

TOWN OF AMHERST
Zoning Board of Adjustment

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

1 In attendance: Doug Kirkwood (Chair), Danielle Pray (Vice Chair), Jamie Ramsay (Secretary),
2 Charlie Vars, and Tony Ortiz (alternate)
3 Staff present: Nic Strong, Community Development Director
4

5 Doug Kirkwood called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. He then outlined the process for the
6 meeting. If an applicant does not agree with the decision, they can apply for a request for a
7 rehearing within 30 days of this meeting. In the application for a rehearing, the applicant needs to
8 add a letter explaining why they think the rehearing is necessary. If the applicant is still not
9 satisfied after the rehearing, there is recourse to the Superior Court, within 30 days from the
10 rehearing date.

11
12 Doug Kirkwood introduced the Board members. He noted that Tracy McInnis has resigned from
13 the Board due to health issues and he would like Tony Ortiz to sit as a regular member in her
14 place.

15
16 **Danielle Pray moved to appoint Tony Ortiz in place of Tracy McInnis until the vote**
17 **at Town Meeting in March. Jamie Ramsay seconded.**
18 **Voting: 4-0-1; motion carried [T. Ortiz abstaining.]**
19

20 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 21
22 **1. CASE #: PZ18354-122823 – VARIANCE**
23 **AZ Realty LLC (Owner) & Northpoint Construction Management (Applicant);**
24 **108 Ponemah Road, PIN #: 002-109-000 – Request for relief from Article III**
25 **Section 3.11, Paragraph B.1. to construct a building which is set back 60 feet from a**
26 **scenic road where a 100-foot setback is required. *Zoned General Office. Postponed***
27 ***from January 16th due to winter snowstorm.***
28

29 Jamie Ramsay read and opened the case.
30

31 Morgan Hollis, Esq., Gottesman & Hollis, P.A., addressed the Board. He explained that this
32 property contains an existing structure and sits on a scenic road. The building has fully
33 depreciated and is obsolete for a future use. The applicant is a construction manager working
34 with the owner of the property, with an intention to create a new dental office business. The
35 existing building is only approximately 45' from the scenic road, where the requirement is for a
36 100' setback. A new building would need to meet that 100' setback. There is a significant
37 topographic drop on this property from the front of the property to the rear, leading to a utility
38 easement and railroad line at the back of the property. The right-hand side of the property also
39 drops to a wetland area. There is a required 25' buffer to the wetland. If the building was pushed
40 back 100', it would be far down the hill, leading to extreme construction costs. The proposal is to
41 set the building back 60' from the road. This will be less encroaching than the existing building.
42 This proposal will need to go before the Planning Board, if approved by the Zoning Board. The
43 plan proposes no parking between the building and the road and that the building will be parallel
44 to Ponemah Road. The driveway will be kept in essentially the same position. The proposed

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

45 building will be further from the driveway and the scenic road. If the building is required to be
46 pushed further back, parking will be required to be placed in front of it toward the road. This
47 would be contrary to the public interest, in that the public would likely prefer to see an area of
48 grass along a scenic road. The topography severely limits the layout of structures on the site. The
49 plans demonstrate why the setback cannot be complied with.

50

51 Attorney Hollis addressed the five criteria:

52

53 1. *How will granting the variance not be contrary to the public interest?*

54 Granting the variance to allow 40' of encroachment into the 100' setback for scenic road
55 Route 122 will not conflict with the express purpose of the particular ordinance
56 provision, which is to preserve and enhance the rural open character of the Town as
57 viewed from the scenic road and to prevent unsightly development along the scenic road
58 because the existing structure, an old building formerly used as a real estate office, which
59 must be demolished because of its state of disrepair, currently encroaches greater than the
60 proposed encroachment, and allowing the proposed encroachment allows parking to be
61 located in the rear of the building rather than in the front yard of the building. The
62 character of the immediate surrounding neighborhood is that most existing structures do
63 not comply with the 100' scenic setback in that they are pre-existing nonconformities,
64 and this proposed encroachment will not alter that character. Granting the variance will
65 not threaten public safety as it will not affect any sight lines for traffic on the scenic road.

