



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - AGENDA

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, November 18, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

1. ATTENDANCE

2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2010.

3. OLD BUSINESS

4. NEW BUSINESS

- A. *Z 10-16 Chris & Rebecca Anderson, 83 Spruce Ln., Tax Map I, Lot 81-R, zoned R-40, requests a setback and an Area Variance from the terms of Article IV, Section 170-12.B and Article X, Section 170-40.A and 170-41.D, to allow construction of an addition to an existing non-conforming dwelling within approximately 11.5 & 29 feet of the front property boundaries, where a minimum of forty (40) feet is required, and relief from the requirement that the maximum area of the addition shall not exceed 20% of the gross habitable floor space of the existing dwelling.

5. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

6. ADJOURN

*If the application is accepted for discussion, the public hearing will be held that evening.

Persons with questions or wishing to see the plans are invited to visit the Planning Office, weekdays from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm. You may also view materials at www.dover.nh.gov, a map showing project locations can be found at www.dover.nh.gov/planhome.html. Follow us on Twitter @DoverNHPlanning and find us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/CityofDoverNHPlanning.



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, October 21, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

1. ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Sam Reid (Chair), William Colbath (Vice Chair), James Kelley, Otis Perry, Frank Landford

Members Not Present: Chris Prior (Alternate member)

Staff Present: Bruce Woodruff (Zoning Administrator), Lisa Ertle (Recording Secretary)

2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2010.

Motion: O.Perry motioned to approve the September 16, 2010 minutes. J.Kelley seconded. Vote: Unanimous approval.

3. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Z 10-11 Chad Weathers & Olga Mollin, 24 Westwood Cr., Tax Map F, Lot 17-N, zoned R-40, requests a Variance from the terms of Article IV, Section 170-12.B, to construct an addition (garage) within 11 feet from a side property line where a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet is required.

Note: This item was tabled from the meeting of August 19, 2010.

The Chair read a correspondence from an abutter who is in favor of this application. (Copy in file)

Motion: O.Perry motioned to remove application from table for consideration. F.Landford seconded. Vote: Unanimous approval.

Chad Weathers and Olga Mollin, of 24 Westwood Circle, stated they are looking to remove an existing garage and replace it with a two bay garage. C. Weathers discussed a letter of correspondence from an abutter who is in favor of the request. (Copy on file)

Public Hearing Opened

In favor of the request-No one spoke.

Not in favor of the request-No one spoke.

B.Woodruff discussed the mapping of the property and noted the change of the Zoning district from R-1 to R-40 after the houses had been constructed in 1979, which changed the side setback requirements. The Planning Department recommends the application be approved with the following condition: That the required building permits are acquired and a foundation plot plan is prepared by a surveyor prior to constructing the new garage.

The Chair and B.Woodruff confirmed the requirement for the foundation plot plan due to the fact that certification of foundation would not be required.

Public Hearing Closed

The Board discussed a surveyed map of property. (Copy on file)



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, October 21, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

The Chair asked C. Weathers if there are any other garages this size in the neighborhood. C. Weathers noted possibly two other neighbors.

Public Hearing Closed

Motion: O.Perry motioned to grant the variance. F.Landford seconded. Vote: Unanimous approval.

Motion: O.Perry moved to amend motion to add the condition that the foundation is surveyed to confirm that the foundation is 11 feet from property lines. F.Landford seconded. Vote: Unanimous Approval.

Findings of Fact:

1. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not be contrary to the public interest? Yes. Per submission and presentation.
2. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates how a variance observes the spirit of the ordinance? Yes. Per submission and presentation.
3. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates how a variance will result in substantial justice? Yes. Per submission and presentation.
4. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not diminish the values of surrounding properties? Yes. Per submission and presentation.
5. 5A. The Applicant was to provide proof that literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. (i) Did the Applicant demonstrate that special conditions of the property exist that distinguish it from other properties in the area? Yes. Per submission and presentation. (ii) Did the Applicant demonstrate that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property? Yes. Per submission and presentation. (iii) Did the applicant demonstrate that the proposed use is a reasonable one? Yes. Per submission and presentation.

4. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Z 10-14-A Suzanne French, Trustee, (Owner: Noel R. Goulet & Rachel R. Goulet Living Trust), 6 Hall St., Tax Map 37, Lot 17A, zoned B-3, requests a Use Variance from the terms of Article IV, Section 170-11.A, B & D, to develop the land for either single family residence or a duplex residence.

Note: The following item will be heard if the previous item is granted.

- B. Z 10-14-B Suzanne French, Trustee, (Owner: Noel R. Goulet & Rachel R. Goulet Living Trust), 6 Hall St., Tax Map 37, Lot 17A, zoned B-3, requests an Area Variance from the terms of Article IV, Section 170-12.A & B and Section 170-39, to construct a single-family residence or a duplex residence with a front setback requirement of twelve (12) feet, where fifty (50) feet is required.



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, October 21, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

Attorney James Schulte represented the applicant. He discussed the unique location of this property that is located on Hall Street and abuts Hannaford shopping plaza property. There is little use for commercial this lot and feels residential is the best use. The applicant is asking for allowance of a single or multi family unit. The setbacks would be consistent with the neighborhood. The structure built will be constructed further back to avoid an existing sewer line.

Public Hearing Opened

In favor of the request-No one Spoke.

Not in favor of the request- No one Spoke.

B.Woodruff discussed the B-3 district zone. He noted the street is residential in character, and can not handle commercial traffic. The Planning Department recommends approval of this application with the following condition: That the use on the property remains residential in keeping with the neighborhood, that any future owner that may wish to use the property or structure for a commercial use (usually allowed by right) shall come back to the ZBA to request a change in the terms of this variance.

The Chair and B.Woodruff discussed the city regulations for this site and the concern from abutters. The Chair read a letter of concern from an abutter. (Copy on file)

The Board discussed the following: the purview of the Zoning Board, the permitted uses for the homes in the B-3 zone, and amount of mixed-used dwellings.

W.Colbath asked why the applicant is asking for a 12 ft. front setback. As stated previously from Attorney J. Schulte, the setback is consistent with other structures in the neighborhood. It is the front setback directly across the street, which is in an Office zone.

The board discussed the boundary lines that connect Dover into Rollinsford; Hall Street extends approximately 200 ft., which connects the City of Dover into the town of Rollinsford.

Public Hearing Closed

O.Perry and Attorney J. Schulte discussed the necessity of the condition for “multi-family” use.

The Chair noted his concern with the size of the lot and the street. J.Schulte discussed the average size lots in the City. J.Kelley noted his concern with crowding on the small lot. Discussion ensued on the size of the lot. If a multi unit is built there will be crowding on the lot and in the neighborhood.

Motion: O.Perry motioned to grant the variance for residential, subject that it only be a single family use, without the Planning Department recommendation. He noted his concern with the Planning Department recommendation. J.Kelley seconded. Vote: 4-1 (opposed F.Landford)

Motion: O.Perry motioned to grant a variance to allow the front setback to be 12 ft. F.Landford seconded. Vote: Unanimous approval.



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, October 21, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

Findings of Fact:

1. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not be contrary to the public interest? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney.
 2. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates how a variance observes the spirit of the ordinance? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney.
 3. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates how a variance will result in substantial Justice? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney.
 4. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not diminish the values of surrounding properties? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney.
 5. 5A. The Applicant was to provide proof that literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. (i) Did the Applicant demonstrate that special conditions of the property exist that distinguish it from other properties in the area? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney. (ii) Did the Applicant demonstrate that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney. (iii) Did the applicant demonstrate that the proposed use is a reasonable one? Yes. Per submission and presentation by applicant's attorney.
- C. Z10-15 Michael & Maureen Ryan, 15 Arch St., Tax Map 10, Lot 162, zoned RM-U, requests an Area Variance from the terms of Article IV, Section 170.11 and Section 170-12, to subdivide a parcel into 2 lots, creating one with frontage of sixty (60) feet, where a minimum of eighty (80) feet is required.

