46

**Town of Sandown** 1 **Zoning Board of Adjustment** 2 Minutes 5/29/14 3 4 5 **Meeting Date:** May 29, 2014 6 **Type of Meeting: Public Hearing** 7 Method of Notification: Public Posting - Sandown Town Hall, Sandown Post Office, 8 Sandown Website, Eagle Tribune 9 **Meeting Location:** Sandown Town Hall 10 **Members present:** Chairman - Steve Meisner, Christopher True – Vice Chairman, 11 Brian St. Amand 12 Dave Ardolino, Donna Green, Curt Sweet, Absent: 13 Hans Nicolaisen – Selectmen's Liaison 14 15 **Opening:** Mr. Meisner opened the meeting at 7:11 p.m. 16 17 **Public Hearing for Case # 01 – M6 L11.** The property is located at 66 Phillips Pond Road and identified on Map 6 Lot 11. An application submitted by Peter Holmes 18 19 requesting a variance from Article II, Part B, Section 3B to permit the subdivision of Map 20 6 Lot 11 into two single family dwelling lots resulting in one with insufficient frontage. 21 22 Tim Peloquin from Promised Land Survey was presenting the case. 23 24 Mr. Meisner noted for the applicant that the board only had three members present which 25 meant he needed a unanimous vote to pass the variance. They had the right to postpone 26 the hearing to another time when there could be more members. 27 28 Mr. Peloquin recommended to Mr. Holmes that he hold off until he had more board 29 members. 30 31 Mr. Meisner noted that they could continue with the hearing and present their case and 32 for any reason during the hearing decide to postpone it without prejudice. Mr. Holmes 33 asked if it would be proper to poll the board and see how they were feeling. Mr. Meisner 34 noted they had not heard the case yet and was not comfortable doing that. 35 36 Mr. Holmes noted, as much as he dislikes waiting because the process has been fairly 37 long, he would prefer to postpone the hearing. 38 39 Mr. Meisner noted they were trying to schedule another hearing date for a failed septic 40 system and would see if they could add that to the next agenda. Mr. Peloquin noted they would prefer to have as many members in attendance as possible and would be willing to 41 wait until June 26<sup>th</sup> if necessary. 42 43 44 Mr. Meisner noted that case Case # 01 – M6 L11 for Peter Holmes has been postponed to 45 the next available meeting.

47 Public Hearing for Case # 02 – M22 L55. The property is located at 56 North Road and 48 is identified on Map 22 as Lot 55. An application submitted by Nordic Lincoln Realty 49 Trust requesting a variance from Article IIB, Section 3B of the zoning ordinance to 50 permit a new lot to be created with 50' of frontage.

51

52 Kevin Hatch, Cornerstone Survey Associates presented the application.

53 54

The applicants Ed Mencis, Mitchell Mencis and Linda Meehan were also present.

55 56

Mr. Hatch noted the variance was granted in 2007 and it had since expired. They took the exact plan to the planning board and received conditional subdivision approval. They didn't record the plan so their conditional approval had expired.

58 59

57

60 Mr. Meisner made the applicant aware that they only had three board members. Mr. 61 Hatch noted they would like to move forward knowing there are only three members 62 present.

63 64

65

66

67 68

69

70

71

Mr. Hatch showed the location of the proposed lot and noted the lot is tucked into the woods. The existing road frontage is 394' for the parent lot, just short of the 400' that is required for the two lots. For the new lot, they would access the property through the graveled access road that already exists. The property would have an access easement on that road. Even though they will access the property through the graveled access road, they still want some frontage for the lot. The home will be tucked back so far, it will be out of site from the road. The lot size exceeds the town requirements, the location keeps the rural character. The previous board granted the variance. They will need to go back to planning board and get those approvals again.

72 73 74

75

76

Mr. Meisner asked the board if they had any questions, Mr. Meisner asked Mr. Hatch to point out the existing lot. Mr. Hatch highlighted the two properties and explained that there are actually three lots. The third lot received planning board approval in 2006 before the 2007 lot was created. That third lot could be created without a variance.

77 78 79

80

81

Mr. St. Amand clarified how they would get from North Road to their property. Mr. Hatch explained they will have a deeded access easement on the third lot. No matter what, he will be able to get to his property. He noted they did that so they wouldn't have to create an additional dredge and fill by adding in a driveway.

82 83 84

Mr. Meisner clarified where the building envelopes were on the lots. Mr. Hatch showed him the plans for the planning board which indicated test pits, proposed well, and building boxes. The plans have been reviewed and approved by the town engineer.

86 87

85

- 88 Mr. Meisner noted that because they are dealing with a frontage issue, they could put in 89 stipulations to help meet the spirit of the ordinance, to reduce overcrowding. For
- 90 example, on Mr. Lake's property, they granted the variance but they included a condition 91 to have an additional side setback. (Increased to 75' no cut setback). Meisner verified the
- 92 building envelopes to make sure the homes wouldn't be on top of each other. Even

