Please send this form with Plot Plan and List of Abutters to the Town of Durham, 15 Newmarket Rd., Durham, NH 03824, Attn: Zoning Board of Adjustment.



Appeal for Applicant

State of New Hampshire		Strafford, SS
To: Zoning Board of Adjustment, Town of Du		/ Heather +.
Name of Applicant: Stephanie M	. Higgs/	Stephen Mern 1
Address: 18 Oyster River Rd, Dur	ham Phone #_	969-6943
Email: Smhiggs@ hotmail.	com	
Owner of Property Concerned: Same		
Address: Sawe (If same as above	, write "Same")	
(If same as above, write "Same")	,a 1,	1
Location of Property: 18 Oy Ster R Number, Subdiv	rision and Lot number	-26 map 6
Description of Property (Give Tax Map numb and other pertinent descriptive information)		e, side and rear lines
Aplzmail notice of public l dove add to the phame f Fill in Section 1, 2, 3 or 4 below as appropri	rearing to bo	th the Mern 115 (a)
Fill in Section 1. 2. 3 or 4 below as appropri	ate. Do not fill in	more than one section.
This application is not acceptable unless all	required statemen	ts have been made.
Additional information may be supplied on		
inadequate.	~	
SECTION 1: APPEAL FROM AN A	DMINISTD AT	TVE DECISION
Appeal must be filed no later than 30 days fro		
Tipped mast se med no later man se asys me		- O
Relating to the interpretation and enforcement	of the provision of	the Zoning Ordinance.
Decision of the enforcement officer to be revi	ewed:	
	Number	Date
Article Section of t	ne Zoning Ordinanc	e in question.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION

the Zonin	g Ordinance	d use showing Article	Section	on	·	
	 : ;			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		.,,,
SECTIO	ON 3: API	PLICATION	FOR EQ	UITABLE	WAIVE!	<u>R</u> .
		y requests an E 33-A of the Nev				
Please giv	ve a brief des	cription of the	situation:	. 1		·
					•	
			:			
SECTION	ON 4: API	PLICATION	FOR A V	ARIANC	<u>E</u>	
each of the granted.	ne following o Prior to seeki	REVIEW: To conditions must ing a variance, Building Inspe	t be found in the property	order for a vowner must	variance to b have been D	e legally ENIED a
2. G 3. D	ranting the valenial of the v	value of surrou ariance would r ariance would	not be contrai	ry to the pub	lic interest;	
	y granting the	e variance subs				e.
	ce is requeste te to permit_	ed from Article	14 a dec	Section S	175-74 him th	A _ of the Zonin; VC
Sha	reland	Cella	ck.			
			-	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Variance Request – Durham Zoning Board 18 Oyster River Road- Durham Stephanie Higgs- prior owner Stephen and Heather Merrill- current/new owner

6-19-14

This deck was built, naively in retrospect, under the assumption that it would fall into a grandfathering clause given the existence of decks on the surrounding properties that are well within 125' from the Oyster River, and the prior existence of a deck on this property itself.

This home is now owned by new owners who were not involved in the construction of this deck.

1. No decrease in value of surrounding properties:

This deck, though larger, replaces a deck that existed when the home was purchased ~16 yrs ago. The original deck was in poor condition and became worse over the course of the next several years until it became a safety hazard. A deck was always on the house, with a back door always exiting onto it. The new deck enhances this property and by doing so, helps increase the property values of homes adjacent to it.

2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest:

This deck is very private, with trees on all sides. It is only visible by one neighbor (and again, through trees). The deck is attractive and made of natural wood. The deck is far from any public space, with a large wooded area between this property and the open park area down the road. There would therefore be no negative impact on the public.

3. (B)Owing to special conditions of the property, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance of the ordinance, and a variance is necessary to enable reasonable use:

On this property, as with many others along the river, the home itself was built within 125' of the river, let alone the decks themselves. This home, again, like many others along the river, does not have large usable backyard space and therefore the existence of decks allows the use and enjoyment of the behind-the-home space. Without the allowance of a deck, the backyard space on this property is extremely limited and would decrease its value in comparison to adjacent/neighboring properties which have decks.

4. By granting the variance, substantial justice would be done:

Decks on homes along the Oyster River on Oyster River Road are very common, many of which are much closer than 125' from the river, and have been grandfathered as such. The original deck on this property was, as with these others, less than 125' from the river also. These decks are common for river-bordering properties. Without this variance approval, this property would be singled out in a negative way and its comparable value to adjacent and nearby properties would be decreased.

5. The use would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinance:

This deck remains much further from the river than decks on adjacent/nearby properties along the river, with no negative impact on the river, wildlife (we have deer, foxes, beavers!), or these surrounding properties.