



City of Keene Zoning Board of Adjustment

AGENDA

Monday, May 4, 2026

6:30 p.m.

City Hall, 2nd Fl Council Chambers

I. Roll Call:

II. Minutes of Previous Meeting: March 2, 2026

III. Hearings:

ZBA-2026-03: Petitioner, S., requests a , for property located at 1t., Tax Map # and is in the District. The Petitioner is requesting a to permit relief from per Article of the Zoning Regulations.

IV. Staff Updates:

OpenGov

V. New Business:

Findings of Fact

Office of Planning & Zoning Spring 2026 Conference, May 9, 2026.

VI. Adjournment:

Page intentionally left blank

**City of Keene
New Hampshire**

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, March 2, 2026

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Richard Clough, Chair
Edward Guyot, Vice Chair
Zach LeRoy
Adam Burke
Stephen Buckley, Alternate
Michael Zoll, Alternate

Staff Present:

Evan Clements, Planner, Zoning
Administrator

Members Not Present:

Tad Schrantz

I) Roll Call

Chair Clough called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and explained the procedures of the meeting. Roll call was conducted. Chair Clough asked Mr. Buckley to be a voting member for tonight’s meeting.

II) Minutes of Previous Meeting: September 15, 2025 & February 2, 2026

Mr. Guyot made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of September 15, 2025. Mr. LeRoy seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4 to 0. Mr. Buckley abstained, since he was not a member at the time of the meeting.

Mr. Buckley made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 2, 2026. Mr. Guyot seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

III) Hearings

A) ZBA-2026-02: Petitioner, Spencer & Ashley Noyes, 134 Arch St., requests a Variance, for property located at 134 Arch St., Tax Map # 237-036-000- 000 and is in the Rural District. The Petitioner is requesting a Variance to permit relief from the side setback of 50 ft for the installation of a 18’ x 36’ inground pool per Article 3.1.2 of the Zoning Regulations.

33 Chair Clough introduced ZBA-2026-02 and asked to hear from staff.
34

35 Evan Clements, Planner/Zoning Administrator, stated that the subject property is an existing
36 two-acre lot on the southern side of Arch St., approximately 900 feet east of the intersection with
37 Whitcomb’s Mill Rd. He continued that the property contains an existing single-family home of
38 about 2,600 square feet with an attached garage and associated site improvements. A detached
39 ADU is currently under construction on the part of the property closer to Arch St. with
40 associated site improvements including a driveway. The property is relatively flat, with the
41 White Brook located along the southwestern corner of the property.
42

43 Mr. Clements continued that directly to the rear of the property on an adjacent parcel is Langdon
44 Place, an assisted living facility. A right-of-way easement exists along the western edge of the
45 subject property, to the benefit of Langdon Place, and contains an access drive through the
46 subject property and connects Langdon Place to Arch St. The subject property has connected
47 their driveway for the single-family home to this access drive in order to reach Arch St. The
48 purpose of this application is to seek a Variance to allow for the construction of the 18’ by 36’
49 in-ground pool to be located entirely within the side yard setback. The proposed location of the
50 pool is within an existing fenced-in area located to the east of the residence. The residence is
51 oriented to face the access drive with the fenced-in area being in the “backyard.”
52

53 Mr. Clements continued that surrounding uses are the assisted living facility to the south, located
54 in the Rural District, with single-family residential to the east and west, and the Low Density
55 District located to the north on the other side of Arch St., also containing single-family
56 residential as a predominant use. Additional information provided in the Staff Report includes
57 the definitions for “building setback” and “side setback,” the Purpose Statement for the Rural
58 District, and the Dimensions and Siting table for the Rural District, including the 50-foot
59 frontage and setback requirements, as well as the minimum lot area and the width at building
60 line. Regarding the draft motion, at this time, staff is not recommending any conditions related to
61 this application.
62

63 Chair Clough asked if the Board had any questions for Mr. Clements. Hearing none, he asked to
64 hear from the Petitioner.
65

