



Answering Mr. Pieper, Mr. Heuser says these are preliminary sketches he drew up when contemplating how to design the subdivision.

Referring to Exhibit A-1, Mr. Heuser says it is a two lot subdivision fronting on Church Street, and shows the new lot, 18,523 sq. ft. can be constructed to conform to the R 100 zone. It also shows the house lot, which is the corner of Charm Court and Church Street, with minor variances. Instead of 100 ft. frontage, it would have 99.18 and instead of 100 ft. width it would have 97. Basically it shows a conforming lot off of Church Street and minor variances for the house lot.

Mr. Heuser says there is no sewer on Church Street. Mr. Heuser says they did meet with the Board's professionals back in the fall on this subdivision.

Referring to Sketch "D" Mr. Heuser says it shows two lots fronting on Charm Court, instead of Church Street. The existing house is placed 72 ft. from Church Street with a 10 ft. side yard, leaving them with frontage on the new lot of 79.66 ft.

Mr. Heuser says the property is Block 61, Lot 16, on the southeast corner of Charm Court and Church Street. It contains 37,497 sq. ft. The frontage on Church Street is 199 ft. and Charm Court frontage is 189.69 ft. There is a one story dwelling on the lot, No. 214 Charm Court. Approximately half the property is wooded, and water and sewer utilities are on Charm Court. There is no sanitary sewer located on Church Street. The rear of Lot 16 abuts the woods that belong to Calvary Baptist Church. The other dwellings on Charm Court are from a subdivision dating back to 1970 called Colonial Park. The elevation and topography of the lot goes from a high elevation on the northeast corner of Church Street to the lower elevation on Charm Court is a 10 ft. drop. In the top right hand corner of the map, which is the corner of Church Street and this property, and the church, and the topography drops.

Mr. Heuser says they propose to subdivide Lot 16 to create one building lot and to retain the existing dwelling on the other lot. The R 100 zone requires lot area of 10,000 sq. ft. One proposed lot will have an area of over 15,000 sq. ft., the other will have a lot area of over 21,000 sq. ft. The question is where will the new lot front, either Church Street or Charm Court. During the review with the Board's professionals, Sketch "D" was the favorable one. Looking at Sketch "D" the two lots would front on Charm Court. Based on the existing house location, strike 10 ft. to have the new line. The Lot Width and Lot Frontage would each be 79.88 ft. where 100 ft. is required for each for a new lot.

Lot 16 has a frontage on Charm Court of almost 190 ft. To divide the frontage in half, both lots would have a frontage and width of 95 ft, only 5 ft. short. A hardship exists due to the location of the existing dwelling. A new dividing line would provide a minimum 10 ft. buffer side yard for the existing dwelling. Thus the two variances are created.

As reasons for favoring the new line on Charm Court rather than on Church Street, Mr. Heuser says access to the new lot off Charm Court, a cul de sac offers a safer traffic access rather than the busier Church Street access. There is no sanitary sewer on Church Street in front of Lot 16 or near vicinity. A sewer line for the new house would have to go thru the existing house lot to connect to the sewer line on Charm Court. Further, the topography on Church Street drops 5 ft. in a very short distance, creating a sight distance problem for a new driveway if it was constructed on Church Street. If the new lot fronts on Church Street, approximately 5,000 sq. ft. of woods would have to be removed.

Mr. Leckstein asks the distance from the concrete walk to the proposed dividing line; can he squeeze out a little more property to make that lot a bit bigger. Mr. Heuser says there is another 4 or 5 ft. Mr. Heuser says he was trying to make a straight line. Mr. Abbonizio says you want to maintain the 10 ft. side yard setback to the original house. He says you would not meet your 100 ft. without encroaching on to the adjacent house. He prefers the way it is proposed, because you are allowing the setback to be met. Mr. Heuser says he could angle the frontage to gain a couple of feet. Mr. Leckstein says it is always better the corner lot be bigger.

Mr. Brady says there is a significant slope to the south. Is there any thought to drainage issue, especially going towards Lot 15. Mr. Heuser says he has created two swales on the side of the first house, and all drainage will go to the street of Charm Court. They are going to do very little grading in the area. Further, as he discussed with the engineer tonight, he was finally able to access the property and see the existing trees that are there, and based on the location of the trees, he is going to shorten up his limit of disturbance, making it smaller, to save more trees. Mr. Brady says he just wants to make sure they do not have a drainage issue on Lot 15, and come back to the town saying their lot is now wet. Mr. Heuser is in agreement, and he has discussed it with CME. The roof leaders and sump pump will be directed into the storm drain system.

Answering Mr. Shenton's question about removing the ditch, Mr. Heuser says the ditch is not going to be removed nor touched; it is actually in the back of Lot 15.

Answering Mr. Leckstein's inquiry about the storm drain connections, Mr. Heuser says the roof leaders will be directed to the street on Charm Court. Answering Mr. Vena's inquiry about going directly to a catch basin, Mr. Heuser says he does not believe there is a catch basin nor does he believe there is an under drain to Charm Court. Mr. Heuser says there is a catch basin on Charm Court, about 200 ft. or about 120 ft. from his lot. Showing it on his map, it is near Lot 14.

Answering Mr. Pieper's question about drainage and elevations, Mr. Heuser says it would drain down, going from elevation 98 on his property to the catch basin at 96-1/2.

Mr. Brady asks Mr. Dolan if there will be a basement in the proposed house; Mr. Dolan replies it will probably be a crawl space. The existing house has a crawl space.

Mr. Abbonizio says when Mr. Heuser revises his plan to include the limit of disturbance, he needs to identify the trees to be removed, as referred to in their review letter of January 30, 2015, Item 4.4.1. He says Mr. Heuser has submitted revised plans that have addressed the majority of their comments.

Mr. Abbonizio says architectural testimony was to be given tonight as to the proposed home to be built. Mr. Pieper says his client has not gotten to that point; Mr. Dolan says the house is proposed to be 1800 sq. ft. Mr. Pieper says plans will be submitted to the engineer. Mr. Pieper says Mr. Dolan's brother, Kevin Dolan, can elaborate as he has built in the area. Mr. Leckstein says the Board likes to see what is being proposed. It is more critical when two houses are going up to make sure they are not identical. Mr. Heuser says the proposed home will be two stories.

Answering Mr. Vena as to where the sewer will tie in in the rear, Mr. Heuser says it will tie in in the front.

Mr. Pieper says three waivers are requested, the Environmental Impact Statement, Traffic Impact Statement and showing features more than 50 years old and within 200 ft. of the boundary.

Mr. Awofolaju moves to grant approval with conditions, seconded by Mr. Vena.

Yes: Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Vena, Mr. Shenton

No: None

Abstain: None

Mr. Leckstein reminds Mr. Pieper to provide the elevation so that filing of deeds is not held up.

Meeting adjourned.

