EXHIBIT B Melissa Tomei & Mark Borowicz 1905 Woodfield Ct. (PIN 08-31-301-017)

EXHIBIT 1: Section 6-3-6:2: Standards for Granting a Zoning Variance and/or Sign Variance

The removal of our existing 14'x12' enclosed porch and the addition of a 17'x17' sunroom is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Title 6 Zoning Regulations and the city's Comprehensive Master Plan. The requested variance does not impede upon the public health, safety, comfort, convenience, or general welfare of nearby residents. The addition would not cause overcrowding of land and maintains adequate standards for the provision of light, air, and open spaces. It would conserve the value of the building and encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the City. Furthermore, the addition is in compliance with the East Sector Comprehensive Master Plan goal of preserving high-quality residential developments.

Strict enforcement of this Title would result in practical difficulties or impose exceptional hardships due to special and unusual conditions which are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district.

- It is not possible to put an addition on the northwest side of our home, because it is a split-level house with the split on that side. Additionally, the neighbors' home has a grandfathered 6' side yard, which makes for too narrow of a space with an addition.
- It is not possible to put an addition on the southwest side of our home where our garage is. There is only an additional 10' of space before the 15' side yard requirement, which is not a usable space on the side of a garage for anything other than an expanded garage.
- Building upward would alter the essential character of the neighborhood; we could not find any other split-level models in Old Farm North with upward additions, only rear.
- The only place on the property where it is physically possible to put an addition is in the rear off of the main ground level, where the current enclosed porch is located. The property does not have a subbasement or a dining room, and our family needs the additional living space. The current enclosed porch cannot be used in hot or cold weather.

The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent property. The property directly behind us (123 Cedarbrook Rd.) also has a rear addition with an approved variance of 18' for the rear setback. The house across the street from us (1904 Woodfield Ct.) has a side addition with a significantly less than 15' side yard. In a brief, non-exhaustive walk through a small portion of Old Farm North less than half a mile from our home, we were able to find several houses with rear additions, most of which without a 30' rear setback.

- 2006 Springside Dr. with a rear addition and significantly less than a 30' rear setback
- 2012 Springside Dr. split-level model with a rear addition and less than a 30' rear setback
- 211 Longridge Ct. split-level model with a rear addition
- 133 Kingswood Ct. ranch model with a rear addition and less than a 30' rear setback
- 115 Kingswood Ct. ranch model with a rear addition and less than a 30' rear setback

Rear additions seem to be commonplace in the neighborhood and contribute to its essential character.