66

67 2. *How will the granting of the variance ensure that the spirit of the ordinance will be*
68 *observed?*

69 Granting of the variance will ensure the spirit of the ordinance will be observed by
70 recognizing the need to be setback as far from the road as possible, further than the
71 current encroaching structure, and allowing for parking to be placed in the rear of the
72 building rather than in the front yard closer to the scenic road. The appearance of the
73 development from the scenic road will be better if the variance is granted than if not
74 granted. There will be no alteration of the character of the neighborhood and there will be
75 no threat to the health, safety, or welfare of the public or other private properties.

76

77 3. *How will substantial justice be done?*

78 Substantial justice will be done in that, if the variance is granted, the new building will
79 set back slightly more than the existing building, with no resulting harm to the public or
80 others, in that the current and long standing view from the scenic road will not be
81 different, with no resulting harm to the public or others while the benefit to the applicant
82 is to not be required to perform significant excavation, and import substantial fill, all at
83 great expense, for no valid reason, and not require the parking area to be located in the
84 front yard closer and more visible to the scenic road.

85

86 Attorney Hollis noted that his client has offered proof that a 100' buffer would require
87 approximately 3,800 cubic yards of fill, additional retaining walls of 120-140 linear feet
88 at approximately 10'-15' high, guardrails, steps to the building from the parking area, and

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

89 taller foundation walls at approximately 18'-20' tall. These additional items would incur
90 approximately \$320,000-\$380,000 site costs and additional building costs of
91 approximately \$100,000.

92

93 4. *How will the value of the surrounding properties not be diminished?*

94 Granting the variance will not cause any diminution in value of surrounding properties in
95 that the present building on the property encroaches greater than the proposed building
96 and there is no adverse impact on values allowing this new building to be 40' closer than
97 permitted. In fact, pushing the building back will result in parking in the front right along
98 the scenic road which would have greater potential for adverse impact on property values.

99

100 A memo from an appraiser was included in the packet which addressed the proposed
101 project's valuation of surrounding properties. It concludes that the plan does not alter the
102 character of the neighborhood, will not distract from the aesthetics, and that granting the
103 variance requested to allow construction of the building with a 60' front setback from a
104 scenic roadway instead of the 100' as required will not adversely affect surrounding
105 property values.

106

107 5. *Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in unnecessary*
108 *hardship because:*

109 (A) *For the purpose of this sub paragraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that*
110 *owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other*
111 *properties in the area:*

112 (i) *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public*
113 *purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that*
114 *provision to the property,*

115 *and*

116 (ii) *The proposed use is a reasonable one:*

117 There is currently an old building in total disrepair on the property and the owner desires
118 to construct a new building for its growing dental practice, which is currently located in
119 Amherst. The property itself has unique topographic characteristics in that it slopes
120 tremendously and very steeply to the rear of the property (east) and to the side of the
121 property (south), resulting in elevation changes making construction of a building on the
122 property very difficult if the scenic setback is to be honored. The current building
123 encroaches approximately 55' and the proposed building would encroach approximately
124 40' into the setback area. The further back the building is required to be located from the
125 scenic road, the more difficult and expensive and less possible the project becomes. The
126 property also abuts the railroad line to the rear, limiting development to the rear, and is
127 located adjacent to a wetland which has a 25' buffer from wetland boundaries. The
128 property also is located along a curve of Ponemah Rd. resulting in an unusual shape of
129 the lot. All of these unique features constrict the ability to develop and use this property
130 in a reasonable fashion.

