Vol. (Paga 12635 BEFORE THE HEARINGS OFFICER KLAMATH COUNTY, OREGON

2 In the Matter of Request for) 3 Variance No. 81-16 for 4 Dewey Dryer, Applicant 5

2044

1

6

KLAMATH COUNTY PLANNING FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER

A heacing was held in this matter at Klamath Falls, 8 Oregon, on May 13, 1981, pursuant to notice given in conformity 9 with Ordinance No. 35, Klamath County, before the Klamath County Hearings Officer, Jim Spindor. The applicant was present. 11 Klamath County Planning Department was represented by Jonathan 12 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 15 owners present who stated they had objections to the proposed 13 14 16 Variance requested by the Applicant. The following exhibits were offered, received, and made 17 a part of the record: Klamath County Exhibit A, the Staff Report Elamath County Exhibit B, photos of the subject property 18 Klamath County Exhibit C, Klamath County Assessor's Map 19 20 21 of the subject property Applicant's Exhibit No. 1, plot plan 22 Applicant's Exhibit No. 2, letter of explanation The hearing was then closed, and based upon the evidence 23 submitted at the hearing, the Hearings Officer made the following 24 25 26 Findings of Fact: 27 FINDINGS OF FACT; 28

05 00

2-

1 1. There are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances 2 which apply to the property involved which do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity, in that the only portion of 3 applicant's property on which an addition of the nature contem-4 plated can be placed requires the granting of this Variance. $\mathbf{5}$ 6 2. The granting of this Variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of the applicant's right to make full 7 8 use of tis property, a right which is possessed by other property Owners in the vicinity. If this variance is not granted, undue 9 10 hardship will be caused the owner. 11 3. No one testified in opposition to the Variance and there wes no evidence suggesting there would be any detrimental 12 effects to the public health, safety or welfare, or any detri-13 14 mental effects to abutting property owners. 15 4. The requested variance is the minimum variance which will alleviate the hardship due to the particularities of the 16 17 applicant's property. 18 5. The Variance will not allow use of the property for 19 a purpose which is not authorized within the zone in which the 20 property is located, 21 6. The granting of this Variance is consistent with the 22 goals of the L. C. D. C. 23 The Hearings Officer, based on the foregoing Findings of 24 Fact, accordingly orders as follows: 25 That real property described as the 26 "parcel of land approximately six acres in size, generally located north of Highway No. 66 about 27 five miles west of its intersection with Highway No. 140, and more particularly described as being 28 in the NW4 of Section 33, Township 39, Range 8, VAR. 81-16 Page -2-

