VAR 20-5 Thomas Lynch 1826 E. Main Street Variance to Permit Reduced Frontage On A Street

Variance From Standards		
Standard	Required	Requested Variance
Section 9.2.12	Minimum lot width measured along a street in a B-1 district is 50 feet	Reduce lot width to 0 feet

FACTS

- 1. The applicant is proposing a lot split to the parcel located at 1826 E. Main Street that will create a new parcel without frontage along M-21.
- 2. The separate parcel will have road access via an easement off M-21.
- 3. There are existing structures on the parcel including a primary structure and storage buildings.
- 4. The lot split will separate the primary structure and the storage buildings onto separate lots.
- 5. Minimum lot width required in B-2 zoned district is 50 feet.
- 6. It is unclear exactly where the proposed split will be located.

STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF VARIANCES Under the Township Zoning Ordinance

In consideration of all variances, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall review each case individually as to its compliance with each of the following standards and may only approve variance requests which comply with all of them:

comply with all of them:				
STANDARDS			s Site M guireme	
STANDARDS			<u> </u>	
		Yes	No	N/A
The standard for which the variance is being gra	anted would unreasonably			
prevent the owner from using property for a per				
	mitted purpose or would			
render conformity unnecessarily burdensome.				
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT:	STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSIT	ION:		
An adequate easement size would keep the existing	It is unclear why the parcel split	is neces	sary.	
access to the 1826 E. Main Street property and allow	, , ,		,	
continued use of the new parcels without hindering the				
,				
applicant's ability to use the parcel.				
APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:				
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT:	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPF	OSITIO	N:	

DOCS ONE WEEK	STANDARDS	Does Site Meet
---------------	-----------	----------------

The variance would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the zoning district and a lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: A lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because whe location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: There do not appear to be any other property owners in this zoning district who have not direct frontage along a road. STAPPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION:	Demiliarments				
The variance would do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the zoning district and a lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: A lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 5-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: There do not appear to be any other property owners in this zoning district who have not direct frontage along a road. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split.				•	
property owners in the zoning district and a lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: A lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: Very No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split.			Yes	No	N/A
standard would not provide substantial relief and be more consistent with justice to others STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: A lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STANDARDS STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF PROBLEM That requires a parcel split is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split.					
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: A losser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: There do not appear to be any other property owners in this zoning district who have not direct frontage along a road. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: Very No N/A It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split.					
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: A lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STANDARDS STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STANDARDS STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STANDARDS STANDARDS	•	nd be more consistent with			
A lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split.					
substantial relief because the location of the parcel prile. APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: M/A STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: If it is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: If it is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: If it is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:		STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSIT	ION:		
split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage rule. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:			not direc	t frontag	e
APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	split requires a full elimination of the 50-foot frontage	along a road.			
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements	APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:				
STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements					
STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT:	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPF	POSITIO	N:	
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A				0: 1	
The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	07.110.000				
The problem is due to circumstances unique to the property and not to general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	STANDARDS			•	
general conditions in the area. STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:			Yes	No	N/A
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT: N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	•	to the property and not to			
APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: STAFF SINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split.					
APPLICANTS COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT: APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:				_	
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION: STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	N/A		that req	uires a p	parcel
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: STANDARDS STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:				
STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS STANDARDS STANDARDS Does Site Meet Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	DUBLIC/DC COMMENT IN SUDDODT:	DUBLIC/DC COMMENT IN ORD	OCITIO	NI:	
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT.	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPP	031110	IN.	
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
STANDARDS Requirements Yes No N/A The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:			Doo	s Sito M	loot
The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	STANDARDS				
The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by the applicant or previous owners of the property STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	OT/ NED/ NEDO				
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	The problem that resulted in the need for the variance was not created by		103	140	14/73
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT N/A STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSITION: It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:					
N/A It is unclear what the problem is that requires a parcel split. APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:			ION.		
APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:				uiros o r	orool
APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:	IVA			uires a p	Jaicei
	ADDI ICANTS COMMENTS IN SUDDODT:	Spiit.			
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION:	APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT.				
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT: PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPPOSITION:					
FUBLIO/FU CONTINUE IN THE CONTINUE OF FUSITION.	PURLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT:	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN ODE	OSITIO	NI·	
	ODEIO/I O GOIVIIVIEIVI IIV GUFFOIVI.	1 ODLIG/1 O OOIVIIVILINI IIN OFF	551110	I V .	

		Does	Site	Meet
STANDARDS		Requirements		
		Yes	No	N/A
Issuance of the variance would still ensure that the spirit of the Ordinance				
is observed, public safety secured and substant	tial justice done.			
STAFF FINDINGS IN SUPPORT:	STAFF FINDINGS IN OPPOSIT	ION:		
An adequate easement size would keep the existing	The purpose of requiring comm	ercial pa	rcels to l	have
access to the 1826 E. Main Street property and allow	road access is to ensure adequa			
continued use of the new parcels without hindering the	volume of traffic these parcels g			ce of
applicant's ability to use the parcel.	this variance would not be in the	e spirit of	f the	
	ordinance.			
APPLICANTS COMMENTS IN SUPPORT:				
PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN SUPPORT:	PUBLIC/PC COMMENT IN OPF	POSITIO	N:	

Sample motion to approve:

I make a motion to approve the requested variance based on the following findings of fact:

It complies with Standard 1 based on the fact that an adequate easement size would keep the existing access to the 1826 E. Main Street property and allow continued use of the new parcels without hindering the applicant's ability to use the parcel.

It complies with Standard 2 based on the fact that a lesser relaxation of the standard would not provide substantial relief because the location of the parcel split requires a full elimination of the 50 foot frontage rule.

It complies with Standard 3 based on

It complies with Standard 4 based on

It complies with Standard 5 based on the fact that an adequate easement size would keep the existing access to the 1826 E. Main Street property and allow continued use of the new parcels without hindering the applicant's ability to use the parcel.

Further, in order to ensure compliance with these standards, the following conditions are part of my motion to approve: (Sample conditions)

•	
•	
•	

Sample motion to deny:

I make a motion to deny the requeste	ed variance based on the following findings of fact:
It does not comply with Standard	based on
It does not comply with Standard	based on

R:\sdsk\Proj\F11742\ZBA\Variance\2020\VAR 20-5 Tom Lynch\Variance Checklist.docx