ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
30 PAYSON HILL ROAD
RINDGE NH 03461
PH. (603) 899-5181x105 FAX (603) 899-2101 TDD 1-800-735-2964
www.rindgenh.gov

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

October 27, 2026 – 7:00pm

7:00 pm - Meeting called to order by Chairman George Carmichael
Members present: George Carmichael, Marcia Breckenridge, Ross Thermos, Marty Kulla, Phil Stenersen
Alternates present: Peter Letourneau, Kevin Sawyer, Terence Fogg
Members and Alternates absent: n/a
Public Present: Jim Critser, David Drouin, Nick Mason, Kimberly Naresky, Megan Naresky, Andy Ladeau, Jeff Burns, Dee Burns, Jim Mack, Jackie Naresky

---

For general information, the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) has five voting members.
Alternates may participate during the testimony phase and are permitted to ask questions, as may members of the public. Anyone wishing to speak during portions of the hearing open to public comment must first be recognized by the Chair and should state their name and address for the record.
Once the testimony phase is closed, only the five voting members will participate in the deliberations and decision-making process.
If a regular member is absent or recuses themselves from a case, the Chair will appoint an alternate to serve in their place.

Recusals: None.
Sitting on Case #2026-13 will be: George Carmichael, Marcia Breckenridge, Ross Thermos, Marty Kulla, Phil Stenersen
Notice of Public Hearing posted: Town Offices (2x), Rindge Post Office (1x), Monadnock Ledger Transcript, Rindge town website.

ZBA Case# 2026-13: A Variance is requested from Article V, Section B, of the Rindge Zoning Ordinance to permit subdivision of the subject parcel into two lots, each with less than the minimum frontage of 250' required in this district for the property located at 32 McGregor Lane, Tax Map 6, Lot 50-9, owned by Kimberly Naresky.

- Breckenridge read the relevant ordinances regarding the case; Article V, Section B.

Presentation of Case & Public Testimony

- Nick Mason, Shaheen and Gordon, presented on behalf of the applicant Kimberly Naresky.
    - History of the lot at 32 McGregor Lane: Lot was created in 1974 as a nonconforming lot, which was recorded in 1984, of 41.6 acres of backlot with two pipestems on Hunt Hill Road. Lots to east and west of existing pipestems both use these as access routes. At time, ordinance required 150' of total frontage, not continuous frontage. This made the original lot a nonconforming lot.
        - August 2025: applied for variance to allow building one house one subdivided 2 acre lot, referenced in original application and meeting minutes. August 2025 variance approved.

DRAFT

        - November 2025: applicant requested variance under Article XII, Section E, which was applicant error based on incorrect knowledge of when zoning ordinance was adopted. November 2025 variance approved.
        - May 2026: applicant went before Planning Board and received conditional approval for subdivision pending ZBA approval of frontage variance.
        - Applicant then secured Shaheen & Gordon to represent and reapply. Secured an appeal for rehearing.
        - October 2026: application for variance from Article V, Section B required 250' of contiguous frontage for a subdivided lot in the district, lot currently has a total of 100', conditionally approved by Planning Board.
    - Mason then reviewed the five criteria for a variance approval based on the case
        - Criteria 1: Variance will not be contrary to public interest
            - Project will not add substantial new traffic as a single-family road, access already shared with other lots. Does not add new driveway or curb cut.
            - Will not change visibility along the road.
        - Criteria 2: Granting the variance is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance
            - Promoted health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants of the community. Keeps an extended family together and calls back the New England tradition of family living close together for communal support.
            - Project matches the overall density and character of the town.
            - Carmichael noted to Mason that he has trouble justifying the creation of two lots with a combined 1/5 lot frontage as it would be inconsistent with the spirit of the ordinance. Mason responded that spirit of the ordinance in the preamble of the Zoning Ordinance is to preserve the character and attractiveness of the town, which is achieved by not creating additional traffic, visibility or density and therefore is sufficient.
        - Criteria 3: Substantial Justice
            - Loss to the individual is not outweighed by a gain to the general public. Mason argued that denial would result in a loss to the applicant without a corresponding tangible benefit to the public. Elaborated on the loss to the individual (applicant) if the application were to be denied including access to independent living, family services, and potential for young family to be priced out of Rindge if not allowed.
        - Criteria 4: Property Values
            - Mason questioned the validity of the realtor letter presented in May 2025 variance application where the topography will not affect existing neighbor's current view as proposed house will be 15-20' below line of sight. Noted that lack of view easement is issue, neighbors have no right to view. Applicant could block view without variance with plantings, etc.
        - Criteria 5: Unnecessary Hardship