Attorney James Schulte represented the applicants. The Arch Street zone is currently designated RM-U, but there is a petition currently being brought before the Planning Board to vote on rezoning this to the R-12 zone. The street is residential with a mix of residential uses, and is used as a through street. The applicant will keep the existing house on one lot with a division line, and would prefer not to have a shared driveway. They plan to live on the new lot and sell the old lot. The purpose of frontage is to allow spacing for the buildings and to meet the setback requirements. He discussed the abutting properties, which are mainly backyards facing this property. He cited a letter from a RE Max realtor that addresses the issue of diminution of value to the abutting properties. (Copy on file)

Public Hearing Opened
In favor of the request-No one Spoke
Not in favor of the request-

Carol Boc, of 8 Arch Street, noted her concern of this application in regards to the current petition to the City for rezoning Arch Street. She stated her concerns with the 60ft. frontage request, the congestion of traffic the paving will incur, and the up keep of characteristic for this neighborhood. She submitted a plan that detailed the square footage of frontage for each home on Arch Street. (Copy on file) C.Bok suggested the following conditions for approval: applicant create a shared driveway, limit the house to single family residence.



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, October 21, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

Robert Doyle, 22 West Concord Street, noted his concern with the frontage of the lot, and the width of the driveway. The abutting backyard neighbors will have to look into a parking lot. He feels this will be best as a single family home.

Attorney J.Schulte stated having separate driveways is important to the clients. He discussed the concerns with having a shared driveway. The applicants would be willing to accept the condition of building a single unit residence with the 60 ft. frontage.

C.Boc stated she would stand by the approval of two lots with 70 ft. sq. frontage and two single units, with a shared driveway.

B.Woodruff noted the Planning Department recommends the ZBA ask the applicant whether this use is for a single or two family structure. The Planning Department recommends screening and a shared driveway to be considered as conditions. If the Board approves the variance, staff would suggest the following conditions: The plat shall go to the Planning Board for their review and approval; that the residential use be limited to a single family dwelling.

B.Woodruff discussed the rezoning of the district in 2009, and the replacement of frontage with build to lines to match the frontage in the neighborhood. Discussion ensued with the Board on this subject. W.Colbath suggested to make the two lots with 70 ft. sq. frontage, and to limit both lots to single family residence. Attorney Schulte noted the applicants are limited on the size of development and are willing to accommodate.

The Board and Attorney Schulte discussed the setbacks in regards to the neighborhood, and the position of the driveway in concern to abutters. Attorney Schulte suggested making both lots 70 ft. setback, and place the driveway on the right, and new house be centered on the lot.

J.Kelley and Attorney Schulte discussed the dimension of the lots and the dimensions of the existing garage. O.Perry noted the driveway access may be best placed on the southern side of the lot, and the residential use be a single family use. Discussion ensued on the garage located at the rear of the parcel.

Public Hearing Closed

C.Boc asked for clarification on the procedure in regards to changing the particulars in variance requests. B. Woodruff clarified that this was allowed.

Motion: O.Perry motioned to grant a variance subdividing the lot into 2 lots, one lot with 70 ft. of frontage and the new lot having 69.6 ft. of frontage (more or less); and on the new lot the driveway be on the southern side and no closer than 5 feet to the abutting lot. Finally, that the new lot be allowed only a single family residence use. J.Kelley seconded. Vote: Unanimous Approval.

