1. That compliance with the Zoning Ordinance would result in practical difficulties due to exceptional, extraordinary, or unique characteristics or conditions of the land or lot of record, including but not limited to:

a. Exceptional narrowness of the width or depth of a lot of record, or an irregular shape.

b. Exceptional natural or topographic features located on the lot of record, such as steep slopes, water, existing significant trees, or other unique or extreme physical conditions of the land.

c. Extraordinary location of an existing building or structure that allows no other practical or feasible location for expansion because of exceptional features of the land.

d. Other exceptional or extraordinary dimensional conditions or characteristics of land or lot of record.

Neighbors will not be impacted. There is already an existing deck structure attached to the house, that was built with the house originally.

2. That the unusual circumstances do not apply to most other lots of record in the same manner or to the same extent to other lots of record in the same zoning district.

The circumstances are the same as many other lots in the area. Most of the other property owners have similar size lots and similar structure and layout.

3. That the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right. The possibility of increased financial return shall not of itself be deemed sufficient to warrant a variance.

The variance is not necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right. The owner still has the right to replace the existing deck with a maximum size of 200 square feet. There would be no increased financial return.

4. That the granting of the variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent and nearby land uses and properties.

Granting of the variance would not be of substantial detriment to adjacent and nearby land uses and properties. There is already an existing deck that was built with the house. 5. That the applicant shall not have created the problem for which the variance is being sought.

The applicant did not create the problem for the variance being sought. The applicant/homeowner is trying to replace the current conditions of the deck, which are deemed unsafe for any individual to walk on. The house was built in 1990, which indicates the wooden built deck is approximately 35 years old. It is rotting and falling apart. There is also a door at the back of the garage, which we will need steps to get in the yard.

6. That the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the public interest and that the spirit of this ordinance shall be observed, public safety secured, and substantial justice done for both the applicant and other property owners in the district.

The zoning regulations for Southland court, and surrounding neighborhoods (Eastland and Westland Court) seem contradictory. As stated earlier, most of the homes in the surrounding neighborhoods are of similar lot layout and lot size. This unique case may help other homeowners in the area when they need to replace their deck.



See photos.



Parcel 70-16-17-206-012

Zoning R-2

