

 City of Glendale Development Services Department Planning Division	
<input type="checkbox"/> Failed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conditionally Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Approved	
VAR24-17 Narrative	
Sydney Tinella BY	5/9/2025 DATE

Variance Request Narrative
VAR24-17
8606 N 56th Dr.
APN: 148-19-230

First Submittal: October 2, 2024
Second Submittal: March 10, 2025
Third Submittal: May 7, 2025

The property owner is requesting a variance to reduce the rear and south side setback to zero feet and to increase the lot coverage maximum from 40% to 45.7%.

This variance is for an existing RV shade structure located on the southwest corner of the property. The structure is 522 square feet, 14 feet in height, and constructed with non-combustible material. The property is zoned R1-6 and the lot size is 6,713 square feet.

The request meets the Variance Criteria per Section 35.6.209 of the Unified Development Code:

1. Existing unique circumstances or conditions on the subject property that prevent the universal application of the zoning standard.

The lot is one of the smallest in the Pace West subdivision, creating a unique condition. With the size and dimensions of the lot, an adequately sized shade structure for a standard 33’ long RV cannot be built to meet the setback standards or lot coverage standards for detached structures in the R1-6 zoning district. Similarly, an RV shade structure that meets the standards for attached structures cannot be built on this lot.

The proposed 0-foot perimeter setback is the minimum setback needed for an adequately sized RV structure on this lot. Per the code standards, the perimeter setback is determined by the height of the detached structure; therefore, the setback should be three feet for structures up to seven feet in height, and for every foot over seven feet, the setback shall increase by two feet. The height of the shade structure is greater than seven feet to accommodate the height of a typical 33’ long RV (approximately 13.5’ tall); however, the required setback would not be feasible on this lot due to the lot size dimensions.

The size of the lot and the existing lot coverage also present limitations to the size of any new structure built on the property. The home itself comprises a 36.35% lot coverage as it is 2,440 square feet under the roof. The lot coverage maximum in R1-6 is 40%, allowing 245 square feet of improvements to the property, which is insufficient for an RV shade structure.

Additionally, the property has an 8-foot easement in the rear of the property per the subdivision plat. The plat specifies that “no structures of any kind be constructed or placed within the easements...”; thereby preventing any additions along the western property boundary. The location of this easement therefore limits the location of a detached

structure on the property. Despite this, the property owner could only accommodate the detached structure on the southwestern corner of their property, where the easement is located. This is the only area of the property where there is available space for a detached structure and access to an existing gate, which is necessary for secure RV storage. The placement of the structure could not be placed anywhere else on the property without encroaching into the front yard.

Through an investigation by the property owner, it was found that there is a private company utility within the easement. The owner has reached out to the utility providers and has received a “letter of no objection” from Century Link (Appendix A) and SRP (Appendix B) for the encroachment of the shade structure on the easement. The letters include a stipulation that if utility facilities are found and/or damaged within the area, the property owner will be responsible for the cost of relocation and repair of such facilities. The property owner agrees to this stipulation.

2. The literal interpretation of the Unified Development Code would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district.

Other property owners in the subdivision, which have the same R1-6 zoning, have constructed similar detached shade structures. Thus, applying this interpretation of the UDC to the property would deprive the property owner of having a similar right to enjoy what their neighbors on the same street enjoy.

3. Any hardship caused by the provisions of the Unified Development Code is more than personal inconvenience or a financial hardship and is not the result of actions by the applicant.

The lot size with the utility easement in the rear limits the improvements that can be made to the property, which creates a hardship. The home was built in the 1970s before the Sprugascis took ownership of the home, which was in 2005; therefore, the home size, lot design, and easement location are not the result of the actions of the current owners.

4. Granting the variance will not interfere with or alter the appropriate and legal use of adjacent conforming properties in the same zoning district.

The built structure is located up to the property owner’s south wall, which shares a wall with their neighbor, and the west wall, which shares a wall with a City park. The use does not interfere with or alter the appropriate and legal use of the south neighbor’s property as the structure does not encroach onto the neighbor’s property, nor does it interfere with the City’s use of the property to the west. The property owner to the north is not affected as the structure is not located on the north side of the property.