To whom it may concern: The original request for a variance was To accomodate a handecapped bus with demensions of 8's wide/13th with left down, 23's long and 9's ft tall. We are looking to protect this vehicle (putue included) from the clements. If we need to shorter this structure to a 21 ft length; we can. Hark you for your consideration in this matter Sould Senth (502) 432-9369

RECEIVED

NOV 06 2017

PLAN DESIGN SERVICES

Variance Justification:

In order to justify approval of any variance, the Board of Zoning Adjustment considers the following criteria. Please answer <u>all</u> of the following items. Use additional sheets if needed. <u>A response of yes, no, or N/A is not acceptable.</u>

1. Explain how the variance will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare.

THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE WILL BE CONSTRUCTED BY A REPOTABLE COMPANY. IT WILL BE HIGH ENOUGH SO AS NOT TO IMPEDE VISION OF ONCOMING YEHICLES OR PEDESTRIANS.

2. Explain how the variance will not alter the essential character of the general vicinity.

WE'VE COLLECTED SIGNATURES OF 7 SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS EXPRESSING NO ISSUES WITH THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE TO ALTER THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTER OF THEIR INVESTMENTS.

3. Explain how the variance will not cause a hazard or a nuisance to the public.

THE VARIANCE REQUESTED DOES NOT ENCROACH INTO AN EASE-MENT OR PROPERTY OF SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS.

4. Explain how the variance will not allow an unreasonable circumvention of the requirements of the zoning regulations.

WE KNOW NOTHING ABOUT SUCH ZONING REGULATIONS IN THIS AREA CONCERNING A CARPORT STRUCTURE. ANY UNREASONABLE CIRCUMVENTION WILL NEED TO BE BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION,

RECEIVED

Additional consideration:

1. Explain how the variance arises from special circumstances, which do not generally apply to land in the general vicinity (please specify/identify).

WE PURCHASED A SPECIAL NEEDS VEHICLE FOR WHICH WE SEEK PROTECTION FROM NATURE'S ELEMENTS. AFTER MUCH CONTEMPLATION WE CONSIDERED AN OPEN, FREE STANDING CARPORT TO BE OUR BEST OPTION.

2. Explain how the strict application of the provisions of the regulation would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of the land or would create unnecessary hardship.

WE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THE REGULATION DID NOT NECESSARILY NEED TO BE A STRICT APPLICATION AND THAT REASONABLE USE OF THE LAND WAS NOT IN QUESTION.

3. Are the circumstances the result of actions of the applicant taken subsequent to the adoption of the regulation from which relief is sought?

WE PURCHASED AN OVERSTZED VEHICLE UNAWARE THAT THERE WOULD BE ANY PROBLEM STORING IT: WE DID NOT CONSIDER AS HOMEOWNERS OR LANDOWNERS THAT THERE MIGHT BE AN ISSUE ON OUR OWN PROPERTY. THIS ACTION WAS NOT TAKEN SUBSEQUENT TO THE ADOPTION OF THE REGULATION.