

PUBLIC NOTICE

Application No: LU18-0199

Applicant: Robert & Karin Mattson

Proposal: FRONT YARD SETBACK VARIANCE REQUEST
at 1766 N JACKSON AVE - variance for minor expansion of existing
attached garage at a single family residence.



To submit comments or obtain information contact:
Planning and Development Services
747 Market Street, Room 345, Tacoma, WA 98402
(253) 591-5030

www.tacomapermits.org









1766 N Jackson Ave
Parcel: 5930000350
Robert & Karin Mattson

Narrative

Proposal: A front yard setback variance, for an existing single family dwelling, to be located 5.5 feet off the front (east) property line as part of an addition. The site is located within the "R-1 VSD" Single-Family Dwelling & View Sensitive Overlay District, where a 25-foot front yard setback is required. The 25-foot back yard setback, 7.5 foot side yard setback and 25-foot height limit will not be impacted by this addition.

1. What are the hardships on the property, such as size, shape, location, or other conditions that make it difficult to meet zoning standards? How will zoning goals still be met with the request (such as maintaining space between structures to prevent fire hazards and ensuring yard space for neighbor privacy)? The response should clearly describe what the specific hardship is, how the applicant did not create this hardship, and why strict application of the zoning code would be unreasonable due to this hardship.

Response: The home was originally built in 1958 and the constraints are not the result of actions of the applicant. The front yard setback codes have since been changed to 25 feet. The existing garage needs to be enlarged to more modern dimensions and the narrow room at the rear of the house is not reasonably functional. Since the addition is at the narrow end of the lot, our proposed increase of 12 feet to the East (towards the street) increases the number of feet that the house would be out of compliance. The house would be approximately 5.5 feet from the front yard property line. However, the garage and narrow 7 foot room inside the house would become more functional. The neighbor's house to the South is approximately 7 feet from the street and many other houses on our street are within the 25 foot setback. The back yard setback of 25 feet (west) and a steep slope precludes putting additional square feet back there without an additional variance. Extending the house toward the slope is just not reasonably feasible. Additionally, the view is one of the most important attributes of the property so extending back (west) would reduce the back yard and the enjoyment of the view. An addition to the rear of the house would also block a portion of the view of our neighbor to the south.

We are requesting a reasonable accommodation pursuant to allow the addition of 440 sq ft to enlarge the "Garage" and "Small Room" at the rear of the house to make them reasonably useable. The "Garage" would have 108 sq ft of non-living space added. The "Garage" dimension would increase from approximately 18' wide x 20' deep (360 sq ft) to 18' wide x 26' deep (468 sq ft) deep. The "Other Room" would be become a "Family Room" by adding 108 sq ft of living space. The room dimension would increase from approximately 18' x 7' (126 sq ft) to 18' x 13' (234 sq ft).

2. Is the request the minimum necessary to afford relief from the hardship that exists on your property? Explain why each aspect of the project is the minimum needed to afford relief from the code.

Response: Yes, the requested setback reduction on the East side of the house is the minimum necessary for a functional Garage and Family Room inside the house. The setback reduction provides enough space to allow for a standard-size garage which can accommodate the length of today's full size pickup truck. The general observation, of the area, on the Tacoma GIS/Dart website show many structures, mostly garages, are currently infringing into the required 25 foot front yard setback. The requested variance does not go beyond the minimum to afford relief.

3. How does the project allow for a reasonable use of the property? How does the project allow for a more environmentally sensitive property design or construction than would otherwise be allowed? How do the affected neighbors feel about the project? Would approval of the request grant special privilege that is not enjoyed by other properties in the area?

Response: The project allows for reasonable use because the project is a minimal increase of the existing structure and the remodel will update the exterior with a more aesthetic architectural design, while not increasing roof height or obstructing current views from the neighbors. The shorter driveway would still be greater than car length, so guests would be able to park in the driveway and not on the street. The homes have been there for 60 years. The proposal does not change the environmental impact of the property. The proposal will not grant special privileges.

In past years the neighbors have been in the house and understand the need to enlarge the garage and “other room” at the rear of the house. They agree with the changes that we have proposed to them.

By changing the direction of the gable at the south end of the house it will slightly increase the view for the neighbor across the street. The amount of impervious surface will not increase. The addition will replace a portion of a pre-existing driveway.

4. How would the project be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? How would the project improve the character of the neighborhood? Describe specific aspects of the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood characteristics that would be consistent with or improved by the project.


Response: The project adheres to the current zoning regulations and roof height restrictions. It would improve the character of the neighborhood by updating the exterior of the house and would break up the completely flat face of the entire length of the house. A larger garage would allow both home owner’s vehicles to park inside, and not have to park in the driveway or on the street. Enlarging the back room will make it more usable.

5. How would the project be beneficial to the public interest? Describe specific aspects of the proposal and how it would be beneficial to the public’s interest.

Response: The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and will not have a detrimental effect on neighboring properties as the addition will be in-keeping with the rest of the home in height, bulk, and scale. The quality improvement and increased functionality, the residence will improve the look of the neighborhood and the view of our neighbor across the street. The proposal will not cause a detrimental effect to the public interest.

6. Is the intent of the variance request to prevent development cost increases? Is the intent of your variance request to allow the project to follow a standardized corporate design? If not, demonstrate how the project does not follow a standard corporate design and how the purpose of your request is not primarily to avoid increased development costs.

Response: The intent of the variance is to create a functional garage while also creating more functional space on the interior of the house by increasing the 7 foot wide “other room” behind the garage to 13 feet wide. This room is on the west side of the home with the view. The addition to the house will reflect the surrounding neighborhood designs while updating the 1958 house that has not been renovated at all during the last 60 years. The cost of the addition will not be lower due to the variance.



- Existing House Foundation Perimeter
- Addition Foundation Perimeter
- Property Line
- Street Curb

1766 N Jackson Ave
 Parcel: 5930000350
 Robert & Karin Mattson