66 Spencer Noyes of 134 Arch St. stated that he and Ashley Noyes are looking to put in a pool in
67 their backyard, 16’ by 36’, in ground, with a privacy fence so that it is not visible to anyone.
68

69 Chair Clough asked Mr. Noyes to go through the five criteria.
70

71 *1. Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest.*
72

73 Mr. Noyes stated that the pool improves their lot, and he thinks the Board would agree that it
74 only improves the value of the surrounding properties. He continued that the pool is not visible
75 to anyone. It will be 15 to 20 feet off their property line still. If they lived across the street, this

76 would not be a problem. Their neighbors across the street, about two houses down, just put in an
77 in-ground pool. Because they live across the street, they did not have to deal with getting a
78 Variance.

79

80 2. *If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed.*

81

82 Mr. Noyes stated that aside from the setback deviation, the project is fully compliant and
83 otherwise fully consistent with the spirit of the Land Development Code (LDC).

84

85 3. *Granting the Variance would do substantial justice.*

86

87 Mr. Noyes stated that the loss he and his family would suffer in the use and enjoyment of their
88 property far exceeds any gain to the public.

89

90 4. *If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be
91 diminished.*

92

93 Mr. Noyes stated that their family pool is in a residential neighborhood and cannot possibly
94 diminish any surrounding property values, especially when it is not visible to anyone.

95

96 5. *Unnecessary Hardship*

97

98 *A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other
99 properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship
because*

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

103 *and*

104 *ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one.*

105

106 Mr. Noyes stated that it is probably tough to say that it is an unnecessary hardship for him and
107 his family to not be able to put in a pool, but they have four little girls, and his in-laws will be
108 living next door in the ADU that is currently being built, so they have this nice little family
109 compound they are trying to put together so they can enjoy the summers.

110

111 Mr. Buckley asked Mr. Noyes to explain the special conditions of the property as compared to
112 other properties nearby. He continued that he sees that the property has a rather substantial
113 vegetative screen from the rear, and it appears that there are other areas, not in the setback, where
114 the Noyes could put their pool. He asked Mr. Noyes to explain why he feels their property has a
115 special condition that dictates the pool be in this location within the setback.

116

117 Mr. Noyes replied that he thinks Mr. Buckley is referring to the vegetation on the southern line.
118 He continued that the right-of-way they have that goes up to Langdon Place is like the Noyes'

119 street. It should have a street name, because it is such a heavily traveled road. Their house faces
120 west, which faces that right-of-way. To his family, what the tax map calls their “backyard” is not
121 their rear lot line; it is the abutting lot line to their neighbors. To his family, the front of the house
122 faces the right-of-way, and the back of the house faces their neighbors’ property. It is not the rear
123 lot line. The way the house is built, with the sliding glass door on the rear of the house, means
124 that their fenced-in area on the rear of the house is not what the *tax map* calls the rear of the
125 property, but to his family it is the rear of the house and it is where they spend their time. As you
126 get closer to the river, and the vegetation, you are not getting the sunlight. In his opinion, it is the
127 right-of-way that makes the pool’s location seem like the correct place.

128
129 Mr. Buckley asked if it is correct that Mr. Noyes is saying that the way the house is oriented, and
130 the sliding glass door that one would normally use to exit from the rear of the house to a patio
131 and then perhaps to a pool, means that this is the special condition the Noyes have, and that is
132 due to how Langdon Place was oriented and how the Noyes’ house was built. Mr. Noyes replied
133 yes, that is correct.

134
135 Chair Clough stated that the southern end has the waterway. He asked if it is correct that
136 although the Board is seeing vegetation, there is actually wetland or a waterway that cuts across
137 the Noyes’ property. Mr. Noyes replied yes, it is a river. Chair Clough asked if it is accurate that
138 the Noyes could not put their pool in the southerly area because they would be in the waterway.
139 Mr. Noyes replied that they would be closer to the waterway, and the pool would be in a
140 floodplain. He continued that he does not know if there are regulations against having a pool too
141 close to a natural water source, but his family stays away from that side of the house due to fear
142 of their children falling in the river. There are no doors on that side of the house. The only time
143 he remembers that side of the house exists is when he has to mow it.

