

City of Rochester, New Hampshire

Zoning Board of Adjustment

Variance Application

TO: BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CITY OF ROCHESTER

NM Cook Development LLC & NM Cook 17 Farmington Road LLC
E-mail: mcook@metrocast.net Phone: 603-502-5200
Applicant Address: 22 Isaac Lucas Circle, Dove, NH 03820
Property Owner (if different): Same
Property Owner Address: Same
Variance Address: "0" Farmington Road & 17 Farmington Road
Map Lot and Block No: Tax Map 216, Lot 29 & Tax Map 221, Lot 164
Description of Property: Commercial Building, Tides Fish Market and Vacant Parking Lot
Proposed use or existing use affected: Proposing to Merge the parcels and redevelop the site with multiple buildings
The undersigned hereby requests a variance to the terms of the Rochester Zoning Ordinance, Ch. 275, Section
and asks that said terms be waived to permit

The undersigned alleges that the following circumstances exist which prevent the proper enjoyment of his land under the strict terms of the Zoning Ordinance and thus constitute grounds for a variance. I understand that while presenting my case the testimony should be confined to the 5 criteria and how they pertain to my case.

Signed:__

- Chapter 275-12.8 Uses Allowed, to permit the corner of a proposed building within 50' of a wetland boundary.
- Chapter 275-12.8 (B)(8) to permit land disturbance within 25' of a wetland boundary
- Chapter 275, Article 23.2 (7)(a) to permit a drive through window to be placed on the front of a structure.
- Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (1) minimum setbacks to permit a building closer than 100° to the rear boundary line.
- Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (1) minimum setbacks to permit a building closer than 50' to the front boundary line to NH Route 11
- Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (5) to permit the development without the need for the 300' buffer requirement.



City of Rochester, New Hampshire

Zoning Board of Adjustment

Variance Criteria

Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because: See Narrative ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **
2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: See Narrative
3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because: See Narrative
4.) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because: See Narrative
 5.) Unnecessary Hardship: a. Owning to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because: i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: See Narrative
And: ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:
b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use of it.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

335 Second Crown Point Road Barrington, NH 03825 Phone: (603) 332-2863 Fax: (603) 335-4623 www.BerrySurveying.Com crberry@metrocast.net September 20, 2023

City of Rochester Zoning Board

Attention: Shanna Saunders, Director of Planning & Development

33 Wakefield Street Rochester, NH 03867

Re:

NM Cook Development LLC & NM Cook 17 Farmington Road LLC

Property Located Between 21 and 17 Farmington Road

Farmington Road / NH Route 11

Tax Map 216, Lot 29 & Tax Map 221, Lot 164

Variance Request(s)

Ms. Saunders

On behalf of our client, NM Cook Development LLC & NM Cook 17 Farmington Road LLC, Berry Surveying & Engineering (BS&E) is requesting variances to six portions of the City of Rochester Zoning Ordinance.

- Chapter 275-12.8 Uses Allowed, to permit a portion of a proposed building within 50' of a wetland boundary.
- Chapter 275-12.8 (B)(8) to permit land disturbance within 25' of a wetland boundary
- Chapter 275, Article 23.2 (7)(a) to permit a drive through window to be placed on the front of a structure.
- Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (1) minimum setbacks to permit a building closer than 100' to the rear boundary line.
- Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (1) minimum setbacks to permit a building closer than 50' to the front boundary line of NH Route 11
- Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (5) to permit the development without the need for the 300' buffer requirement.

Background and General Narrative:

The existing primary sites for development are Tax Map 216, Lot 29 and Tax Map 221, Lot 164, which is situated between the new Meredith Village Savings Bank (MVSB), located at 21 Farmington Road and the plaza located at 17 Farmington Road. The plaza is on Lot 164. The subject parcels and others noted below are all located within the Granite Ridge Development (GR) Zone. Mr. Cook, of NM Cook Development LLC & NM Cook 17 Farmington Road LLC the "applicant" has purchased a number of properties in the area over the years. The presented project combines and promotes uses on each one of the project sites and locations.

In May of 2006, Mr. Cook purchased 23 Farmington Road where he owns and operates Rochester Motorsports. The facility has grown over the years and now offers multiple maintenance and seasonal storage options for their clients.

In May of 2020 Mr. Cook purchased the location at 17 Farmington Road, known by many as "Cardinals Plaza" The site contains multiple store fronts as well as the Mobil Gas station situated against NH Route 11. Tide's Fish Market is located at the back of the site. Over the past few years, Mr. Cook has made internal and external improvements to the building and has improved the occupancy and capacity of the total structure. To increase the business potential located at 23 Farmington Road, the basement area of 17 Farmington Road is being used for storage of the various items sold at Rochester Motorsports.

In July of 2021, Mr. Cook purchased the site formerly known as 21 Farmington Road which is largely comprised of a vacant parking lot. The site has had various uses throughout history. Shortly after purchasing the property, a subdivision and site plan was conducted to permit the construction of MVSB. The shape of the out parcel and the remaining land was intentional and provides connection between the Rochester Motorsports, the remaining middle parcel, and the plaza at 17 Farmington Road.

During former development contemplation of the 21 Farmington Road project site, BS&E has worked with NHDOT on modifying and obtaining updating permitting to access the site in the location across from Rochester VW. During the design of MVSB and the subdivision of the out parcel, BS&E again worked with NHDOT to provide an updated entrance and permit. A dedicated reciprocal access easement was established between the two lots and includes access ability to 17 Farmington Road. A widened shoulder was established to promote the access point as the primary entrance. This entrance provides the greatest sight distance and is the furthest in proximity to the next abutting driveway to the south, and is furthest from the crest within NH Route 11.

The rear of the subject parcel is sloped in the north-northeast direction. The effects of the slope can be seen by the use of a retaining wall on the MVSB project site. The entire parking area and developed site at 17 Farmington Road is sloped in the north-northeast direction. There is an existing gravel road / trail that has been used between the sites within the wetland setback that was historically used to gain access to the rear of one of the former buildings on the 21 Farmington Road site, now occupied by MVSB.

