

Dear Appleton Common Council,

I am writing as a resident of 1610 W. Glendale Ave. regarding Mr. Mark Van Grinsven's request for a variance to extend the driveway.

Back in May of 2020, my significant other, Matthew Van Grinsven, and I both graduated from law school. It was the height of the global pandemic of COVID-19. We had to make a decision about where to live. Matthew's parents were generous enough to invite us back into their home with our 5-month old daughter in tow.

Mr. and Mrs. Van Grinsven are both retired and aging. Mr. Van Grinsven has been issued a disability parking permit. Mrs. Van Grinsven, while a very strong woman, has been suffering from severe pinched nerves – she continues to find the strength to care for our two young children. We now have a 2-year-old daughter and a 4-month-old son. Both Mr. and Mrs. Van Grinsven still drive and have no reason not to. We also live with Marcus Van Grinsven, Mr. and Mrs. Van Grinsven's oldest son, who drives and has his own car.

I tend to think we are living in an unconventional way, with three generations under one roof. I do believe it has become more common since the global pandemic of COVID-19 and it certainly is common in other cultures. There are of course significant benefits to all living under one roof. And there are drawbacks, one of which is limited parking.

Being that the home we live in, and houses in the area generally, have been built for the conventional family, the amenities can be inadequate. This is particularly true of the parking area that was built with the house. The parking area was not built for 5 persons of driving age to be able to each have their own car. And due to overnight parking restrictions of the city, street parking is not an option. We have room in the driveway and garage to park 4 cars but need room for 5.

It is unclear to us why the permit is being denied. It appears to me that what is being requested falls, at least mostly, within the guidelines outlined in Sec. 19-91(f) by the enumerated conditions as follows:

- (1) Permits have been requested but denied to fulfill the request.
- (2) The extension is to be paved.
- (3) The extension would be 12 feet wide (the maximum allowed).
- (4) The paved area would be no longer than the driveway.
- (5) It is practicable and possible to extend the driveway towards the nearest side lot line (which is the north border of the plat).
- (6) This is not a circular driveway.
- (7) I am uncertain if these requirements are problematic in any way with this particular request.

But if there is something that I do not understand I hope you will approve this as a variance given the explanation above.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kayla Taggart