

## Variance Request

1000 Laurel Avenue  
Hamilton, Ohio 45015

Applicant:  
Community Design Alliance  
Attn: Steven Gebhart  
236 High Street  
Hamilton, Ohio 45011

Building owner:  
Gerry Saurber  
5358 River Road  
Fairfield, Ohio 45014

## Landscaping Variance

We are requesting a variance in the landscaping requirement for the project. We are requesting that no landscaping be required with this conditional use.

1. Will the property yield a reasonable return or can there be a beneficial use of the property without the variance?

**The requirements are not possible in this situation no matter what use is in the building. With the building footprint on the property line there is not space for any landscaping to be added, as any landscaping would have to be done in the right of way.**

2. Is the variance substantial?

**Yes. A large requirement is not able to be met in its entirety.**

3. Would the Variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services?

**No. The building would continue to function as it has for many years. Access to the building would not be any more limited than current conditions.**

4. Did the property owners purchase the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction?

**The building was purchased over 20 years ago. I believe this was before current landscaping requirements were in place.**

5. Could the problem be solved in some other manner other than the granting of the Variance?

**No. There is no other room other than the right of way to plant bushes/trees.**

6. Would the Variance preserve the spirit and intent of the zoning requirement and substantial justice be done by granting the variance?

**This is a unique situation where the building is the entire footprint of the property. I don't believe this is a commonly occurring condition in the Lindenwald neighborhood.**

## Parking Requirement Variance

We are requesting a variance in the requirement on number of off-street parking. We are requesting that no additional parking from the existing on-street parking is required.

1. Will the property yield a reasonable return or can there be a beneficial use of the property without the variance?

**The requirement is not possible on this property without the acquisition of another property for parking or renting spaces from a nearby lot. Any use that moves into this space will have the same issue.**

2. Is the variance substantial?

**Yes. There is not any space on site for off street parking. The entirety of the requirement cannot be met.**

3. Would the Variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services?

**The limited parking on street would be the only parking access for vehicles visiting the site. Other governmental services that do not require parking on site would not be affected.**

4. Did the property owners purchase the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction?

**The property was purchased over 20 years ago. I believe this was before current requirements were in place.**

5. Could the problem be solved in some other manner other than the granting of the Variance?

**As mentioned in question one, the acquisition of another property or renting spaces from a nearby lot are the only viable solutions.**

6. Would the Variance preserve the spirit and intent of the zoning requirement and substantial justice be done by granting the variance?

**This is a unique situation where the building footprint is the entire property. It is an existing condition from before the current zoning guidelines were in place, today any new build would include parking in the plan. I don't believe this is a commonly occurring condition in the Lindenwald neighborhood. This is more of a condition seen in downtown or on Main Street, where there is public parking options nearby.**