144
145 Mr. Buckley stated that on the handwritten drawing Mr. Noyes provided to the Board, it appears
146 that there is plenty of space to put a pool in the southern part, but the area is compromised either
147 by slope or wetlands. He asked if that would be a fair statement. Mr. Noyes replied yes.

148
149 Mr. Burke asked when the right-of-way was granted, relative to the Noyes’ property. Mr. Noyes
150 replied that his family bought the house in 2018. He continued that the right-of-way was put in
151 when Langdon Place was built, which he thinks was in the late 1990s. The house was built in
152 1988, and then the right-of-way was granted to Langdon Place whenever Langdon Place was
153 built. Thus, he and his family unfortunately inherited the right-of-way. Mr. Buckley asked if it is
154 correct that the Noyes did not grant the right-of-way to the Langdon Place developer. Mr. Noyes
155 replied no, they did not.

156
157 Chair Clough asked if the Board had further questions for the Petitioner. Hearing none, he asked
158 if any members of the public were opposed to the application. Hearing none, he asked if any
159 members of the public support the application. He continued that for the record; he sees five
160 members of the public who have their hands raised to indicate their support and he believes they

161 are related to the Applicant. Hearing no public comment, Chair Clough closed the public hearing
162 and asked the Board to deliberate.

163

164 *1. Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest.*

165 Mr. Buckley stated that he agrees that granting the Variance would not be contrary to public
166 interest. He continued that there is no inherent flaw or impact to the general purposes of the
167 Ordinance that would dictate that this is contrary to the public interest. Chair Clough stated that
168 he agrees.

169

170 *2. If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed.*

171

172 Mr. Guyot stated that he believes the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed, for the same
173 reasons as it meets the first criterion.

174

175 Mr. Buckley stated that the setbacks are designed to ensure that the density of the particular areas
176 are not compromised. He continued that he does not see how an in-ground pool could affect the
177 appearance of the density of the area, so it is hard to find that it would be anything other than
178 meeting the spirit of the Ordinance.

179

180 Chair Clough replied yes, especially since a fence is already there. He continued that there would
181 have to be a huge waterslide or something like that to make that unusual.

182

183 *3. Granting the Variance would do substantial justice.*

184

185 Mr. Buckley stated that this is a benefit and burden analysis the courts have suggested boards
186 use. He continued that if the burden on the applicant is greater than the benefit to the public,
187 consequently you find in favor of the applicant. In this instance, substantial justice would be
188 done to the applicant.

189

190 Chair Clough stated that he agrees.

191

192 *4. If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be*
193 *diminished.*

194

195 Chair Clough stated that he agrees with this criterion; it is straightforward.

196

197 Mr. Guyot stated that he agrees.

198

199 *5. Unnecessary Hardship*

200 *A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other*
201 *properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship*
202 *because*

203 *i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public*
204 *purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that*
205 *provision to the property.*

206 Chair Clough stated that the Board asked some questions to determine the placement of the
207 building, the alignment of the building, and the suitability of where a pool could be put. He
208 continued that to him, that goes into the special conditions. It speaks to why the pool would be
209 situated there.

210
211 Mr. Buckley stated that he would emphasize that the Harborside case dictates that the special
212 conditions can arise from the property itself, and that is really a function of how this house was
213 built in relation to the right-of-way and the fact that when you take into account that this is an in-
214 ground pool. He continued that it will not have any impact. Setbacks make sure you do not
215 impinge upon the density of the rural area. He thinks Mr. Noyes has demonstrated there are
216 special conditions that satisfy this prong of the hardship test.

217
218 *and*

219 *ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one.*

220
221 Chair Clough stated that the Board affirms that the use is reasonable.

