# Variance Request Statement

| *Describe any proposed variance associated with the development. Identify whether it is Type II or Type III.* | **The proposal does/does not include a request for variance. [ If yes, explain]** |
| --- | --- |
| *Degree of proposed variance(s) to quantitative standard(s), if any.* | The proposed variance is to increase/reduce **the [Specify Title and Section Reference of Standard to be Varied] by [Specify Percentage Increase or Reduction]** **from the standard [Specify STANDARD amount/quantity/measurement]** **to a proposed [Specify PROPOSED amount/quantity/measurement]** |

# 10.1502 – Exceptions

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1502 – Standards that May Not Be Varied |  | The applicant understands that standards relating to a) permitted uses; b) definitions; c) minimum/maximum densities; and d) restrictions on uses or development that contain the word “prohibited CANNOT be varied. The proposed variance(s) complies with these limitations. |

# 10.1510 – Type II Minor Variance Provisions

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1510(A) – Need for the Variance |  |  |
| 10.1510(B) – Minimum Necessary |  |  |
| 10.1510(C) – Impetus for Variance (Grievance of Impracticality) |  |  |
| 10.1510(C) – Impetus for Variance (Grievance of Denial of Substantial Property Right) |  |  |
| 10.1510(D) – Meeting Purpose of Code |  |  |

# 10.1530 – Type III Major Variance Provisions

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1530 – Type III Variance Criteria |  | In addition to meeting the Type II variance criteria, the proposed Type III variance meets **Subsection A/Subsection B/both** of the additional criteria of this section as documented below. |
| 10.1530(A) – Unusual Circumstances |  |  |
| 10.1530(B) – Public Safety/Welfare |  |  |

# 10.1531 – Private Residential Access for New Dwellings Under Unit Ownership

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1531(A) – Public Streets/Circulation |  |  |
| 10.1531(B) – Additional Off-Street Parking |  |  |

# 10.1532 – Varying Max Height in the GBSV District

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1532(B) – Compliance with Type II and Type III Variance Criteria |  | The proposal complies with the Type II and Type III variance criteria as described above. |
| 10.1532(C)(1) – Visibility from Beyond the GBSV District |  | A site plan, **[Specify Title and Sheet Number]** and elevations, **[Specify Title and Sheet Number(s)]**, demonstrate that the proposed structure will not be visible from parcels outside the GBSV district. **EITHER: The structure is no taller than the existing evergreen canopy as measured from the downslope side**. **OR: The structure is topographically screened by its placement behind a [describe natural feature]** |

## 10.1532(C)(2) – Rendering/Simulation

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1532(C)(2) – Photo Simulation Using 3D Analyst and BLM Manual 8431 |  | A photo simulation from parcels outside of the Gresham Butte Scenic View overlay has been submitted as **[Specify Document Title or Attachment or Exhibit Name]**. An analysis using the Bureau of Land Management’s Manual 8431- Visual Contrast Rating is submitted as **[Specify analysis document title and date]**. The analysis concludes **[Summarize conclusion of the analysis].** The proposed structuremeets/does not meet the Class I/Class II Objectives found in Appendix 2 of the BLM manual 8431, when observed from viewpoints outside of the GBSV District. |
| 10.1532(C)(2) – Alternate Analytical Methodology |  | **[Describe alternate methodology used, if any]** |
| 10.1532(C)(2)(a) – Alternate Methodology Determination (Preservation of Existing Character) |  | **[Describe in detail how the alternate methodology was able to review and conclude that the existing character of the landscape will be PRESERVED; level of change is very low and does not attract attention away from the forested landscape.]** |
| 10.1532(C)(2)(b) Alternate Methodology Determination (Retention of Existing Character) |  | **[Describe in detail how the alternate methodology was able to review and conclude that the existing character of the landscape will be RETAINED; level of change is very low and does not attract attention away from the forested landscape.]** |

## 10.1532(C)(3) – Replacement of Natural Loss of Vegetation Screening

| **Standard** | **N/A** | **Findings** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1532(C)(3) – Maintenance of Vegetation Screening by Applicant or Assignees |  | The applicant understands that if vegetation used for screening is removed through natural circumstances such as disease or fire, replacement vegetation must be planted within 6 months of the event and be of a species that will grow to an equal or greater size, height, and canopy spread as the vegetation that was removed. Replacement plantings will meet the minimum size at planting requirement. **[Identify the person, agent, trust or company]** will be the responsible party with respect to revegetation. They may be contacted at **[Phone]** or **[E-Mail]** or **[Mail Address]** |