Use Code). The lot was platted with the intent for a mobile home. Additionally, there does not appear to be any exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of such property that would prohibit the applicant to replace the dwelling unit with one of similar size. Most lots, if not all, within this subdivision are not bound to any exceptional topographic conditions. It does not appear this criteria has been met or can be met.

3. A variance from such strict application is reasonable and necessary so as to relieve such difficulties or hardships, and the variance will not injure the land value or use of, or prevent the access of light and air to, the adjacent properties or to the area in general or will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public;

If granting this variance is the minimum required to move forward, Staff does not believe that the new dwelling unit would injure the land value, prevent access of light and air to adjacent properties or to the area in general and will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public.

It should be noted that if a variance is granted, the PUD Guide still requires at least 2 off street parking spaces. These spaces are currently provided on the southernmost portion of the lot. From the Site Plan submitted, it appears that the existing parking spaces would decrease from approximately 23 feet in length to 12 feet in length from the edge of sidewalk. Staff does not support this modification and although not technically part of the Variance request, it does increase the chance of creating unnecessary issues with off street parking. Thus, playing a factor into this approval criteria from a safety standpoint. Additionally, Staff does not support these parking spaces being relocated to the north side of the property because of clear sight issues along the north side of Honeysuckle Circle.

This criteria can be met if the variance does not create a safety issue.

4. The circumstances found to constitute a hardship are not due to the result or general conditions throughout the zone, was not induced by any action of the applicant, and cannot be practically corrected, and;

It appears that from the project narrative, the hardship found by the property owner is the condition of the mobile home and that the property owner has already obtained financing on a new mobile home without checking the setbacks for the particular zone. This
hardship does not appear to be a result of the general conditions throughout the zone. However, the hardship was partly due to the action of the applicant. It could be difficult and costly to the applicant to undo their own hardship because the project narrative states they have already obtained financing for a particular dwelling unit. It’s unclear to Staff if the poor living conditions of the current dwelling unit were a result of their own doing or just a result of time. However, it does appear that the property owner could have averted a Variance request prior to obtaining financing on a new dwelling unit. Because the hardship was induced by an action of the applicant/property owner, this criteria has not been met.

5. **The variance granted is the minimum necessary to alleviate the exceptional difficulty or hardship.**

   From what has been submitted, the Variance request from a 20 foot setback to a 12 foot setback on the east side of the property appears to be the minimum necessary.

   Although the requested variance can be considered to meet three of the approval criteria that must be met, a majority of the criteria have not been met.

D. **Final Decision.** Any decision of the Board of Adjustment shall be final, from which an appeal may be taken to a court of competent jurisdiction, as provided in accordance with Section 31-23-307, C.R.S.

E. **Reconsideration of Denial of Variance.** Whenever the Board of Adjustment denies an application for a variance, such action may not be reconsidered by the Board for one (1) year unless the applicant clearly demonstrates that circumstances affecting the subject property have substantially changed, or new information is available that could not with reasonable diligence have been presented at the previous hearing.

**REVIEW COMMENTS:**

There are no review comments for this variance request. This variance request was reviewed by city staff but is not required to be reviewed by outside agencies such as Ute Water or the Grand Valley Drainage District because the variance does not affect outside agencies.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No written public comments have been received regarding this variance application.

**LEGAL NOTICE:**

Pursuant to section 17.01.130 Public Notices of the Fruita Land Use Code.

Paper – 2/9/2020
Property – 2/5/2020
Postcards – 2/5/2020
This is a copy of the Notice of Public Hearing postcards mailed to property owners within 350 feet of the subject property. Pursuant to Section 17.01.130 (A) (4) of the Land Use Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Fruita Board of Adjustment will hold a public hearing **Thursday, February 27, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.** at the Fruita Civic Center, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 325 E. Aspen Avenue. If you have an interest in an item on the agenda, please call 858-0786 or come to the Planning & Development Department office located at 325 E. Aspen Avenue, Fruita, CO to review the information in the file. Your appearance at this public hearing is encouraged to ensure your concerns are accurately represented or you can write a letter outlining your concerns and submit it to the Planning & Development Department.

