Brad Boehringer <br/>bradboehringer@gmail.com>@To: Frank H Benesh <frank\_benesh@alum.mit.edu>

Cc: andy@ammonoosucsurvey.com

Re: Variance Application

4 Attachments, 402 KB

April 30, 2013 3:15 AM

Frank,

Here are detailed responses:

Q. The Ammonoosuc Survey has no date nor signature. Why is that? Will they be providing a signed survey.

I had forgotten some of this info as the survey was done nearly two years ago but this was a "preliminary" survey for the following reasons. Ammonosuc Survey was only able to find 2 of the pins (on the southwest and southeast corners of my property) and extrapolating the boundary lines they basically found discrepancies between the plans as laid out to the town in the subdivision formation and what was realistic based on their actual findings given all of the other surrounding property lines and pins that they could locate. They have laid out the lines given both their best guesses of what the plans predict compared to what they found. See the attached survey schematics. I will try to explain them as best I can:

**Boehringer1**: this shows the two pins ("IP found") along the southern boundary line. The purple hashed line denotes what would be expected given the 40' right of way as laid out in the subdivision plans. As such the pink box would denote the "buildable area" given strict 50 foot setbacks from the northern and eastern boundary lines.

**Boehringer2:** this survey is the same as Boehringer1 except with respect to the "buildable area" (pink box). If we are to assume the travelled way that boarders the eastern half of my property is a driveway serving the few properties there at the end that would allow me some leeway with the more lenient 25' setback thus expanding the buildable area to include my proposed project.

**Boehringer3:** this survey delineates with a solid black line my property boundary on the northern and eastern aspect if one was to use the confirmed, two found pins as a foundation and subsequently the measurements (100' as a northern boundary and 116' as an eastern boundary) as outlined on the subdivision plan. This would expand my "buildable area" to what is shown using the strict 50' setbacks on the northern and eastern aspects.

**Boehringer4**: this survey is the same as the aforementioned except in that it allows for the 50' setback from the northern boundary and a 25' setback from the eastern boundary thus expanding the buildable area as shown by the pink box.

Q. The survey appears to depict two possible lot plans, why is that and which is correct.

See the above explanation and updated, attached surveys. I hope this will clarify what their thought process is.

Q. The survey has a "reserved forty foot ROW' line along both roads, but there is no mention of that on your deed. What is that about?

The ROW, as I understand it, was on the original design of the subdivision. I've cc'ed Andy from Ammonosuc Survey so that perhaps he can add some clarity where I fall short on this discussion. It seems like this was the intention of the subdivision in the planning phase but falls short of what is likely in reality.

Q. The proposed drawing does not clearly indicate how much of the new structure is in the proscribed setback.

This depends on how you interpret both the setbacks (50' on both aspects or 50 on one and 25 on the other) and the property lines (using existing road, ROW and listed property measurements on the plan). I hope I have made this clear in the context of your first question.

Q. There does not appear to be any information or drawing indicating by how much the structure's height will be increased and how much of that increased height will be within the proscribed setback. Elevation drawings clearing indicating this will be necessary.

The goal would be not to increase the height of the building at all and just go down with respect to the proposed foundation. However, this is all completely dependent on the what is found when the excavating takes place.

Q. It is not clear how much additional floor space will be created and whether a basement is being created. Nor is it clear if you are creating additional bedrooms or bathrooms.

As noted on the application there will not be additions of either bedrooms or bathrooms. The area that the foundation creates will be basement area. Depending on what sort of footprint is feasible (squared off or in the abstract current design) the bathroom would likely need to be reorganized given a new layout but this is ultimately dependent on what the town and the ZBA allows. I didn't go to the expense of full architectural design until I could be assured that any change to my building might even be considered.

Q. What is current status of septic plan approval.

In my research prior to my initial building application and in conversations with Andy at that time I didn't realize this needed to be done. Last week I spoke with Andy twice and once also left a message regarding this matter and he was going to check the records to see if a septic

design was on file though I doubt this ever was done as to the best of my knowledge I have an old tank system. I asked him about whether or not a new septic plan was needed if I keep the current footprint but put a full foundation under the existing building and he was unsure of that answer and advised me he would get back to me hence my follow-up call and message to him. I have yet to hear back on either accord to date.

Q. When was the shed on the property constructed and was there a permit for it.

To the best of my knowledge there was not a building permit for the shed though it was constructed before I bought the property in 2007. I have attempted to touch base with the former owner without success.

I hope that these provide more clarity to my application. While I realize I may now need a new septic system designed and implemented which could put this entire project out of reach financially for me I would very much like to discuss my eventual options with the board given the restraints and some of the unknowns of my property.

Please let me know if there is anything further I can obtain for you.

Respectfully, Brad Boehringer







