

VARIANCE CRITERIA

Respond completely and fully to all 6 criteria listed below to demonstrate that the request meets the standards of Seminole County Land Development Code Section 30.3.3.2(b) for the granting of a variance:

1. What are the special conditions and circumstances that exist that are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved, and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district?

The existing residence predates current zoning standards; many homes in Lakewood Shores were built in the 1950s with setbacks less than the current 30 ft requirement. The subject lot and adjacent parcels were developed before the current code, creating a uniform but non-conforming pattern. Additionally, the home sustained major fire damage which necessitates full roof reconstruction, giving rise to this request to replace and modernize existing structures within a similar footprint.

2. How are the special conditions and circumstances that exist not the result of the actions of the applicant?

The hardship results from the age and layout of the original subdivision and the recent fire event, neither of which were caused by the owners. Both the existing rear porch and covered parking pre-date the current owners' 1999 purchase and the current setback standards.

3. How would the granting of the variance request not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by Chapter 30 to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district?

The requested variances merely allow the property to maintain and rebuild structures comparable to those historically present on the lot and consistent with neighboring homes.

4. How would the literal interpretation of the provisions of the zoning regulations deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant?

Requiring full compliance would prevent the owners from rebuilding a functional porch and retaining their existing carport, substantially reducing usable outdoor space and harming the property's architectural balance following the fire.

5. How would the requested variance be the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure?

The requested variance represents the least relief required to rebuild the residence and restore functional outdoor living space. The new rear porch will not extend any further into the rear setback than the existing structure already does, and the proposed front porch (while within the current front setback) introduces only a modest architectural feature to complement the home's design. Both elements are proportional to the house, consistent with neighboring properties, and do not intensify any existing encroachments beyond what has historically existed on the site.

6. How would the granting of the variance be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the zoning regulations and not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare?

The project restores a single-family residence to safe, code-compliant condition while maintaining the neighborhood's established character. The improvements will enhance aesthetics and value, without impairing neighboring properties or passersby.