

Respond completely and fully to all six criteria listed below to demonstrate that the request meets the standards of Land Development Code of Seminole County Sec. 30.43(3) for the granting of a variance:

1. Describe the special conditions and circumstances that exist which 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.

Our property has unique size and layout characteristics that make a larger accessory structure appropriate. The lot is significantly larger and more open than all other surrounding residential parcels which allows for an accessory building of this size without impacting neighboring properties.

2. Describe how special conditions and circumstances that currently exist are not the result of the actions of the applicant or petitioner.

The lot size, shape, and smaller square footage of the existing home were all present prior to this variance request. These factors create limitations under the current code that the applicant did not create. The need for a larger accessory building arises from the inherent layout and functional requirements of the property itself, rather than from any modification by the applicant.

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

Granting this variance would not provide any special privilege, as several nearby homes already have similar metal garages or accessory buildings. This request simply allows the applicant to use the property in a way that is consistent with existing neighborhood improvements, maintaining fairness, compatibility, and the established character of the zoning district.

4. Describe how the literal interpretation of the provisions of the zoning regulations would deprive the applicant, or petitioner, of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant or petitioner.

The literal interpretation of the zoning regulations would prevent the applicant from constructing a metal garage similar to those already built on nearby properties within the same zoning district. This restriction would deprive the applicant of a reasonable and commonly exercised use of their property that neighboring owners already enjoy. Enforcing the regulation without flexibility would create an unnecessary & undue hardship by limiting the applicants ability to store equipment, protect vehicles, and maintain the property in the same manner as other neighbors.

5. Describe how the requested variance is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure.

The requested variance is the minimum necessary to allow for the reasonable use of the property. The applicant is only seeking the amount of relief required to construct a metal garage of appropriate size and placement for essential storage and maintenance needs.

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

Granting this variance aligns with the intent of the zoning regulations because similar accessory structures already exist in the neighborhood.

The proposed garage will not harm surrounding properties or public welfare and will remain compatible with the areas established character and use.