222
223 Mr. LeRoy made a motion for the Zoning Board of Adjustment to approve ZBA-2026-02 to
224 allow for the construction of an 18' by 36' in-ground pool to be located entirely within the side
225 yard setback on property located at 134 Arch St., Tax Map #237-036-000-000 as shown in the
226 application and supporting materials received on February 6, 2026, with no conditions.

227
228 Mr. Buckley stated that he has a clarifying question. He asked if it is correct that the pool would
229 be built within an existing, fenced-in enclosure. In response to an off-camera, inaudible reply,
230 Mr. Buckley replied that he heard that it is already there.

231
232 Mr. Buckley seconded the motion.

233
234 *1. Granting the Variance would not be contrary to the public interest.*

235
236 Met with a vote of 5-0.

237
238 *2. If the Variance were granted, the spirit of the Ordinance would be observed.*

239
240 Met with a vote of 5-0.

241
242 *3. Granting the Variance would do substantial justice.*

243
244 Met with a vote of 5-0.

245

246 4. *If the Variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be*
247 *diminished.*

248
249 Met with a vote of 5-0.

250
251 5. *Unnecessary Hardship*

252 A. *Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other*
253 *properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship*
254 *because*

255 i. *No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public*
256 *purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision*
257 *to the property.*

258
259 Met with a vote of 5-0.

260
261 *and*

262 ii. *The proposed use is a reasonable one.*

263
264 Met with a vote of 5-0.

265
266 The motion to approve ZBA-2026-02 passed by unanimous vote.

267
268 Chair Clough stated that last month, the Board discussed whether they would make a motion
269 about their findings of fact for something like this. He continued that that has not been set in
270 stone. He asked if the Board wants to do it this time, or if they feel they have covered the bases
271 enough. Mr. Buckley replied that there had been discussion about seeking guidance from the
272 City Attorney. Mr. Clements replied that that conversation is still ongoing. He continued that it is
273 up to the Board whether they want to really solidify the findings of fact, which could not hurt.

274
275 Mr. Buckley made a motion that the Zoning Board of Adjustment find as a fact that there are
276 special conditions that affect this property, given the orientation of the house in relation to
277 Langdon Place, and the probability that building the pool in the southern part of the property
278 would be compromised either by slope or wetlands, and that the proposed location and the
279 configuration of the house demonstrate that there is sufficient hardship to justify granting the
280 Variance. Mr. Burke seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

281
282 **IV) Staff Updates**

283
284 Mr. Clements stated that he has no new business, but he apologizes for not having gotten a
285 definitive answer from the City Attorney about the findings of fact issue. He continued that they
286 would keep working on it, and as soon as they have something, he will bring it to the Board.

287
288 **V) New Business**

289 Chair Clough asked if anyone had any new business.

290

291 **VI) Adjournment**

292

293 There being no further business, Chair Clough adjourned the meeting at 6:56 PM.

294 Respectfully submitted by,

295 Britta Reida, Minute Taker

296

297 Reviewed and edited by,

298 Corinne Chaisson, Board Clerk

Page intentionally left blank

STAFF REPORT




Fig 2: Aerial of 0 Grove St outlined in yellow with surrounding zoning districts

Surrounding Uses:

North: Multifamily residential

South: Two-family residential

East: Two-family & single family residential

West: Two-family residential

Application Analysis: The following is a review of the relevant sections of the Zoning Ordinance and how they impact the subject property:

1.3.3 Setbacks & Build-To Dimensions:

Building Setback. The required minimum or maximum distance all buildings or structure must be located from a lot line, which is unoccupied and unobstructed by any portion of a building or structure, unless expressly permitted by this LDC.

Rear Setback. The required minimum or maximum distance that all buildings or structures must be located from the rear lot line, unless expressly permitted by this LDC.

STAFF REPORT

Side Setback. The required minimum or maximum distance that all buildings or structures must be located from the side lot line, unless expressly permitted by this LDC. A side setback may be measured perpendicular to the interior side setback or to the corner side lot line.

