



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: August 26, 2014
Decision Date: August 26, 2014
Case Number 1072

Notice of Decision

Case #1072: Alan and Susan Seagrave, Jr, 169 Woodbound Road, Rindge, NH 03461, Tax Map 46 Lot 1 in the Residential District for a Variance from Article IV, Section B2 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit construction of a storage shed within setback from the road.

Sitting on this case were: David Drouin, Joe Hill, Janet Goodrich, Bill Thomas, Phil Stenersen.

The Board found that:

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

It doesn't violate the basic zoning objectives; it does not alter the character of the neighborhood and does not threaten the public health, safety or welfare.

Vote: 5-0-0

2. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

There is no gain to the public in denying this because of the size of the lots in this neighborhood.

Vote: 5-0-0

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

It allows him to maintain his property and to store things reasonably; it preserves the value and character of the town and it is consistent with other storage areas in Woodmere.

Vote: 5-0-0

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

It is consistent with surrounding properties and would only increase the value of the property.

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 is distinguished from properties surrounding it due to the paper roads, the small lot sizes and this is unique to the Woodmere community.

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:

Not Applicable

Vote: 5-0-0

AND

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

The properties are all small in this area.

Vote: 5-0-0

MOTION: Joe Hill moved to grant the Variance with no conditions because all five criteria have been met. Janet Goodrich seconded the motion. **Vote: 5-0-0**

The Variance has been GRANTED.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Hoyland, Clerk



David Drouin, Chairman



Marcia Breckenridge, Vice Chair