

APPLICANT RESPONSE STATEMENT- VARIANCES

The applicant finds that the following standards are relevant in balancing the interest in promoting the public health, safety, morality, or general welfare against the right to unrestricted use of property and shall govern the exercise of the zoning power.

If this application is in response to a variance, please respond to the following standards in the form of a written narrative. In the case of concurrent variances, a response to the standards below should be provided for each variance requested.

1. Explain requested variance.
 - A. Section 18.405 Table 11.A- Requiring buildings along secondary frontages.
 - B. Section 18.405 Table 11B. Requiring façade on primary frontage along 60% of the frontage. The building only has 37% of primary frontage at setback.
 - C. Section 18.405 Table 11B – No building is placed along secondary frontage which requires 60% coverage.
2. There are exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question, due to its size, shape or topography.
 - A. The site has two road frontages. With the access point on the secondary frontage, there is not an ability to provide a building frontage along this frontage.
 - B. The Ridgeway parkway frontage has a lot of width but the site's depth would not allow enough area for a building to cover 60% of the site.
 - C. The site is narrow and wide making a second building along the secondary frontage impractical.
3. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.
 - A. The lots shape and topography make compliance with the building placement requirements impractical.
 - B. The lots shape and topography make compliance with the building placement requirements impractical.
 - C. The lots shape and topography make compliance with the building placement requirements impractical.
4. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.
 - A. The site's limitations are particular to this property. The site is limited by the roads and stream buffers making compliance with the building placement requirements impractical.
 - B. The site's limitations are particular to this property. The site is limited by the roads and stream buffers making compliance with the building placement requirements impractical.
 - C. The site's limitations are particular to this property. The site is limited by the roads and stream buffers making compliance with the building placement requirements impractical.
5. A literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicants of any rights that others in the same district are allowed.
 - A. The site has limitations that limits the develop ability of the property. The applicant has

- the right to a reasonable economic use of their property.
- B. The site has limitations that limits the develop ability of the property. The applicant has the right to a reasonable economic use of their property.
 - C. The site has limitations that limits the develop ability of the property. The applicant has the right to a reasonable economic use of their property.
6. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of this ordinance.
- A. The relief does not cause any detriment to the public good. The applicant will create attractive landscaping along both road frontages.
 - B. The relief does not cause any detriment to the public good. The applicant will create attractive landscaping along both road frontages.
 - C. The relief does not cause any detriment to the public good. The applicant will create attractive landscaping along both road frontages.
7. Special circumstances or conditions applying to the building or land or building and land in question are peculiar to such premises and do not apply generally to other land or buildings in the vicinity.
- A. The property is unique because it is bound by two roads and two stream buffers making the property narrow and wide which restricts the location of building placement along both road frontages.
 - B. The property is unique because it is bound by two roads and two stream buffers making the property narrow and wide which restricts the location of building placement along both road frontages.
 - C. The property is unique because it is bound by two roads and two stream buffers making the property narrow and wide which restricts the location of building placement along both road frontages.
8. Granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a property right and not merely to serve as a convenience to the applicant.
- A. The requested variances are essential for the preservation of property rights.
 - B. The requested variances are essential for the preservation of property rights.
 - C. The requested variances are essential for the preservation of property rights.
9. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from willful action by the applicant.
- A. The property is bound by stream buffers and roads.
 - B. The property is bound by stream buffers and roads.
 - C. The property is bound by stream buffers and roads.
10. Authorizing the variance will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonably increase the congestion of public streets, increase the danger of fire, imperil the public safety, unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding areas or in any other respect impair the health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the City.

The proposed variances don't have any impact on adjacent or nearby properties.

RECEIVED FEB 08 2019