- In residential zoning districts, the corner side lot line shall be measured from the property line adjacent to the street, and shall be 10-ft greater than the minimum side setback required in the zoning district.

Structure Setback Exceptions:

- One detached utility accessory building of less than 125-sf (e.g. garden shed)

3.2.1 Residential Preservation Purpose:

The Residential Preservation (RP) District is intended to return this area of the City to neighborhoods composed predominantly of moderately dense single-family residential development. This district serves as an additional downtown zoning district that promotes pedestrianscale development, walkability, bikeability, and urban green space where possible. All uses in this district shall have city water and sewer service.

3.2.2 Residential Preservation Dimensions & Siting:

Front Setback: 15 ft

Rear Setback: 20 ft

Side Setback: 10 ft

Table 17-2: Dimensional Requirements for Cottage Court Developments:

Setbacks from existing roads external to the development may be less than the underlying zoning district in order to match an established building line along the road.

Suggested Conditions and Draft Motion:

Approve ZBA-26-3 to permit the encroachment of 5 ft into the 20 ft rear yard setback per section 3.2.2 of the zoning regulations as shown on the plan titled "Setback Variance" prepared by SVE Associates at a scale of 1"=10' dated March 31, 2026 and in the application and supporting materials received on March 31, 2026 with no conditions.

0 GROVE ST.
ZBA-26-3



Petitioner requests to permit encroachment of five feet into the rear setback per Article 3.2.2 of the Zoning Regulations.



Notice of Public Hearing

A meeting of the Keene Zoning Board of Adjustment will be held on **Monday, March 2, 2026, at 6:30 PM** in the 2nd Floor Council Chambers of City Hall, 3 Washington St, Keene, NH 03431 to conduct a hearing on the following petition.

ZBA-2026-3 Petitioner, Matthew Keenan of Monadnock Habitat for Humanity, requests a Variance, for property located at 0 Grove St., Tax Map # 585-057-000-000 and is in the Residential Preservation District. The Petitioner is requesting a Variance to permit encroachment of five feet into the rear setback per Article 3.2.2 of the Zoning Regulations.

Why am I receiving this notice?

You are receiving notice of this hearing as an abutter to, or owner of, property within 200-ft of the subject parcel. Please be advised that this may be the only notice you will receive, and the nature of the proposal may change in scope.

Where can I find the application materials?

Materials for this application are available for public review in the Community Development Department on the 4th floor of City Hall between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:30 pm. The agenda packet is typically posted on the Zoning Board of Adjustment webpage (keenenh.gov/zoning-board-adjustment) one week before the meeting.

How can I provide my feedback?

Written comments in the form of a letter can be mailed to or dropped off in the City of Keene Community Development Department on the 4th Floor of City Hall. Letters can also be emailed to communitydevelopment@keenenh.gov or dropped off in person and will be accepted up until 3:00 pm on the day of the meeting.

Can I attend the meeting?

Yes, you have the right to attend the meeting and provide your feedback on the proposal. If you are unable to attend in person, you can view a livestream of the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting on the City of Keene website and YouTube channel, barring any technical difficulties.

How can I follow along with this project?

You are encouraged to review any future agendas for updates on the status of this and other applications on the Board webpage. All decisions made by the Zoning Board of Adjustment are posted under the "Actions" section of their webpage the next business day. If you have any questions, please contact the Community Development Department at (603) 352-5440.

Zoning Board of Adjustment Variance Application



For Office Use Only:	
Case No.	ZBA-26-3
Date Filled	3/31/2026
Rec'd By	CJC
Page	1 of 10
Rev'd by	CJC

If you have questions on how to complete this form, please call (603) 352-5440 or email communitydevelopment@keene-nh.gov

SECTION 1: CONTACT INFORMATION

I hereby certify that I am the owner, applicant, or the authorized agent of the owner of the property upon which this appeal is sought and that all information provided by me is true under penalty of law. If applicant or authorized agent, a signed notification from the property owner is required.

