

JUSTIFICATION

To justify approval of any variance, the Planning Commission considers the following criteria. Please answer **all** the following items. Use additional sheets if needed. Responses of **yes, no, or n/a** will **not** be accepted.

Explain how the variance will not adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare.

The sign exists at this location and the proposal is to refurbish an existing non-conforming sign to bring it into the current branding standards, there will be no increase to the existing nonconformity

Explain how the variance will not alter the essential character of the general vicinity.

The proposed sign face is the same size as the existing sign, we are giving the sign a face lift to bring the images into the current branding. This will not have a negative impact on the existing character of the general vicinity but prove to be an upgrade to the current signage.

Explain how the variance will not cause a hazard or a nuisance to the public.

The sign is currently in existence and the plan is to reface the top portion of the sign, which will not create a hazard or a nuisance to the public as the current sign does not create a nuisance.

Explain how the variance will not allow an unreasonable circumvention of the requirements of the zoning regulations.

The existing non-conforming sign predates the current ordinance, and could continue to remain at this location without any changes. Upgrading the sign has created the need for the variance. Replacing the sign with something smaller will create a hardship given the base of this sign is over existing infrastructure that cannot be disturbed.

Explain how the variance arises from special circumstances, which do not generally apply to land in the general vicinity (please specify/identify).

This is a drive up fast service restaurant and the parking lot lay out is existing. The sign location is existing. Changing the sign height, size, type will cause disturbance to a lot layout that cannot be altered.

Explain how the strict application of the provisions of the regulation would deprive the applicant of the reasonable use of the land or would create unnecessary hardship.

The sign can continue to exist without changes, the changes have created the need for the variance. The strict application of the provisions would prevent the applicant from continuing the use of their corporate branding on a sign base that already exists. This is a sign that patrons are familiar with and expect to see.

Are the circumstances the result of actions of the applicant taken *after* the adoption of the regulation from which relief is sought?

The applicant is seeking to update a legal non-conforming sign that predates the ordinance.

RECEIVED
FEB 06 2024

PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES

24-VARIANCE-CO14