The subject parcels have a large amount of frontage along NH Route 11. The parcel has 410.49 feet along NH Route 11 in a contiguous format. There is an additional 35' on the north side of MVSB and there is frontage created along a perpendicular section to NH Route 11 which bumps out around the portion of the gas station on the parcel. The average depth of the parcel is approximately 254'.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

The Proposal:

Mr. Cook is proposing to develop the underutilized parking lot with a mix of commercial development in multiple buildings. This includes merging the two parcels to have one project site unencumbered by internal boundary lines. The rear of the site is proposed to be developed with a building that is approximately 12,500 Sq.Ft. in size. The building is proposed to contain a full basement for storage use of the abutting complimentary uses. The first-floor commercial space is designed with a large inviting sidewalk at the front to make way for integrated landscape features as well as activated space. The building's basement design is designed around the topographic feature at the rear of the site, and allows for the required slope of the drive aisle to work with the foundation wall. Additional parking is proposed at the rear of this building. The rear building is of regular increment, and is positioned as far to the south as the site will allow. The parking array to the south, parking adjacent to the plaza and the installation of sidewalk for walkability positions the building on the site. Due to this positioning the rear corner of the building is located within the 50' wetland setback, 41.77' at the closest point. A variance for the structure is requested whereas it is not a permitted use in the overlay district.

The drive aisle at the rear of the structure along the abutting boundary line, is proposed to continue to the lower section of the building. It will transition from a 24' aisle to a 15' paved access road which will traverse between the subject parcels and the Rochester Motorsports to the north. This will formally allow materials to travel to and from the sites without the need to enter and exit onto NH Route 11 and the existing traversing activities within the right of way will be discontinued. Though the proposed access road is permitted by Conditional Use, granted by the Planning Board, portions of the access and the associated grading will be located within 25' of the wetland boundary, which is not permitted within the overlay district and therefore requires a variance.

The center of the site contains the main drive aisle and is designed to promote all of the users of the site to enter and exit through the northern entrance previously discussed. The site proposes parking arrays opposing the drive aisle in a conventional design.

Two buildings are proposed at the front of the site. The northern building is approximately 3,600 Sq.Ft., and the southern building is approximately 3,200 Sq.Ft. in size. The intent of the two separated buildings is to promote internal landscaping, visual connection to the rear of the site and the creation of internal activated space. The walks waysadjacent to the center aisle are proposed to be an inviting 8' wide. Though the primary store fronts of the buildings will be internally facing, the architectural requirements of the GR zone will dictate the required features facing NH Route 11.

The southern building is proposed to contain a tenant that would require a drive-through order and pickup window and is logically proposed along the length of the building facing NH Route 11. Article 23.2 (7)(a) requires that these uses are placed on the side or rear of the structure. As noted above the best traffic pattern for NH Route 11 and the site is to promote activity at the



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

northern most entrance. This entrance provides for the greatest queue length for the user and will remove the possibility of stacking into the entrance and exit lanes. Additionally, a by-pass lane is proposed to eliminate the potential for congestion. Placing the pickup window on the southern end of the building is not possible due to existing traffic conflicts with the gas station and access in and out of the existing plaza site at the southern entrance.

The design is careful to create an internal traffic connection, safe pedestrian connection and a cohesion between the proposed pad sites through the use of landscape, hardscape and activated space. If a drive through were forced to the internal facade of the building, required parking would be placed at the front of the site and the site will operate as multiple disjointed users which is contrary to modern design ideals.

<u>Variance Criteria for</u> Chapter 275-12.8 to permit a structure within 41.77' of the wetland boundary.

- 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

 The public interest is in keeping the largest protections to the natural wetland system as practical while providing an opportunity for land owners to exercise property rights. In this case the area of the site where the building is proposed within the 50' required setback has historically been disturbed and is in an unnatural condition.
- 2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed. In other commercial zones buffer reductions such as this are permitted with the overlay district. This speaks to the balance placed in the ordinance to environmental sensitivity and economic growth. The incursion into the setback is small and is within an area of previous disturbance, and is within the spirit of allowing controlled development to take place in economically developing sections of the city.
- 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

 Substantial justice in this case is achieved whereas the benefit to the applicant far outweighs the detriment to the general public or the ordinance as a whole. The ordinance permits disturbances within the 50' setback by Conditional Use for specific uses, however the building is not a listed use. The proposed building proposes no greater detriment to the wetland than an access road or prior disturbances found onsite. The reduction of the leasable space onsite for the purposes of removing the impact, within an impacted area is a detriment to the applicant and is avoidable with the granting of the variance.
- 4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding property values will not be changed. The uses proposed are commercial and are within the GR zone which is inherently commercial. The change in the wetland setback will have no bearing on the abutting land uses and therefore will not affect value.

- 5) Unnecessary Hardship:
 - a. Owning the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

In this case there is no fair and substantial relationship between the public purpose and the specific application to the property. The public purpose is designed to protect the wetland boundary by situating buildings a minimum of 50' away. The ordinance then allows for certain disturbances between the building and the 25' buffer. However, portions of the ordinance also permits buffer reductions for the purposes of building commercials sites. Applying a more stringent standard (50') without the benefit of the buffer reduction on a property that is clearly commercially used and within a commercial zone creates an inequitable relationship. The applicant has attempted to reduce the building structure to fit the site, fit the contour of the land, is of regular constructable shape, and meets the needs of the applicant

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The request is small compared to the size of the wetland and given the impacted history on the project site. This is a reasonable request given the potential buffer reduction offered to other land owners in other commercial zones.

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use for it.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

The special condition of this parcel is the general dimension of the property in relation to the existing buildings already situated on the project site. When these factors are considered, adjacent to the wetland onsite, which cuts through the corner on an angle, the constraints pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant.

