TOWN OF RAYMOND APPLICATION TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS

| Staff Use Only: | | | Received Date |
|--|---|-------------------------|---------------|
| Application Fee Recording Fee Notice Fee \$8.00/abutter Publishing Fee | , | \$ 75,00 \$ \$ \$ | |
| Escrow-if required | | \$ | |
| | | T 8 = = | |

| Name of Applicant Jeffrey D. Clark and Bethany A.F. Clark Mailing Address 715 Webbs Mills Rd Raymond, Me Primary Phone 207-655-6270 C VH W email in belark 870 gmail.com Date property acquired: (month and year) 717 2020 |
|---|
| Name of Owner (if different than applicant) 5 Am E Mailing Address |
| Town: State Zip Code |
| Primary Phone C H W email |
| Property Address (street number and name): 3 Orchard Estates |
| Town of Raymond Map(112 Lot 044/000 Zone R |
| Registry of Deeds Book 369 Page 259 |
| The undersigned applies for the following: |
| 1. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL. Applicant requests relief from the decision, or lack of decision, of the Code Enforcement Officer. The undersigned believes that (check one) An error was made in the denial of the permit Denial of the permit was based on the misinterpretation of the ordinance The permit was not approved or denied within a reasonable period of time Other: |
| 2. VARIANCE (the information listed on the following page must be submitted) |
| 3. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT For(use) in Zone |
| 4. VARIANCE PROVISION(S) FOR NON-CONFORMING Lot Structure Use |
| 5. SETBACK REDUCTION |
| I have read, understand and agree to the above instructions and conditions. I also authorize any Board Member or other Town Officials to enter onto the site. I certify that the information contained in this application and its supplement is true and correct. |
| Date: 2/4/202/ Appellant: Machany Clark |
| Date: 2/14/2021 Property Owner: Jeffrey & Bothany Clark |

VARIANCE CRITERIA

| a. Nature of variance: Describe the nature of the variance. To create (1) one buildable (3) three-acre lot to allow for construction of a new home and | to create (1) |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| one non-conforming 2.05 acre lot, which will encompass existing structures which are more | |
| but would have to be included in a mortgage on the new house if unable to obtain the nor | |
| lot, and still build a house on same lot. | |
| | |
| NOTE: Eight (8) copies of a sketch plan of the property <u>must</u> accompany this applicate the dimensions and shape of the lot, the size, setbacks and location of existing building and dimensions of proposed buildings or alterations, the location of any buildings within the lot, and any natural or topographic peculiarities of the lot in question. | s, the location |
| o. Justification of variance: In order to be granted, the Appellant MUST DEMONSTIBO BOARD of Appeals that the strict application of the zoning ordinance would cause UNDUHARDSHIP. MAINE STATE LAW REQUIRES FOUR CRITERIA, WHICH MUDE of the Board of Appeals can find that the hardship exists. Please explain how your SEACH of these criteria listed below: (If these are not answered, the appeal will not be SEACH) | JE JST BE MET situation meets |
| . The land in question cannot yield a reasonable return unless the variance is granted | • |
| By limiting/decreasing the square footage on the mobile home, in order to build a new ho | use, thus |
| having (2) two houses on the existing lot, the mobile home would be less rentable and les | s income |
| yielding, decreasing the income derived currently. | |
| 2. The need for a variance is due to the unique circumstances of the property and not to conditions of the neighborhood. The lot size is currently not large enough to have two full sized dwellings without decreasi | _ |
| square footage on the mobile home. | |
| 3. The granting of the variance will not alter the essential character of the locality. | |
| The request or a variance would not alter the essential character of the locality – it would | remain rural |
| residential. | AND AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY. |
| . The hardship is not the result of action taken by the appellant or a prior owner. | |
| This is the size the of the lot and it was never intended to be split by the prior owners. | |