DRAFT

- Means that owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area: where no fair and substantiation relationship exists between the general public purposes and that the use is a reasonable one.
    - Noted that lot at 32 McGregor Ln is only and largest one on the road with two existing pipe stems.
- Mason argued that purpose of the ordinance is already upheld (no new driveway, additional traffic, curb cuts), new lot would be extension of existing McGregor Lane.
- To requirement of reasonable use, Mason noted that use being applied for (creation of single-family home) is already permitted by ordinance.

▪ Mason added that alternative definition is available in Criteria 5 in which lot is not otherwise compliant with zoning regulations, not submitting argument.

- Carmichael asked Mason to expand on fair relationship existing and pointed to similar properties in which hardship and special conditions exist. Mason noted that special conditions does not equate to unique conditions and that McGregor Lane would still qualify under this definition as it has special conditions that distinguished it from other lots in town.
- Thermos asked if McGregor Ln was private or public. Mason noted that it is a private right of way that serves three houses and is private despite having an official street sign.
- Jeff Burns, 92 Hunt Hill Rd, read a statement on behalf of himself and Dee Burns, which was distributed to the Board, to applicant's Counsel (Mason), and to the Clerk to enter in the record. His objections to the five criteria statements provided by the applicant summarized below:
    - Criteria 1: Disagreed with applicant's claim that granting variance will not be contrary as it stands in contrast to values held by Rindge residents.
    - Criteria 2: Noted that the spirit of the ordinance would not be observed by allowing for the subdivision of the lot since it contrasts the public vote.
    - Criteria 3: In regards to substantial justice, Burns noted that the three options presented by the applicant in case of the variance being denied is heavily dramatized considering outside factors including existing living arrangements of the applicants, note to a potentially illegally pre-existing ADU
    - Criteria 4: Burns argued that there is substantial concern to surrounding property values as the applicant has repeatedly threatened removal of their view as abutters with the addition of trees or barns to obstruct the existing view. Burns argued that the view is not their main concern, it is based on the construction of an unlawful home in their backyard that will decrease their existing home value. He adds that there is nothing unique about the property and stated that the original developer created the lot as such to better enjoy nature and not for future construction as argued by the applicant.
    - Criteria 5ai: The applicant is continuously making a case for hardship where none exists.
- Jim Critser, Main Street, asked Carmichael clarification on whether or not McGregor Lane is a public or private road. It was reaffirmed that McGregor Lane is a private right of way more akin to a shared driveway. Critser noted that the topic of making McGregor Lane a town road was

DRAFT

never entertained. He noted that making McGregor Lane a town road could provide the necessary frontage.

