



Site Visit Report of November 1, 2014 read into the record.

Mr. Keller thought that as the Board had some questions about the Architecture he suggested that Ms. Napurano, Architect be sworn in to give testimony.

Ms. Napurano, was sworn. She gave a brief description of what is presently there and what is proposed. The approach we took was to put all the living space on the first floor level. The original concept was to expand the kitchen and dining room into a family room. We were trying to get a new powder room, laundry room in the basement. What we found was that it was pushing the addition too far into the yard which made a much bigger variance as well as being costly. Part of what we are doing is trying to do is to improve the flow between the first floor and the basement. We redid the design again (Ref. to sheet 2). with a compromise that they would take the family room into the basement which would allow us to utilize space in the basement which is now being used for storage, etc. We now have created a free working kitchen. Off of the kitchen is a small hallway that creates a flow where the powder room is not off the kitchen. In the hallway there is also a pantry closet. Although the kitchen looks spacious it really doesn't have a lot of closet storage because of all the appliances. The mudroom and the laundry room has a small sink/counter and are standard. The powder room is designed to meet accessibility standards and, if need be, down the line there is room for a shower. We made the stairs an ample size so there was plenty of space to get downstairs. One other thing we did do is move the door that went out the side of the house to provide more privacy from the patio. Now you would come in through the back or front of the house. There will be general renovations to the house such as replacing doors/windows. We have made improvement to the exterior. We have changed the siding, trim and put in new garage doors. The major improvement is to the back of the house (Sheet B7). There are other homes on that street that are either expanded capes or ranches but not turned in to two story homes. We are trying to keep that diversity and still compliment the that other houses on the street.

Mr. Vivona noted that a lot of trees had been lost during the hurricane and he thought there was only one big tree in the back yard.

Mr. Foley said there were three large oaks and a beech which they are going to keep.

Mr. Vivona asked if they were bringing all the equipment around the back from the bedroom side of the house (side with drainage). He noted caution would be need where the drainage is concerned. He also pointed out that a little patio area in the back corner was still in question - if it were taken out could they put it back in. He felt it would not affect anyone and he did not think the applicant would have to come back to this board on that matter.

Mr. Vivona felt it was good to have the older homes left intact in town. The thought the compromise of your design to fit in and get what you want out of it; the street side with the wrought iron was a plus; as far as the rest of the design left him with no questions.

He asked if any of the other members had question of this witness. None Heard.

Mr. Keller presented a photo board dated 9/8/2014 showing how the property sits (Exhibit A14) in comparison to the neighboring properties. From the street, adjacent properties or from the high school property the addition will not be seen. The variance is for maximum building coverage as we conform to all the setback requirements. In terms of impervious coverage we are actually almost 1200 sf less than what is allowed by code. The variance relief that we are seeking is for maximum building coverage based upon the formula you have for this size property. We are permitted 2600.5 sf. The existing house is already over by 176 sf. which not uncommon in a ranch style home. What we are proposing brings the total to 3053 sf. This would be seen as a C2 variance and a C3 variance where the purpose of the land use is advanced and the benefits outweigh the detriments. The applicants felt it was important to keep the house in character with the neighborhood. It is a type of house people can age into. A lot of their changes also make this house handicap accessible allowing them to age in the house and not have to move to an aging residence. It preserves a type of housing. It also is a desirable visual environment. Regarding the negative we have demonstrated that the project will know substantial detriment to the public good or the zoning ordinance. We see no detriment. We have done substantial improvements to the façade in the back. We see no negative impacts.

Mr. Vivona questioned the sliding doors under the deck. What would you be walking out to?

Ms. Napurano, said nothing had been planned.

Mr. Keller said because it was under the deck you would not get grass to grow so gravel has been considered. It will be easy to maintain. It will not be a patio that people would occupy. If the clients choose to put something in there they would still be under the allowable coverage.

Mr. Vivona did not recall a walkway around the existing doors.

Mr. Keller thought there was presently a path.

Mr. Vivona asked if there were any further question/comments from the Board.

Mr. Ruschke, asked if you consider the basement a story?

Mr. Keller said he thought that they were still 3 ft. higher on the left side than the right side you probably under.

Mr. Ruschke thought that given the amount of the impervious and building coverage proposed they may want a waiver on this. We consider it minor regarding size but I know he referenced dry wells/storm water. In this case I would suggest we waive that. He has touched on the other issues such as drainage.

Mr. Vivona asked for further concerns/questions. None heard from either Board or Public.

Mrs. Kenny made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Nelson.

Roll Call: Mr. Style, Mrs. Roamano, Mr. Weston, Mrs. Kenny, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Vivona  
All in favor.

Mr. Shaw advised that the Resolution of Approval would be prepared for the December meeting.

**Mr. & Mrs. Dalpe**

27 Falmouth Road  
Block: 89 Lot: 10

**Calendar BOA 14-89-10**

Mr. Sincox, Planner/Architect

Mr. Vivona advised the applicant that for this evening all that was needed was a general outline of the project and that a site visit would be set up for December 6<sup>th</sup> at 9 am. On the meeting of December 18<sup>th</sup> you can give a more detailed description of what is proposed.

Mr. Vivona swore in all concerned with this application.

Mr. Sincox said the applicants wished to add a second floor addition to their ranch style home. In order to modernize this house and provide more modern space for modern living we would need to go up. Currently it is a 3 bedroom ranch which was built in the 50's. The rooms are all small. The variance we have to address are created by the existing house (existing/non-conforming). The non-conformity will be expanded by the second story.