The denial of the variance would cause an unnecessary hardship to the owner in that it places the site at an economic disadvantage to other identical sites in more favorable zones. This is unnecessary if the variance is granted for a minor encroachment within the 50'

<u>Variance Criteria for Chapter 275-12.8 (B)(8)</u> Land surface within 25' of a wetland is proposed to be altered.

- 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because: The public interest is the balance between the environmental longevity of the natural resources in the City of Rochester and the growth potential and traffic connectivity of parcel within the GD Zone. In this case the applicant is proposing an access for the connectivity of multiple parcels to alleviate the need to enter into NH Route 11, which aids in the much-needed traffic management issue along the corridor.
- 2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed whereas the applicant has designed the access and associated grading to be the most limited needed which allows for a remaining buffer around the wetland boundary. Stormwater and buffer plantings will be evaluated during the planning process of the project to ensure current design philosophy is utilized.
- 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

 Substantial justice in this case is achieved where the applicant gains and maintains access between the parcel without there being a detriment to the ordinance or abutting land owners. The disturbance within 25' of the wetland boundary will not cause harm to abutting land owners in the area and satisfies a need between the multiple project sites.
- 4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

 If the variance were granted, the values will not be diminished whereas value is

If the variance were granted, the values will not be diminished whereas value is not determined by the breadth of wetland buffers. The reduction in the buffer will not pose environmental harm given the existing disturbance with the area of impact.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

5) Unnecessary Hardship:

- a. Owning the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The special condition of this parcel is the shape in the context of the existing natural features as well as the topographic features at the rear of the site. The wetland buffer and setback in this area has some existing disturbance. The ordinance is designed to ensure the remaining buffer provides a level of protection to the wetland boundary. This can be done with innovative stormwater methods and enhanced plantings in the area and therefore there is no relationship between the purpose and this specific application.

The denial of the variance would cause an unnecessary hardship to the owner by not allowing access between the parcels in the most appropriate way possible given the context of NH Route 11 and the GR Zone. Connectivity is promoted throughout the GR ordinance and this proposal follows suit on a project specific level.

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The proposed use is a reasonable one because it allows for the reasonable development of the existing disturbed area around a wetland to be used for a traffic management purpose.

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use for it.

Though other properties in the immediate area have wetlands on them, this lot is special given the less uniform nature when compared to the property boundary and the existing buildings situated thereon. The need to traverse along the wetland boundary within the buffer is a direct result of the wetlands shape and position as it relates to the developable land on both



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

sites. Denial would pose an unnecessary hardship by not permitting a formal access between the parcels.

<u>Variance Criteria for Chapter 275</u>, Article 23.2 (7)(a) Drive Through Window must be on the side or rear of the building.

- 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

 The public interest is ensuring the corridor is not lined with drive-thru services at the front of project sites, which tend to cause traffic congestion and queuing issues with public highways. In this case, the purpose of the request is to ensure there is adequate traffic management and queue length for the modern-day drive-thru and pick up window.
- 2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: The spirit of this ordinance is likely to promote building facades that face the corridor. Drive-thru location and proper building facades are not mutually exclusive items. The site will contain a landscape design between the aisles and the right of way and the building design can still contain architectural elements that are required in the GR Zone.
- 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

 Substantial justice is provided by allowing the owner to develop the site in a cohesive manner that promotes the best traffic and pedestrian management. There is no detriment to the ordinance or the general public in light of the fact that the alternative options were reviewed and found to pose site related issues that are contrary to other section of the GR Zoning ordinance.
- 4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:
 If the variance were granted the values of the surrounding property values would not be diminished. There are no abutting properties that would be impacted by allowing the drive-thru components to be placed at the front of the site. In fact, the closest abutting residential user is at the rear of the project site.
- 5) Unnecessary Hardship:
 - a. Owning the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The special condition of this parcel is the width vs the depth of the property in conjunction with the two restricted, dedicated, access points on the property. The GR district promotes small commercial pods that are interconnected by walks, activated spaces, and cohesive traffic flow. On this property, the public purpose noted above and the public purpose of providing drive-thru items on the side and rear for traffic management reasons are in conflict with one another. Since the traffic management proposed is the reason for the placement of the drive-thru there is no substantial relationship between the two.

The denial of the variance would cause an unnecessary hardship in creating a disjointed development on the project site. If a drive-thru were forced on the rear or side of the building each pad site would be designed to work independently of each other creating disconnection on the entire site.

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The proposed use is reasonable whereas the traffic management component and the aesthetic purpose can be satisfied despite having the drive-thru on the front of the building.

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use for it.

As noted above, given the special nature of the parcel's width and depth in conjunction with the southerly abutting building, existing gas station location and existing dedicated driveway locations would not reasonably allow for a drive-thru (an allowed use) to be placed on the project site while maintaining a high level of traffic management and meeting the goals and objectives found in the GR Zone. Not permitting a much needed use on the site due to the location poses an unnecessary hardship to the applicant.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

<u>Variance Criteria for Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (1) minimum setbacks to permit a building closer than 100' to the rear boundary line.</u>

- 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

 The public interest is to provide separation of larger projects within the GR Zone from abutting users that are likely not within the GR Zone. In this case there is a large wooded buffer between the rear building and the closest abutting non-congruent use. (Residential). The building proposed is not imposing and is not proposed to be a tall mixed use building.
- 2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed whereas the project design is relatively small in horizontal and vertical scale. Larger setbacks are supported in projects that have larger massing associated with them. This can be seen later in the GR ordinance where larger buffers from larger structures is contemplated.
- 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

 Substantial justice in this case is achieved where the applicant is allowed to develop a site that does not contain an abundance of depth, on a scale that is practical given the context of the site.
- 4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:
 If the variance were granted, the values will not be diminished whereas the proposed reduction in the rear setback is not outside the disturbances and constraints currently observed on the site now. The buildings are not proposed to be large or imposing and are on the same scale as what has been developed on the site in the past.
- 5) Unnecessary Hardship:
 - a. Owning the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The special condition of this parcel is the shape in the context of the scale of the proposed project. The lack of sizable depth makes



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

compliance and reasonable development of a parcel in the GR Zone impossible and therefore constitutes an unnecessary hardship to the applicant. If the intent is to promote larger building projects to have larger setbacks, there is no substantial relationship to projects that are smaller in footprint and profile.

