

To: Barrington Zoning Board of Adjustment

From: Loria and Carl Crosby

Re: Opposition as abutters to Application for Variance from

Article 4, Section 4.1.1, Table 2 to allow setbacks of 12.16' vs 30' and a front setback of 35.76' where 40' is required on Flower Drive. Map 111, Lot 6.

Date: June 12, 2023

We are opposed to the granting of a variance from setback requirements for the property on Flower Drive, Map 111, Lot 6. This lot is located almost at the end of Flower Drive next to our small summer campsite. Flower Drive is narrow and about a mile long; the area is wooded and remote, far from the Fire Station and EMS. We strongly feel that locating a house so close, approximately 12 feet, to our property line represents a safety hazard. Should a fire start on that property it could quickly reach ours well before fire trucks could arrive. Without a 30 foot buffer we would also suffer from noise from the house and visual degradation from the reduced buffer. Such a large house so close to neighboring properties does not conform in any way to the character of the neighborhood.

Reducing the front setback from the road is also problematic because Flower Drive is so narrow. All vehicles need to be off Flower Drive at all times so that the folks at the end of the road, one of whom is disabled, can always safely go in and out. Same for emergency vehicles. There is no turn around at the end of Flower Drive.

As the owner's application narrative states, the purpose of the Zoning ordinance is to provide for the 'Safe' development of the town. Granting a variance to set back requirements in this case does not serve that goal. It does not promote public safety nor does it safe guard natural resources. In this case reducing setbacks reduces the amount of land around the house that should be available to soak up rain and water and filter out pollutants.

As the owner's narrative states, a house 35' wide could be built on the lot which would meet the zoning criteria. That's what should be done. It isn't a hardship to build a smaller house. The lot can be developed differently than the proposed plan.

The other matter of concern is the distance of the house from the lake. We do not understand why the buffer on the plan is 50 feet instead of the 75 feet required by the Town's Shoreland Protection District Overlay which is part of the Zoning ordinance. It is our understanding that a lot of record must conform to the maximum possible with town regulations. Hence the need to conform to the 30' side setbacks, the 40' front setback AND the 75' set back from the shoreline. The SPDO clearly states the "...lots of record that existed prior to July 28, 1988", which this one is, "are exempt from these shoreland setback provisions to the extent that it can be demonstrated that conformance is impossible..." When did that happen? After years of cyanobacteria blooms Nippo Lake has recently been restored thanks to a huge effort by lake residents and NHDES. The ecosystem is fragile and very susceptible to pollution. Every effort needs to be made to protect the watershed and the lake. The variances requested do not do this. Conformance with the Zoning ordinance does.

Approving the requested variances does not meet the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance to safeguard natural resources, promote public health and safety and preserve the essential character of our neighborhood.

Although we are not opposed to having a new neighbor. We just feel the home should fit the neighborhood. Cutting down the size of the home is a simple solution.

Thankyou,

Jocia A Cusky

Carl W Cusky

419 Greenleaf Ave.
Portsmouth N.H.
03801

Camp Lot
443 Flower Drive
Lot 5 map 111
Barrington N.H.