93 94	U	family is going to live there, they still want to keep the spirit of the ordinance and
94 95	кеер п	rural since it may not always be family living there.
	Mr. M	aigner questioned how alose the home was for the shutter. Mr. Hetah noted it was
96		eisner questioned how close the home was for the abutter. Mr. Hatch noted it was
97	over 1	00' away and they wouldn't see the home.
98	1414	-i
99		eisner opened the hearing up to the public at 7:45. There was no public in
100	attend	ance. Mr. Meisner closed the hearing to the public.
101 102	Mr. H	atch read his application and the answers to the variance questions:
103		•
104	1.	The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: It would allow a
105		residential home to be built in a residential neighborhood secluded from view.
106		
107	2.	The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: It will allow the landowner a
108		reasonable use of his land while maintaining the rural character of Sandown.
109		
110	3.	Substantial justice is done because: The existing 26.8 acre lot has just under 400-
111		feet of frontage and this variance will allow a low impact use without a new town
112		road.
113		
114	4.	The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished because: This
115		residential home will have no effect on the surrounding residential property values.
116	_	T7 T7 11.
117	5.	Unnecessary Hardship
118		(A) Owing to anotical conditions of the managery that distinguish it from other
119 120		(A) Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other
120		properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:
122		narusinp because.
123		(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general
123		public purposes of the ordinance and the specific application of
125		that provision to the property because: The intent of this ordinance
126		is to retain the rural character by separating houses with 200-feet of
127		frontage. This new house will be secluded from view, and
128		significantly separated from others.
129		(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one because: It allows a
130		residential use in a residential zone without the need for a new town
131		road to be built and maintained.
132		
133		If the criteria in subparagraph (A) are NOT established, an unnecessary
134		hardship will be deemed to exist, if and only if:
135		
136		(B) Owing to the special conditions, set forth above, the property cannot be
137		reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is
138		therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it because: The location of the
139		existing house, and the existing frontage being 6-feet short of the requirement for two
140		lots would disqualify the landowner from putting 2 houses on his 26 acre parcel.

- Mr. True questioned why they would have any frontage if they planned to access the lot
- from the graveled road. Mr. Meisner noted because they would then have a lot that is
- completely non-conforming.

144

- 145 Mr. Meisner noted he hoped the Planning Board would require an easement on lot 22-55-
- 1. Mr. Hatch noted when the original deed is drawn, it will have an easement on it.

147

- Mr. Meisner noted given how far back this lot sits he doesn't feel like it would need any
- additional buffers, in his opinion. His concern was that other houses may be able to see
- the home and that doesn't seem to be a concern.

151

- 152 **MOTION:** Mr. St. Amand made a motion to approve the application submitted by
- Nordic Lincoln Realty Trust requesting a variance from Article IIB, Section 3B of the
- zoning ordinance to permit a new lot to be created with 50' of frontage. The property is
- located at 56 North Road and is identified on Map 22 as Lot 55.

156

157 Mr. True seconded the motion.

158 159

159 Discussion: Mr. True didn't feel there was a need to put any conditions on it.

160

- 161 Mr. St. Amand feels that they've met the criteria. They are large lots. If they were small
- lots, he wouldn't be comfortable with it. There is plenty of room and the homes wouldn't
- be on top of each other.

164

165 Mr. Meisner agreed with that.

166

All members voted unanimously in favor; no opposed, no abstentions. The variance was granted with a 3-0-0 vote.

169

Mr. Meisner reminded the applicant that there was a 30-day appeals timeframe.

171

- 172 **Review of applications**
- 173 Case #3-M29L43. The property is located at 34 North Shore Road and is identified on
- 174 Map 29 as Lot 43. An application submitted by Patricia L. Rivers requesting a variance
- from Article II, Part A, Section 15 to allow the installation of a replacement septic system
- 176 closer than 75' from wells and surface water.

177

178 Mr. True and Mr. St. Amand verified the abutters list was accurate.

179

- Mr. Meisner noted they have the application fee and five stamped and addressed
- envelopes and all the criteria questions were answered.

182

- Mr. Meisner noted they need a stamped and certified septic plan and hoped the applicant
- would bring that to the hearing. He noted they needed that so they had something to
- reference which would show exactly where the septic system would be.

186

- MOTION: Mr. True made a motion to accept the application for case #3-M29L43. The property is located at 34 North Shore Road and is identified on Map 29 as Lot 43. An application submitted by Patricia L. Rivers requesting a variance from Article II, Part A, Section 15 to allow the installation of a replacement septic system closer than 75' from wells and surface water with the following condition:
  - A septic plan must be presented at the hearing

192 193 194

Mr. St. Amand seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

195

Case #4-M6 L72. The property is located at 20 Beechwood Road and is identified on Map 6 as Lot 72. An application submitted by Carolyn Miro and Thomas Whiteneck requesting a special exception from Article V, Section 5 to permit an accessory apartment.

200

201 Mr. True and Mr. St. Amand verified the abutters list.

202203

204

Mr. Meisner confirmed there were drawings of the home, test pit data sheet, application fee, plot plan from 2001, eight stamped and addressed envelopes and the criteria questions have been answered. There is a complete application.

205206207

208

209

210

**MOTION:** Mr. True made a motion to accept the application for case #4-M6 L72. The property is located at 20 Beechwood Road and is identified on Map 6 as Lot 72. An application submitted by Carolyn Miro and Thomas Whiteneck requesting a special exception from Article V, Section 5 to permit an accessory apartment. Mr. St. Amand seconded the motion. Members voted unanimously in favor. The motion passed.

211212213

- Correspondence
- Legal notice from the Town of Merrimack regarding a cell tower.

214215

217

- 216 **Review of Minutes** 
  - Minutes needed to be deferred to the next meeting because they didn't have enough members present who attended those meetings.

218219

Members discussed trying to have a second meeting on June 19<sup>th</sup> to accommodate the hearing for the failed septic. Mr. Meisner, Mr. True and Mr. St. Amand all noted they could be there for that meeting.

223

MOTION: Mr. True made a motion to adjourn. Mr. St. Amand seconded the motion. All members voted in favor. The motion passed. Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

226

227 Respectfully Submitted,

Janes Rains

228 229

Andrea Cairns