

To: Members, Zoning Board of Appeals
From: Cindy Tyminski, AICP
Date: August 31, 2020
Re: Variance #ZBA 20-0305.
233 Hillspoint Road. Supplemental Staff Report #2.

The applicant submitted two revised elevations today (8/31/2020), one day prior to their scheduled hearing. Staff has not had time to fully review these elevations and did not have a paper copy so was unable to scale the drawings. Staff makes the following observations:

1. The applicant states that on the plans last revised 8/14/2020, the distance to the ridge of the highest roof was not denoted from the average finish grade, but from a level below this grade (the driveway). The applicant should note that the dark line baseline on all elevations should indicate the average existing grade and not some arbitrary level below grade. The existing grade (on this property) is the baseline from which height is measured.
2. The applicant has not requested a height variance and the applicant states that this is not a new application but a modification of a previous application, so they do not need a height variance.
3. All variance applications in Westport are approved with a specific set of architectural and site plans, if the application chooses to alter the plans then they must return to the ZBA with a new application. They have requested with this application all the variances that were received on the plans approved by the ZBA.
4. The elevator shaft does not meet the height regulations.
5. The elevator shaft is higher on the current revision than on the approved plan and does not meet the height exemption regulations.
6. If the elevator shaft is a cupola, as the applicant suggests, then it cannot *extend more than 5 feet above the ridge of the roof or top of flat roof on which it is located*.
7. The applicant has stated they reduced the parapet from 3.5 feet to 3 feet; staff is not able to scale this.
8. The applicant has submitted photographs of the two proposed fences that surround the property; one a metal rod pole system across the waterside and a solid wooden fence around the remainder of the property.
9. The applicant explained that there are noise and venting issues with placing the mechanicals under the house and continues their request to have them on the roof. The applicant states that the mechanical height on the new plans meet the height requirement. If this location for the mechanicals is approved, then the height from existing grade to the roof deck is required and specifications of the mechanicals should be provided