

## Justification & Compatibility Statement

### Variances:

1. *Explain what circumstances or conditions apply to this property that may not apply to other properties in this area of zoning district (example: size, shape, topography, location or surroundings).*

Our house on 614 N. Orange was built in 1949. It sits on two land parcels, 135-24-023 and 135-24-024. 135-24-024 is the main parcel size of 60.5' wide by 130.59' deep. This is where the most of the house sits. 135-24-023 is the secondary parcel that is 30.25' wide by 130.60' deep. Part of our house and our driveway sit on this parcel. The driveway that sits on this partial has been there since the beginning. The sidewalk that runs by our house is stamped 1963 and appears to be the original sidewalk, curb, and driveway from the beginning. The driveway to our house is unique. It sits on the south edge of our property and is a drive thru to the backyard of our house. Our house has a garage door that opens and allows us to drive thru to our backyard where we have a three-car carport. The garage pull thru is part of our house and has been there as long as we have known. Our driveway and pull thru garage sit on the south edge of our property and does not have the current 7' minimum side yard setback that current city zoning RS-9 requires. We have lived in the home for fourteen years and the previous owner had been there a lot longer than that. Our home was built 70 years ago at a time when city zoning and codes were different than today's codes. The street we live has a vast array of houses. The oldest home was built in 1920 and the newest home was built in 2005. Because of this vast difference in the ages of homes on our street, you see a wide variety of home sizes and property sizes. There are several homes that sit on multiple lots of land like ours. The house behind us sits on three different parcels. This also creates challenges for our street because not all houses meet the current city zoning standards.

2. *Explain how the special circumstances or conditions cited in Question #1 originated. Are these conditions pre-existing and not self-imposed? Why or why not?*

We are wanting to add onto our home. We love the area and would like to stay in our home. We are wanting to add onto the north side of our home, the side that is currently conforming to current city ordinance. We are leaving the south side of our home as is. This is the side that has our drive thru garage. We believe our driveway that led to the carport that was then turned into a drive thru garage was built many years before we purchased the home in 2005. It appears that the three-car carport in the

back was built sometime after 1986. I requested a permit look up with the City of Mesa and it appears the carport was built in 1990 according to the permit that was pulled. This date also corresponds to satellite imagery. The driveway to the home that leads to the drive thru garage appear to have been there since the house was built around 1949. The nonconforming conditions are pre-existing and not self-imposed.

3. *Explain how strict compliance of the Zoning or Sign Ordinance would deprive the property of uses or development options available to other properties in the same zoning district.*

For our property to be in compliance with current RS-9 code, would mean that we would need to demolish our drive way, drive thru garage, and carport to allow the 7' of side yard setback on the south side of our home. The whole house is set up around the drive way and carport. Anything we go to do on our house that requires a permit from the City will not be currently granted to us because of how the house was set up in 1949 when it was built. We can't change the history of the home but we can make sure that as we change the home, that the changes we make will meet the current zoning ordinances. We are asking that the City to allow us to keep the house as is with the nonconforming south side of our house while allowing us to add onto the north side of our home keeping to current city zoning ordinances.

4. *Explain why the requested variance will not grant special privilege or unusual favor to this property or development over other sites with similar circumstances and zoning.*

If the City of Mesa grants a variance, this will not be seen as a special privilege or unusual favor to our property. There are other houses in the neighborhood that have similar situations. We have provided photos of a few of these to Evan Balmer. These houses do not meet the current side yard setback requirements. Our property is not looked at as a special circumstance. This is true with the fact that our house sits on two parcels of land. There are other house in the neighborhood that have the same situation, including the house north, south, and west of us.

We love that our neighborhood is full of diverse houses with every one being unique. We feel like this addition to our home would enhance our home and the neighborhood in a good way. We just have a unique situation with our home that has been this way from the beginning, 70 years ago. We are simply wanting to add on to our home and will work with the city to make sure it adheres to the current city zoning ordinances.