Town Office Section Only
Case No. 2018 - 1105 A
Date Filed: CC+ 18, ZUIS
Received By: Aimle

Application for an Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements

Name of applicant: David M Dolan, LLS; David M Dolan Associates, PC

Address:	PO Box 1581, Center Harbor, NH 03226				
Owner:	Slava Gaufberg				
	(if same as applicant, write "same")				
Location of j	property: <u>Tax Map 215 Lot 23; 542 Dane Road</u> (Street, number, tax map & lot number)				

NOTE: This application is not acceptable unless all required statements have been made. Additional information may be supplied on a separate sheet if the space provided is inadequate.

APPLICATION FOR AN EQUITABLE WA IVER OF DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

An Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements is requested from article <u>V</u> paragraph <u>5:11:3</u> of the zoning ordinance to permit <u>a recently constructed two-story addition</u> located a distance of 69.7 feet from the <u>shoreline</u>, 75 feet required

1. Explain how the violation has existed for 10 years or more with no enforcement action, including written notice, being commenced by the town ______

or

and how the violation was not an outcome of ignorance of the law or a bad faith but resulted from a legitimate mistake _____ See attachment **—** ••• -----____ Explain how the nonconformity does not constitute a nuisance nor diminish the value or interfere 3. with future uses of the property in the area See attachment Explain how the cost of correction far outweighs any public benefit to be gained 4. see attainment Applicant Date 10/17/18 Т

Application for a Request for an Equitable Waiver Slava V. Gaufberg Tax Map 215 Lot 23 542 Dane Road

Abutter's List

Map	Lot	Lot Owner
Owner of]	Record:	
215 23	23	Slava V. Gaufberg
		25 Swan Road
		Winchester, MA 01890
Owner's Agent:		David M. Dolan, L.L.S.
	C	David M. Dolan Associates, P.C.
		PO Box 1581
		Center Harbor, NH 03226
Contractor:		Joe Keller
		Aztec Woodworks
		116 Holland Street
		Moultonborough, NH 03254
Plan for Se	ewage	
Disposal System:		Peter S. Schauer
		138 Cross Brook Road
		Loudon, NH 03307
Abutters:		
215	22	Matthew and Susan B. Weatherbie
		POB 269
		Center Harbor, NH 03226
215	24	James Swain and Elizabeth Peress
		141 East Lane
		Stamford, CT 06905
215	9	Amanda J. King and Clinton C. King
		POB 253
		Meredith, NH 03253
215	8	Carol A. Sullivan Revocable Trust
		POB 1044
		Center Harbor, NH 03226

SLAVA GAUFBERG TAX MAP 215 LOT 23 542 DANE ROAD, CENTER HARBOR

<u>Attachment to Application for</u> <u>An Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements</u>

The property is part of a subdivision approved by the Center Harbor Planning Board in 1978. (Lot 2 on a plan entitled "Plan of Subdivision for Owner Coosaukee Corporation …" recorded at Belknap County Registry of Deeds Book 68 Page 63.) The lot is approximately 4.09 acres in area, and has over 300 feet of frontage on both Squam Lake and Dane Road. The original dwelling was constructed in the late 1970's, per the Town of Center Harbor Assessor's records, available online.

The property is heavily wooded, with a cleared area encompassing the existing dwelling, and the shorefront area in the vicinity of the dock.

The property is served by a private well and an on-site private sewage disposal system (NH-DES Construction Approval Number eCA2016120614-A, for a 3 Bedroom dwelling). Electricity, telephone, and CATV are provided by above-ground facilities which will not change.

The 'grandfathered' portion of the existing dwelling is located 43.2 feet from the shoreline of Squam Lake. In 2017 an addition to the building was constructed, extending the building in a southerly (away from the lake) and westerly. A portion of the 'recently constructed addition' is in violation of the required 75 foot setback from the lake.

The portion of the 'recently constructed addition' that is in violation of the 75 foot setback is located a distance of 69.8' feet from the lake, and has a footprint area of approximately 42.5 square feet.

1. Explain how the nonconformity was discovered after the structure was substantially completed or after a vacant lot in violation had been transferred to a bona fide purchaser:

Plans provided to the Town as part of the Building Permit application for the 2017 building addition depicted the required 75' foot setback, as well as the shoreline location. The proposed building addition was depicted as being compliant with required 75 foot shoreline setback. This office was recently hired to perform a survey and prepare a plan of a portion of the property, as needed for permitting and applications as needed for the construction of a proposed attached deck. In the execution of our work, it was discovered that the required shoreline location, and thus the 75 foot shoreline were incorrectly depicted on the plans as submitted for the 2017 building addition, and that a portion of the 'recently constructed addition' was in violation of the required 75 foot setback.

2. The violation was not an outcome of ignorance of the law or a bad faith but resulted from a legitimate mistake.

The violation appears to be a legitimate mistake in the drafting of the 75 setback, as being drawn from the location of the location of the lake, based on the location of the water as mapped at the time of field work, rather than the correct location of the "Full Lake Elevation" of 562.5 of Squam Lake.

3. The dimensional violation does not constitute a public or private nuisance, nor diminish the value or interfere with future uses of other properties in the area:

The portion of the 'recently constructed addition' that is in violation of the 75 foot setback is located a distance of 69.8' feet from the lake, and has a footprint area of approximately 42.5 square feet.

The subject addition is located at a greater distance from the lake than the existing grandfathered 'non-conforming' dwelling.

Mature trees surround the existing dwelling, and provide a visual buffer between the existing dwelling and the lake, as well as abutting properties. Those trees will remain and continue to provide the same benefit to the general public and those abutting properties.

The addition does not result in a visual impact on surrounding properties. The addition has also resulted in and improvement in the value of the property, and is not anticipated to diminish surrounding property values.

4. Explain how the cost of correction far outweighs any public benefit to be gained.

The 'recently constructed addition' is two story constructed on a concrete foundation. The removal of the triangular shaped 43 square foot portion of said addition, and modification of the remaining portion of the addition would provide not public benefit, as there would be virtually no visual impact to neighboring properties or the general public. The cost to remove and modify that portion of the structure would cost tens of thousands of dollars, which greatly outweighs any public benefit to be gained.