August 8,2017

Case # 478

Andrew Herrold & Danielle Stewart seek a variance for insufficient lake front setback.

Alicia, Mark, Bob, Amy and Tom were present. Jack Parsons, Abutters; Steve Wingate and the Nasek's were present. Applicant Stewart and their agent Vaune Dugan also present.

Mark opened the hearing with the particulars of a variance.

Vaune Dugan presented. They are proposing a new house further from the lake then the existing house but still within the 50' setback. The existing house is 24'5" new house will be 39'2" on the front and 44'9" on the side which is an inset of water that was man made with rock wall surrounding the water. They also need a variance for the garage which is a separate structure and that they would like to make it into a 2 bay garage, right now the setback to the boundary is 4'9", the other side of the boundary is very poorly drained soil that means nothing to either parcel. (See plan in folder). Trees totally surround the property and work as a buffer to abutters and the lake. They would not like to cut any trees, and want to protect the shoreline and the lake quality. To move the house further back than proposed would damage the environment. The house is a cape with a series of additions with different roofs and ceiling heights and would be difficult to improve therefore they felt the best solution is to tear down and rebuild a more useful home. The new structure will meet all codes, current house does not.

Mark asked about the septic. Existing septic is at the back of the property. White Mountain Survey is now analyzing the situation and it will probably be replaced.

Bedrooms now? 4. New house? 4.

The area reduction in the setback is 765 square feet of porch and 156 square feet of living space, so making it a much better situation.

The garage will be expanded on the current driveway and no closer to water. The existing garage is 24' x 16' would add 9' to the 16' and it would still be 24' deep.

They anticipate 4 season use so a 2 bay garage would keep automobiles undercover and it would have no impact on the neighbor's. The roof overhang is within the dimensions.

Mark asked if the abutters had any imput? Mrs. Nasek is pleased with the improvement and felt it would not impact them. She had seen all the plans and is looking forward to them going forward. Steve Wingate promotes water quality and has had many work sessions the Herrold's and will vouch for this project as being done to the best for all, totally supportive.

No other questions?

# 1 Contrary to public interest; all felt it was not contrary, it is a very private piece of property and no impact on anyone.

- # 2 Spirit of the ordinance observed: Great care has been taken to preserve the property, all agreed.
- # 3 Substantial justice; All yes.
- # 4 Diminish values of surrounding properties: It's an improvement. All agreed.
- # 5 Hardship: Unusual piece of property with two areas of wet, one possibly man made. All agreed it was reasonable to move further away from the lake.

Mark made motion to grant the variance. Bob 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in favor.

Hearing adjourned.

Mark made motion to accept the minutes of Case #477 as written. Alicia 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in favor.

Meeting adjourned

Jackie Rollins, Secretary