



RINDGE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
30 PAYSON HILL ROAD
RINDGE NH 03461
PH. (603) 899-5181 x 100 FAX (603) 899-2101 TDD 1-800-735-2964
www.town.rindge.nh.us

Hearing Date: July 23, 2013
Decision Date: July 23, 2013
Case Number 1054

Notice of Decision

Case #1054: William & Anne Thomas, 15 Todd Hill Road, Rindge, NH 03461, Map 27, Lot 11-2-1, for a Variance from Article VI, Paragraph C,2 of the Rindge Zoning Ordinance to allow the addition of a garage to the side of the barn within 50 feet of the right of way.

Sitting: Dave Drouin (Chair), Phil Stenersen, Rick Sirvint, Forbes Farmer and Joe Hill.

The Board found that:

1. The variance use would not be contrary to the public interest because:

It does not alter the character of the neighborhood nor threaten public health, safety and welfare. It does not further violate the existing building setback.

Vote: (Y) (All) N

2. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

The landowner would suffer if this property could not be repaired and there is no loss to the interest of the public. The public does not gain anything by not granting the variance.

Vote: (Y) (All) N

3. The variance would be consistent with the spirit and intent of the Rindge Zoning Ordinance because:

The variance would be consistent with maintaining the health, safety welfare and preserving the value and character of the town.

Vote: (Y) (All) N

4. Granting the variance would not diminish surrounding property values because

It is in character with the existing buildings in the neighborhood and it only improves the property.

Vote: (Y) (All) N

5. Special conditions do exist on the property that distinguishes it from other properties in the area, such that literal enforcement of the ordinance results in unnecessary hardship.

Special conditions do exist: there is an extremely short set back from the right of way to the existing building; there is no substantial change to the use in terms of the neighborhood; and the character of the building which is a long rambling building,

Vote: (Y) (All) N

5a. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance provision(s) and the specific application of the provision(s) to the property because:

Not applicable, see #5

Vote: (Y) (All) N

5b. the proposed use would be a reasonable one because:

Not applicable, see #5

Vote: (Y) (All) N

The variance was granted because it met all five criteria.

Vote: (Y) (All) N

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Hoyland, Clerk


David Drouin, Chairman


Marcia Breckenridge, Vice Chairman