NOTICE OF DECISION

Washington Zoning Board of Adjustment

Case No: 14-296

Date of Decision: 2/28/2024



The Select Board, any party to the action, or any person directly affected has a right to appeal this decision. For complete information, see RSA 677:2 Rehearing and Appeal Procedures. This notice has been placed on file and made available for public inspection in the records of the ZBA. Copies of this notice have been distributed to the applicant and the Select Board.

Applicant	John A Rankin and Laure A Rankin
Address	52 Lincoln Drive, Washington NH 03280
Owner	John A Rankin and Laure A Rankin
Lot	14-296

You are hereby notified of the decision by vote of the ZBA of the following variances.

	Variance	LUO	Decision
1	Impervious coverage of 22.7% where 20% is allowed	201.5	DISMISSED

References

RSA 674:33	Powers of Zoning Board of Adjustment	https://tinyurl.com/3s33w79d
RSA 677:2	Rehearing and Appeal Procedures	https://tinyurl.com/mr3erk82
LUOs	Washington Land Use Ordinance	https://tinyurl.com/yrdscxba
Application	Application for a Variance 1/3/2024	http://tinyurl.com/26935jt8

Findings of Fact

Upon inspection, the Board found that the applicant proposes building a permanent awning over a 6' x 16' walkway. The awning consists of a "tin roof" supported by four 4" x 4" posts, themselves supported by concrete piers embedded in the ground. The awning extends the existing roofline.

Because the existing roofline already extends approximately 12" over the walkway, the awning only adds 80 sq ft to the total building coverage. As the building coverage is only 3.8% of the lot, no variance is needed.

The Board observed that the walkway surface consists of the same crushed stone as the driveway that it extends and consequently is already impervious. Therefore the Board dismisses the request for an impervious coverage variance as unnecessary.

Motion to Dismiss

The Board moves to DISMISS the request for a variance for impervious coverage as the proposal builds over an area which is already impervious and the variance is therefore not required.

The Board respectfully requests the Select Board to vacate its denial of the LUCC Permit application and instead grant it as submitted.