



PHILIP C. PIRES

Please Reply To Bridgeport
Writer's Direct Dial: (203) 337-4122
E-Mail: ppires@cohenandwolf.com

August 31, 2020

VIA E-MAIL (ZBA@westportct.gov)

Westport Zoning Board of Appeals
Planning & Zoning Department, Room 203
110 Myrtle Avenue
Westport, CT 06880
Attn: Mary Young

Re: Variance Application (ZBA-20-00305) of 233 LLC for 233 Hillspoint Road

Dear Ms. Young:

We are responding the staff comments of Cindy Tyminski dated August 26, 2020. We are also submitting substitute evaluations (A2.20 and A2.00). As more fully described below, the only changes in these elevations are the addition of measurements to confirm heights.

1) Height

- a. As previously articulated, the Applicant is requesting modifications to its existing variance approval. Therefore, a height variance for the cupola is not required.
- b. The proposed dwelling is not taller than what the ZBA previously approved. The dimension from the average grade to the top of the ridge was not shown on the 8/14/20 set of plans. For clarity, we have submitted substitute elevations (A2.20 and A2.00) showing this dimension, confirming that the height of the dwelling has not changed from the ZBA approval.
- c. The parapet was not dimensioned on the drawings previously submitted. It will have an elevation of 3 feet, as clarified on the substituted elevations (A2.20 and A2.00).
- d. The height of the mechanicals on the roof is now indicated on the substitute elevation A.220.

2) Location of Mechanicals

- a. At the hearing on July 14, 2020, the ZBA indicated its preference against the mechanicals being mounted on a platform on the side of the house. The Applicant considered putting the mechanicals under the house, however, there are multiple issues that make it difficult or undesirable. In order to ensure enough airflow for the HVAC, there would need to be a very large, unsightly vent on the side of the building. In addition, putting the AC units and the heat pump in an enclosed space under the dwelling, directly under the kitchen, would likely create

Page 2

a sound issue for the kitchen, and possibly, the neighbor. As a result, the roof was a better location for the mechanicals.

3) Extension of Roofline

- a. When we reduced the amount of glass in the façade design, the end of the roofline on the rear elevation appeared misaligned with the windows and the new layout of the façade. This was not as evident when the rear façade was nearly all glass. The extension of the roofline removes this apparent misaligned condition from your eye, resulting in a cleaner, more attractive visual roofline.

4) Fence

- a. The Applicant has now provided photographs and renderings that are illustrative of the two fences proposed in the Landscaping Plan.

Very truly yours,



Philip C. Pires

cc: Attorney Peter Gelderman, via e-mail (pgelderman@berchemmoses.com)