131

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

132 The general purpose of the ordinance provision as to the 100' setback from scenic roads
133 is to preserve and enhance the rural character of the Town and to prevent unsightly
134 development. Because of the pre-existing encroachment and the unique features of the
135 lot, enforcing the ordinance against this property does not bear a fair and substantial
136 relationship to these purposes in that, if a variance is granted, the character of the area
137 will remain unchanged. In fact, granting the variance will allow the applicant to provide
138 parking to the side and rear rather than in the front yard, which might have an even more
139 adverse impact on the purposes of the ordinance.

140
141 The proposed encroachment is reasonable in that the setback to the scenic road will be
142 slightly greater than the existing building, will not impact the existing character of the
143 neighborhood, and will provide for a better view from the road than if it was filled with
144 parking in the front yard area. Granting the variance will allow a reasonable permitted
145 use without unnecessary significant costs and trucking activity related to the
146 development, thereby allowing an existing Amherst business to remain in Town.

147
148 *(B) Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph A above are not established, an*
149 *unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special*
150 *conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the*
151 *property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and*
152 *a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it:*

153 If the criteria established in subparagraph A of the statutory requirements as described
154 above are not satisfied, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if,
155 owing to special circumstances of the property that distinguish it from other properties in
156 the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in conformance with the ordinance, and
157 a variance is necessary. In this case, because of the topography, the proximity to the
158 wetlands, the proximity to the railroad track, the unusual shape of the lot due to the
159 curves of Ponemah Rd., and the preexisting unrepairable structure, establishing a new
160 building outside of the scenic road setback becomes a near impossibility, and as a result,
161 the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance, and the
162 variance is necessary.

163
164 Charlie Vars noted that the lefthand corner of the existing building does not include the porch,
165 which is 8'-10' additionally toward the road. From the roadway to the property line, there is an
166 additional 15'. The building likely has a lot of issues for it to be remodeled. The proposed
167 building is probably four times the size of the existing building; moving it back to the 100'
168 setback line would lead to the proposed building being only 2 ½ times the size. The proposal is
169 an enhancement to the area.

170
171 Tony Ortiz asked how far the existing walkway is from the road. Attorney Hollis stated that this
172 is approximately 45' from the edge of the right of way.

173
174 Danielle Pray stated that the appraisal did not include a map to the comparable properties
175 mentioned, and it is unclear how close they are to this property. She asked what is on either side

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

176 and across the street from this property. Attorney Hollis stated that directly across the street is an
177 office building. Next to that is a condominium building, and to the north is another office
178 building. Nic Strong displayed the NRPC GIS maps of the lots in the neighborhood.

179

180 Danielle Pray asked about the width of the proposed building when looking at it from the road.
181 Attorney Hollis stated that this is approximately 100 - 120' long. Danielle Pray asked about the
182 parking lot. Attorney Hollis stated that there would be no parking between the building and the
183 road, and the start of the parking lot would be in line with the front of the building.

184

185 There was no public comment at this time.

186

187 **Charlie Vars moved to enter into deliberations. Jamie Ramsay seconded.**

188

Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

189

190 **CASE #: PZ18354-122823 – VARIANCE**

191 **AZ Realty LLC (Owner) & Northpoint Construction Management (Applicant);**

192 **108 Ponemah Road, PIN #: 002-109-000**

193

194 **Jamie Ramsay moved no regional impact. Danielle Pray seconded.**

195

Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

196

197 Jamie Ramsay asked if this is one of the two General Office Zones in Amherst. Charlie Vars
198 stated that was true. Jamie Ramsay stated that the residential properties in this area preceded the
199 number of businesses that have since moved in. The building may have outlived its life.

200

201 Danielle Pray noted that she would like a condition that there be no parking between the building
202 and the street.

203

204 The Board reviewed the variance criteria tests:

205

1. The Variance will not be contrary to the public interest.

206

- T. Ortiz – true, this will not threaten the public health, safety, or welfare. Granting this variance will be a benefit to the public interest and public safety as the proposal relocates the entrance of the building currently facing the road, as well as the walkway from the road, and places them facing northward away from the road.

