APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE

TOWN OF CENTER HABOR - ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Name of Applicant: Joseph Battani	Town Office Section Only	
Owner: Joseph & Danielle Battaini (If different from applicant)	Case No. 2018-0409	
	Date Filed: <u>03-22-18</u>	
Physical Address: 24 Dew Point Lane, Center Harbor, N.H. 03226	Received By: Pobin/HmS	
Mailing Address if different: P.O. Box 1082, Worcester, MA 01613	/	
Email: joseph.battaini@marshmma.com Phone: 508-450-8773		
Map Lot:		
**Note: This application is not acceptable unless all required state Additional information may be supplied on a separate sheet if the According to the Center Harbor Zoning Board of Adjustment By application shall be read into the record by the applicant, applicant	space provided is inadequate. Laws, Section 6 (b), the nt's designee or clerk **	
A variance is requested from article section permit See attached.	of the zoning ordinance to	
Facts in support of granting the variance: 1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest be See attached.	ecause:	
2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be ob	served because:	
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because: See attached.		

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because See attached.
5. Unnecessary Hardship
A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:
i. 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 because
See attached.
and:
ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:
See attached.
B. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, and unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.
See attached.
Applicant Signature: Joseph B. Buttann Date: 3/19/2018

Application for Variance – Town of Center Harbor – ZBA

Joseph Battaini

Map 103 Lot 015-000

A variance is requested from 5:3:1 of the zoning ordinance to permit coverage of greater than 150 square feet within the 50-75 foot setback zone from lake as determined by comparison of existing conditions versus additions made resulting in net effect.

Facts in support of granting the variance:

- and
- 2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, and if a variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

See <u>Farrar v. City of Keene</u>, 158 N.H. 684, 691, 973 A.2d 326 (2009) and <u>Chester Rod and Gun Club v. Town of Chester</u>, 152 N.H. 577, 581, 883 A.2d 1034 (2005) for the development of the premises that in the first instance, the two criteria are considered together and require a determination of whether the variance would "unduly and in marked degree conflict with the ordinance such that it violates the ordinance's basic zoning objectives." 5:3:1 of the zoning ordinance has a limitation of 150 square feet for patio area and like improvements constructed within 50' to 75' of the shore. The basic objective is aesthetics and limiting runoff impact concerning the lake. The objectives are met as the design provides that runoff is contained with some placement of stone retaining walls, ample green space, and with numerous plantings at and near the shore. The improvements are of a low profile and not readily noticeable.

- 3. Substantial justice is done: Approximately 750 square feet of area is to be added with existing of 590 square feet of reconfigured area connecting paths, patio and outdoor entertainment areas and steps to dock. The additional impact is not contiguous with ample spacing of previous areas with plantings containing and controlling runoff. Therefore, net effect is there is no harm to the general public or to other individuals. The general public will not realize an appreciable gain from denying the variances. See generally Malachy Glen Associates v. Town of Chichester, 155 N.H. 102, 109, 920 A.2d.
- 4. The values of surrounding properties are not diminished: The improvements are in place, albeit through mistake under the assumption only state permitting was required. The area of improvement is landscaped with ample screening. The improvements are level to the ground or low profiles with retaining walls which overall presents a pleasing appearance to the waterfront not diminishing surrounding properties.
- 5. Unnecessary Hardships: Literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. Unnecessary hardship means:

Because of special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

- (a) There is no fair and substantial relationship between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property; and
- (b) The proposed use is a reasonable one.

Alternatively, unnecessary hardship means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance.

The subject lot is irregular in shape having a bow tie appearance with the residence constructed at the wider area comprising the shore lot with other end of lot extending to Whittier Highway. The shore area of the lot falls off to the lake. Because of the sloping conditions toward the lake, the improvements constructed stabilize the slope making for stabilization to the water's edge with stone retaining and leveling of ground to slow runoff. Adjoining lots are level without the degree of sloping the subject lot presents. The general public purpose of the ordinance is for aesthetic and natural conditions for runoff containment. Because of the special conditions, runoff comes from the top of the property and through a narrow neck that funnels runoff to the shore. The improvements make for a more controlled condition for runoff containment. The improvements are reasonable and do not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.



Subject Property:

Parcel Number:

103-015-000

CAMA Number:

103-015-000

Property Address: 24 DEW POINT LANE (PVT)

Mailing Address: BATTAINI, JOSEPH B. AND DANIELLE C.

11 SADDLEBRED DRIVE

LEOMINSTER, MA 01453

Abutters:

Parcel Number: 103-014-000

CAMA Number: 103-014-000

Property Address: DEW POINT LANE (PVT)

Parcel Number: 103-021-000 CAMA Number: 103-021-000

Parcel Number: 103-016-000 CAMA Number: 103-016-000

Property Address: 18 DEW POINT LANE (PVT)

Mailing Address: RICCIARDI, WM & WEED, JILL

PO BOX 1261 CENTER HARBOR, NH 03226

Mailing Address: DUYMAZLAR, MEHMET H

10 SUDBURY DR

NASHUA, NH 03060

Mailing Address: WATSON, HAROLD E & DEBORAH C 639 EAST SHORE RD

JAMESTOWN, RI 02835

Parcel Number: 217-007-000 CAMA Number: 217-007-000

Property Address: 217 WHITTIER HIGHWAY

Property Address: WHITTIER HIGHWAY

Mailing Address: GEORGE, PAUL E & HELEN D

57 TYLER ROAD BELMONT, MA 02478