- Carmichael asked Mason to confirm that the applicant was issued a variance to build a home, which was confirmed.
- Breckenridge asked Burns to provide any relevant information from a real estate agent to support his claims that property values would be diminished with the building of a new home. Burns shared the letter, prepared by Marc Tieger, to Breckenridge who read it aloud to the public in attendance.
    - Thermos asked the Burns if the realtor's letter was based on a planned drawing or a proposal of where the house would be placed, and if they walked the property to spec where the house was to be built. Burns conceded that they led the realtor to a generalized area where the home would likely be placed but they did not have physical site visit to the exact presumed home location. Burns argued that the presumed area could still count as a reference.
- Breckenridge asked Burns and Naresky if amicable resolution of the issue has reached a nontenable resolution. Burns stated that it has. Naresky declined to confirm.
    - Burns noted that he and Dee had made efforts to amicably resolve situation to purchase a view easement, buffer zone, or right of first refusal. At first the proposal was considered, then was denied by the Naresky family. There was no legal representation involved in this process.
    - Naresky noted Burns' offers were not taken into consideration because she was unsure of how it would affect her daughter's chances of receiving a variance.
- Stenersen addressed the realtor letter decreasing property values is a nonpoint because a similar structure in the surrounding location on the property would not diminish property values based on the location. Any other structure or planting would potentially similarly impact surrounding home values under that argument.
    - Stenersen and Carmichael discussed potential alternative solutions and debated the granting of the variance and if it would decrease surrounding property values.
- Thermos asked if conditional approval was granted from the Planning Board for this subdivision, which Mason agreed to.
- Stenersen argued when the original variance was given, he believes it was for two lots.
- Mason responded to points presented in Tieger's letter which Tieger noted that the view of the mountain and the landscape from Burns' property forms a part of the value of the property but is not an amenity that the Burns are entitled to. Mason noted that while Naresky's improvement of the view is a benefit to the property owners, but one created by his client and not owned by the Burns.
    - Breckenridge asked about NH view taxes and if it is still in effect and would constitute partial ownership. Mason noted that view taxes are largely nonexistent and are instead combined with the property and building values. Carmichael noted that if taxes and valuation are connected to a view, would taking away the view therefore decrease the value.

DRAFT

        - Mason asked, by Carmichael's logic, would it be necessary to first plant trees or build a barn to take away the view and decrease the surrounding values first then be granted a variance.
- David Drouin, Conservation Comm, acknowledged the potential effect on the abutting property supported by the Burns, but questioned what the potential impact of the other abutters who did not present or show up at the meeting. Carmichael acknowledged that no other abutters submitted testimony or attended the meetings in any capacity in support or opposition.
    - Breckenridge asked Burns to confirm that his testimony was submitted on behalf of himself and his wife
- Jim Critser, Main Streeet, noted that the topic of making McGregor Lane a town road was never entertained. He noted that by making McGregor Ln a town road, it would achieve necessary frontage.
- Mason argued to Burns' point of being the only abutters being impacted by the plan put forth as there are three other abutters who share the driveway who did not come with any testimony in opposition.
    - Burns argued again that there is an additional ADU on Naresky's property that creates additional traffic. Carmichael addressed Burns and stated that it is not the ZBA's jurisdiction to address it's existence.
- Stenersen asked Critser to elaborate on his earlier point regarding creating McGregor Ln as a public road to solve the lack of frontage present. After elaborating, Mason acknowledged that alternative solutions may be present, but that is not a condition of the variance to have no other solutions.
- Carmichael noted that the lack of frontage overall on the lot and questioned if the proposed lots would have any frontage at all. Mason clarified that the two 50' pipestems of frontage are located on Hunt Hill Road, each lot would have 50' of frontage while access would come from McGregor Lane.
- Dee Burns, 92 Hunt Hill Road, noted that the presence of alternative options for home locations would give alternative places for a home locations that would not impact their view or their home value. She noted that a home proposed in a different location would be much more palatable to her and her husband.
    - Jeff Burns noted that given the conditional approval of the Planning Board
- Breckenridge moved to enter Deliberative Session, seconded by Thermos. Board voted 5-0, motion passed and the Board moved to Deliberative Session.

Deliberative Session

- At the beginning of deliberative session, Thermos asked Mason to clarify whether the subject property was located on Hunt Hill Road or McGregor Lane. Mason explained that the frontage is on Hunt Hill Road, while shared access and the likely USPS address would be on McGregor Lane. Thermos then questioned whether the variance was required in light of the Planning Board's conditional approval. Carmichael noted that the Planning Board's approval was conditioned upon ZBA approval of the frontage variance. Breckenridge, Carmichael, and Thermos discussed the interpretation of the ordinance and application.
- Breckenridge read the five criteria for the Board to review and discuss.

