RECEIVED

Please send this form with Plot Plan and List of Abutters to the Town of Durham, 75th of Durham, Newmarket Rd., Durham, NH 03824, Attn: Zoning Board of Adjustment. MAR 26 2014

Appeal for Applicant

Planning, Assuming and Zoning

State of New Hampshire			Strafford, SS
To: Zoning Board of Adjustment, Town	n of Durham N	NH 03824	
Name of Applicant: Young Driv	e LLC	Attw!	Francis Chase
Name of Applicant: Young Driv Address: 14 New Zealand Rd Seal rook NH 038 Owner of Property Concerned: (If same as Address: 5Ame (If same as above, write "Same" Location of Property: 6 YOU (Street & Number,	Box 2815 74 Youn s above, write "	Phone # <u>G_Drive_L</u> Same")	LC
Address: SAME (If some as above write "Same"	<u> </u>		
Location of Property: 6 YOC (Street & Number,	ng Dave , Subdivision as	nd Lot number)	
Description of Property (Give Tax Mag and other pertinent descriptive information	number land	th of frontage	side and rear lines
Fill in Section 1, 2, 3 or 4 below as ap This application is not acceptable un Additional information may be supp inadequate.	dess all requi	red statemen	is have been made.
SECTION 1: APPEAL FROM Appeal must be filed no later than 30 cm.	I AN ADM days from the	INISTRAT date of the ori	IVE DECISION ginal decision.
Relating to the interpretation and enfo			
Decision of the enforcement officer to	be reviewed:N	umber	Date
ArticleSection	of the Zon	ning Ordinanc	e in question.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Ordinance Article 179 Section 29 B Attached
711 0 0
3: APPLICATION FOR EQUITABLE WAIVER
gned hereby requests an Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements as RSA 674:33-A of the New Hampshire Planning and Land Use Regulations.
a brief description of the situation:
A ADDITION FOR A WARIANCE
N 4: APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE
RD OF REVIEW: The New Hampshire Legislature has declared that following conditions must be found in order for a variance to be legally rior to seeking a variance, the property owner must have been DENIED a sermit by the Building Inspector or approval by the Planning Board.
decrease in value of surrounding properties would be suffered;
nting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest; nial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner seeking
granting the variance substantial justice would be done; e use must not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinance.
e is requested from Article 175 Section 46 F:1,2 of the Zoni to permit farking area d vehicles in Front of
I I
).nq

Facts supporting this request:	
1. No decrease in value of surrounding properties would be suffered because: Proposed USE would NOT detract from Current Planned Subdivision and would Protect wetlands	
2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because: Wetlands would be protected. Parking for Buildings would be on site. Proposal Lits within Current Planned subdivision a	Mahe v
Current law requires the existence of unnecessary hardship for the granting of any variance, whether that is for a use not allowed in a particular zone or a deviation from a dimensional requirement.	,
 3(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: a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: 	
b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because:	

Or

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. PARKing area and Vehicles (Defined AS STructures)
Con only be placed in Front of Building due To wellonds
in other areas of Lot. Strict conformance would not
allow for a parking Area for Building
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done because:
The planned subdivision can be completed in a uniform
Way which adds benefits to the Community in the form of Affordable Housing. 5. The use will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinance because:
5. The use will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinance because: The Area will Not Impact LAND VAIVES now detract
From the rural Character which was Intended for
The Coe's Corner DISTRICT

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF SPECIAL EXCEPTION YOUNG DRIVE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH 175-29 (B) THE FOLLOWING IS OFFERED:

- 1. The lot in question is an official Lot of Record recorded in the Strafford County Registry of Deeds. The lot was recorded prior to the creation of the Wetlands and Shoreline protection areas.
- The use cannot be carried out by strict conformance because the setback requirements cannot be met. In order to complete the planned subdivision a Special Exception is needed to allow for building within the new wetlands setbacks.
- 3. If the Special Exception is not granted, no viable building can take place on the vacant lot. The original concept for the planned subdivision cannot be completed due to the nature of the setback requirements which currently exist.
- 4. If approved, building will take place in such a way as to afford the maximum conceivable setbacks from wetlands and shoreline areas. Applicant will make every effort to ensure the maximum protection of wetlands.
- 5. Any new septic/sewage infrastructure required will be constructed in such a way as to protect the wetlands and shoreline.
- 6. There will be no threat to public health and safety and there will be no damage to properties if the Special Exception is granted. Any new infrastructure will be in compliance with construction standards and will be installed in such a way as to protect wetlands and surrounding properties.
- 7. State and Federal approvals, if not already granted, will be obtained before construction.
- 8. If required, the applicant will seek approval from the Planning Board. At this time the proposal will not have to go before the Planning Board as it is in an existing, pre-approved Planned Subdivision.