The Board will consider:

- **Application #**: 2020-05
- **Application Name**: Fessler Variance
- **Application Type**: Variance
- **Property Owner**: Michael Fessler
- **Representative**: Clayton Homes; David Mahovsky
- **Location**: 230 Honeysuckle Circle
- **Zone**: Planned Unit Development (PUD)

This is a request for a variance on the east setback from 20' to 12' in the Red Cliffs Subdivision.

Physically disadvantaged persons who wish to obtain information or need assistance in attending the Public Hearing, may call (970) 858-0786, the hearing impaired may call Relay Colorado at 1-800-659-2656, or visit our website: www.fruita.org

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Because the variance request does not meet the approval criteria that must be met, staff recommends **denial** of the requested variance.

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING DATE:** February 27, 2020
PUD GUIDES
FOR
RED CLIFFS MOBILE HOME VILLAGE #1 & #2
AND LITTLE RED CLIFFS SUBDIVISION

The following are the zoning requirements for the three separate PUD zones covering the Red Cliff's subdivisions. Items not addressed by this PUD Guide are required to follow the Community Residential zone (including all changes over time). This is for items such as fences, home occupations, keeping of animals, etc.

Included with this PUD Guide is a summary of the review of the information used to create this PUD Guide. The recorded plats for Red Cliffs Mobile Home Village, Little Red Cliff Subdivision, and Red Cliffs Mobile Home Village No. 2 serve as the Final PUD Plans for these PUD zones.

The following apply to all three PUD zones:

- Each residential lot is permitted one mobile home, and appurtenances (like an attached carport or porch and stairs), and can be used only as a single family dwelling (skirting required).

- Only one accessory building (like a shed) is permitted for each mobile home lot.

- Two off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit are required.

- One recreational vehicle is permitted to be parked on each residential lot (in compliance with the Municipal Code.

Red Cliffs Mobile Home Village (#1):

- Building setbacks which are applicable to the primary building are: Front - 20 feet (including all street frontages); Side - 5 feet; Rear - 10 feet. The setbacks for accessory buildings follow the standards of the Community Residential zone.

- It should be noted that 287 Red Cliffs Drive has a front and side setback variance that affects the lot to the east also. The front setback can be 19'-6" and the east setback can be 4'-6". The lot directly east requires a west side setback of 5'-5".

- Permanent foundations are not required.

- Uses permitted on Lot B (the lot abutting Highway 340 directly south of Red Cliffs Drive) are identified in the letter dated May 8, 2001, and signed by Bennett Boeschenstein (included as part of this PUD Guide). The only issue with this letter is that the City will not require changes to the covenants in order to use this lot for the uses listed in the letter; the commercial lot can be used for limited commercial development, or it can be used for a residential mobile home lot as stated in the
letter. Any subdivision of the commercial lot or uses not identified in the May 8\textsuperscript{th} letter will require a PUD zone amendment.

**Little Red Cliffs Subdivision:**

-The required building setbacks are the same setbacks as Red Cliffs Mobile Home Village \#1. Primary Building: Front - 20 feet (including all street frontages); Side - 5 feet; Rear - 10 feet. The setbacks for accessory buildings follow the standards of the Community Residential zone.

-Maintenance on the Highway 340 side of the rear yard fences is the collective responsibility of the owners of the lots abutting Highway 340 (these lots extend west past the existing fence, almost to the sidewalk)

-Permanent foundations are required.

-The east 20 feet of lots 1 & 3 are reserved for a common driveway for lots 1, 2 & 3 and no structures or parking is allowed in this shared driveway area.

**Red Cliffs Mobile Home Village No.2:**

-Building setbacks which are applicable to the primary building (not accessory buildings): Front - 15 feet (including all street frontages except as identified below); Side - 5 feet; Rear - 5 feet. Except lots 1-10, Block 2 have a 10 foot rear setback. The setbacks for accessory buildings follow the standards of the Community Residential zone.

-Block 3, Lot 1 and Block 4, Lot 13 (148 & 149 Hollyberry Way) are required to have a 20-foot setback from 17 ¼ Road (Mesa Street).

-Permanent foundations are required.

-The second phase of development will require City Council approval though the public hearing process before construction can begin on public improvements and before Planning Clearances are issued.

**Impact Fees:**

With the exception of the second phase of Red Cliffs Mobile Village \#2, the following impact fees have been paid: Transportation Impact Fee; Drainage Impact Fee; Chip/Seal fee; Parks, Open Space and Trails fee.

