1. Not to be contrary to public Interest
	1. Due to the unusual circumstances of the house being positioned non central to the lot deems it necessary to request a variance. Restrictions prohibit placement of the garage elsewhere on the lot. (Septic, set backs, easements, ROW.) The proposed attached garage plan would be the logical position for cost, functionality and esthetics. Furthermore, the requested variance is on a private way not visible from public roads in a neighborhood where noncompliance exists. This will not interfere with the general character of the neighborhood. Furthermore, I see no risks to the health, safety, or general welfare of the public. I do not feel the public interest will be harmed if so is granted.
2. Spirit of the ordinance is observed
	1. Due to the unusual boundary and the restrictions from easements, ROW, buried pool and septic, there are limited buildable location for this garage on the lot. The major desire is being attached with an air lock mud room entry to the house. Currently neither exist. The addition will not be used for commercial, retail or commercial enterprise. The garage will have a pitched roof loft, not a 2nd floor to keep the height to minimum. There are no apparent increase to congestion, fire hazards or safety concerns. For this I request consideration on my behalf.
3. Substantial justice is done.
	1. The lot has considerable amount of unbuildable land. Either due to layout , wetland, buried pool, boundary or easements. The abutter has given verbal consent to the requested variance. There are some stakes on the property for a physical observation. The building inspector, Kevin Bennett, has observed the layout.
4. Values of surrounding properties are not diminished.
	1. With the garage addition this will increase the value of the property, hence increasing the average value of the neighborhood. The abutter has great views to the east and south. The west and north less impressive by comparison. The construction of that house reflects those points with windows and doors. Moving the garage in the northern direction insured that the southern view of the abutter’s view would not see this garage. This were my major concern prior to selecting this location to place the garage. I would have not gone forward without the abutter’s consent.
5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.
	1. Considering the building was built before the lot was created, and seeing that existing boundary setback liberties were allowed with the creation of my lot shape, and other conditions in the neighborhood. I can not see any unnecessary hardship resulting with the granting of this variance.