The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The proposed use is reasonable given the scale that is contemplated.

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use for it.

It is unreasonable to think the properties in the GR Zone with such stout depths could reasonably be developed to a high potential with such a large rear setback. This poses an unnecessary hardship on the applicant by not permitting the highest in best use of a parcel in a zone that promotes the highest and best uses.

<u>Variance Criteria for Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (1) minimum setbacks to permit a building closer than 50' to the front boundary line to NH Route 11</u>

- 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

 The public interest is to provide separation of larger projects within the GR Zone from the road right of way so that they are less imposing to the corridor. The proposed building is set further back from the corridor than the two abutting buildings to the north and south.
- 2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed whereas the project design is relatively small in horizontal and vertical scale. Larger setbacks are supported in projects that have larger massing associated with them. This can be seen later in the GR ordinance where larger buffers from larger structures is contemplated.
- 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

 Substantial justice in this case is achieved where the applicant is allowed to develop a site that does not contain an abundance of depth, on a scale that is practical given the context of the site.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

If the variance were granted, the values will not be diminished whereas the proposed reduction in the front setback is not outside the disturbances and constraints currently observed on the site now. The buildings are not proposed to be large or imposing and are on the same scale as what has been developed on the site in the past.

- 5) Unnecessary Hardship:
 - a. Owning the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The special condition of this parcel is the shape in the context of the scale of the proposed project. The lack of sizable depth makes compliance and reasonable development of a parcel in the GR Zone impossible and therefore constitutes an unnecessary hardship to the applicant. If the intent is to promote larger building projects to have larger setbacks, there is no substantial relationship to projects that are smaller in footprint and profile. Prior to the latest revisions on the zoning document there were not prescribed setback requirements within the zone.

The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The proposed use is reasonable given the scale that is contemplated.

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use for it.

It is unreasonable to think the properties in the GR Zone with such shallow depths could reasonably be developed to a high potential with such a large front setback. This poses an unnecessary hardship on the applicant by not permitting the highest in best use of a parcel in a zone that promotes the highest and best uses.



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

<u>Variance Criteria for Chapter 275-8.5B.10(a) (5)</u> to permit the development without the need for the 300' buffer requirement.

- 1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

 The public interest is to provide separation of larger projects within the GR Zone from the road right of way so that they are less imposing to the corridor and allow the front 300' to be use for smaller scale commercial ventures. This project is within that spirt but cannot meet the buffering requirements within the chapter. Internal landscaping and perimeter landscaping will be proposed and reviewed by the planning board as part of the project but the percentages prescribed in the ordinance will not be obtained based on the entire parcel being located within the 300' buffer.
- 2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because: If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed whereas the project design is relatively small in horizontal and vertical scale and will provide the highest level of landscaping appropriate for the site design.
- 3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

 Substantial justice in this case is achieved where the applicant is allowed to develop a site that does not contain an abundance of depth, on a scale that is practical given the context of the site. The site is currently developed and contains no landscaping or vegetation to speak of. The development of the site will improve the landscaping and will bring it closer to compliance.
- 4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:
 If the variance were granted, the values will not be diminished whereas the site will contain more buffering than the existing condition. Being more inviting and walkable will promote businesses to locate in the area and will raise overall property values.
- 5) Unnecessary Hardship:
 - a. Owning the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in an unnecessary hardship because:
 - i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

The special condition of this parcel is the shape and the fact that it is already fully developed. The development will bring the site closer to complying with the buffering regulations and therefore there is no fair and substantial relationship between this site and the need for full compliance within the zone. Full compliance would require the applicant to not develop the site to the highest and best use which places the land at an economic disadvantage, which is an unnecessary hardship but for the variance request.

The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The proposed use is reasonable given the scale that is contemplated and the fact that it will be developed closer to compliance than the existing condition.

b. Explain how, if the criteria in subparagraph (A) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owning to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in the strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore necessary to enable reasonable use for it.

It is unreasonable to think the properties in the GR Zone with such shallow depths could reasonably be developed to a high potential with such a large buffering requirement. This poses an unnecessary hardship on the applicant by not permitting the highest in best use of a parcel in a zone that promotes the highest and best uses.

We hope the board finds this project is worthy of a variance and approves the request. Thank you all for your time and attention this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

Christopher R Borry, SIT Principal, President



BERRY SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

275-12.8Uses allowed.

- <u>A.</u> The CO District is an overlay district. Where the provisions of this article conflict with those of the underlying zoning district, the more restrictive standards shall apply.
- **B.** The following uses are allowed in this district:
- (1) Wildlife habitat development and management.
- (2) Conservation areas and nature trails, provided that the Planning Board, in consultation with the Conservation Commission, reviews and approves plans of such areas and trails prior to their development.
- (3) Recreation, including open-air recreational uses consistent with the purpose and intent of this article, such as cross-country skiing, ice skating, hiking, and photography.
- (4) Education, including natural and environmental science walks, wildlife and botanical studies and similar activities.
- (5) Seasonally permitted hunting and fishing, as regulated by New Hampshire Fish and Game Department.
- (6) Forestry, including both logging operations and tree farming subject to RSA 227-J:9. Logging and any associated road building and/or skid trail construction shall be conducted in accordance with the then-current Best Management Practices for Erosion Control on Timber Harvesting Operations in New Hampshire published by the UNH Cooperative Extension and New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development and the New Hampshire Division of Forests and Lands, on file with this article with the City Clerk.
- (7) Production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any fruit, vegetable, floricultural or horticultural crops, conducted in accordance with Best Management Wetlands Practices for Agriculture, July 1993, amended September 1998 (on file with this article with the City Clerk), but not within 25 feet of the edge of the adjacent wetland.

