Perillie, Michelle

From: Perillie, Michelle
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 11:58 AM
To: don bergmann
Cc: Peter Gelderman; Zoning Board of Appeals
Subject: RE: Variance Appl. 3 20-00305 233 Hillspoint Rd.

Hi Don,
I discussed your e-mail with Chairman Jim Ezzes and we agree that there will not be further requests to the applicant for building plans/documents as there is sufficient information in the files at this time for the Board to make a decision.
Thanks,

Michelle Perillie, AICP/CFM
Planner
203-341-1076

WESTPORT
CONNECTICUT

From: don bergmann <donlbergmann@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 10:46 AM
To: Zoning Board of Appeals <ZBA@westportct.gov>
Cc: Perillie, Michelle <mperillie@westportct.gov>
Subject: Variance Appl. 3 20-00305 233 Hillspoint Rd.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Town of Westport's email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Zoning Board of Appeals and P&Z Staff

In trying to determine all of the changes proposed by the Applicant from the structure and site plans approved by the ZBA and the P&Z Commission, there appear to be no drawings comparable to the "north", "south' and "east" drawings that show how the structure would have looked from those three directions had the house been built as approved.. All that appears in the file for the latest version are architectural drawings as to certain floors. In reading the Applicant's comments as to what is now being proposed, it appears that the application seeks to make further changes from those that are evident in the one photograph of the uncompleted, existing structure.

I believe it crucial that an artist type drawings of the now proposed house be prepared and placed in the file immediately. The drawings should show the north, south, east and west sides of the now desired structure. Only then can all understand what the now proposed final structure will look like. Those drawings should also note the siding, the roof and other aesthetic materials that would be used if the ZBA were to approve the Application for a variance now pending.

Also, it was my sense from the July 14th Public Hearing that the Applicant may be making further changes, i.e. changes to reflect comments of the ZBA to the present, "new" design. If that occurs, drawings as requested above should then be provided as part of that submission. Without all such clear visual drawings, no one other than an architect can understand what the final proposed structure will look like.

Finally, all of these changes from the original approvals, namely those already made, those proposed to be made and those that might still be proposed, suggest that the Applicant should combine all of its efforts, drawings and submissions in one inclusive application for a variance for what it would like the ZBA to act upon. The present approach is, to me, wrong, likely to generate confusion, likely to omit items or cause important items not to be evident. It would be much cleaner and probably more in compliance with the Law, Regulations and the Administrative obligations of the ZBA if the Applicant began again with one, new variance application. Without that, the public and probably the ZBA will not be absolutely certain of what is occurring. In addition, absent that approach, one new application, I will speculate that the ZBA will simply vote to deny the pending application on September 4th since all is too confusing. While some may like such an outcome, it actually may be unfair to the Applicant. I ask the ZBA, P&Z Staff and Town Counsel to consider my thinking.

This matter deserves a complete "do over". Thank you.

Don Bergmann 32 Sherwood Dr. Westport CT 203 226 8712