



City of Rochester, New Hampshire

Zoning Board of Adjustment



Variance Application

TO: BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CITY OF ROCHESTER

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

CASE NO. _____

DATE FILED

10/28/21

ZONING BOARD CLERK

Applicant:

Steven Huntford

E-mail: SJHuntford@gmail.com

Phone: 603-581-3042

Applicant Address: 5 Wilson St. Rochester NH. 03867

Property Owner (if different):

Property Owner Address: 5 Wilson St.

Variance Address: 5 Wilson St.

Map Lot and Block No: Block # 128, Lot # 249

Description of Property: Single family home

Proposed use or existing use affected: Storage

The undersigned hereby requests a variance to the terms of the Rochester Zoning Ordinance, Ch. 275, Section 23.2

and asks that said terms be waived to permit the construction of a 12'x16' shed

inside the 10' set back from property line. proposed distance of 4' from line

The undersigned alleges that the following circumstances exist which prevent the proper enjoyment of his land under the strict terms of the Zoning Ordinance and thus constitute grounds for a variance. **I understand that while presenting my case the testimony should be confined to the 5 criteria and how they pertain to my case.**

Signed:

Date:

10-27-2021



City of Rochester, New Hampshire

Zoning Board of Adjustment

Variance Criteria

1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

The shed is on a 1 acre lot and is positioned mostly from view and is mostly hidden by fence and tall shrubs.

2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

ordinance would only be effected by 4' set back. property owner on side of project is fine with set back and a letter from him will be included with paperwork. as far as neighbor of neighborhood, many houses on my street have sheds or structures right on their line. I'm asking for 4 ft.

3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

The extra storage I gain from having a shed allows me to move tools and lawn equipment out of my garage so I'm able to park both my vehicles inside.

4.) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

The shed would blend with the house by means of color and roof type. and like previously mentioned would be no different than sheds in my neighborhood that are closer to their lot lines than I am proposing.

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 an 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:

A variance for my 4' set back instead of 10' would not distinguish it from others in my neighborhood because like mentioned before there are others closer than I want. hardship would be that I would lose out on extra needed storage and all costs to build it.

And:

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use of it.