 [Amended at time of adoption of Code (see Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. II)]
- (8) The land surface within 25 feet of the edge of the wetland shall not be altered. Herbicides and heavy equipment are prohibited within 25 feet of the edge of the wetland. New lawns may be established beyond 25 feet from the edge of the wetland

provided the wetland has been delineated/flagged by a certified soil scientist. Fertilization shall be limited to lime and wood ash.

- (9) Removal of hazardous trees.
- (10) Removal of invasive vegetation (see Notes on Native Trees and Shrubs and Their Use in Landscaping, by the Rochester Conservation Commission, on file with this article with the City Clerk).
- (11) Minor accessory structures of 200 square feet or less (in which there is no storage of petroleum products, hazardous chemicals or materials). Such accessory structures shall not be constructed with any of the following materials: asphalt shingles or pressure-treated or chemically treated/preserved wood.
- <u>C.</u> Any uses not listed in this section are prohibited in the CO District.

//0000//5/00	Laicel ID 0441/ 0104/ 0000/
14000	777
	Laicein
17 FARMINGTON RD	
Property Location	Vision ID 686

989

Card #

203,000 000'26 705,900 203,000 97,000 203,000 1,048,300 Permit #: M-19-PU NEW TANK 748,300 1,048,300 JRVR- CNG CO Year | Descri | Prior Assesse | Year | Descri | Prior Assess | Year | Descri | Prior Assesse ,005,900 WROTE MR. C F - WITHOW ROCHESTER, NH Land Use 3250 Print Date 6/4/2023 1:42:49 PM **NOISIN** Notes Notes Total Land Value otal BLDG LAND Total 1,005,900 Total APPRAISED VALUE SUMMARY **IISIT / CHANGE HISTOR** 2022 203,000 748,300 203,000 97,000 Assessed Purpost/Result Current Assesse 1,048,300 Value JOUS ASSESSMENTS (HISTOR) MEAS+INSPCTD DEED CHANGE DEED CHANGE 705,900 SENT NOTICE 97,000 INTER ONLY Appraised Extra Feature Value (Bldg) EXT ONLY Appraised Outbuilding Value (Bldg) Appraised 203,000 NO INSP Value Appraised Building Value (Card) Total Appraised Parcel Value Total Appraised Parcel Value Appraised Land Value (Bldg) 705,900 203,000 97,000 1,005,900 LUC Co | Prior Assessed CURRENT ASSESSMEN BLDG LAND **۴ 등 등 등 등** UnitPrice 175,000 OB Valuation Method Account # Bldg # 1 2021 03-22-2021 06-03-2020 02-21-2020 04-09-2018 01-02-2018 04-13-2023 07-10-2017 Date Infl3 Adj 624,700 203,000 910,200 82,500 Total 325 325 325 Infl3 77 TIF3 ರೆ ರೆ sewer and water connections for 6 units for future plumb move toilet, install HWH, install mop sink, install 2 beaut Lighting, Receptacles in Basement, lighting recess cans Infl2 Adj otal Description Gasnine manifold for convection oven and conkton BLDG LAND Sec # Infl2 BLDG LAND 2020 LAND LINE VALUATION SECTION OB 1.16 AC Infl1 Adj gas furnace and air conditioning; JR COMMERCIAL RT11 N new condneser and evaporator coi Rough plumbing for 1/2 bathroom ESMNTS BK3973 PG707 & PG709 TERMINATED BY BK- 4766, PG- 2 Coverting basement to storage SONING 25 45 25 81 82 83 Infl1 G GRANITE Description UnitPric | Size Adj | Cond | Nbhd | Nb Adj | Parcel Total Land Area EXEMPTIONS GAS PIPING; JR 100,000 900,000 1,000,000 SALE PRICE 3001 EGAL DESCRIPTION EIGHBORHOOD WALL 1.00 **BUILDING PERMIT RECORD** OPO Code 3001 888888 Stat $\circ\circ\circ\circ$ 1.00000 BUILDING NOTE O ILEVEL 12-26-2017 02-10-2012 SALE DATE 10-05-2006 C % 06-01-2020 12-01-2011 9999 Year Total Card Land Units 1.16 AC Disclaimer: This information is believed to be correct but its subject to change and is not warranteed 175,00 04-13-2023 04-13-2023 03-22-2021 03-22-2021 04-13-2023 04-13-2023 02-21-2020 04-13-2023 03-22-2021 03-22-2021 04-13-2023 03-22-2021 Insp Date UTL/ST/TRAF BK-VOL/PAGE 1,000 0 CITY WATER C 0 NONE CITY SEWER 234 260 989 715 Loc Adj 500 8,000 5,000 4,800 1,500 5,000 500 10,000 4,000 50,000 500 400 0 NONE 0 PAVED 0 HEAVY Price 4766 4539 4000 3973 ۵. PRIMARY LandU | Land Type HEATING SYS Description CARDINAL PLAZA: MOBIL & 3 VACANT PLUMBING PLUMBING PLUMBING 03820-4910 ELECTRIC ROOFING **FIN BSMT** NM COOK 17 FARMINGTON RD LLC NM COOK 17 FARMINGTON RD LLC MANUAL MANLIAI RECORD OF OWNERSHIP SIGN SIGN 1.160 CURRENT OWNER CARDINAL RENE & WAYNE CARDINAL RENE & WAYNE Permit Id 둗 RETAIL/SVC Description M-21-57 M-21-29 P-20-186 E-20-486 SG-21-45 SG-21-17 MJB-21-4 22 ISAAC LUCAS CIR B-20-447 M-19-16F P-22-36 P-22-19 **BGF REALTY LLC** BGF-ALLC Issue Date 05-03-2019 02-14-2022 03-04-2021 01-19-2021 12-22-2020 12-04-2020 07-27-2020 07-21-2022 03-09-2022 02-03-2021 11-05-2021 04-16-2021 3250 LUC VISION ID DOVER В

