

Minutes of the Antrim Board of Adjustment, October 1, 1987

Subject: Case #110, Variance concerning Article V, Section D.4.a.
Deliberation after site review.

On October 1, 1987 at 6:30 P.M. Mary Allen, Harvey Goodwin, David Penny, Everett Chamberlain and Patricia Hammond-Grant met for a site review of the aforementioned property after which they adjourned to the Town Hall for a meeting and deliberations on case #110.

The meeting was opened at 7:45 by Mary Allen, Chairman. The Chairman read the resignation submitted by Robert B. Flanders. Moved by David Penny to accept same with regret, voicing appreciation for the fourteen years of service given to the Board by Mr. Flanders. So moved.

The Board also discussed the need for additional members to fill the vacancies.

The Board opened deliberations on Case #110 Steve & Kathy Kennedy requesting a Variance of Article V, Section D.4.a. of the Antrim Zoning Ordinance.

The Board deliberating were:

Mary Allen, Chairman
Harvey Goodwin
David Penny
Everett Chamberlain
Patricia Hammond-Grant, Clerk

The five Board members and Robert Bennett, Contractor for Steve & Kathy Kennedy, the petitioner, met at Pierce Lake at which time Mr. Bennett pointed out the existing cottage and the location of the new cottage.

David Penny opened the discussion stating that it was a non-conforming lot and because of the topography it was difficult to conform. He felt that the applicant was improving a bad situation. The septic tank could be a problem. The Board agreed to make the Selectmen aware of the problem and turn compliance over to them. (Board of Selectmen)

After further discussion the Board determined that the applicant had met the five conditions for granting a variance.

1. Granting the variance would not diminish the value of property as the applicant is increasing the setback from the lake and replacing a deteriorating structure with a new one.
2. Granting the appeal would be in the public interest. Same reason as above.
3. Denial would be a hardship as the slope and other topographical features make the property difficult.
4. Granting the variance would do substantial justice, because the applicant is removing the existing structure and bringing it closer to compliance.
5. Granting it will not be contrary to the spirit of the Ordinance. Same as 4.

Minutes of the Antrim Board of Adjustment, October 1, 1987
Case #110, Steve & Kathy Kennedy. Deliberations (page 2)

Moved by David Penny that the Board finds that the five conditions necessary for granting a variance have been met and the Variance has been granted. Second by Patricia Hammond-Grant. The vote went as follows:

David Penny	yes
Everett Chamberlain	yes
Harvey Goodwin	yes
Patricia Hammond-Grant	yes
Mary Allen	yes

The vote was unanimous and the Board will draft a letter to the Selectmen making them aware of the fact that after site review there is some question about the septic system.

The Chairman then spoke to the matter of how the applications are being filed. It was suggested that potential applicants meet with the Board in order that they are clear about which Article or Section of the Ordinance applies to their situation.

Respectfully submitted

Patricia Hammond-Grant, Clerk
Antrim Board of Adjustment
Minutes prepared by
Barbara Elia