2

3

4

6

7

8

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

In the Matter of Request for ) Variance 79-22 for Richard Hundley II, Applicant)

Klamath County Planning FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER

A Hearing was held in this matter at Klamath Falls, Oregon, on July 11, 1979, pursuant to notice given in conformity with Ordinance No. 35, Klamath County, before the Klamath County Hearings Officer, Jim Spindor. The applicant was represented by Bruce Froemke. The Klamath County Planning Department was represented by Carl Shuck. The Hearings Reporter was Barbara Thomson.

Evidence was presented on behalf of the Department and on behalf of the applicant. There were no adjacent property owners present who stated they had objections to the proposed Variance requested by the applicant.

The following exhibits were offered, received and made a part of the record:

> Klamath County Exhibit A, the Staff Report Klamath County Exhibit B, photos of the subject property Klamath County Exhibit C, Klamath County Assessor's Map of subject property Applicant's Exhibit No. 1, Plot Plan

The Hearing was then closed, and based upon the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Hearings Officer made the following 28 | Findings of Fact:

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

- 1. There are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances which apply to the property involved which do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity, in that the only portion of the applicant's property on which a mobile home can be placed, requires the granting of this Variance.
- 2. The granting of this Variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the applicant's right to make full use of his property, a right which is possessed by other property owners in the vicinity; if this Variance is not granted undue hardship will be caused to the owner.
- 3. No one testified in opposition to the Variance, and there was no evidence that there would be any detrimental effect to the public health, safety, or welfare, or any detrimental effect to abutting property owners.
- 4. The requested Variance is the minimum Variance which will alleviate the hardship, due to the size of the applicant's property and the placement of the present structures
- The granting of this Variance will not allow use of the property for a purpose which is not authorized within the zone within which the property is located.
- 6. The granting of this Variance is consistent with the goals of the L.C.D.C.

The Hearings Officer, based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, accordingly orders as follows:

That real property described as the

"parcel of land generally located west of VAR. 79-22

Page -2-

2

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

VAR. 79-22 Page -3-

28