

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATIONS

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape or topography (the hardship must relate to the physical character of the lot and not to a personal or economic hardship).

RESPONSE: There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to this property due to its **topography and elevation above Jesse Jewell Parkway**. The church sits on a raised site with a retaining wall along the frontage, which severely reduces visibility of the building and signage from the roadway. A conforming sign limited to **6 feet in height and 20 square feet in area** (per **UDC Sec. 8.6.14.A**) would not be visible to approaching motorists traveling at corridor speeds. The hardship arises from the **physical character of the lot**, not from personal or economic circumstances.

2. The application of the requirements of this resolution to this particular property would create an unusual hardship.

RESPONSE: Applying the strict requirements of the ordinance would create an unusual hardship because the church would be unable to identify its location to the traveling public in a safe and effective manner. Without adequate sign visibility, motorists may pass the entrance, attempt last-minute turns, or miss the property altogether. This deprives the property of reasonable use of signage for identification that is otherwise essential for institutional uses.

3. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved and not common to other properties in the neighborhood. That is, the application of the regulation would deprive the applicant of the rights commonly enjoyed by others in the neighborhood.

RESPONSE: The hardship is **peculiar to this specific property** and not common to others in the neighborhood. Most nearby properties fronting Jesse Jewell Parkway do not have the same combination of **elevated topography and retaining wall** that obstructs visibility. If the church is limited to a small, low sign, it would be deprived of the rights commonly enjoyed by other corridor properties that have effective visibility from the roadway.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATIONS

4. Such conditions are not the result of any actions of the property owner

RESPONSE: The need for relief is not the result of any actions taken by the property owner. The **elevation of the lot, retaining wall, and roadway design** are existing physical site conditions beyond the church's control. The request is based solely on adapting signage to these conditions.

5. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of this resolution provided; however, that no variance may be granted for a use of land or building or structure that is prohibited by this resolution. For example, granting the variance would not confer any special privilege that is denied by this regulation to other property in the same zoning district.

RESPONSE: Granting the requested variance will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the intent of the UDC. The proposed sign is consistent in scale with other signs along the corridor and is intended to **enhance safety by improving visibility** for motorists. The variance will not confer a special privilege prohibited to others; rather, it allows this property the same functional right of identification and visibility enjoyed by other institutions and businesses in the area.

Respectfully,



Jennifer Wolfe
Variance Consultant
770-568-8867