OWNER / APPLICANT

NAME/COMPANY: Monadnock Habitat for Humanity Inc

MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 21, Keene, NH 03431

PHONE: (603) 933-1344

EMAIL: keenan.matt1@gmail.com

SIGNATURE: *Matthew Keenan*

PRINTED NAME: Matthew Keenan

APPLICANT (if different than Owner/Applicant)

NAME/COMPANY: Matthew Keenan /Monadnock Habitat for Humanity Inc

MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 21, Keene, NH 03431

PHONE: (603) 933-1344

EMAIL: keenan.matt1@gmail.com

SIGNATURE: *Matthew Keenan*

PRINTED NAME: Matthew Keenan

AUTHORIZED AGENT (if different than Owner/Applicant)

NAME/COMPANY: Liza Sargent/SVE Associates

MAILING ADDRESS: 439 West River Road, Brattleboro, VT 05302

PHONE: (802) 257-0561

EMAIL: lsargent@sveassoc.com

SIGNATURE:

PRINTED NAME: Liza Sargent

SECTION 2: PROPERTY INFORMATION

Property Address: 0 Grove Street, Keene NH 03431

Tax Map Parcel Number: 585-057-000

Zoning District: Residential Preservation

Lot Dimensions: Front: 54 Rear: 56 Side: 70 Side: 55

Lot Area: Acres: 0.11 Square Feet: 4959

% of Lot Covered by Structures (buildings, garages, pools, decks, etc): Existing: 0% Proposed: 32%

% of Impervious Coverage (structures plus driveways and/or parking areas, etc): Existing: 95% Proposed: 60%

Present Use: paved parking lot

Proposed Use: Residential Duplex

SECTION 3: WRITTEN NARRATIVE

Article 26.5.4.A.: Describe the property location, owner of the subject property, and explain the purpose and effect of, and justification for, the proposed variance.

The existing parcel at 0 Grove Street is a vacant paved parcel historically used as over flow parking by former businesses. The parcel is in the Residential Preservation zone, and abuts both the Downtown Transition and Downtown Growth zones. The 0.11 acre parcel is owned by Monadnock Habitat for Humanity, an organization that helps limited-income families own housing. With the completion of this project, two limited-income families will have the opportunity to purchase a safe living space in the City of Keene. This request is for variance of Land Development Code 3.2.2 for minimum setbacks required from the property line.

The space required for the footprint this duplex encroaches the rear 20' setback. The proposed duplex was configured to maintain the average building lines along Grove and Water Streets, as well as the 10' side setback. The encroachment into the rear 20' setback varies from 0' to 5'.

SECTION 4: APPLICATION CRITERIA

A Variance is requested from Article (s) 3.2.2 of the Zoning Regulations to permit

Minimum setback distance required at the Rear of the lot.

Briefly describe your responses to each criteria, using additional sheets if necessary

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

Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because it would make the lot more conforming for the zone. Instead of being a parking lot, it would be a residence in the Residential Preservation zone. It would also decrease the overall amount of impervious surface area from 95% impervious to 60% impervious.

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 because granting the variance would create a safe residence for two families within the City of Keene. The vision of the Monadnock Habitat for Humanity is "A world where everyone has a decent place to live", and their quest has created a safe living space for families for over 17 families to make the City of Keene and the Monadnock area their chosen homes.

Per the Land Development Code, the Residential Preservation district promotes moderately dense residences to return this area of the city into neighborhoods, that promote walk/bike-ability. The spirit of the ordinance would be observed by removing the parking lot and replacing it with a duplex.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Granting the variance would do substantial justice because the parcel in question at the corner of Water and Grove Street is only 0.11 acres. Such small lot makes it difficult to construct a proposed residence. Granting the variance would make the footprint of the duplex both aesthetically and functionally pleasing both to the residents and the neighborhood.