Print Date 6/4/2023 1:42:49 PM Land Use 3250 104 686 FFL BMT (3,328 sf) 35 Account # Bldg # 1 FFL BMT (3,364 sr) 2 ರ್ ರ 163,185 652,545 53,673 9,400 18,000 37,000 5,172 13,500 874.575 006'91 Undeprec Value Appr. Value Card # Sec # % Gd Unit Price Grade Adj. 88888 24.42 97.66 61.27 40.41 Unit Cost OB - OUTBUILDING & YARD ITEMS(L) / XF - BUILDING EXTRA FEATURES(B) 1.25 1.25 23.25 15000.00 2.57 0.00 Hoor Area Ell Area 6,682 6,682 6,682 876 0 128 0 1 Parcel ID 0221/ 0164/ 0000/ / 1,671 6,682 0 8.353 Percentage CONSTRUCTION DETAIL (CONTINUED) <u>6</u>00 Description SAME 74 689,600 931,900 COST / MARKET VALUATION 88889 1.000 1986 14,368 26 G 1986 1986 2017 2017 Condition | Yr Blt 1980 BUILDING SUB-AREA SUMMARY
LIVING Area Floor MIXED US Description Cost to Cure Ovr Cost to Cure Ovr Comment Misc Imp Ovr Comment 289'9 6,682 0 0 RETAIL/SVC 838888 Depreciation Code Dep % Ovr Dep Ovr Comment Functional Obsol Remodel Rating Year Remodeled Economic Obsol Extra Fix Rating Depreciation % Half Bath Ratin Extra Fixture(s) Grade Percent Good Misc Imp Ovr **Factor** Special Adj Condition % Element 'ear Built RCNLD III Gross Liv / Lease Area Code 3250 RCN 32000 43 15000 12000 FRAME SHED BULKHEAD/FRAME UTILIT Description FORCED W/A 17 FARMINGTON RD MULTI TYPE CONCRETE Description MULTIPLE AVERAGE Commercial MIX RETAIL PROPANE AVERAGE CONSTRUCTION DETAIL Average Qnty SAME SAME VINYL <u>1</u>9 1ST FLOOR OPEN PORCH 100.00 100.00 6.00 BASEMENT PAVING ASPH PARK'G SPAC TANK I/G FIB TANK I/G FIB C39 0.00 COMM CANO GAS PUMPS Description Property Location Vision ID 686 3/4 Bath(s) 3/4 Bath Rating # Heat Systems Residential Unit Basement Floor Half Bath Ratin 2nd Ext Wall % Extra Fixture(s) Exterior Wall 1 Exterior Wall 2 Roof Structure Interior Floor 2 2nd Heat Type Interior Wall 1 Interior Wall 2 Interior Floor 1 2nd % Heated Comm Units Element Full Bath(s) Half Bath(s) Bath Rating AC Percent Wall Height Roof Cover Heat Type Bedrooms Heat Fuel % Heated Code Grade Stories Model Units OFP Η 두 8 유 모 못

705,900 203,000 97,000 748,300 000'26 203,000 1,048,300 1,005,900 Descri Prior Assesse 1,048,300 ROCHESTER, NH Land Use 3250 Print Date 6/4/2023 1:42:50 PM **VISION** Notes Notes Total Land Value Total BLDG LAND OB APPRAISED VALUE SUMMARY VISIT / CHANGE HISTORY Current Assesse 748,300 203,000 97,000 Year Assessed 2022 Purpost/Result 1,048,300 Value 1,005,900 1,048,30 VIOUS ASSESSMENTS (HISTOR) 705,900 203,000 97,000 | Year | Descri | Prior Assess | 1,005,900 Appraised Extra Feature Value (Bldg) Appraised Value Appraised Outbuilding Value (Bldg) Appraised Building Value (Card) Total Appraised Parcel Value Fotal Appraised Parcel Value Appraised Land Value (Bldg) 705,900 203,000 97,000 LUC Co | Prior Assessed Total BLDG LAND Adj UnitPrice p 175,000 Valuation Method Account # Bldg # 2 2021 Infl3 Adj Date Prior Assesse 203,000 82,500 624,700 910,200 Total 325 325 325 Infl3 77 ರ್ ರ್ Infl2 Adj 2 / Descri otal Description BLDG LAND OB Sec # Inf12 Year BLDG LAND 2020 LAND LINE VALUATION SECTION 90 1.16 AC Infl1 Adj COMMERCIAL RT11 N ESMNTS BK3973 PG707 & PG709 TERMINATED BY BK- 4766, PG- 2 Notes SALE CODE NHBD NAME ZONING Infl1 92 45 84 81 G GRANITE Description Size Adj | Cond | Nbhd | Nb Adj | Parcel Total Land Area 1.000 Parcel ID 0221/0164/0000// EXEMPTIONS 100,000 1,000,000 3001 SALE PRICE LEGAL DESCRIPTION VEIGHBORHOOD 1.00 BUILDING PERMIT RECORD Year Code 3001 Stat 1.00000 O ILEVEL BUILDING NOTE 06-01-2020 12-26-2017 02-10-2012 12-01-2011 10-05-2006 C % SALEDATE 175,00 Total Card Land Units 0.00 AC Total Card Land Units 0.00 AC UnitPric Insp Date UTL/ST/TRAF 0.000 0 CITY WATER C BK-VOL/PAGE UTILITIES 0 NONE 0 CITY SEWER 715 0 234 260 989 Loc Adj 4539 4000 3973 0 Price 0 PAVED 0 HEAVY 4766 0 NONE م PRIMARY Land Type Description 03820-4910 NM COOK 17 FARMINGTON RD LLC BGF REALTY LLC NM COOK 17 FARMINGTON RD LLC RECORD OF OWNERSHIP LandU 0.000 **CURRENT OWNER** BGF-A LLC CARDINAL RENE & WAYNE CARDINAL RENE & WAYNE Permit Id Į Description RETAIL/SVC 22 ISAAC LUCAS CIR **TIDES FISH MARKET** Issue Date 3250 TOC Vision ID DOVER В 2