Findings of Fact:

Document Created by, Planning
Secretary

Document Posted on: October 19, 2010

Draft.2010.10.21_ZoningBoardofAdjustment.Minutes.doc

Page 5 of 6



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Thursday, October 21, 2010**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

1. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not be contrary to the public interest? Yes.
2. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates how a variance observes the spirit of the ordinance? Yes.
3. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates how a variance will result in substantial Justice? Yes.
4. Did the Applicant provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not diminish the values of surrounding properties? Yes.
5. 5A. The Applicant was to provide proof that literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. (i) Did the Applicant demonstrate that special conditions of the property exist that distinguish it from other properties in the area? Yes. (ii) Did the Applicant demonstrate that no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property? Yes. (iii) Did the applicant demonstrate that the proposed use is a reasonable one? Yes.

5. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

The Chair noted the receipt of a letter from Ann Wilkins, who had come before the ZBA Board for a variance to the side setback. B.Woodruff discussed the variance that was approved with a plan, which was submitted from the applicants, by the Zoning Board. The Wilkins are looking for clarification on the specifics of the variance. Discussion ensued on the variance that was granted, whether the variance was decided on the plans and documents submitted, and the concerns of the Wilkins. B.Woodruff noted he will not sign off on a building permit for the building official to grant a permit to build a foundation up to line the ZBA granted because the submitted plans indicated that the planned overhang of 2'-6" was at the approved setback. It has to be the plans that the ZBA approved. Any variances from this line will need to be brought before the ZBA Board.

B.Woodruff noted he has booklets of resource that may be helpful to Board Members. These are available for ordering to any of the Board members.

The Chair noted that B.Woodruff submitted a handout of policies and procedures for Findings of Fact that are used in other municipalities. B.Woodruff spoke about the handout. The Board discussed the terms necessary for the Finding of Facts. The facts have to come from the individual ZBA member and not as group, but all facts need to come together as a consensus from the group.

6. ADJOURN

O.Perry motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:49 pm. W.Colbath seconded. Vote: Unanimous.



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – ABUTTER NOTICE

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
 Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
 Meeting Date: Thursday, November 18, 2010
 Meeting Time: 7:00 pm

INTENT: To obtain a front setback Variance (11.5 and 29 ft to the front property lines where 40 ft. is required) and relief from the requirement that the maximum area of an addition to a non-conforming structure be limited to 20% of the total existing structure area.

LOTS/UNITS PROPOSED: None

AGENDA ITEM #: 4-A

ZONING DISTRICT: R-40

FILE: Z10-16

APPLICANT(S): Chris & Rebecca Anderson

OWNER(S): Chris & Rebecca Anderson

LOCATION: 83 Spruce Lane (Assessor's Map I, Lot 81R)

ACREAGE: 9,751 sq. ft. (0.224 acre)

EXISTING LAND USE: Single Family Dwelling

PROPOSED LAND USE: Same

SURROUNDING LAND USE: Single family houses

ZONING HISTORY: Zoned R-1 in 1948, amended to R-40 in 1979

PREVIOUS ZBA ACTION:
None

ATTACHMENTS:
None

PLANNING BOARD APPROVAL REQUIRED: No

Dear Property Owner: As an owner of abutting property, which is either adjoining or located directly across the street from the subject parcel, you are hereby notified of the public hearing on the bolded item below.


The full Zoning Board of Adjustment agenda is as follows:

1. ATTENDANCE
2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2010.
3. OLD BUSINESS
4. NEW BUSINESS

A. *Z10-16 CHRIS & REBECCA ANDERSON, 83 SPRUCE LN., TAX MAP I, LOT 81-R, ZONED R-40, REQUESTS A SETBACK AND AN AREA VARIANCE FROM THE TERMS OF ARTICLE IV, SECTION 170-12.B AND ARTICLE X, SECTION 170-40.A AND 170-41.D, TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING NON-CONFORMING DWELLING WITHIN APPROXIMATELY 11.5 AND 29 FEET OF THE FRONT PROPERTY BOUNDARIES, WHERE A MINIMUM OF FORTY (40) FEET IS REQUIRED, AND RELIEF FROM THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE MAXIMUM AREA OF THE ADDITION SHALL NOT EXCEED 20% OF THE GROSS HABITABLE FLOOR SPACE OF THE EXISTING DWELLING.

5. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS
6. ADJOURN


*IF THE APPLICATION IS ACCEPTED FOR DISCUSSION, THE PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD THAT EVENING. PERSONS WITH QUESTIONS OR WISHING TO SEE THE PLANS ARE INVITED TO VISIT THE PLANNING OFFICE, WEEKDAYS FROM 8:00 AM TO 4:00 PM. YOU MAY ALSO VIEW MATERIALS AT WWW.DOVER.NH.GOV, A MAP SHOWING PROJECT LOCATIONS CAN BE FOUND AT WWW.DOVER.NH.GOV/PLANHOME.HTML. FOLLOW US ON TWITTER @DOVERNHPANNING AND FIND US ON FACEBOOK AT WWW.FACEBOOK.COM/CITYOFDOVERNHPANNING.



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – ABUTTER NOTICE

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
 Meeting Location: Council Chambers - 288 Central Avenue, Dover, NH 03820
 Meeting Date: Thursday, November 18, 2010
 Meeting Time: 7:00 pm



...GIS\Dover\dgn\basemap.dgn 10/25/2010 2:47:30 PM Scale 1"=20' North at top of page not a survey R-40 setbacks apply



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD - STAFF MEMO FILE #Z10-16

Application Type:	Front Setback (both frontages) and 20% expansion Variance
Applicant(s):	Chris & Rebecca Anderson
Owner(s):	Chris & Rebecca Anderson
Location:	83 Spruce Lane (Assessor's Map I, Lot 81R)

INTENT: To obtain a front setback Variance (11.5 and 29 ft to the front property lines where 40 ft. is required) and relief from the requirement that the maximum area of an addition to a non-conforming structure be limited to 20% of the total existing structure area.

LOTS/UNITS PROPOSED: None

AGENDA ITEM #: 4-A

ZONING DISTRICT: R-40

EXISTING LAND USE: Single Family Dwelling

PROPOSED LAND USE: Same

SURROUNDING LAND USE: Single family dwellings

PREVIOUS ZBA ACTION: None

PB APPROVAL REQUIRED: No

ATTACHMENT: Plan, application

APPLICATION IS COMPLETE: Yes

NOTICES AS REQUIRED: Yes

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Department recommends that the application be approved.

quite one-third of the required lot size for a lot with City sewer and water in the R-40 zone. It must be noted that the subdivision was approved and the dwelling constructed under the old R-1 regulations that were put in place in 1948. The R-40 area regulations were instituted in 1979 and the parcels in this subdivision really don't fit/comply with those area and setback requirements. The parcel and the dwelling structure are grandfathered non-conforming. The parcel is a corner lot which therefore has two frontages, one side and one rear setback which leaves a very small building envelope (refer to plan) that if adhered to would preclude a common-sense addition given the internal layout of the house.

This older subdivision on the south side of Spruce Lane abuts the less restrictive R-12 district which is directly across the street. When the major zoning amendments were codified in 1979, it may have made more sense to have included this neighborhood in the R-12, rather than drawing the boundary along the Spruce centerline. Since this was not done, granting relief from dimensional requirements appears to make sense.

The arguments put forth in the variance requirements narrative appear sound and logical.

Reason for Staff Recommendation

The requested action appears to be consistent with the Master Plan which guides development in the City of Dover. It appears to be supportive of the community's goals and vision for long term growth and sustainability. A review of the City's Geographic Information System maps shows that the entire neighborhood south of Spruce is comprised of non-conforming sized parcels in the R-40 zone.

Staff concur with the variance requirement narrative contained in the application, however, would recommend placing substantial weight on any abutter comments during the public hearing before making a decision.