207

208

209

210

- C. Vars – true, the proposal is better for sightlines as it will be set back further, and the public will see less of it than the existing building.

211

212

- J. Ramsay – true, the proposal keeps with the character of the General Office Zone. This road is not quite what one would think of as a scenic road in Town, as it has continued to be developed along.

213

214

215

- D. Pray – true, the encroachment of 40' in a required 100' setback does not affect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. It does not alter the character of the neighborhood, where there is a current encroachment of 45'.

216

217

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

- 218 • D. Kirkwood – true, the pushback of the building gives more of a chance for the
219 building to blend in with the surroundings. There is no threat to the public health,
220 safety, or welfare.
221 **5 True**
222
- 223 **2. The Variance will ensure that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed.**
- 224 • C. Vars – true, the proposal fits the General Office Zone and the alternate plan shown
225 puts extensive parking at the front of the site. The proposal will be better along the
226 scenic road and will not detract from the neighborhood.
227 • J. Ramsay – true, for reasons previously stated.
228 • D. Pray – true, the spirit of the ordinance is concerned with the view from the road.
229 This variance would push the current setback further back. Coupled with the
230 condition of no parking in the front of the lot, the spirit of the ordinance would be
231 observed.
232 • T. Ortiz – true, approving this variance will result in the property being closer in
233 consistency with the scenic setback requirement, as it increases the building setback
234 for a net increase and this proposal will not negatively affect the neighborhood.
235 • D. Kirkwood – true, this proposal will improve the sight distance along the road.
236 **5 True**
- 237 **3. Substantial justice is done.**
- 238 • J. Ramsay – true, this allows for a commercial building in a General Office Zone,
239 fitting with the intent and purpose. The owner will get out of the building exactly
240 what is permitted within the Zone and have enjoyment of the property without
241 restriction to the general public.
242 • D. Pray – true, when balancing the harm to the public versus the benefit to the
243 applicant, the harm to the public in this case is minimal. The proposal is less of an
244 encroachment than what currently exists and the costs of following literal
245 enforcement of this ordinance would require substantial funds from the applicant
246 which do not outweigh any benefit to the public in this case.
247 • T. Ortiz – true, the proposed use is a reasonable one, as the applicant is looking to
248 improve the property based on current conditions which must be addressed. Denying
249 the application provides no benefit to the public.
250 • C. Vars – true, this will have a positive impact on the area. The existing garage is also
251 proposed to be removed and is in bad shape. The view from the road will not be much
252 different. The applicant will benefit by being able to use the existing grades and
253 slopes.
254 • D. Kirkwood – true, for reasons previously stated.
255 **5 True**
256
- 257 **4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished.**
- 258 • D. Pray – true, the applicant submitted an appraisal from an appraiser which stated
259 that the property values would not be adversely affected by granting this variance,
260 and there was no evidence presented to the contrary.

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

- 261 • T. Ortiz – true, there was no evidence provided to indicate the value surrounding
262 properties will be diminished. The proposed structure is a significant improvement
263 from the existing one. It may actually benefit the surrounding property values.
264 • C. Vars – true, for the reasons already stated.
265 • J. Ramsay – true, the proposed building is suited to its purpose and will be fairly
266 attractive. This will be at least commensurate with or an increase to surrounding
267 property values.
268 • D. Kirkwood – true, for the reasons already stated.

269 **5 True**

270 **5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an**
271 **unnecessary hardship**