DRAFT

- During review of the five criteria, Stenersen repeatedly referenced the Preamble to the Zoning Ordinance to explain his interpretation of the purpose and intent of the ordinance and how he believed those purposes applied to each of the variance criteria.
    - Criteria 1: Public Interest
        - Carmichael was not persuaded that substantial frontage discrepancy does not meet the criteria for Public Interest. Stenersen asked for Carmichael to elaborate that granting the variance would threaten health, safety or welfare; which he did not believe would be threatened with the creation of this variance. Stenersen continued that he believes that the town instituted the frontage requirement to lessen lot congestion with proximity to each other along a street, which this proposal would not create given size and location of the lot.
        - Kulla noted that purpose of the ZBA is to judge when a deviation from the ordinance would be allowable and just, not if it conforms to the ordinance.
        - Breckenridge noted struggle in defining a town maintained road
        - Stenersen moved that on Criteria 1 that the variance would not be contrary to public interest because granting the variance would not change the character of the neighborhood or threaten public health safety or welfare. Seconded by Kulla.
            - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting.
    - Criteria 2: Spirit of the Ordinance
        - Carmichael noted that the proposed lots have only 50' of the required 250' requested by the voters for the Rindge Zoning Ordinance. Stenersen argued that the question asks if the reduction in frontage would threaten health safety or welfare or not. Breckenridge noted that she is unsure of the location of the property on a public vs private road and therefore unsure of the voter's intent in ruling on a private road or right of way.
        - Stenersen moved that granting the variance would be consistent with the Rindge Zoning Ordinance because reducing the required frontage from 250' to 50' for the backlot would not change the character of the neighborhood or threaten public health, safety, or welfare. Seconded by Kulla.
            - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting.
    - Criteria 3: Substantial Justice
        - Carmichael reminded the Board that the interests of the Rindge community are what the voters indicated which is 250' of frontage and 2 acres per lot. Stenersen countered asking how denying the variance would counter the substantial variance. Stenersen noted that the loss to the public would outweighed by the loss to the landowner.
        - Stenersen moved that Criteria 3 it requires a balancing test and the loss to the landowner in not being able to divide 40 acres does not outweigh the benefit to the general public. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because the loss to the landowner of being able to subdivide their property would not be outweighed by a benefit to the benefit to the general public. Seconded by Kulla.
            - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting.
    - Criteria 4: Surrounding Property Values
        - Breckenridge noted that it has been the Board's experience to use the testimony of a realtor as expert testimony and referenced Tieger's letter. Stenersen reminded Breckenridge that the criteria asks whether or not granting

DRAFT

the variance would decrease surrounding property values, not if building a home would decrease the value. Breckenridge read from the realtor letter which referenced the construction of a home on a proposed area. Thermos noted that the realtor is referencing a general proposed location, not an exact location. Carmichael counters that the realtor is referencing the proposed location based on the plans presented, though he was unsure if the realtor was referencing the most current plan.

- Stenersen agreed that any building whether a home or other building/planting (the location) would diminish the value of the view for abutters, but it does not have relevance in relation to the variance (the use) diminishing the value. Carmichael agreed that the application is for the variance not the location.

- Stenersen moved that granting the variance would not diminish surrounding property values, seconded by Kulla.
  - Board voted 3-2 in favor.

- Criteria 5: Unnecessary Hardship
  - Carmichael did not believe that applicant sufficiently proved relationship between frontage requirements and unnecessary hardships. He noted that the size of the lot should not matter when debating this.
  - Kulla noted that the hardship is that there is not enough frontage but they are compliant for a lot in all other areas. Carmichael noted that the landowner has full use of the property because they already have a home on the property.
    - Stenersen noted the presence of the frontage through the two existing pipestems which creates special conditions.
  - Kulla moved that there is special conditions on the property that distinguish it from others, seconded by Stenersen.
    - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting.
- Criteria 5a: Special Conditions
- Criteria 5b: No fair and substantial relationship exists
  - Stenersen moved that the criterion was satisfied. Seconded by Kulla.
    - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting.
- Criteria 5c: Proposed use is reasonable
  - Stenersen moved that the use is reasonable due to the size of the lot and its location off the road because it would preserve the values and charm of the town and would not adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of the town. Seconded by Kulla.
    - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting.