686

Card #

17 FARMINGTON RD

Property Location

 \circ

22 Land Use 3250 Print Date 6/4/2023 1:42:50 PM GAR (308 sf) 7 1日 訓練 4 FFL (196 sf) ない 調 はな FISH MAKEET 14 14 686 12 Account # Bldg # 2 NE ರ್ ರ Undeprec Value 15,808 78,128 4,675 415 280 47,424 1,600 146,730 Card # Sec # Appr. Value STG (20 st) Unit Price Grade Adj. 19.00 76.00 15.18 16.59 9.34 57.00 1.00 Unit Cost OB - OUTBUILDING & YARD ITEMS(L) / XF - BUILDING EXTRA FEATURES(B) S4P 312.50 312.50 Parcel ID 0221/ 0164/ 0000/ / HON EIT Area Percentage 208 1,028 1.860 CONSTRUCTION DETAIL (CONTINUED) 00 c Description PS % 146,730 COST / MARKET VALUATION 40 58,700 5 5 5 1.000 1950 832 ,028 308 3,055 9 Grade Condition Yr Blt 1990 1990 MIXED USE Description Cost to Cure Ovr Comment Misc Imp Ovr Comment 0 0 0 0 0 0 624 1.652 RETAIL/SVC Depreciation Code Dep Ovr Comment Functional Obsol Economic Obsol Cost to Cure Ovr Extra Fixture(s) Extra Fix Rating rear Remodeled Remodel Rating Depreciation % Half Bath Ratin Percent Good Misc Imp Ovr BUILDING SUB-AR Element rend Factor Special Adj Condition % Dep % Ovr ပ ပ rear Built RCNLD Code 3250 III Gross Liv / Lease Area RCN FRAME SHED BULKHEAD/FRAME UTILIT STOOP 3/4 STORY Dim 2 Dim 1 ASPH SHINGLE Description Commercial RETAIL STORE 17 FARMINGTON RD FORCED W/A CONCRETE Jescription AVERAGE AVERAGE CONSTRUCTION DETAIL Qnty GABLE SAME SAME VINYL 500 등 L/B 12 100.00 1ST FLOOR BASEMENT 0.00 LIGHT M/POL LIGHT M/POL 94 C37 D 0 1.00 8.00 Description GARAGE Property Location Vision ID 686 Exterior Wall 1 Exterior Wall 2 2nd Ext Wall % Basement Floor # Heat Systems 3/4 Bath Rating Half Bath Ratin Residential Unit Interior Floor 1 Interior Floor 2 Extra Fixture(s) Roof Structure 2nd Heat Type Interior Wall 2 Interior Wall 1 2nd % Heated Element Comm Units Half Bath(s) Wall Height AC Percent Roof Cover Full Bath(s) Bath Rating 3/4 Bath(s) Heat Type Bedrooms % Heated Heat Fuel Code Stories Grade Model GAR Units STG STP TQS ≥ ≥

Land Use 3900 Print Date 6/4/2023 1:40:10 PM 099 Account # 1 Bldg # 1 1 1 of of Card # Sec # Parcel ID 0216/ 0029/ 0000/ / Property Location 0 FARMINGTON RD Vision ID 660

CHRENTOWNER	UTILITIES	T	TOPO	ZONING		CURRENT	CURRENT ASSESSMENT	400			
NM COOK DEVELOPMENT LLC	0 CITY WATER C	0 LEVEL	LEVEL (G GRANITE NHBD NAME	Description	LUC Co	Prior Assessed	Current Assesse	Sse 200	VISION	Z
	_		N	COMMERCIAL RT11 N		9	2,1		ž Ž	CHES I	Y, NH
22 ISAAC LUCAS CIR	0 NONE	Year	Code	Description	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 					THE SAME	
DOVER NH 03820		T								ROCHES	TEN TEN
		LEGAL DI	LEGAL DESCRIPTION							and the same of th	
	ESMNTS BK3973 PG707 & PG709 TERMINATED BY BK- 4766, PG-	9G707 & PG709	TERMINATED	BY BK- 4766, PG- 2		F	184 200		184 200		
SALES INFORMATION- GRANTEE	BOOK/PAGE	SALEDATE	SALE PRICE	SALE CODE		PREV	OUS ASSESS				
NM COOK DEVELOPMENT LLC 21 FARMINGTON ROAD LLC CARDINALS SEAFARER RESTAURANT CARDINAL RENE & WAYNE DEMERITT WILLIAM F & ISABELLE	4942 928 4248 628 1140 789 992 107 896 479	07-10-2021 10-08-2014 07-16-1984 12-30-1976 12-03-1971	925,000 717,534 0 30,000 0	00 14 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	Year Descri 2020 LAND	Prior Assesse 140,100 352,300 34,100	Year Descri	Descri Prior Assess LAND 140,600 352,300 43,500	Year Do	Descri Prior Assesse LAND 184,200	184,200
					Total	526,500	Total		Total	Total	184,200
	B	BUILDING NOTES	S				APPR	APPRAISED VALUE	SUMMA	RY	
VACANT		2				Appraise Appraise Appraise Total App	Appraised Building Value (Card) Appraised Extra Feature Value (Bldg) Appraised Outbuilding Value (Bldg) Appraised Land Value (Bldg) Total Appraised Parcel Value	(6 ₁			0 0 184,200
	BUILDI	BUILDING PERMIT RECORD	CORD			Valuation	Valuation Method				O
Issue Date Permit Id Description	Price	Insp Date % C S	Stat	Notes							
09-07-2021 D-21-46 DEMOLITION 10-23-2019 E-19-435 ELECTRIC 07-13-2016 E-16-230 ELECTRIC	20,000 800 800	03-25-2022 100 C 02-21-2020 100 1	CE TWO SMAL C new 100A e CE TEST CIRC	TWO SMALL BUILDINGS new 100A electrical service on utility pole; TEST CIRCUITS TO MAKE SAFE;	y pole;	Total Ap	Total Appraised Parcel Value	√alue			184,200
E-16-230	009	_	C OFFICE BI	DE & STE BLDE STIL	HERE	Date	PI	VISIT / CHANGE HISTORY Purpost/Result	Result	_	otes
10-29-2015 12097 DEMOLITION 10-29-2015 12097 DEMOLITION 04-15-2008 08-313 GARAGE	6,800 30,000	01-20-2017 0		OFFICE BLDG & STG BLDG OFFICE BLDG & STG BLDG STRUCTURE NOT BUILT,		06-03-2022 04-11-2022 04-11-2022	도유심	CORRECTION EXT ONLY MAPPING CHG		3/25/22	CORRECTED 3/25/22- ALL BL
	-		LAND	LAND LINE VALUATION SECTION	CTION			1			
B LUC Description LandU Land Type	ype Loc Adj	UnitPric Size Adj	dj Cond Nbhd	Nb Adj Infl1 Infl1 Adj	dj Infl2 Infl2 Adj	Infl3 Infl3 Adj	Adj UnitPrice	₹	Assessed Value	Notes	SS
1 3900 COM DEV L 1.000 PRIMARY 1 3900 COM DEV L 0.610 EXCESS A	SS A E 1.000	15,000. 1.00000 15,000. 1.00000	0 1.00 3001	1.000		71F3	15,000	9,200	9,200		
Total C	Total Card Land Units	1.61 AC	Parcel Total Land Area	1.61	AC				Total Land Value	d Value	184,200
District to share information in bothward to be covered but in publicat to chance and in not warranteed	ut is subject to shance and it	s and warranteed									

