



**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: April 22, 2014  
Decision Date: April 22, 2014  
Case Number 1065

### **Notice of Decision**

**Case #1065:** Camp Starfish/Emily Golinsky, 1121 Main Street, Lancaster MA 01523 for property located at 12 Camp Monomonac Rd, Tax Map 3, Lot 71 in the Residential District, for a Variance from Article IV, Section A of the Zoning Ordinance to permit 2 shed-style buildings for use as learning spaces for campers; expansion of one cabin to allow for more sleeping space; addition of two cabins to the same village; small bump out on side of existing building to permit one additional sleeping space; creation of emergency egress fire escape stairs with possible bump out of partial side of dining hall to accommodate it, addition of third row of parking spaces at field parking area.

Sitting on this case were Joe Hill, Marcia Breckenridge, David Drouin, Phil Stenersen and Bill Thomas.

### **The Board found that:**

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

The expansion would not be visible to the public

**Vote: 5-0-0**

**2. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:**

It is addressing special needs students. There is no gain to the public and only a loss by denying this.

**Vote: 5-0-0**

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

It promotes health, safety and welfare of special needs children

**Vote: 5-0-0**

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

There is no impact on surrounding properties and no evidence to dispute that.

**Vote: 5-0-0**

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

It's a large block of property in an area of small properties set up for semipublic use.

**Vote: 5-0-0**

**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:**

This does not apply.

**Vote: 5-0-0**

AND

**5b. The proposed variance would be a reasonable one because:**

It is in keeping with the existing use and is a minor expansion.

**Vote: 5-0-0**

**MOTION:** Joe Hill moved to grant the Variance because all five criteria have been met. Phil Stenersen seconded the motion. **Vote: 5-0-0**

**The variance was granted as all five criteria were met**

**We incorporate by reference the approved minutes of the meeting of April 22, 2014**



David Drouin, Chairman



Marcia Breckenridge, Vice Chair