- Approval or Denial of Variance for Case #2026-13
  - Stenersen moved to approve/deny the variance in case #2026-13 to permit subdivision of the subject parcel into two lots, each with less than the minimum frontage of 250' required in this district for the property located at 32 McGregor Lane, Tax Map 6, Lot 50-9, owned by Kimberly Naresky as it met all five criteria. Seconded by Kulla.
    - Board voted 4-1 in favor, with Carmichael dissenting. Variance approved.
      - Carmichael noted to applicant and representative that all parties have 30-day window to appeal decision.
- Carmichael moved to exit deliberative session, seconded by Breckenridge.
  - Board voted 5-0 in favor, returned to Public Session.

DRAFT

Approval of Minutes: September 22, 2026

- Carmichael moved to accept the minutes of September 22, seconded by Breckenridge.
    - Board voted 5-0 in favor.

Other Business

- Website updates – J. Critser in relation to update to the Rules of Procedure and Web
    - Jim Critser presented on recent updates to the ZBA web page and proposed edits to the "About" section of the ZBA page to better inform the public as the purpose and function of the Board and the process for the public to apply for information. Board reviewed edits and suggested approved language to be uploaded, as noted below:
        - Revised "About" Description:
            - *The Zoning Board of Adjustment hears and acts upon appeals for relief in granting a variance, special exceptions, equitable waivers, and administrative decisions under the Zoning Ordinance.*
              The community of Rindge, NH has enacted a Zoning Ordinance to preserve the character of the Town and allow for orderly growth.
              The Zoning Board of Adjustment hears and acts upon appeals for granting a variance, special exceptions, equitable waivers, and administrative decisions under the Zoning Ordinance.
              Those Citizens seeking appeal for relief should review the Rules of Procedure document elsewhere on this web page before seeking appeal by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
        - Carmichael moved to accept the changes as presented with the additional suggestion from David Drouin to add "relief" to the edited paragraph, seconded by Kulla.
            - Board voted 5-0 in favor. ZBA clerk will update website
- Application for Rehearing – ZBA Case 2026-12
    - Carmichael moved to rehear the case for the reasons presented in the letter submitted by the lawyer, seconded by Breckenridge.
        - Board voted 3-2 in favor. Case 2026-12 will be reheard.

Adjournment

- Carmichael moved to adjourn, seconded by Breckenridge.
    - Board voted 5-0 in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:50pm

Respectfully submitted, Amanda Nardini

DRAFT

Attachment 1: Letter from Tieger Realty, May 2026

TIEGER REALTY COMPANY, INC.
25 TURNPIKE ROAD, JAFFREY, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03452 TEL: 603/532-8765 FAX: 603/532-4519
Email: info@tiegerrealty.com www.tiegerrealty.com

May 26, 2026

Town of Rindge ZBA
Attn: George Carmichael
Hand Delivered

Dear George,

I have been asked by Jeff and Dee Burns of 92 Hunt Hill Road to comment on the request for a variance by Kim Naresky, to Article V, Section B of the Rindge Zoning Ordinance, specifically the question of diminution of value of surrounding properties. I have been to the Burns property and observed the presumed placement of a new dwelling. I understand that the applicant owns 42 acres, +/-, part of which is within the view of Mr. & Mrs. Burns house. Dee asked me that if a house were placed there, would their property value be diminished? My answer is an unequivocal yes it would. As one looks out from the rear yard of the Burns house, what is seen are trees, a meadow and, of course, Mt. Monadnock. That view would be seriously affected, and the value of Mr. & Mrs. Burns house would certainly be lessened.

Most of us have lived in New Hampshire for some time. We are aware of how fortunate we are to have "Our Mountain". We have co-existed with our neighbors by being good neighbors. This is an example of how, with a little consideration, our relationships within the community would be upheld.

I write as a Realtor in the Rindge-Jaffrey area for 50+ years.

Very truly yours,

Marc P. Tieger, President
Tieger Realty Co., Inc.