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 properties would not be diminished because there would be a new residence instead of a vacant paved parking lot. The new residence would add green space which would be an asset to the neighborhood, helping with stormwater runoff, and reducing radiant heat in the summer.

5. Unnecessary Hardship

A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in 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:

Owing to the special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because, the very small corner lot is limited in size, conforming to the rear setback would greatly minimize the size of an aesthetically pleasing home. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provisions and the specific application of that provision to the property because of the lots size, and current amount of impervious surface.

and

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The proposed use is a reasonable one because it would reduce the amount of impervious surface area on the lot, and provide a duplex in the Residential Preservation district.

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


Because of the parcels very small size (0.11 acres), the property cannot reasonably be used in strict conformance with the ordinance, because a residence could not fit within the average building lines on Grove Street and Water Street, the 10' side setback and the 20' rear setback, and still have enough square footage to function as a residence.

NOTICE LIST

This template can be used to record the name, mailing address, street address, and tax map parcel (TMP) # for each party that is required to be noticed as part of an application.

OWNER NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	STREET ADDRESS (if different from mailing address)	TAX MAP PARCEL (TMP) #
Wendi L Hulstander	20 Viro Street, Keene, NH 03431	4 Cross Street 134 Water St. 88-90 Water St	100-100-000 100-023-000 100-024-000
Cityside Housing Associates LP	63 Community Way, Keene, NH 03431	92 Water Street	585-025-000
Members of Board for Hundred for	POB 21, Keene, NH 03431	0 Water Street	585-026-000
Hundred Nights Foundation Inc	122 Water Street, Keene, NH 03431	122 Water Street	585-027-000
B&D Holding Inc	110-100-000 100-023-000 100-024-000	131 Water Street	585-030-000
Pemi Properties NH LLC	110 Farm Road, New Ipswich, NH 03071	113 Water Street	585-031-000
Kevin H Provost	8 Grove Street, Keene, NH 03431	8 Grove Street	585-032-000
Trustees of Church of Christ	24 Church Street, Keene, NH 03431	14-16 Grove Street	585-033-000
Lawrence R Gilmet Jr	123 North Lincoln Street, Keene, NH 03431	18 Grove Street	585-034-000
Roberts S Crowell	24 Grove Street, Keene, NH 03431	24 Grove Street	585-035-000
Lisa Kimpf & David Broughton	29 Grove Street, Keene, NH 03431	29 Grove Street	585-052-000
1925 Grove Street LLC	295 Beaver Pond, Ferrisville, NH 03490	25-26-27 Grove St. 25 Grove St. 19 Grove St	585-054-000 100-024-000 100-025-000
210 Holdings LLC	PO Box 164, Marlow, NH 03456	13 Grove Street	585-056-000
Hilary Soldati & Laci Vidensky	PO Box 1852, Merced Bay, CA 93743	91 Water Street	585-058-000
Elm City Properties LLC	18 North Shore Road, Spofford, NH 03462	87 Water Street	585-059-000
Greenwald 2 LLC	PO Box 361, Keene, NH 03431	81 Water Street	585-060-000
Melrose & Dawn Property Management	10 Willow Street, Keene, NH 03431	10 Willow Street	585-063-000
Trustees of the Keene Public Library	134 Davis Street, Keene, NH 03431	16 Willow Street	585-064-000
Bill Hotz/Bensonwood	6 Starkyard Crossing, Walpole, NH 03608		architect
Liza Szegent/SVI, Associates	435 West River Rd, Brattleboro, VT 05307		engineer
David Mann	40 Gull Hill, Chesterfield, NH 03441		land surveyor

Drawing name: P:\Project\NH-PROJECTS\K2813 Habitat\Grove Street\Design\K2813 Site.dwg Feb 16, 2026 - 1:48pm