Recommendation

The Planning Department recommends the Zoning Board accept the application, hold the public hearing. Additionally, staff recommends the Board ask questions and deliberate on the proposed bulk of the addition and how it may affect other aspects of the lot, such as driveway location and capacity. If the Board approves the variance, staff offer no conditions for this application.

Summary of Request and Background

The residential lot at 83 Spruce Lane contains approximately 9,800 sq. ft. area which is not



CITY OF DOVER

ZONING BOARD - STAFF MEMO FILE #Z10-16


Application Type: Front Setback (both frontages) and 20% expansion Variance
Applicant(s): Chris & Rebecca Anderson
Owner(s): Chris & Rebecca Anderson
Location: 83 Spruce Lane (Assessor's Map I, Lot 81R)



...\\GIS\Dover\dgn\basemap.dgn 10/25/2010 2:47:30 PM Scale 1"=20' North at top of page not a survey R-40 setbacks apply

CASE # 210-16 DATE RECEIVED _____

AMOUNT PAID \$ 240.00 TIME RECEIVED _____



**CITY OF DOVER
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
APPLICATION**

I. APPLICANT Chris Anderson
ADDRESS 83 Spruce Ln

PHONE #: 603-343-1350

PROPERTY OWNER - Rebecca Anderson
ADDRESS - 83 Spruce Ln Dover NH

PROPERTY LOCATION - 83 Spruce Ln Dover NH 03820

BRIEF DIRECTIONS - Back river rd, left on to Spruce Ln. Corner of Spruce and Tanglewood.

ZONE R40 **ASSESSOR'S MAP** X **LOT #(S)** 83 81R

TYPE OF APPEAL: (Please check off one)

X **VARIANCE** ARTICLE IV SECTION 170-12B
X **SPECIAL EXCEPTION** ARTICLE _____ SECTION 170-40A § 170-41D
_____ **ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION** ARTICLE _____ SECTION _____
_____ **EQUITABLE WAIVER** ARTICLE _____ SECTION _____

Describe briefly your plans for this property: To add an addition in the dimensions of 20' wide x 28' long and 1' overhangs on loweaves. This will allow for 1 additional Bed Room, 1 additional bath room and a family room.

II. REQUIREMENTS SUBMITTED: (Please check off)

A. Plot plan drawn in accordance with a boundary line survey to scale not less than 1" = 40', (12 copies). They need to include the lot dimensions including area in square feet, and also the size and location of existing and proposed buildings if applicable, including setbacks. _____

B. List of abutters including addresses and map and lot number of parcels who adjoin or are directly across the street or stream from property. X

C. Application fee of:
\$100.00 VARIANCE \$100.00
\$100.00 SPECIAL EXCEPTION \$ _____
\$25.00 APPEAL FROM ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION \$ _____
\$100.00 EQUITABLE WAIVER \$ _____

D. Certified letters fee:
of abutters 8 X \$8.00 = \$64.00
Applicant & Owner 2 X \$8.00 = \$16.00
Foster's ad \$ 60.00

TOTAL \$ 240.00

III. **NARRATIVE:** Complete the section pertaining to your request for a dimensional/area variance. Keep your answers brief and be prepared to explain them in detail at the meeting. The burden of proof is on the applicant. If you need more space use an additional sheet of paper

DIMENSIONAL/AREA VARIANCE REQUIREMENTS: (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT IN INK)

1. Provide proof that special conditions exist and that literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Demonstrate that an area variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property; and that the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some other method reasonably feasible for the applicant to pursue, without the area variance.

Our property sits on a corner lot with 2 frontages. An addition will not fit in building envelope and provide normal floor plan. It would also be an odd shaped structure unlike the addition we would like to build. The property was originally zoned as an R1 zone and now we can't add to the property due to the zone change.