MPT/pg

PERSONALIZED REAL ESTATE SERVICE

Attachment 2: Slide Deck, Shaheen & Gordon Presentation (individual slides available on request)



Attachment 3: Jeff & Dee Burns Testimonial Letter (3 pages, italicized)
October 27th, 2026

To: The Rindge Zoning Board of Adjustment and to Whom it may concern:

Good evening, this is the testimony of Jeff and Dee Burns, of 92 Hunt Hill Rd., abutter to Kim Naresky, pertaining to the granting of a variance from Article V, Section B, of the Rindge Zoning Ordinance on Tax Map 6 Lot 50-9.

I have read the application and the addendum submitted by the applicant, and I would like to make a few statements about the replies given to the criteria questions.

Question One asks If the variance is contrary to the Public interest. The applicant claims it does not, "in any way". I disagree, per the zoning ordinance the purpose is to promote the health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants, and preserve the values and charm now attached to the town. The fact that a road frontage requirement exists and has increased in length, is evidence that this is a value to our residents.

Question Two pertains to the spirit of the ordinance being observed. The applicant provides their own definition of the objective served by a frontage requirement as "generally, frontage minimums exist to provide lot access and utility connection routes, to ensure safe sight distances for traffic entering the right of way from private driveways, and for emergency service access." While those aspects are indeed relevant, specifically, the basic objective of this ordinance is 250' of road frontage. The logical explanation for why it has increased over the years is the town wants to preserve its essential character and not become a place where backlot acreage is divided up for housing. The applicant later says, "the variance does not affect the basic objective of a frontage requirement at all". I say it does indeed affect the spirit.

Question Three deals with whether substantial justice would be done if the variance were granted. The applicant decides to answer this by proposing what would happen if it was denied. I quote, "the loss to the applicant is that she will have 41 mostly empty acres, and must either share her single-family with her adult daughter's family; or force her daughter into a much smaller accessory dwelling unit; or live further, potentially much further, from her family." I would like to say a few things about this statement. First, the use of "must", as if only 3 courses of action are available. I'd like to introduce a fourth, she could put an addition on the existing home, sharing a home with your 33yr old single daughter is something countless people do. Secondly, quote "living further, potentially much further, from her family", as though failure to receive a variance will rip the family apart. The daughter and her boyfriend currently live less than 5 miles down Rt. 202 in an apartment owned by her boyfriend's parents. But it is the third option which I find most peculiar. The applicant could, I quote, "force her daughter into a much smaller accessory dwelling unit," end quote. Force, really. But, the really ironic part is the daughter would be forced to live with her brother and his girlfriend because they are presently living in the existing accessory dwelling unit over the garage on the applicant's property. In case you are now just learning of the existence of an accessory dwelling unit on the applicant's property, that is because the

DRAFT

applicant and her family have done an excellent job, over the last decade plus, of concealing it from the town. Primarily, to avoid inspection, building codes and taxation. The applicant then continues her answer to question 3 by stating, quote, "but for the frontage limit, the applicant could have subdivided as proposed by right, and construction would be well under way already," end quote. But for the frontage limit, anyone with 4 plus acres of land in Rindge could capriciously subdivide their property into 2 acre plots and sell them, like they were having a literal yard sale. The next part of this answer, pertaining to substantial justice, deals with the general public and how abutters are not the general public but rather, specific individuals.

I just want to point out that the general public is made up of many specific individuals, each and every one abutters to others in the community. The applicant then proceeds to, under the pretense of "by right", list off a litany of intimidating and mean spirited examples of the things they can do to block their neighbor's view, including barns, garages and planting rows of trees. Immediately following this bully aggressiveness, the applicant concludes their answer to this question, by stating, quote, "we thus have concrete and substantial harm to the applicant balanced against a public who would be as or more impacted by uses that are already allowed by right on the property." This type of threatening logic is the exact opposite of what the town of Rindge, with all its values, charms, and sense of community represents.