- 272 • C. Vars – true, there are unique topographical characteristics of the site. The railroad
273 tracks at the back of the lot also constrain the building area. The proposal preserves
274 and enhances the rural character and the General Office Zone in this location will be
275 unchanged.
276 • J. Ramsay – true, the slope to the rear of the site is a challenge and predates the
277 existing building. There would be a hardship to not allow the owner to improve the
278 site to the extent proposed. This is an unusual property.
279 • D. Pray – true, the applicant outlined unique characteristics of the lot, including its
280 unusual shape on a curved road, the topography with steep inclines on the side, and
281 wetland buffers that would need to be considered in any development. The current
282 building and shed on the property are in need of repairs and there is a utility easement
283 on the property as well. All of this limits the opportunity for development on this
284 property. This is a fair and reasonable use of this property as it is in the General
285 Office Zone and the building has been an office in its previous life.
286 • T. Ortiz – true, the proposed use is a reasonable one and the best option considering
287 the characteristics of the lot. The applicant brought forward a plan that aligns closer
288 to the ordinance. Denying the variance would pose hardship and cause the applicant
289 to consider other options which may conflict with additional ordinances, such as the
290 rear setback and wetland buffer requirements.
291 • D. Kirkwood – true, for the reasons already stated.

292 **5 True**

293 Doug Kirkwood stated that the application, having passed all of the tests, is granted, with the
294 condition that there be no parking in the front of the building, between the building and the road.

295
296 **Charlie Vars moved to exit deliberations. Jamie Ramsay seconded.**
297 **Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.**
298

299 Doug Kirkwood suggested that the next agenda item be taken up in Executive Session. Danielle
300 Pray stated that this item would only be addressed by the Board and could be done in Open
301 Session.

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345

REQUEST FOR REHEARING

2. CASE #: PZ18136-110223 –VARIANCE

Divest LLC (Owner & Applicant); County Road & Thornton Ferry Road II;
PIN #: 004-142, 142-10, 142-12, 142-13 – Request for relief from Article III, Section 3.9, Paragraphs B, C & D to maintain three existing reduced frontage lots as previously approved, and from Article IV, Section 4.3, Paragraph C.2. to maintain an existing corner lot as previously approved. *Zoned Residential Rural. Postponed from January 16th due to winter snowstorm.*

Charlie Vars stated that there are three criteria for granting a rehearing and, in this case, this item does not meet these. The Findings of Fact covers what the Board previously discovered for this case. He is concerned with the abutter’s approach that the three houses around the cul-de-sac be built close to the front property line, thus leaving approximately 300’ from the existing houses on the adjacent road.

Danielle Pray stated that the Board made an error in how it examined the case. The Board reviewed a plan from 2005/2006 that did not closely abide by what the current ordinance is. Changes are made to the ordinance and the Board must review all applications presented to it to with the new ordinance in mind. Even though this was a good plan originally, the ordinances have changed. The applicant for this rehearing spoke to the fact that the spirit of the ordinance was not observed, as the Board needed to review the application within the current ordinance. There was also mention that great deference was given to the developer for the cost of redoing the design. This is not a hardship, or not a hardship that overrides the public interest, which was passed by the voters in this Town with the new ordinance. She would vote for a rehearing.

Tony Ortiz stated that he would also vote for rehearing, as he believes the Board made an error. There are some outstanding issues that the Board needs to address regarding this case and the ordinance.

Jamie Ramsay agreed with Danielle Pray. He stated that the subdivision plan was a thoughtful plan but had lapsed in terms of what is clearly approvable under current zoning.

Charlie Vars stated that he will certainly not stand in the way of a rehearing and, under the circumstances, would vote favorably for one.

Danielle Pray moved to grant a rehearing for CASE #: PZ18136-110223. Tony Ortiz seconded.

Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Minutes: November 30, 2023; December 19, 2023

February 20, 2024

DRAFT

346

347

Charlie Vars moved to approve the meeting minutes of November 30, 2023, as presented. Jamie Ramsay seconded.

348

349

Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

350

351

The Board tabled discussion of the meeting minutes of December 19, 2023, until a future meeting.

352

353

354

2. Any other business that may come before the Board

355

356

The Board presented Doug Kirkwood with a certificate of appreciation celebrating his years of service on the Board.

357

358

359

Danielle Pray moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:16pm. Tony Ortiz seconded.

360

Voting: 5-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

361

362

Respectfully submitted,

363

Kristan Patenaude