88366

1

2

6

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

**2**5

26

## Page 15384 BEFORE THE HEARINGS OFFICER

KLAMATH COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of Request for) Variance No. 80-20 for Doug Cope, Applicant

Klamath County Planning FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER

7 A hearing was held in this matter at Klamath Falls, Oregon, on August 13, 1980, pursuant to notice given in conformity 9 with Ordinance No. 35, Klamath County, before the Klamath County 10 Assistant Hearings Officer, James R. Uerlings. The applicant was 11 present. The Klamath County Planning Department was represented  $12 \parallel$  by Jonathan Chudnoff. The Hearings Reporter was Barbara Thomson.

13 Evidence was presented on behalf of the Department and 14 on behalf of the applicant. There were two (2) adjacent property 15 owners present who stated that they had objections to the proposed 16 Variance requested by the applicant.

The following exhibits were offered, received, and made 18 a part of the record:

Klamath County Exhibit A, the Staff Report

Klamath County Exhibit B, photos of subject property

Klamath County Exhibit C, Klamath County Assessor's Map of subject property

Klamath County Exhibit D, diagram of SP-1 (Rural Residential) zone

Applicant's Exhibit No. 1, the Plot Plan

The hearing was then closed, and based upon the evidence 27 submitted at the hearing the Hearings Officer made the following 28 Findings of Fact:

## FINDINGS OF FACT;

- 1. There are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to this property which do not apply generally to other property in the same vicinity and zone.
- 2. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right of the applicant which right is possessed by other property owners under like conditions in the same vicinity and zone.
- 3. The granting of the requested variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, convenience and welfare or injurious to the property improvements in the same vicinity and zone in which the property affected is located and will not be contrary to the intent of this ordinance.
- 4. The variance requested is the minimum variance from the provisions and standards of this regulation which will alleviate the hardship.
- 5. The granting of the variance will not allow use of the property for a purpose which is not authorized within the zone which the property is currently in.
- 6. The granting of this variance is consistent with the L. C. D. C. Goals and Guidelines as set forth in the Staff Report, Klamath County Exhibit A, which I incorporate in my findings.
- 7. The setting of the house in any different manner will prevent the applicant from getting the proper septic tank system in that the Department of Environmental Quality requires.
- 8. This is the best arrangement for the house in consideration of the property rights of all the adjacent property owners.

VAR. 80-20

Page -2-

1 The Hearings Officer, based on the foregoing Findings of  $\mathbf{2}$ Fact, accordingly orders as follows: 3 That real property described as the 4 "parcel of land approximately 10,000 square feet in size, generally located northwest of 5 the intersection of Maidu Way and Shoshoni Circle, and more particularly described as being in the 6 SW4 of Section 7, Township 35, Range 7, Tax Lot 3300, Klamath County, Oregon" 8 is hereby granted a variance in accordance with the terms of the 9 Klamath County Zoning Ordinance No. 35, and, henceforth will be 10 allowed to reduce front yard setback from 50' to 41.5'; side 11 yards from 20' to 8'; and back yard from 25' to 10' in the 12 SP-1 (Rural Residential) zone. 13 14 Entered at Klamath Falls, Oregon, this ( day 15 16 17 18 KLAMATH COUNTY HEARINGS DIVISION 19 Assistant Hearings Offi 20 21 22 23 FATE OF OREGON; COUNTY OF KLAMATH; 53. Hed for record of request of Klamath County 24 his 15th day of August A. D. 19.80 at 0'clock A. A. and 25 duly recorded in Vol. M80 , of Deeds on Page 15384 26 Wm D. MILNE,, County Clark 27 Commissioners Journal

NoFee \$

28 VAR. 80-20 Page -3-