Question Four asks whether the value of neighboring properties is diminished by granting this variance. From reading the applicants response to this question, it is obvious that they have missed the point of our concerns. So instead of listing all of the cruel, malicious, and mean spirited examples, like a view blocking barn or rows of trees, that they could use to "remove the view", rightfully; as justification for why we are not relevant in a question pertaining to the diminishment of value of surrounding properties. I will proceed to, as clearly as possible, reiterate our concern about the creation of this subdivision. It stems from the fact that it is a 13 acre plot located directly in our backyard. And, if created, the options and potential for diminishment of value are unlimited. The view per se is just one example. There are multiple potential building sites available and countless other variables which would dramatically and negatively transform the nature of our property. Then add to this the direct threats made multiple times of just selling the new lot to a third party and the very vindictive intimidation with respect to "removing our view". This is why we are concerned. Basically speaking, if approved, anything could happen- none of it for the better. So enough with "the view". We are defending against unlawful, unjustified and unnecessary use of land encroaching into the lives of people who have consistently demonstrated a love of nature, a deep respect for Rindge, and wonderful stewardship of their land. Against an individual who has been doing the exact opposite to her property at every opportunity.

Question Five part one pertains to what is unique about the property. In response the applicant says, quote, "the property is a large back lot formed by subdivision that created a number of home lots along Hunt Hill Rd., leaving it with minimal frontage along the road." My take on this is that the developer created the maximum number of home lots, with respect to the 13 year old road frontage ordinance, i,e, he removed all the valuable parts and left the rest for a future backwoods home site, if special permission were to be granted, and then did absolutely nothing else with the land, but sell it.

DRAFT

Eleven years later, via special variance, a single family home was built in the woods. Back to the applicant's response, they continue with the backlot is, quote, "several times the size of any lot it abuts along Hunt Hill Rd., and largely under built by comparison to those lots." My response to this is, several times less valuable according to the taxes paid per acre compared to every other house it abuts. As to the "largely underbuilt", it is actually one of the more overbuilt lots it abuts, with its 2 story home with sunroom, 2 story detached garage with an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and massive view, that includes the entire Monadnock region and extends to the mountains of Vermont. Plus the value derived from having 30 plus acres of land clear cut, by a firewood dealer in 2025. The applicant also delves into speculation as to the meaning of the so called "pipe stems". Theorizing their existence proves future intent to develop. They rationalize that if the easterly stem was not there the lots would be slightly larger and therefore more valuable. Now I present what I believe to be equally plausible, if not more plausible, since it actually happened this way. The 2 so called "pipe stems" were created for the owner of the back lot to lawfully hike onto the property and enjoy nature. Further, each stem created an intersection with Hunt Hill Rd. that allowed the four abutting properties to attach their driveways, which all 4 properties utilized. And, as to the eastern stem and the supposedly less profitable decision to reduce each lot by 10 percent, It is a fact that both of the properties bordering the eastern stem have very wet and swampy land bordering Hunt Hill Rd.. I propose that the developer created a more profitable lot by creating the stem and selling the lots with the option to use the stem for part of their driveway and not having to bridge the wetland themselves. This is exactly what happened. The intention of the western stem may have been to someday put a driveway, like the one that exists today, but even that did not happen for 11 years. So, really, there is nothing unique about the land.

Question Five part a., i., . The applicant continues to apply their own limited "generally" definition of the frontage variance, completely disregarding the minimum length of 250' and proceed to again, make a case as to how there is no relationship between having frontage and not having it.

Question Five part c., Is the proposed use a reasonable one. They state "uses allowed by right are per se reasonable and construction of a single family home on a freestanding lot is allowed by right." To this I say, the lot is 41 acres and there has been a single family home there for 41 years.

In conclusion: We have been directly witnessing the efforts of the applicant to strip every piece of value out of this parcel of land for the last 2 years, including a massive clear-cut of 30+ acres and now this attempt to subdivide. This, when added to the blatant disregard she has for the community of Rindge, with respect to deception. And the fact that the applicant has full use of the land, leads me to impel the board to deny said variance.

Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight and God bless.

Respectfully,

Jeff Burns and Dee Burns on October 27, 2026

DRAFT