

Minutes Meeting of March 22, 2006- Sullivan, Provost, Wiesner, Bee/Suslowicz

Members Present: Stuart Schulman, Alison Manugian, Jay Prager, Chase Duffy, Mark Mulligan

The Chairman convened the Sullivan hearing by reading the Legal Notice.

The applicant presented a plan showing what is planned, noting a proposal to demolish the main house and keep the tack room, garage and barn that is currently attached to the main house. He said that the front area will be a paddock and noted that they are moving the driveway to the right of the existing house so there are better site lines.

The Chairman said that there is plenty of acreage so the only issue is having a second dwelling on the lot temporarily.

Mrs. Sullivan noted that one bay of the garage is currently used for hay storage.

Mr. Sullivan said that when the house is demolished the breezeway will likely go.

The Board moved to grant the applicant a special permit to allow a temporary second dwelling such that they can remain in the existing house during the construction of a new dwelling for a period of two years and the existing dwelling will be removed with six months of issuance of the occupancy permit.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The Chairman convened the Provost hearing by reading the Legal Notice.

The applicant was present, noting that they want to enclose their deck to make a three season porch so his disabled father can keep some of his belongings there and be out of the way. He noted that there is a 10 foot wide strip that is a public way, but is actually a vertical drop along Boat House Way. He noted that he put a guard rail there for safety purposes.

Discussion ensued regarding what the ramifications of adding two three seasons rooms would be.

Mr. Provost said that he has a holding tank. He noted that the only way to access the porch is from the outside and noted that to add a new interior egress would entail cutting a major beam. He said that he set up the hill during construction so that his father could access easily and submitted plans that showed a major storm water management system to keep water from running into the lake.

Discussion ensued regarding how the porch enclosure may affect the runoff.

Mr. Provost said that it should not affect the runoff system.

Of note: the roof pitch of porch will mimic what is there.

The Board moved to grant a variance from setback to allow the enclosure and conversion of the upper and lower decks into three season rooms abutting the right of way, and as shown on the plan, with the following conditions:

No closets shall ever be added by any owner. No additional bedrooms shall ever be added by any owner. No additional plumbing shall be added by any owner. No new interior access to either deck/room shall be added by any owner. The only access to the upper deck shall be from the exterior as it currently exists on the deck on the water side and as shown on the plan, for perpetuity. The existing interior deck access shall remain unchanged on the lower deck/room and the only new exterior access shall be located on the water side as shown on the plan, for perpetuity. All Conservation Commission conditions shall be complied with.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The Chairman convened the Wiesner hearing by reading the Legal Notice.

The applicant was present, noting that the house was built in 1945 and that they originally wanted to save the garage. She said that she hired a timber framer (post and beam) and now the height is increasing. She stressed that it will be used just storage and that she wants to keep the older trees. She said that it is a nice protected area by the river and noted that she will need to go to the Con. Comm. but is not altering the vegetation.

Margaret Sheehan, resident across the street, noted that the structure is directly in front of her house. She said that she is objecting to the fact that they want to raise it, noting that it is an isolated structure that doesn't look like it belongs to her property. She also said that it is not currently being used as a garage.

Ms. Wiesner said that when she moved in there was a trailer by the garage and the owner of the trailer took a backhoe and pushed dirt and trash up against the garage. She said that she had to hire someone to take away three tons of trash. She said that the property was totally denuded and that she had to do a major clean up. She suggested that it now seems isolated because a lot more work needs to be done. She said that she wants to put in a garden bed and add other trees with the permission of the Con. Comm., as well as parking her truck there. She stressed that she doesn't want to enlarge the driveway and noted that she has only been there for two years and hasn't had time to incorporate the garage into use yet. She said that she wants to fix it up and make it apart of the whole property, parking the truck on the outside. She said that because of the post and beam construction, a large central beam is required which means that the height is increasing.

Discussion ensued regarding how to renovate and move versus rebuilding the entire structure in a

slightly different location. Of note: If the garage is razed then a variance would be required, as well as a special permit because of the height.

Mr. Prager asked whether she would consider a different construction technique so that the garage wouldn't be so tall.

The Board suggested a site walk and a continuation to 4/12/06 at 8:30 pm.

The site walk is scheduled for 9 AM on 4/1/06.

The Chairman convened the Suslowicz/Bee hearing by reading the Legal Notice.

Mr. Visniewski, engineer for applicant, said that the property is on Whiley Road and showed a picture of the property as it is today. He said that there is very steep topography, and Duck Pond is around it. He noted that the property was bought by Barney Suslowicz in 1947 and he just passed away a few months ago. He said that the property has an existing septic system and well and a very steep driveway and a large parking area where the well and septic system are located. He said that they want to build a 26 x 36 foot, relatively modest structure with no garage, and a new septic system for a two bedroom home. He noted that he is re-grading the driveway because it is so steep so that it meets the 10% grade requirement. He noted that he has a Con. Comm. Order of Conditions and a BOH Title V septic system, stressing that he has met all the necessary criteria. He said that a variance is needed from things that he has no control over, ie the size of the 30,000 square foot lot, the 175 feet of frontage and the 150 foot diameter circle. (He said that he has 89 feet for the diameter). He stressed that he has control over the Con. Comm. and BOH issues and they have approved this plan.

Mrs. Manugian asked whether there are any wetlands on the property.

Mr. Visniewski said that pond and wetlands are on the abutting property, noting that this lot is very much high and dry. He said that he got a variance from the Con. Comm. for 77 feet from an isolated wetland because they felt this plan would not affect the pond or wetlands.

Discussion ensued regarding how big a 150' circle variance is actually required.

Mr. Visniewski described the topography, noting that there is an immediate 10 foot drop from Whiley Road that is more than 10% drop (which will be corrected with new plan). He stressed that because of topography, this is the best place for the dwelling and noted that he made the septic farthest away from the pond with the least disturbance.

Kanti Mann, abutter, presented a handout, noting that the first picture is what one sees from her house. She said that it is the same distance from their house to the cottage and the cottage to the Anderson house. She expressed concern about a 10 foot higher dwelling, noting that she understands that there will be a replacement.

Mr. Visniewski said that it will be a one story house with a second story within the attic space, like a gambrel.

The Chairman said that he wants to know what type of house will be built. He said that a 26 x 36 house is a modest house compared to the two houses on either side, noting that this is consistent with neighborhood and is not a huge house. He said that they are not asking for a variance from house type, noting that the footprint is restricted.

Ms. Visniewski said that a relative wants the lot and isn't totally sure what type of house will be built.

The Board requested more details and a plan.

Discussion ensued regarding how to require plan specifics.

Mrs. Manugian wanted to know how tall the house would look.

Mr. Visniewski said that the grade on the right side of the house is at basement level, noting that the left side has a walk in basement from behind. He said that the drop would be no more than 7'6", the standard distance between floor joists.

Mr. Prager asked what the Manns were complaining about specifically if the house is fitting into the existing footprint and height. He said that the applicant is not talking about a full two story building, but a Cape style house without a garage.

Mr. Anderson said that he looks up at the cottage and is visualizing that the walk out basement is at current grade with the first floor above that. He stressed that he doesn't want a towering inferno.

Discussion ensued regarding how to handle design issues.

Ms. Mann said that the house is on a postage stamp lot between two larger lots/houses.

Mr. Prager said that he thinks the proposed dwelling is to scale with the abutters but felt it would be helpful to see a plan.

The hearing was continued to 4/12/06 at 8:45 pm.

A site walk was scheduled at 4/1/06 @ 10 am.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.