



CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF A ZONING VARIANCE (ZONING CODE, SECTION 19.04.1404(B))

Your answers to the following questions will be used in the decision on your application. Please respond fully to all of the following questions (attach extra sheets, if necessary). It is the applicant's responsibility to show the Hearing Examiner that all four of the variance criteria are satisfied.

1. Describe the special circumstances applicable to the lot or tract (e.g. size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, trees or vegetation, other physical conditions, installation of a solar energy system, or the orientation of a building for the purposes of providing solar access.

A short plat was approved in 1960 for two lots. At that time, second class shoreland could be included in lot area. Since both lots remained under common ownership when city laws changed to exclude second class shorelands, the city will not recognize the validity of this short plat. The property itself has a house on the eastern portion and apx. 140' of rolling lawn between the house and lake. The lawn area is a logical building location, with access from the end of S. E. 28th St.

2. Explain why the variance would neither alter the character of the neighborhood nor impair the use or development of adjacent property.

Other lots in the neighborhood have been divided into two (see attached map.) particularly to the east, 2 lots of 7,500 Sq.Ft. were created through the variance process; 2 more lots of 7,500 Sq.Ft. received variances on 61st; 4 lots of 8,400 Sq.Ft. were created to the north. Access from S.E. 28th St. will not encroach on Calkins' Landing, and will be similar to the existing access to the Gai's on the south side of S.E. 28th

3. Explain why the variance would not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is situated.

Public use of Calkins Landing will not be affected. An additional house along the waterfront will actually continue the present development pattern established on a number of nearby lots. Both lots would be larger than many existing lots in the neighborhood (see attached map.).

4. Explain why the variance would not conflict with the general purposes and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Two houses would not overcrowd the land-there is plenty of property for two houses; adequate light and air would still be available to Calkins Landing and surrounding properties.

RECEIVED

MAR 16 1989

DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CITY OF MERCER ISLAND
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jerry Bacon

FROM: Scott Greenberg, Principal Planner SG

DATE: March 24, 1989

SUBJECT: Bender Variance application

This variance application was submitted by my mother-in-law, for property she owns on Mercer Island. I would normally process a variance request before the Hearing Examiner. However, given the situation, I cannot be involved in any substantive discussion, staff recommendation or hearing on the item.

cc: Paul Lanspery