Mr. Shaw asked that the exhibit be marked as A8 – photo board.

Mr. Sincox says it shows the existing house. Some of the adjacent homes have been expanded. The lot sizes vary in depth/width. This is just to take a look at the size of the lots and the buildings on the lots.

You can see the existing footprint. We will be adding a garage. Currently there is a small one car garage which when done will be an adequate two car garage. The little patio area in the back will become living space. We are over on the front yard setback as well. To create the second floor it will affect this setback. One side yard is 15 ft. and the other 12 ft. We also have a rear yard setback as the existing is a little less than 45 ft. We will be building out from the existing wall which is less than a foot over on that setback. The upstairs will have 5 bedrooms. The livable structure is about 3500 sf.. The existing footprint is about 1600 sf. so with the expansion we will be bit over. We are still under the impervious conditions. We meet the height requirements. It is really the existing setback creates the problem as well as the coverage. It is consistent in this transitional neighborhood.

Mr. Vivona asked Mr. Ruschke re: roof space, if anything had to be done with their drainage.

Mr. Ruschke said if was probably minor but he would recommend verification of the height.

Mrs. Kenny – the variance is anything that is proposed is existing except for the windows in the back.

Mr. Sincox said that was correct.

Mrs. Kenny asked how wide the garages were. Is it possible to make them a little narrower?

Mr. Sincox did not think so. They are each about 11 ft. wide to allow for a bigger vehicle.

As there were no other questions, Mr. Vivona said they would be at the Dalphe's on the sixth of December, 9 am. The matter will carry to the December 18<sup>th</sup> meeting without further notice.

**Mr. & Mrs. Fuller**

768 Shunpike Road

Block 144 Lot 20

**Calendar BOA 14-144-20**

Peter Dorne, Architect

Mr. Vivona explained the process for this meeting and set up a site visit for December 6<sup>th</sup> at 9:30

Peter Dorne said that this property was 32 ac. There are two buildings and we are proposing to link them together. (Inaudible – papers/plans overriding testimony)

Mr. Vivona asked if the towers were gone

Mrs. Kenny asked what the variance were.

Mr. Dorne said they were at the pool house. One is a height variance. There is a variance needed for an additional building to the property (expansion of stable)

Mrs. Kenny asked if that was coverage of an accessory building.

Mr. Dorne said it was – 924 sf. for both.

Mr. Shaw asked if the sewer connection hooked up in the main building. There is no new sewer connection.

Mr. Dorne said there was not.

As there were no more questions/comments Mr. & Mrs. Fuller were advised that they would have their site visit on December 6<sup>th</sup> – 9:30 am. The application will continue on the December 18<sup>th</sup> with no further legal notice required.

**Myra D. Cole**

25 Cedar Lane,

Block: 56 Lot: 3.

**Calendar BOA 14-56-3**

Site Visit Report of Nov. 8, 2014 read into record by Mr. Vivona.

Ms. Cole reviewed previous testimony noting that the addition was being added so that her mother would have a sense of privacy. A bathroom that would accommodate an older person was also proposed as part of this application. The house is on a small property (6000 sf.). Because of its size it is very challenging in adding more space. What is proposed will improve the neighborhood. It will fit in well.

Mr. Toneatti said we have in the existing home a small bathroom. The section on the back is for a proposed bathroom with an additional area for her to sit. It is presently his office but will be moved up to the second floor above. We would move the master bedroom to that corner of the house which gives us a more reasonable area. We will be adding a needed walk-in closet. On the main floor – the tiny kitchen and dining area will be made a bit larger allowing for a dining room table. The deck will be across the back. Stairs will be on the side. (noted that application should reflect this change) Their Mom's room will have a door so she can walk out to the deck. There will be sliding doors from the dining room to the deck. All the siding will be matched color wise.

On the property there is a shed in the back which may require a variance.

Mrs. Cole said that she had a letter from one of the neighbors stating that she had no objection to the changes outline above nor leaving the shed on your property where it is now.

Mr. Vivona, getting back to the steps, when you apply for your building permit you has to make sure that it is drawn correctly.

Mr. Shaw said it would be a conditional of approval for the submission of revised plans so that the building inspector can see where the changes are.

Mr. Ruschke said it's a deck.. It is a hardship because of the size of the property.

Mr. Shaw noted he would have to prepare a resolution and know what the numbers are.

Mr. Toneatti said his preference would be on the rear of the deck so it doesn't encroach the side property.

Deck measurement/step placement discussed.

Mr. Vivona said that the Board understood and if need be we could have a condition of approval. Things are not changing in the at the ridge line in the front. You are changing the roof line in the rear because of drainage problems. You will also put your solar panels up. It is not a two family (no kitchen).

Mr. Vivona said he had no further questions. The deck steps were the main issue as you would be basically transferring the variance from one side to the other side. There are still the same setbacks on both sides of the house. He asked if there were any questions from the Board/Public. None Heard.

Mr. Vivona asked for a motion.

Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the application with the stipulation for the change in the variance for the steps and proper calculations, seconded by Mr. Weston

Roll Call: Mr. Style, Mrs. Roamano, Mr. Weston, Mrs. Kenny, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Vivona  
All in favor.

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted:

Mary Ann Fasano  
Transcribing Secretary

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted  
Mary Ann Fasano

Transcribing Secretary

