

To whom it may concern,

The following is a Narrative Statement establishing and substantiating the justification for the variance submitted by **Jonathan Mast** (Owner) for the property located at 820 Abney Ln. Franklin, OH. (MACKINAW ADD. LOT: 357)

**Standards of Approval:**

**A. Special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable generally to other lands or structures within the same zoning district.**

This lot is small, measuring 50 ft at the front and 75 ft deep. The location of the existing structure does not meet the setbacks required for a lot designated as **R-3**. The requirements not met is for lot size, and rear yard setback.

Minimum Lot Area to be 4000 sq ft. => Current Lot Size measures 50 x 75 = 3750 sq ft

Minimum Rear Yard Setback Requirement 20 ft => Current rear yard setback measures 2 ft

The intent is to remove the above ground structure but leave the existing foundation. The existing foundation would be used to rebuild a new house giving the area a much-needed facelift. The existing foundations initial assessment from a structural engineer shows that it meets the building code for foundation requirements.

**B. The special conditions or circumstances that exist did not result from the actions of the applicant.** The location of the structure relative to property lines has been the same since its construction and the established property lines.

**C. There cannot be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;**

To fully remove the foundation and relocate the structure would drive up the cost with no guarantee that the structure sized for the lot would be beneficial for use as it would be a smaller living space and the yard and driveway would be less functional.

**D. The variance is not substantial and is the minimum relief necessary to make possible the reasonable use of the land or structures;**

The variance request utilizes the existing foundation and maximizes the lot usage with minimal disruption to the building site.

**E. The difficulty or reason why the applicant is seeking a variance cannot be resolved through any method other than a variance;**

Using the existing foundation in the original location requires variance approval.

**F. The essential character of the neighborhood will not be substantially altered nor will adjoining properties suffer substantial detriment as a result of the variance;**

The character of the neighborhood will not be substantially altered but rather improved as the current structure will be removed and a new one built in its place giving the area a much-needed improvement.

**G. The variance will not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services such as water, sewer, and trash pickup;**

The variance will not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services as these services are already provided to the neighboring homes with trash services being provided on the street. No obstruction to these services will be created.

**H. Granting the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning requirement the applicant seeks a variance from and will not otherwise be detrimental to the public's health, safety, or welfare;**

The variance is believed to be in harmony with the general purpose of the intent of the zoning requirement in that it does not present itself with known or unforeseen detriment to the health, safety, or welfare of the property and surrounding community.

**I. Granting of the variance requested will not confer upon the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this UDO to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.**

Understood.