My wife and I recently had triplets in May of 2010. The home is now too small for the family. We now have 6 children 10, 4, 2 and 3 that are 5 months. We would like to remain in Dover and in this school district and neighborhood.

2. Provide proof that demonstrates how granting the variance will result in substantial justice.

The property sits between 2 zones, R12 and R40. We don't have the same ability as neighbors across the street to add on to our property. Being in a R1 zone previously the new building envelope leaves us no room to add to our home.

3. Provide proof that demonstrates how a variance would be consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

The variance would allow us to add to our property given the special circumstances of our property being on the edge of 2 zones.

4. Provide proof that demonstrates the variance will not result in a diminution in value of surrounding properties.

The property is located on a corner lot. The addition will add value to the home and should help raise the value of other houses in the neighborhood.

5. Provide proof that demonstrates the variance would not be contrary to the public interest.

We would be able to add to our property like other neighbors.

CITY OF DOVER

Pursuant to RSA 676:7, the State Law of New Hampshire, the City of Dover is required to notify the applicant and every abutter of the public hearing by certified mail, return receipt requested. The Cost of required publication or posting of notice, and the cost of mailing said notices, shall be paid by the applicant.

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION MUST BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT

"Abutter" is defined in Chapter 170, Dover Zoning Ordinance, as "Any person whose property is located in New Hampshire and adjoins or is directly across the street or stream from the land under consideration by the Board. For purposes of receiving testimony only, and not for purposes of notification, the term abutter shall include any person who is able to demonstrate that his or her land will be directly affected by the proposal under consideration. For purpose of receipt of notification for a public hearing by the Board, the term of abutting property owner for a condominium or other collective form of ownership means the officers of the collective or association as defined in RSA 356-B :3, XXIII."

Tax Map	Lot No	Owner(s) of Record	Mailing Address
I-81I	Lot 80	Stephen and Amy Poulin	80 Spruce Ln
I-81S	Lot 82	William and Narielle Colbath	82 Spruce Ln
I-81M	Lot 84	Gladys and Stephen Marrow	84 Spruce Ln
I-81J	Lot 81	Nancy and Anthony MaCaione	81 ¹⁸ Spruce Ln (EW)
I-99X	Lot 1	James Morrison	1 Tanglewood Dr
I-81U	Lot 2	Richard and Sally Tapan	2 Berkshire Ln
I-99L	Lot 4	Christopher and Wendy Bubar	4 Berkshire Ln
I-81Q	Lot 85	Gloria Stiles	85 Spruce Ln

SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUIREMENTS

1. Explain how the requested use would be essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare.

2. Detail how the requested use would not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety.

3. Describe how the requested use would not overload any public water, drainage or sewerage system or any other municipal system to such an extent that the requested use or any developed use in the immediate area or in any other area of the City will be unduly subjected to hazards affecting health, safety or the general welfare.

THIS SECTION OF THE APPLICATION MUST BE COMPLETED BY ALL APPLICANTS

IV. As applicant of standing of this request, I certify that the information herein is complete and accurate.

[Handwritten signature]

Signature of Applicant*

IMPORTANT
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION SIGN
MUST BE POSTED ON THE PROPERTY
FOR THE 5 DAYS PRIOR TO HEARING.
FAILURE TO POST MAY RESULT IN
APPLICATION NOT BEING ACCEPTED

[Handwritten signature: Rebecca Andr...]

Signature of Owner*

*Both Signatures Required

The applicant waives the requirement of holding a hearing within thirty (30) days of receipt of the application, pursuant to RSA 676:7, II:

Signature of Applicant


Date

TANGLEWOOD

ROW EOP

building setback lines


810




SPURCE
ZONE BNOCKY R-12
R-40

SPUR

850





...\\GIS\Dover\dgn\basemap.dgn 11/1/2010 3:05:05 PM Scale 1"=40' North at top of page not a survey

RECEIVED
NOV 04 2010
By: *[Signature]*