6

8

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

11.4.1

## BEFORE THE HEARINGS OFFICER Page

KLAMATH COUNTY, OREGON

3 In the Matter of Request for)
4 Variance No. 80-9 for )
5 Melvin L. Reeves, Applicant)

Klamath County Planning
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER

A hearing was held in this matter at Klamath Falls,
Oregon, on April 9, 1980, pursuant to notice given in conformity
with Ordinance No. 35, Klamath County, before the Klamath County
Hearings Officer, Jim Spindor. The applicant was present. The
Klamath County Planning Department was represented by Jonathan
Chudnoff. 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, 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 Findings of Fact:

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

% There are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances VAR. 80-9 Page -1-

2728

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 an addition of the nature contemplated 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.
- 3. If this variance is not granted, undue hardship will be caused to the owner.
- 4. 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 any abutting property owners.
- 5. The requested variance is a minimum variance which will alleviate the hardship, due to the size of the applicant's property and the placement of the present residence thereon.
- 6. The granting of this variance is consistent with the goals of the L. C. D. C.
- 7. 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.
- 8. The Variance is approved subject to the following conditions.

## CONDITIONS:

- 1. Applicant shall follow the plot plan which was introduced as Applicant's Exhibit No. 1.
- VAR. 80-9 Page -2-

residence. The Hearings Officer, based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, accordingly orders as follows: That real property described as the "parcel of land approximately 9,900 square feet in size, generally located east of Etna Street and approximately 80 feet south of its intersection with Shasta Way, and more particularly described as Section 2, Township 39, Range 9, being Tax Lot 6800, Klamath County, is hereby granted a variance in accordance with the terms of the Klamath County Zoning Ordinance No. 35, and henceforth will 10 be allowed a rear yard setback from 25 feet to 16 feet in the 11 12 RD 10,000 (Single Family Residential) zone. 13 Entered at Klamath Falls, Oregon, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of 14 15 16 17 KLAMATH COUNTY HEARINGS DIVISION 18 BY Do Dinduction Hearings Officer 19 20 21 22 I'ME OF OREGON; COUNTY OF KLAMATH; 84 23 Hed for record at request of Klamath County 24nis \_\_\_5th day of \_\_\_\_\_\_A. D. 1980. at1:18'clock P.M., are 25 fully recorded in Vol. M80 \_\_\_\_, of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ on Page 8225 26 Wm D. MILNE, County Clerk 27 By A Company of Killing No Fee VAR. 80-9 Page -3-

28