SYMBOL LEGEND

LINE TYPES

- PROPERTY LINE: ————
- AVERAGE BUILDING LINE: ······
- PROPOSED BUILDING: ————
- PROPOSED BUILDING OVERHANG: - - - -

ZONING DISTRICT

- RESIDENTIAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT: [Light Blue Box]
- DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT: [Light Grey Box]

SVE © 2026

Engineering
 Planning
 Landscape Architecture
 Surveying


SVE Associates
 439 West River Road
 Brattleboro, VT 05302
 T 802.257.0561
 www.sveassoc.com

NO.	REVISION	DATE	DWN	CHK


AVERAGE BUILDING LINE

MONADNOCK HABITAT FOR HUMANITY DUPLEX
 0 GROVE STREET
 KEENE, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03431

MONADNOCK HABITAT FOR HUMANITY



GRAPHIC SCALE: 1" = 80'




PROJ. #: K2813

DATE: 15 - JAN - 26

DESIGN: LPS
 DRAWN: AJG
 CHECKED: LPS

SHEET
B




LINE TYPES		SYMBOL LEGEND	
EXISTING MAJOR CONTOUR		300	
EXISTING MINOR CONTOUR			
PROPERTY LINE			
ADULTER LINE			
PROPERTY LINE SETBACK			
WATER MAIN			
ELECTRIC POWER LINE			
SEWER			
UTILITY			
SEWER LINE			
POINTS		MISCELLANEOUS	
IRON PIPEROOD		REBAR	
DRILL HOLE		PAVEMENT	
OPEN SPICE		CONCRETE	
SEWER MANHOLE			
DRAINAGE MANHOLE			
CATCH BASIN			
WATER VALVE			
CLUB STOP			
LIVE HYDRANT			
UTILITY POLE			
CONCRETE DRIVE			
IRON			
SH-UB			

NO. REVISION DATE, DOWN, CHK.

SVE
 Engineering
 Planning
 Landscape Architecture
 Surveying
 SVE Associates
 P.O. Box 1818
 439 West River Road
 Brattleboro, VT 05302
 T 802.257.0561
 www.sverassoc.com

SETBACK VARIANCE
 MONADNOCK HABITAT FOR HUMANITY DUPLEX
 8 GROVE STREET
 KEENE, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03431
 MONADNOCK HABITAT FOR HUMANITY



- NOTES:**
1. TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY CONDUCTED JANUARY 19, 2024 BY SVE ASSOCIATES PERFORMED USING A TRIMBLE S6 ROBUST INSTRUMENT. TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY COMPLETED WITH SIGNIFICANT SNOW COVER.
 2. PLAN USES NAD83 NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE PLAN COORDINATE SYSTEM AND NAVORS ELEVATIONS BASED ON PLAN BY HUNTLEY SURVEY'S DESIGN OF TEMPLE NEW HAMPSHIRE ENTITLED "EXISTING CONDITION PLAN LAND OF GREEN DIAMOND GROUP, LLC, PLAN CATED 001712091, HUNTLEY SURVEY A DESIGN PROJECT NUMBER 1-21-010 AND NGS PICM202020 LIS05 SURVEY DISK SET IN CONCRETE POST.
 3. PLAN REFERENCES PROPERTY LINES FROM RECORDED PLAN ENTITLED "RIGHT OF WAY AND ADJACENT LOT SUBDIVISION PREPARED FOR CITY OF KEENE AND MONADNOCK HABITAT FOR HUMANITY, INC. LOCATED AT 0 GROVE STREET IN THE CITY OF KEENE BY DAVID A. MANN SURVEY OF 80 GOLF ROAD CHESTERFIELD, NH, AND RECORDED IN THE CHESTERFIELD RECORDS UNDER PLAN NUMBER P25157 ON DECEMBER 16, 2023.
 4. ADJUTING PARCELS PROPERTY LINES ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE SOURCED FROM CITY OF KEENE 2023 SITE.

PROJ.#
K013
DATE:
31-MAR-26
DESIGN: LPS
DRAWN: AJG
CHECKED: LPS
EXHIBIT
A