Vacant lots require payment of the School Land Dedication Fee in effect at the time of Planning Clearance. It should be noted that there are only three vacant lots, all of which are located in Red Cliffs Mobile Village \#2. These are 148 & 149 Hollyberry Way and 189 Honeysuckle Circle.
LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Project Name: Fessler Home
Project Location: 230 Honeysuckle Cir
Current Zoning District:
Tax Parcel Number(s): 2697-292-04-015
Requested Zone:
Number of Acres: 0.8
Project Type: New manufactured home

Property Owner: Michael R. Fessler
Address: 230 Honeysuckle Cir
City/State/Zip: Fruita CO 81521
Phone: 970-260-9584
Fax:
E-mail: Liquidfox315@gmail.com

Developer: Clayton Homes
Contact: David Mahovsky
Address: 671 23 Rd
City/State/Zip: GJ CO 81505
Phone: 970-260-8815
Fax:
E-mail: david.mahovsky@claytonhomes.com

Please designate a representative as the coordinator for this application. The representative should attend all conferences/meetings and communicate all information to the property owners.

Owner Rep: Clayton Homes
Contact: David Mahovsky
Address: 671 23 Rd
City/State/Zip: GJ CO 81505
Phone: 970-260-8815
Fax:
E-mail: david.mahovsky@claytonhomes.com

This Notice is application authorizes the owner's representative. If designated, to act on behalf of the property owners regarding this application.

The above information is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name of Legal Owner: Michael R. Fessler
Signature: ___________________________
Date: 1-24-2020

Name of Legal Owner: ___________________________
Signature: ___________________________
Date: ___________________________

Name of Legal Owner: ___________________________
Signature: ___________________________
Date: ___________________________

STATE OF COLORADO
COUNTY OF MESA

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 24th day of January, 2020,
by Michael R. Fessler
My Commission expires: 06-12-2020
Notary Public

Valerie A. Domet
Notary Public

C:\Users\hemphill\Desktop\NEW CHECKLISTS-2017\Preliminary Plan\Land Development Application-2009.doc
Michael Fessler & Dominick Brodine
230 Honeysuckle Cir
Fruita, Co 81521

Project Narrative for Setback Variance

The purpose of this overall project is to replace and upgrade the existing residential home. Current setbacks do not allow a home any bigger than the existing single wide trailer. Specifically, this variance request will reduce the setback on the East side of the property from 20’ to 12’.

The current home on the property is liveable but degrading quickly. The home structure has been compromised from previous overwatering by the neighbor. Specifically, the frame (steel I beam) has been twisted from the supports moving. As a result, the home has floor and wall movement issues in the end bedroom. Throughout the rest of the home the sidewalls of the home shake every time the front or rear door is opened and closed. Due to the age of the home and a swamp cooler that was used prior to my inheriting/moving into the home, I have had to put a support post in the kitchen to stop the ceiling from falling in. There is very little insulation in the home and despite replacing the furnace and windows, the furnace cycles on and off about every 20 minutes or so. The kitchen and bathroom cabinets are, literally, falling apart and need to be replaced. While I could go on, I believe you get the picture. From continually spending time and money to “plug the holes of the dam ready to burst” the issues have led to quality of life issues and, thus, the need to upgrade the home.

The loan that I have closed on will allow me to upgrade the home and, in-turn, upgrade an older neighborhood as well. Unfortunately, the current setbacks (and the property being on a corner) will only allow a single wide mobile home of the same size to go back on to the property. The home I am trying to purchase is a new double section manufactured home. While the home will intrude into the setbacks it will not affect or impede, in any way the neighboring properties, traffic, public safety and/or public health.

Since this issue has come to light, I have also attempted and been unable to secure financing for a singlewide. Overall, the financing for a double section home is, not only, easier to locate a lender and qualify for, but my only option available for financing, at this time.

Overall, I am willing to work out a solution that is acceptable to everyone involved – to include moving the home further north to create more parking (if that is an issue for the planning department). I am just trying to improve the living conditions for myself and my roommates, for many years to come. I am not a “flipper” just trying to purchase this home only to turn around to sell it for a profit.

Thank you for your consideration in granting this variance.