

APPLICANT RESPONSE STATEMENT

ANNEXATIONS AND REZONINGS

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 an annexation and/or rezoning, please respond to the following standards in the form of a written narrative:

1. Explain the intent of the requested zoning. Rezone from R-40 into R2. *This will be a platted subdivision in the City of Woodstock.*
2. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use and development of adjacent and nearby property. *This zoning proposal is suitable in view of the use and development adjacent and nearby property.*
3. Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property. *The zoning proposal will not adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property.*
4. Whether the property to be affected by a proposed zoning has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned. *Yes, the property to be affected by a proposed zoning has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned.*
5. Whether the proposed zoning will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools. *The proposed zoning will not cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, or schools.*
6. Whether the proposed zoning is in conformity with the policy and interest of the land use plan. *The proposed zoning does conform with the policy and interest of the land use plan.*
7. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use and development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approved or disapproval of the proposed zoning. *This property will be annexed into the City of Woodstock and close a gap in property lines between county and city.*

RECEIVED OCT 19 2018

APPLICANT RESPONSE STATEMENT- VARIANCES See attached

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.
2. There are exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question, due to its size, shape or topography.
3. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.
4. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.
5. A literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicants of any rights that others in the same district are allowed.
6. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of this ordinance.
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.
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.
9. The condition from which relief or a variance is sought did not result from willful action by the applicant
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.

RECEIVED OCT 19 2018

Applicant Response Statement – Variance 1 - Neese

1. Request variance for a min of 5500 sq ft variance in place for the size of the detached homes.
2. There are no exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question, due to its size, shape or topography.
3. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would not create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.
4. These conditions are not peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.
5. The literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicant of their rights that others in the same district were allowed.
6. If the applicant was granted relief, it would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of this ordinance.
7. Special Circumstances or conditions applying to the building or land in question are not peculiar to such premises and do apply to other buildings or land in the vicinity.
8. The applicant agrees that granting the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a property right and does not merely serve as convenience to the applicant.
9. The condition from which relief or a variance would be granted, was not a result from willful action by the applicant.
10. The applicant agrees that authorizing the variance will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonable increase the congestion of public streets, increase the danger of fire, imperil the public safety, unreasonable 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.

RECEIVED OCT 19 2018

Applicant Response Statement – Variance 2 - Neese

1. Request variance for 7' side set backs on detached homes.
2. There are no exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question, due to its size, shape or topography.
3. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would not create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.
4. These conditions are not peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.
5. The literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicant of their rights that others in the same district were allowed.
6. If the applicant was granted relief, it would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of this ordinance.
7. Special Circumstances or conditions applying to the building or land in question are not peculiar to such premises and do apply to other buildings or land in the vicinity.
8. The applicant agrees that granting the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a property right and does not merely serve as convenience to the applicant.
9. The condition from which relief or a variance would be granted, was not a result from willful action by the applicant.
10. The applicant agrees that authorizing the variance will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonable increase the congestion of public streets, increase the danger of fire, imperil the public safety, unreasonable 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.

RECEIVED OCT 19 2018

Applicant Response Statement – Variance 3 – Neese/Youngblood

1. Request variance to encroach into 75' impervious setback with pond(s).
2. There are no exceptional and extraordinary conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question, due to its size, shape or topography.
3. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would not create a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.
4. These conditions are not peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.
5. The literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicant of their rights that others in the same district were allowed.
6. If the applicant was granted relief, it would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of this ordinance.
7. Special Circumstances or conditions applying to the building or land in question are not peculiar to such premises and do apply to other buildings or land in the vicinity.
8. The applicant agrees that granting the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a property right and does not merely serve as convenience to the applicant.
9. The condition from which relief or a variance would be granted, was not a result from willful action by the applicant.
10. The applicant agrees that authorizing the variance will not impair adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or unreasonable increase the congestion of public streets, increase the danger of fire, imperil the public safety, unreasonable 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.

RECEIVED OCT 19 2018