RECEIVED Town of Durham

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. AUG 2 2 2013

Planning, Assessing, Appeal for Applicant Zoning & Code Enforcement Strafford, SS State of New Hampshire # 256,00 pd.8/22 — Clever 1238 To: Zoning Board of Adjustment, Town of Durham NH 03824 Name of Applicant: Penny R Wright Address: 32 Route 156, Nottingham, NH 03290 Phone # 603-679-1455 Owner of Property Concerned: Teeri Living Trust, Robert & Gale Teeri, Trustees (If same as above, write "Same") Address: 7007 Hardwood Ridge Road, Carrabasset Valle, ME 04947 (If same as above, write "Same") Location of Property: 66 Piscataqua Road, Durham, NH 03824 (Street & Number, Subdivision and Lot number) Description of Property (Give Tax Map number, length of frontage, side and rear lines and other pertinent descriptive information) Tax Map 11 Lot 28-1 Frontage 226.00' East Side 209.74' Rear 271.96' West Side 180.70' Fill in Section 1, 2, 3 or 4 below as appropriate. Do not fill in more than one section. This application is not acceptable unless all required statements have been made. Additional information may be supplied on separate sheets if the space provided is inadequate. SECTION 1: APPEAL FROM AN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION Appeal must be filed no later than 30 days from the date of the original decision. Relating to the interpretation and enforcement of the provision of the Zoning Ordinance. Decision of the enforcement officer to be reviewed: Date Number Article Section of the Zoning Ordinance in question.

SECTION 2: APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Description of proposed use showing justifithe Zoning Ordinance Article	cation for a Special Ex_ Section	ception as specified in
SECTION 3: APPLICATION FOR	R EQUITABLE W	'AIVER
The undersigned hereby requests an Equital provided in RSA 674:33-A of the New Han		
Please give a brief description of the situation	on:	
SECTION 4: APPLICATION FO	R A VARIANCE	
STANDARD OF REVIEW: The Ne each of the following conditions must be fo granted. Prior to seeking a variance, the probuilding permit by the Building Inspector of	und in order for a varia	ance to be legally e been DENIED a
 No decrease in value of surrounding Granting the variance would not be Denial of the variance would result it; 	contrary to the public in unnecessary hardshi	nterest; p to the owner seeking
4. By granting the variance substantial5. The use must not be contrary to the		
A Variance is requested from Article Ordinance to permit See Attached:	Section	of the Zoning
<u> </u>		

Teeri Living Trust

Robert & Gale Teeri, Trustees

Site: 66 Piscataqua Road

DURHAM ZONING VARIANCES REQUESTED: ZONE - RC. RESIDENCE C

*Article XII, Section 175-54: Request EDA setback to front property line reduced from 40' to 30'.

Request EDA setback to side property line reduced from 50' to 30.9'.

*Article XIII, Section 175-59(A)(2): Request tank be placed within 100' tidal buffer. (tank – 62.42')

*Article XIII, Section 175-65(F): Request tank & EDA be placed within 125' of wet reference line.

*Article XIV, Section 175-74(A1 & B1): Request tank and EDA be placed within 125' shoreland setback.

*Article XV, Section 175-79: Septic has been designed to minimize and/or eliminate flood waters infiltration.

Note: 1) To protect from flooding, tank to be watertight with gasketed risers & screw down covers.

- 2) Tank to be tied down and/or ballasted.
- *Article XXIV, Section 175-139: Proposed tank and EDA are less than 125' from Johnson Creek.

Note: 1) Using innovative technology (aeration pretreatment tank) to overcome difficulties of lot.

- 2) To protect from flooding, tank to be watertight with gasketed risers & screw down covers.
- 3) Tank to be tied down and/or ballasted.

Facts supporting this request:

1. No decrease in value of surrounding properties would be suffered because: Replacing a failed septic protects property values and the

public health.

2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because: It protects the public health.

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:

The existing grandfathered lot location & configuration has no area that meets current regs and allows for the tank to be hooked to existing plumbing that exists building from under cellar floor.

and

b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because:

It allows the existing failed septic to be replaced by a septic that more closely meets current standards, has a sealed tank, & pretreats effluent before discharging into an EDA that is farther from HOTL.

Or

pro	perties i	n the	area	a, the pro	pert	y cannot be	reaso	tnat distingtonably used it essary to ena	n strict co	nforma	ice
	allow	for	a	septic	to	replace	the	existing	failed	septi	c.
							,	<u></u>			
•							-				
4. By granting the variance substantial justice would be done because: It protects the public health.											
					-	_		ntent of the o			
sej	otic.										