Land Use 3900 Print Date 6/4/2023 1:40:10 PM		*	×
1 Account # 660 1 Bidg # 1		No Sketch	#5
Card # 1 of Sec # 1 of			irade Adj. Appr. Value Undepreciated Value
0216/ 0029/ 0000/ /	TAIL (CONTINUED)	DATA Complex # Section # % Owner % Owner 1.000	Yr Bit % Gd Unit Price Grade Adj. Pr Bit % Gd Unit Price Grade Adj. RY SECTION Eff Area Unit Cost Under
Parcel ID	UCTIO	Solar Central Vac Nation Nation Nation Nation Nation Nation Condo Main Adjust Type Condo Location Condo Location Condo Location Condo Location Sec Condo Location Nation Nation Cost / Market Valuation Nation Natio	NG & YARD ITEMS(L) / XF - BUILDING EXTR BUILDING SUB-AREA SUMMARY SECTION Living Area Floor Area Eff Area 0 0 0
0 FARMINGTON RD	TION D	Description	Description Til Gross Liv / Lease
Property Location Vision ID 660		Element Style Grade Stories Units Frame Foundation Exterior Wall 1 Roof Structure Roof Structure Roof Cover View Interior Floor 1 Basement Flo Basem	Code Description

0 & 17 Farmington Road



9/22/2023, 8:36:54 AM

1:1,128

0 0.01 0.01 0.02 mi

Tax Parcels

0 0.01 0.02 0.04 km

Esri, HERE, Garmin, INCREMENT P., NGA, USGS, Esri Community Maps Contributors, Rochester GIS, © OpenStreetMap, Microsoft, Esri, HERE, Garmin, SafeGraph, GeoTechnologies, Inc. METI/NASA, USGS, EPA, NPS, US Census Bureau, USDA

Owner1	Owner2	BillingAddress	City State Zip
COOK N MILES III	ROCHESTER MOTORSPORTS	23 FARMINGTON RD	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
SECKENDORF REAL ESTATE	HOLDINGS LLC	11 FARMINGTON RD	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
20 FARMINGTON LLC		1346 BALD HILL RD	WARWICK, RI 02866
GARZILLO MICHAEL V & JEAN F	REV TRUST TRUSTEES	18 FARMINGTON RD	ROCHESTER, NH 03867-4304
NM COOK DEVELOPMENT LLC		22 ISAAC LUCAS CIR	DOVER, NH 03820
20 FARMINGTON LLC		1346 BALD HILL RD	WARWICK, RI 02866
NM COOK 17 FARMINGTON RD LLC		22 ISAAC LUCAS CIR	DOVER, NH 03820-4910
MEREDITH VILLAGE SAVINGS BANK		PO BOX 177	MEREDITH, NH 03253
10 FARMINGTON ROAD LLC		549 ROUTE 1 BY-PASS	PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801
DONALD TOY REVOCABLE TRUST	BONNIE TOY REVOCABLE TRUST	7497 NE 8TH COURT	BOCA RATON, FL 33487
KAREN & BRIAN TUCKER	JEFFERY TUCKER	23 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
JANET MCDONALD		27 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
MANSON LIVING TRUST	ROBERT & ISABEL MANSON	29 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
DWIGHT & ANNE HARVEY		33 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
JAMES & THERESE GORSUCH		37 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
VIRGINIA CHAPPELL REV TRUST	VIRGINIA CHAPPELL	5772 COUNTY ROAD 4712	LARUE, TX 75770-3519
EDWARD & KATHLEEN WILENT		41 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
LESLIE & ANN HEISLER		45 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867
GOLONKA FAMILY TRUST	WILLIAM & JOANNE GOLONKA	49 SHILOH DRIVE	ROCHESTER, NH 03867

