Weber County Board of Adjustment Application - 1997					
Application submittals will be accepted by appointment only. (801) 399-8791. 2380 Washington Blvd. Suite 240, Ogden, UT 84401					
Date Submitted / Completed	Fees (Office Use) \$225.00	Receipt Number (Office Use)	File Number (Office Use)		
Property Owner Contact Inf	ormation				
Name of Property Owner(g). Aut Fidled		Mailing Address of Property Owner(s)			
Phone %1-393-1229	Fax		398 Ogden Conyon		
Email Address DA S- OLD COM CASS	1.net	Preferred Method of Written Correspo	ondence Cell &1-721-9118		
Authorized Representative					
Name of Person Authorized to Represent the Property Owner(s)		Mailing Address of Authorized Person			
Phone SAME	Fax	-			
Email Address		Preferred Method of Written Correspondence Email Fax Mail			
Appeal Request					
A hearing to decide appeal where it is alleged by appellant that there is an error in any order, requirement, decision or refusal in enforcing of the Zoning Ordinance					
A variance request:					
∑ Lot area ∑ Yard seti	back Frontage width 💆 🤇	Other:			
A Special Exception to the Zoning Ordinance:					
Flag LotAccess by Private Right-of-WayAccess at a location other than across the front lot line					
An Interpretation of the Zoning					
An Interpretation of the Zoning Map					
Other:					
Property Information					
Approximate Address 398 and 400 Ogder (ag	6101	Land Serial Number(s) 20 - 028 - 002	8 (Deckney)		
guoto ppo					
Current Zoning FR-1		20-028-0016 (Pifield)			
Existing Measurements		Required Measurements (Office Use)			
Lot Area 0. 167	Lot Frontage/Width 91.59	Lot Size (Office Use) ALTE	Lot Frontage/Width (Office Use)		
	Rear Yard Setback	Front Yard Setback (Office Use)	Rear Yard Setback (Office Use) 30 Leet		
Side Yard Setback	Side Yard Setback 7.0 15.25	Side Yard Setback (Office Use) Jo Lect	Side Yard Setback (Office Use)		

Applicant Narra Please explain your rec	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH					
		Varrative	12004	Survey.		
Variance Reque					The spirit was the first	
# 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				• . 1.1 . 11	a to the etrict letter of the ord	inanca will
cause unreasonable h	nce will not substantially ardships, the imposition o	affect the comprehensive portions of which upon the petitions	olan of zoning in the G er is unnecessary in o	ounty and that adherence der to carry out the gene	ral purpose of the plan.	mance wiii
cause unreasonable h	nce will not substantially ardships, the imposition of	affect the comprehensive p	olan of zoning in the G er is unnecessary in o	ounty and that adherence.	ral purpose of the plan.	mance will
cause unreasonable h	nce will not substantially ardships, the imposition o	affect the comprehensive postitions	olan of zoning in the G	ounty and that adherence	ral purpose of the plan.	
cause unreasonable h	ardships, the imposition o	f which upon the petition	olan of zoning in the G	ounty and that adherence	ral purpose of the plan.	
cause unreasonable h	nce will not substantially a ardships, the imposition o	f which upon the petition	olan of zoning in the G	ounty and that adherence derived the gene	ral purpose of the plan.	

	tagan period and anggan and dark period an artiflerance are arranged in the first consequence and the filler between the consequences and a
Explain how the previously listed special circumstances are not	
Property Owner Affidavít	
I (We),	, depose and say that I (we) am (are) the owner(s) of the property identified in this application provided in the attached plans and other exhibits are in all respects true and correct to the best of (Property Owner)
Subscribed and sworn to me thisday of	
Authorizéd Représentative Affidavit	
I (We),	, the owner(s) of the real property described in the attached application, do authorized as my, to represent me (us) regarding the attached application and to appear on dy in the County considering this application and to act in all respects as our agent in matters
(Property Owner)	(Property Owner)
Dated thisday of, 20signer(s) of the Representative Authorization Affidavit who du	, personally appeared before me, the uly acknowledged to me that they executed the same.
	(Notary)

•

As owners of Lots 16A (Deckman) and 16B (Fifield) of the Hermitage Subdivision we are requesting an approval of a variance to the standards of the Weber County Land Use Code regarding setbacks (front, rear, and side), width, and area.

Although we respect the zoning standards that are being set within the community, we feel that there are circumstances found with these lots that are unique to the history of the homes and property. They are atypical to the zoning standards and existed in part prior to the establishment of these standards.

The homes on Lots 16A (1922) and 16B (1933) were first built and part of the original development of the Hermitage Hotel and Resort and were both on Lot 16. By 1966 the two homes had been separated roughly in half into two properties.

A survey was conducted of Lot 16A in 2001 prior to the sale of the home, in which showed the common lot line between the two lots to be through a portion of the home on Lot 16B. This was alarming to both owners who sought litigation to resolve the discrepancy. A separate surveyor was consulted, who worked with county officials in determining a resolution. The two owners eventually agreed to a Boundary Adjustment of Lot 16, Hermitage Subdivision in October of 2004. This new survey creatively adjusted the common lot line between the two homes trying to keep an equal distance from each homes.

Widths, setbacks, and lot areas were assumed based on the new configuration. The sale of the home was then conducted, and both parties have been satisfied with the arrangement for the past 11 years.

In the spring of 2015 the Weber County Planning Division staff researched Lot 16B and found no evidence resulting from our meetings of an approval from the Planning Division to reduce the area, width, and setbacks for these lots.

Thus we are requesting that due to the particular and unique circumstances of the properties, based on the historic and boundary conditions, a variance to the FR-1 Zone standards be considered. As owners we are satisfied with the current layout of our homes, yards, and access in regard to the reconfigured property boundaries.

Sincerely,

Paul Fifield Lot 16B

Andrew Deckman Lot 16A